HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, March 14, 1990*

The House met at 2 p.m.

The Reverend Neil Gilmour, Grace Presbyterian Church, Ocala, FL, offered the following prayer:

David Livingston was a tough, intelligent, and inquisitive Scot. He is famous for his pioneering of medical missions. On one occasion an English friend wrote to him and said:

We would like to send other men to you. Have you found a good road into your area yet?

Livingston replied with these words:

I only want men who are strong and courageous and who will only come if there is no road at all.

May I suggest that that should be the thrust of our prayer today for our great Nation?

Let us pray.

God bless America. God bless America with pioneers, with pioneers who, with courage, will build new roads of personal integrity, who with wisdom will harness ethnic energies, who with passion will restore pride and peace to our cities, and towns and villages. In Christ's 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 1, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. RHODES 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.

WELCOMING REV. NEIL GILMOUR

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to tell the House that I am delighted to have my pastor, Neil Gilmour, give the prayer today.

Neil was born and raised in County Antrim in Ireland; unique individual, one of eight children, the oldest child. He put himself through Trinity College in Dublin, and then he went on to the Westminster Academy in Philadelphia.

What is unique about this individual, my colleagues, is he has decided to become a U.S. citizen on March 30, and he has taken all the classes. He is prepared to do it, and here we have St. Patrick's Day on March 17, and it is appropriate that we have an Irish-American come to this great House to give the prayer.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will welcome with me my pastor, Neil Gilmour.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 23]

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Atkins
AuCoin
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Bonior
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Broomfield
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Bruce
Bryant
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clarke
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Condit
Conte
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Courter
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crockett
Dannemeyer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Douglas
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frenzel
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Grant
Gray
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hiler
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Laughlin
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken, Thomas
Lukens, Donald
Machtley
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nielson
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Petri
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Saiki
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (VT)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whittaker
Whitten
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

□ 1425

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 400 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that we are about to take the official photograph of the House. Members are requested to take seats, except that those seats marked with a red stripe will be outside the range of the camera.

Members will face the camera, something I know they are not accustomed to doing. There will be about 11 flashes of the strobe lights, and the process will require about 15 minutes.

Five minutes after the conclusion of the photograph, the House will resume its sitting.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will now stand in recess.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1442

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84, the Chair appoints on the part of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF DELEGATION TO ATTEND INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE ON GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today appointing the following delegation of the House to attend the International Parliamentary Conference on the Global Environment sponsored by the U.S. Senate, to be held here in the District of Columbia on April 29 through May 2, 1990:

Mr. DINGELL of Michigan;
Mr. FASCELL of Florida;
Mr. JONES of North Carolina;
Mr. ROE of New Jersey;
Mr. SCHEUER of New York;
Mr. GREEN of New York;
Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois;
Mr. BROWN of Colorado;
Ms. SCHNEIDER of Rhode Island;

As alternate delegates on the majority side:

Mr. BROWN of California;
Mr. DOWNEY of New York; and
Mr. MILLER of California.

And as alternate delegates on the minority side:

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut and
Mr. SCHUETTE of Michigan.

TIME TO END FREE RIDE OF THE RICH

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, recent studies have shown that in the past decade under the Reagan and Bush administrations, our tax system has become greatly skewed in favor of wealthy Americans. The top 1 percent of our population now with average incomes of $549,000 each have enjoyed $82,000 a year in tax reductions, compared to the pre-1978 Federal tax system, adjusted for inflation. That is a 36-percent drop in taxes.

Yet, the typical middle-income family that is earning $31,000 pays $409 more, or 7 percent more in taxes, under current law.

The poorest 20 percent of all families in America pay 21 percent more in taxes today than they did in 1978.

In effect, the U.S. Treasury has been handing over the hard-earned moneys of working families in this country to the very wealthiest of Americans. Consequently, not only have working families lost out, but the Federal Government has lost nearly $70 billion in revenues in this period of time.

Mr. Speaker, it is time these shenanigans stopped. It is time to fight for the working people in America. It is time to stop letting the rich get off the hook and have a free ride to the detriment of the Government and the rest of the American working people.

A DAY OF HOPE FOR THE HOSTAGES

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

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 18 hostages being held in Lebanon, I ask my colleagues to give 1 day. One day to unite in our thoughts and prayers as we remember their plight.

This Friday, March 16, marks the fifth anniversary of captivity for the longest-held hostage, American journalist Terry Anderson. At noon, in Lafayette Park, this grim milestone will be marked with a Ceremony of Hope. I urge my colleagues to attend this gathering with the families and friends of the hostages. And I urge all of us to use this Friday as a time to rekindle hope, to renew our resolve that these innocent prisoners will not be forgotten.

One day, Mr. Speaker, to remember the 1,825 days Terry Anderson has spent in chains, darkness, and terror. One day to remember the seven other Americans, the four Britons, the two West Germans, the two Swiss, and the Irish and Italian hostages.

One day to rededicate the rest of our days to the principles of freedom and justice throughout the world.

THE GREAT "RIVER-BOAT GAMBLE"

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

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Speaker, David Stockman was right.

It was Mr. Stockman, you will recall, who, while serving as Ronald Reagan's Budget Director, described Republican supply-side tax initiatives of the past decade as nothing more than a "Trojan horse," designed not so much to balance the budget as to cut taxes for the wealthy.

And that is exactly the way it worked.

Over the past decade, Republican tax policies gave the wealthiest 10 percent of Americans a 36-percent tax cut. The other 9 out of 10 Americans—and this includes 100 percent of America's working families—got a tax hike.

And for the poorest 20 percent, that tax increase amounted to 21 percent.

Now, I hesitate to criticize President Bush for offering a real proposal because he does it so rarely. But the President's capital gains tax proposal does not fix this problem. It makes it worse. Eighty percent of the benefit goes to that tiny slice of America which earns $200,000 or more annually. Yet that is George Bush's No. 1 legislative priority this year. And it is all offered—where have we heard this before—to stimulate investment.

The Republicans want the great river-boat gamble to roll on, even though it is now obvious to everyone working Americans lose every time the Republicans throw the dice.

MANDATED FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE: A NECESSITY

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in absolute amazement at

the opposition to the Family and Medical Leave Act.

On the one hand some of my colleagues and some voices in the administration say: "We oppose mandates on business."

But, those same people are enthusiastically supporting other very costly mandates on business.

For example:

First, a child care bill that not only mandates but will cost a good $5 billion per year; and

Second, the Americans with Disabilities Act which mandates costs to business of every size, complete with costs too high to calculate.

Yet there is no concerted opposition to these bills.

But along comes family and medical leave—a bill that takes one small step toward protecting the jobs of working family members at a minimal cost—and the hue and cry goes up: "No mandates."

Tell me, Mr. Speaker, how can anyone in this day and age oppose saving a job for working people when a serious illness strikes a family?

ECONOMIC JUSTICE: A FAIR AND PROGRESSIVE TAX SYSTEM

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, it used to be that we as Americans embraced the ideal as a people that each generation should look forward to some basic improvement in their financial circumstances. We called it economic justice. An essential factor in achieving that ideal of economic justice was a fair and progressive tax system.

Contrary to that ideal over the last 10 years Federal tax rates have risen for the poorest taxpayers in this country while falling for the wealthiest.

□ 1450

Today a family getting by on $20,000 a year pays 6 percent more in Federal taxes than they did in 1980, while a family at the $100,000-a-year level is paying over 11 percent less. It is simply not right that an increasingly larger share of our tax burdens falls on those least able to pay. Instead of being rewarded for their hard work, low- and middle-income families in this country are finding themselves falling farther and farther behind, unable to buy that first home, send their kids to school.

Now is the time to quit shortchanging working families in this country and restore a progressive and fair tax system.

PROPOSED CLEAN AIR ACT PENALIZES MIDWEST HARDER THAN ANY OTHER AREA

(Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the newly proposed Clean Air Act currently working its way through both Houses of the U.S. Congress.

Both the White House and EPA are currently projecting costs of somewhere around $21 billion, but under the Senate provisions alone they are estimating $35 billion, $40 billion.

If I thought this would give us cleaner air, I would certainly support the act. In its current form it hits the Midwest harder than anybody else. There are no experts in the country who are not estimating a cost of at least $40 to $50 billion. There will be $20 to $25 billion cost in compliance alone.

I would not mind that cost if I thought it solved the problem. But all it is going to do is it would be open season for lawyers and suits.

What we have done is give a boost to the East European industrialization, to our competitors.

The Office of Technology Assessment already says the U.S. industry is in the worst shape it has ever been in competitively. Yet we are going to go ahead with a bill for which there was no body of empirical evidence that says the bill is going to solve the problem. We are going to have the same level of acid rain in the year 2000 if we did nothing but put in new plants and give tax credits to the companies building them.

I ask for a study of this bill which does nothing but destroy the industrial base of the Midwest.

THE GOLDEN PARACHUTE LIMITATION ACT OF 1990

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

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to give the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation [FDIC] the authority to prohibit or limit excessive or abusive golden parachutes given to executives, officers, and shareholders of federally insured depository institutions.

Like many people, I was appalled by the stories surrounding the bankruptcy of Drexel Burnham. News accounts reported that Drexel managed to pay $196 million in cash bonuses to its executives in the 2 months before the firm filed for bankruptcy.

Currently, the same possibility for abuse exists in the banking system. During the hearings last year on the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act, I questioned FDIC Chairman Seidman about the FDIC's authority with respect to golden parachute arrangements. I was told that FDIC had sufficient authority, in their role as conservator or receiver of an institution, to disaffirm or repudiate contracts, including golden parachutes.

However, in further discussions with the FDIC and in testimony given to the Financial Institutions Subcommittee today, Mr. Seidman acknowledged the need to give FDIC further authority if they are to prevent all excessive or abusive golden parachutes especially those in institutions that have not yet closed or failed.

My legislation will give the FDIC this authority. It is imperative that we prevent corporate fatcats from lining their pockets and then walking away from an institution that may fail 6 months later. I hope my colleagues will join me in stopping this disgusting and destructive greed from continuing. There is no rationale for providing the management or others involved with a depository institution with a windfall when the taxpayer may eventually have to pick up the tab.

TELECOMMUNICATION DEVICES FOR THE DEAF [TDD]

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, you cannot hear me because I am signing. But that is how 14 million Americans, who are deaf, live every day.

Ten percent of Americans cannot call us with their concerns or with their problems. They are not hearing, they do not use telephones but telecommunications devices for the deaf [TDD]. I believe our democracy and the deaf/hearing impaired's hopes are based upon communication, communication they do not have with us.

Today, on the fourth day of Deaf Awareness Week, I am introducing a bill to direct the Clerk of the House to purchase a TDD for each Member of the House.

I hope the House will quickly pass this resolution.

A BUSH GRAIN EMBARGO AGAINST THE SOVIETS?

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I pray President Bush is not contemplating a grain embargo against the Soviet Union. Why do I have that fear?

Let me quote from his news conference yesterday in response to a question about extending United States aid

to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe:

We have no request for food aid to the Soviet Union—do you just want to put it on a ship and send it over there? No I don't think that's a particularly brilliant idea.

Interestingly, just as Mr. Bush was saying he does not think it is a good idea to ship food aid to the Soviet Union, news wires were carrying results of a General Accounting Office study showing that under the Reagan-Bush administrations, the United States has spent over $481 million to subsidize food shipments to the Soviet Union in 1987, 1988, and 1989.

Well, I think sending U.S. food aid to the Soviets is a brilliant idea, so do American farmers and I am a strong supporter of the program which has been responsible for these shipments. I thought Mr. Bush was, too. When he was campaigning Mr. Bush pledged no grain embargoes during his administration, and said he too supported sending subsidized food shipments to the Soviet Union. Why the sudden change of heart, Mr. President?

Mr. Speaker, I am troubled that these remarks hint at a policy being considered by the administration that would have devastating effects on American agriculture. I am troubled by the confusion the President's remarks cause by contradicting long-standing policy, including his own previous pledges. And, finally, I am troubled that I fear that Mr. Bush may be letting personal partisan feelings color his policy pronouncements. I hope the President will clarify these remarks in the strongest possible terms.

NOTHING NEW IN MAJORITY'S BUDGET PLAN

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the debate launched by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee seeking to craft a solution to our deficit problem. I am disappointed, however, to see that it primarily is a restatement of the policy goals the Democrat majority has sought for the last 9 years.

Moreover, a 1-year budget freeze which excludes major spending categories such as means tested entitlements is a very small reward for, No. 1, eliminating Gramm-Rudman, the one tool we have found so successful in reducing the deficit by $98 billion over the last 5 years, No. 2, for the massive tax increase this proposal represents for a true compromise on the deficit, we need to move away from more of the same tax-and-spend policies of the majority party which have created the impasse we seek to resolve, and which have been so soundly rejected by voters throughout our Nation.

CONGRESS SHOULD REGULATE COMMERCE WITH FOREIGN NATIONS

(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 trade deficit is really down; it is down to $106 billion. Almost $9 billion per month, and everybody is cheering.

Now let us take a look at this: In 1980 there was no trade deficit. Seven years later, $160 billion. The Fed drove down the dollar. We negotiated. We threatened. We passed token laws. The President had a summit.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have done everything here in the Congress except do our job. Article 1, section 8, paragraph 3 says, "Congress is empowered to regulate commerce with foreign nations." Now, if that is regulation, let me tell you what, we need a new Congress.

PUERTO RICO'S FUTURE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend subcommittee chairman, RON DE LUGO, for his leadership throughout the marathon of hearings just completed in Puerto Rico regarding Puerto Rico's future relationship with the United States. I also want to commend the Government of Puerto Rico and the three political parties for providing logistical support and opportunities to meet with the people of Puerto Rico to obtain their candid views of the status issues.

Many of the over 100 testimonies were passionate and charged with emotion and patriotism. I was stirred by the nearly unanimous appeal for the Congress to take action to authorize a referendum on political status. Their requests are properly directed as the Constitution specifies the Congress is to make all needful rules and regulations regarding the territory of the United States.

It has been 92 years since U.S. Army Gen. Nelson Miles invaded the islands and told the people he had come not to wage war but to obtain for the people of Puerto Rico the privileges and blessings of the United States. I strongly urge all Members to support the enactment of legislation to provide a referendum which allows the people of Puerto Rico the opportunity to chose the type of relationship they prefer with the United States.

□ 1550

UNIFICATION FOR JERUSALEM

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, the peace process in the Middle East and Government of Israel were dealt an unfortunate blow by some comments by the President 11 days ago.

By calling into question the unification of Jerusalem, a city whose unification the Republican's own platform called for, the President has thrown a large obstacle on the road to peace.

There should be no misjudging the importance of this issue.

The Jewish community here and in Israel, stand together in the belief that a unified Jerusalem is the integral and indivisible capital of the State of Israel.

In May 1948, the Jordan Arab League drove jews out of the old city by force. Jews were not allowed to visit their holy sites until 1967, many of which were desecrated and destroyed during the occupation. The rest of the world went tsk tsk; but did little. Israelis of all political styles have resolved that will never happen again.

The President's comments were an unneeded, and destructive influence on the peace process. They are inconsistent with the purpose and practice of past U.S. policy.

I hope he and Secretary Baker will reconsider and return to more useful approaches to bring peace to the Middle East.

OIL DRILLING PETITIONS

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, these petitions—containing almost 10,000 signatures and counting—are from ordinary citizens in southwest Florida. Today I am delivering their message to Congress: Ban oil drilling in the environmentally sensitive waters off the gulf coast of Florida.

These signatures are not the product of a national lobbying group's organized petition drive. They have been collected by a local citizens' group based in Bonita Beach, FL.

Their mission is to convince the powers-that-be in Washington that the risks of oil drilling in our region pose a serious threat to the quality of life in southwest Florida—and the economic well-being of the entire State.

I applaud and support the efforts of these hard-working Floridians. Their petitions offer a glimpse of the deep concern that offshore oil drilling in our gulf coast waters could jeopardize the clean white beaches, clear blue

waters, mangrove forests, coral reefs and exotic wildlife that make Florida special for its residents—and the millions of tourists who visit every year.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have been working to ban drilling in the sensitive waters south of 26 degrees north latitude. As President Bush nears a final decision on this issue, I urge consideration for these petitions—and the widespread sentiment among Floridians they represent.

DOMESTIC TEXTILE INDUSTRY ANNIVERSARY

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

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House a significant anniversary which we are celebrating this year. This is the 200th anniversary of the founding of the domestic textile industry.

Following on the success of a man named Samuel Slater, who began producing cotton yarn in Pawtucket, RI, in 1790, the American textile industry provided the foundation for the American industrial revolution and has been an integral part of our socioeconomic heritage. Today, the domestic textile industry complex employs over 2 million workers in all 50 States.

In recognition of this 200th anniversary of America's first basic industry, and as chairman of the Congressional Textile Caucus, I am proud to introduce today a resolution designating the week of October 13-20, 1990, as "American Textile Industry Bicentennial Week." I am especially pleased to be joined in this effort by my colleague, RON MACHTLEY, in whose Rhode Island district the industry got its start 200 years ago. I would urge my colleagues to join us in celebrating this important milestone.

BECK ENFORCEMENT NECESSARY

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, let's be realistic. The Supreme Court's landmark decision in the Beck case cannot help a single worker unless it is enforced. And unfortunately, the decision is not being enforced.

While the High Court upheld the rights of workers, it did not hammer out a detailed remedy as a part of its decision. Not surprisingly, Big Labor has ignored the Supreme Court's decision.

It is obviously a mistake to assume that abolishing or restricting PAC's will address this issue. Even if the mistake were made of restricting or abolishing PAC's, hundreds of millions of dollars of unreported in-kind expenditures would still be made by labor union officials—using money that comes from workers' compulsory fees.

Enforcement of the Supreme Court's decision in the Beck case must be the made the major component of any campaign finance reform effort. The White House includes such provisions in its campaign reform package. The Republican Study Committee issued a policy statement calling for Beck enforcement to be included in any campaign reform package. And I reaffirm my support of this position: We should support no campaign reform measure unless it also includes provisions that would assure enforcement of the Beck decision.

SAVE THE SS "MONTEREY"

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

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep displeasure and opposition to the Maritime Administration's proceedings to permit the sale of the U.S.-flag vessel SS *Monterey* for operation under a foreign flag.

The SS *Monterey* is a valuable asset to our country and particularly to the State of Hawaii. It generates many jobs and a great deal of revenue. Its sale for operation under a foreign flag would remove the SS *Monterey* from this trade and result in a great financial loss to my State, not to mention the loss of jobs of the Hawaii residents employed on board the vessel or others who depend on this vessel for their livelihoods.

American interests are ready and able to purchase this ship for operation under the U.S. flag, thereby ensuring the employment of American workers and generating tax dollars for the United States and Hawaii. The Maritime Administration's actions make it impossible for potential American buyers to negotiate with the mortgage holder for purchase of the SS *Monterey*. This is totally inconsistent with the purposes of the Merchant Marine Acts of 1916 and 1936.

The Bush administration had declared policy to rebuild our vital and essential U.S.-flag merchant marine. The disposition of the SS *Monterey* will demonstrate the degree of commitment by the administration to restoring the strength of our merchant marine. Let us abide by our policy. Let us move in the right direction. Let us save the SS *Monterey*.

SUPPORT URGED FOR PRIVATE SECTOR LONG-TERM HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the Pepper Commission's failure to present to workable long-term care plan for America's seniors, it is clear that at this time there is no consensus for a new and costly Federal entitlement program. But Congress can take immediate steps to help our seniors afford long-term care by encouraging the further development of private sector long-term care insurance policies.

Congress can stimulate the private sector by allowing tax-free withdrawals, from individual retirement accounts and tax-free conversion of life insurance policies if the funds are used to pay long-term care insurance premiums. Congress can also authorizes the Federal Government, as the Nation's largest employer, to offer a long-term care benefit to our Nation's civil servants at no extra cost to the Federal Government. These practical steps to expanding access to long-term care are embodied in three bills I have introduced: H.R. 2132, H.R. 2133, and H.R. 820, respectively.

Mr. Speaker, it appears doubtful that a new Federal long-term care plan will be enacted this Congress, and in any case, the Federal Government will need help from the private sector in meeting this need. I therefore urge my colleagues to cosponsor my legislation to encourage the development of affordable private-sector long-term care policies.

STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] for the kind words earlier.

I returned yesterday from leading a delegation to Puerto Rico for hearings on legislation to authorize a referendum between enhancing the island's current commonwealth and granting statehood or independence to commit the Federal Government to implement the results.

In addition to eight members and staff of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the delegation included your representative, Mr. Speaker, and representatives of the minority leader and the majority and the minority on the Rules Committee, demonstrating the seriousness the House attaches to this issue.

The trip followed a hearing here in Washington at which the presidents of Puerto Rico's three status-based political parties expanded on their joint request for this legislation, which has been endorsed by President Bush.

In Puerto Rico, well over 100 witnesses appeared during some 19 hours

of hearings. We heard additionally from leaders of the three parties in meetings of about 4 hours each.

The clear consensus that Puerto Rico's political status needs to be developed was also indicated by the participation in our visit, in a real sense, of millions of other people.

An estimated 120,000 demonstrated for statehood. Others followed the hearings through extensive television, radio, and newspaper coverage.

Congress has a constitutional—and moral—responsibility to act on their petition. I will try to get this House to do so as soon as possible after the Senate acts on a bill which has been reported by our counterpart committee on the other side of the Capitol.

I want to thank the presidents of Puerto Rico's parties and their representatives, including Gov. Rafael Hernandez Colon and his counselor, Jose Berrocal, of the Popular Democratic (commonwealth) Party; former Gov. Carlos Romero Barcelo and former Representative Benny Frankie Cerezo of the New Progressive (statehood) Party; and former Senator Ruben Berrios Martinez and Senator Fernando Martin Garcia of the Independence Party for their cooperation. I also want to thank the many officials of the Puerto Rican Government, the Air Force, and this House who helped us to carry out our mission.

□ 1510

AMERICANS CANNOT AFFORD A TAX INCREASE

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. There is no end to this story. Last weekend, the Ways and Means chairman blew the dust off the same old Democrat proposal of tax and let us spend.

He proposes a modest spending freeze on only some programs and then demands massive new tax increases. How many times do conservatives have to point out that you cannot reduce the deficit by increasing taxes. Studies of Congress have clearly demonstrated that every time we increase taxes by one dollar, the big spending liberals manage to spend $1.58.

Raising taxes only increases the deficit and the American people are tired of it.

Obviously, the real agenda of the Democrats proposal is to massively increase government spending and demand higher taxes, while at the same time they want to repeal Gramm-Rudman which is the only real restraint on congressional urges to increase spending.

Mr. Speaker, please have the Democrats put that tired tax and spend proposal back on the shelf to collect more dust. The American people don't want it and more importantly, they cannot afford it.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2584

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 2584. Due to staff error, I was inadvertently added to the list of cosponsors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEIGHAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE NORTH PACIFIC FISHING INDUSTRY THREATENED BY DRIFT NET FISHING

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

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, the health of our North Pacific fishing industry and our fragile marine environment are now threatened by a vast and destructive foreign technology, drift net fishing.

The 800-vessel drift net fleet of Taiwan, Japan, and South Korea lays a curtain of death, dragging the North Pacific with these drift nets, some 30 to 40 miles long, stealing our fish and indiscriminately, killing tens of thousands of dolphins, porpoises, and sea birds.

While the United Nations has called for a worldwide ban on drift nets, the administration is entering into agreements with the driftnetting countries to allow the slaughter to continue. In some cases these negotiations have actually opened new fishing grounds to the drift net fleet.

The House of Representatives has acted. We voted overwhelmingly for a drift net ban, which passed as part of the Magnuson Act. Now, we must prompt our colleagues in the other body to reauthorize the Magnuson Act and free our oceans and fisheries of this destructive technology.

THE COTTON COMMEMORATIVE: 200 YEARS OF TEXTILES IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased and proud to join the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD] in the introduction of a resolution to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the textile industry in America.

Mr. Speaker, Rhode Island was the beginning of the growth of textiles in America. Pawtucket, RI, is the home of Slater Mill, now the most historic industrial structure in the country. Built by Samuel Slater in 1793 on the banks of the Blackstone River, Slater Mill is the oldest cotton textile factory in America. Samuel Slater began the industrial revolution for this country.

Mr. Speaker, it is on the banks of the Blackstone River in Pawtucket where the American textile industry was brought to life and changed the future of this country. Today Slater Mill is a national historic landmark and the cornerstone of the Blackstone Valley National Heritage Corridor in Rhode Island and Massachusetts.

Rhode Islanders are proud of the important labor and manufacturing history behind Slater Mill, and I am pleased that the entire textile industry can be commemorated in the resolution we introduce today.

Mr. Speaker, textile workers continue to be some of the most hard workers in America in the industry they represent. I hope my colleagues will join us in cosponsoring this resolution.

THE FIGHT DRUGS ACT

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

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, the Federal Incentives Going To Help Towns Fighting Drugs Act of 1990 or the FIGHT Drugs Act, which would provide taxpayers with the opportunity to fight drug abuse on the local level.

Through a Federal tax checkoff, taxpayers can contribute directly to the antidrug abuse efforts in their own communities. Contributions would be strictly supplemental to other antidrug abuse funding. The spending decisions would be left to local governments in order to meet local needs. Money could be spent on law enforcement, education, treatment, or rehabilitation.

While private and charitable efforts reach only a limited number of people, a tax checkoff would be extremely effective at raising funds at the local level for local initiatives. Fighting drug abuse is clearly a top priority of most Americans. The FIGHT Drugs Act of 1990 would give individuals a greater voice in directing how their tax dollar gets spent.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

DO NOT WEAKEN AMERICA'S SEALIFT

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Maritime Administration is embarked on a course of action which, in my opinion, will seriously set back our efforts to maintain a U.S. flag merchant marine adequate to serve as a useful naval auxiliary in time of war or national emergency.

The SS *Monterey* is one of only three operational oceangoing passenger vessels under the U.S. flag and only one of four qualified to fly the U.S. flag. The *Monterey* recently was laid up and is scheduled to be auctioned this week.

Instead of immediately and conclusively rejecting the application filed under the Shipping Act of 1916 to sell this ship for foreign operation, the Maritime Administration chose to turn the process into one where foreign economic interests could take precedence over America's security and economic interests.

I sincerely hope Maritime Administrator Capt. Warren Leback will truly promote the American merchant marine by insisting that the *Monterey* remains under the U.S. flag.

FOREIGN AID: QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that any time the President and his advisers get an inclination to send some money out of the country, such as $1 billion to Panama, or $300 million to Nicaragua, they sort of swagger around like sailors on shore leave. They wave that money around like it grows on trees.

Sure we have some responsibilities to help our neighboring countries, but I would like to pose a couple of questions about the President's plan.

First, why give it in cash? Why not food, commodities, and equipment—the things that folks in other countries need. Our experience in foreign aid is if we send it in cash, it's going to end up in a Swiss bank. Dye our foreign aid money purple and the Swiss bank vaults will be stained purple in a week.

Second, the President says he can just rearrange some spending in defense, and come up with several hundred million for Nicaragua. If that is the case, why didn't they rearrange that money in defense 6 months ago, and use it to reduce the deficit. If this is money we didn't need, do we give it up only if we are willing to send it out of the country? How many other chunks of $300 million are in the defense budget that we don't need. Maybe we can send some to help central America here in the U.S.A.—North Dakota, Kansas, Iowa—those States who have not been able to participate in the American economic expansion.

Third, since our country has a Federal deficit over $200 billion this year—that's the real deficit—and a $3 trillion debt, and since we will be borrowing nearly $150 billion from the Japanese and other allies to finance this, I'm wondering if it wouldn't be better, rather than borrowing money from Japan to pay Nicaragua, just asking Japan to give Nicaragua and Panama a little help directly. Sometimes it's cheaper to eliminate the middleman.

Oh, I know these are impertinent questions and this is a serious business. But I raise these questions about the priorities of this administration because some of them seem to think it's old fashioned to invest here in America. We need to start paying same attention to rebuilding at home. I'd like to see the some enthusiasm for investment here in the United States of America.

□ 1520

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO IMPLEMENT ADMINISTRATION'S TRANSPORTATION POLICY

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing, with the support of many of my colleagues, the first legislation to implement a portion of the administration's transportation policy.

This legislation recognizes that we as consumers pay more than we need to for the transportation of almost every product we buy. In 1980 we started to solve the problem of excessively high transportation costs by deregulating interstate truck shipping. Consumers have saved about $11 billion annually as open competition brought down motor freight rates. Yet, 42 States continue to maintain some type of control over motor freight rates, and it is costing us a bundle. Estimates show that we may save twice as much—another $11 billion—by removing remaining State controls on motor carrier freight.

Intrastate burdens on the transportation of goods add up every time we buy groceries or clothes for our families. These hidden costs of goods also place us at a competitive disadvantage internationally.

The Secretary of Transportation, in his national transportation policy, make the completion of motor carrier deregulation at the State level a priority. I am hopeful that this legislation can accomplish that goal.

WHAT WILL THE CONSERVATIVES DO NOW?

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago one of the stalwart liberals in this House about 10 feet to the west of me approached me and said, "What are you conservatives going to do now that communism is dead?"

I would like to put a brass plaque there, because that theme has spread all across the country and even into Western Europe, that we do not know what to do with ourselves now. I guess he never heard of North Korea, Angola, Ethiopia, Albania or China or Castro; China with 1,250,000,000 people, and we just made the top of Beijing's enemies' list.

Here is today's paper, just one little paper. First page:

> Barry. He is back. D.C. still in chaos. He has never let the word cocaine or crack come out of his lips.

Here is Gorbachev at the top of the page, has more power than any Russian leader since Stalin.

Turn inside, here is a rally set to protest U.S. policy. William Sloan Coffman is back. My one-time opponent, Ron Kovic, Rauol, Daniel Elsberg is back on the scene, Ed Asner, they are all going to protest our policy in Central America. They cannot stand victories for democracy in all those countries. They hated Grenada. They hated Panama.

Another page:

> Sexual pioneers come into town, yearn for the good old days, the myth of homosexual AIDS will be one theme, anxious pleasures, the sex lives of the Amazonian people, a field guide to outdoor erotica.

We are looking forward to the nineties when we can bring back reassertion of creative sex, maybe more syphilis, more gonorrhea, more chlamydia, more venereal warts. I always loved the ring of that one.

Another AIDS plague. Phone up the green monkeys. Tell us that they have a good fatal, always fatal disease to spread around.

Then you turn to what is happening in Europe, London. Here it is. A British group tells of child sex rings, pornography used to lure, by modern day Fagins, more kids into sex.

Are you liberals kidding? What did the rooster say when faced with a thousand chickens? "So much work to do, so little time." I hardly know where to start.

I love it that Eastern Europe is free. It frees me up to beat up on liberal philosophy and about a thousand other areas where they wrecked modern American life.

God bless you, Mr. Speaker.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1989

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 355 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 355

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 the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3581) the Rural Economic Development Act of 1989, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, said substitute shall be considered by title instead of by section and each title shall be considered as having been read, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of section 303(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended (Public Law 93-344, as amended by Public Law 99-177) are hereby waived. No amendment to said substitute, except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate, shall be in order except those printed in the Congressional Record prior to their consideration. At the conclusion of the 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, and 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 committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered 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. FEIGHAN). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 355 is a modified open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act of 1989. This is a bill that reorganizes the Department of Agriculture's rural development activities and provides for a new means of prioritizing Federal rural development project funding.

House Resolution 355 is a modified open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate, with the time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. The rule makes in order the Agriculture Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as original text. The bill is to be considered by titles, with each title considered as having been read.

The rule waives section 303(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act against the substitute. This provision would prohibit the consideration of any bill containing new budget authority in a fiscal year prior to the adoption of the budget resolution for that fiscal year. This waiver is necessary for the consideration of this bill as no budget resolution has yet been passed for fiscal year 1991.

The rule also provides that no amendments to the substitute, except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate, are in order except those printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration. An announcement of this restriction was made by Representative FROST on Wednesday of last week.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 355 provides for one motion to recommit this bill, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of a bill that would establish a new Rural Development Administration to administer Department of Agriculture rural development programs. The bill would provide for a new mechanism of delivery of Federal rural development assistance. The measure would also make a number of changes in the Agriculture Department's existing water and sewer, business and industry, and rural electrification programs.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 355 is a straightforward rule that provides for the adequate consideration of the Rural Economic Development Act of 1989. I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased after the exciting 1-minute speeches to continue the excitement by bringing to the Members, House Resolution 355, which is a modified open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act of 1990. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. The rule goes on to make the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute in order as original text for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule, and waives section 303(A)(1) of the Budget Act against the substitute.

Section 303(A)(1) of the Budget Act prohibits the consideration of any bill which provides budget authority prior to the adoption of the budget resolution for that fiscal year. Section 802 of the substitute would make borrowers eligible for lower interest rates on rural health care facility loans from the Farmers Home Administration. In so doing, it lowers receipts in the revolving fund by $1 to $2 million a year and permits Farmers Home to borrow an offsetting amount from the Treasury.

As a result of these lower interest rates, the fund will require additional budget authority and higher outlays. Because we have not yet adopted the budget resolution for fiscal 1991, the bill stands in violation of section 303(A)(1) of the Budget Act. However, the Rules Committee has received a letter dated March 7 from the Budget Committee chairman in which he indicated that a majority of the committee supports a waiver of this section to permit consideration of the bill. The Rules Committee consequently granted the necessary waiver.

Mr. Speaker, the rule on this bill goes on to require that all amendments to the bill, except pro forma amendments, must be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration. Since the bill will be under consideration for amendments tomorrow, that means that Members should have their amendments in the RECORD no later than today to be protected.

Mr. Speaker, I must object to this unnecessary restraint on the right of Members to offer germane amendments. While it is true that the Rules Committee announced this amendments policy on the floor of this House last Wednesday, I nevertheless think it puts Members at a severe disadvantage. This is especially so when you consider that the report was filed on the same day we granted the rule and was not available until this Monday. And the printed substitute was not available from the documents room until Friday. Many, if not most, Members of the House have not had a chance to look at this bill, let alone develop amendments, until their return to the House yesterday. I would hate to think that we might be precluding sincere and worthy efforts to improve the legislation by this rule. And yet, that could well be the case.

I know my chairman and other Rules Committee colleagues share my distaste for such a preprinting requirement for amendments and were reluctant to grant the Agriculture Committee's request for such a restrictive rule.

Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been some movement away from restrictive rules, and I commend the new Speaker and the new Rules Committee chairman on this positive trend toward more procedural openness and fairness. But this rule represents a backward step in that regard. As of

today, some 45 percent of the rules we have granted in this Congress have been restrictive, compared to 46 percent in the last Congress. For the information of my colleagues I will be inserting at the end of my remarks the most recent data on open and restrictive rules. I hope this rule represents only a temporary lapse and not a retreat from our recent march to procedural daylight and sunshine.

Mr. Speaker, the final feature of this rule that I want to call to the attention of my colleagues is that it does permit a motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Those terms protect the minority's traditional prerogative to offer a final amendment prior to final passage.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Agriculture for bringing forward H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act. As one who represents a predominantly rural district in Illinois, I am acutely aware of the needs of our rural areas and the contributions our Federal Government has and can continue to make to their development.

The pending bill should further facilitate that effort by allowing for the pooling of existing funds under a new umbrella Rural Development Administration within USDA. At the same time, the legislation recognizes the need for giving greater flexibility to the States in targeting assistance to their unique problems and needs. The bill accomplishes this by providing for the creation of State rural economic development review panels to assist in allocating their share of funds to designated projects which they determine are worthy of assistance. My main concern is that these review panels include adequate representation by small rural businessmen and farmers—something which seems at present in the panels' makeup.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take further time on this rule to discuss the substance and merits of the bill. There will be ample time for that under general debate and the amendment process. Let me simply say that on balance I think the Agriculture Committee has done an outstanding job in shaping a compromise that will advance the cause of economic development in our Nation's rural areas. The committee is to be saluted both on its work product and the bipartisan manner in which it has been brought to us.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES, 95TH–101ST CONGRESSES

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules [2]		Restrictive rules [3]	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES, 95TH–101ST CONGRESSES—Continued

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules [2]		Restrictive rules [3]	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	49	27	55	22	45

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole.

[Note.—The above data differs slightly from that published in previous Congresses because it is based on a rule-by-rule examination and not just on summary tables from committee surveys for the 95th–99th Congresses as was previously done. Moreover, appropriations rules (which only provide for waivers) and original jurisdiction measures are no longer counted.]

Sources: Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities, 95th–100th Congresses; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 101st Congress, as of March 9, 1990.

[Prepared by the Minority Counsel, Subcommittee on the Legislative Process, Committee on Rules.]

RULES GRANTED IN THE 101ST CONGRESS

[Providing for the initial consideration of legislation]

Rule No. H. Res.	Date granted	Rule type	Bill No. and subject
108	Mar. 14, 1989	MO	H.R. 1231: Emergency Strike Board.
111	Apr. 21, 1989	O	H.R. 1369: Mansfield Business Center.
112	Mar. 21, 1989	MC	H.R. 2: Minimum Wage.
117	Apr. 4, 1989	O	H.R. 18: Uniform Voting Time.
126	Apr. 11, 1989	MO	H.R. 1487: State Dept. Authorization.
127	Apr. 12, 1989	C	H.R. 1750: Contra Aid.
135	Apr. 25, 1989	O	H.R. 2072: Supplemental Appropriations.
138	Apr. 25, 1989	O	H.R. 1486: Maritime Adm. Authorization.
143	May 2, 1989	O	H.R. 7: Voc. Ed. Act Extension.
145	May 2, 1989	MC	H. Con. Res. 106: Budget Resolution.
155	May 16, 1989	O	H.R. 643: Oil Shale Claims.
160	May 23, 1989	C	H.R. 2442: SDI for Drugs Transfer.
161	May 23, 1989	O	H.R. 2392: Oil Shale Claims.
165	June 1, 1989	MC	S.J. Res. 113: FSX Agreement.
173	June 13, 1989	MC	H.R. 1278: Financial Institutions Reform.
179	June 20, 1989	MO	H.R. 2655: Foreign Aid Authorization.
195	July 11, 1989	O	H.R. 2022: Soviet & Indochinese Refugees.
196	July 11, 1989	O	H.R. 989: Tongass Timber Reform Act.
198	July 13, 1989	O	H.R. 1549: NRC Authorization.
199	July 13, 1989	O	H.R. 1484: Park System Review Board.
200	July 13, 1989	O	H.R. 828: BLM Authorization.
202	July 17, 1989	O	H.R. 1056: Federal Waste Disposal.
211	July 21, 1989	MO	H.R. 2461: DoD Authorization.
217	July 28, 1989	C	H.R. 3024: Debt Limit Increase.
224	Aug. 4, 1989	O	H.R. 1668: NOAA—Coastal Authorization.
228	Aug. 4, 1989	C	H.R. 1594: MFN Status for Hungary.
230	Aug. 4, 1989	O	H.R. 2427: NOAA—Satellite Authorization.
234	Sept. 7, 1989	O	H.R. 1759: NASA Authorization.
235	Sept. 7, 1989	O	H.R. 2869: Commodity Futures Improvements.
236	Sept. 7, 1989	O	H.R. 1659: Aviation Security Act.
245	Sept. 21, 1989		H.R. 3299: Budget Reconciliation.
249	Sept. 26, 1989	MC	
246	Sept. 25, 1989	C	H.J. Res. 407: Continuing Appropriations.
254	Oct. 3, 1989	O	H.R. 2748: Intelligence Authorization.
255	Oct. 3, 1989	O	H.R. 1495: Arms Control Authorization.
256	Oct. 3, 1989	C	H.R. 3385: Nicaragua Election Assistance.
266	Oct. 17, 1989	O	H.R. 3402: Polish/Hungarian Initiative.
267	Oct. 17, 1989	O	H.R. 2494: International Development.

RULES GRANTED IN THE 101ST CONGRESS—Continued

[Providing for the initial consideration of legislation]

Rule No. H. Res.	Date granted	Rule type	Bill No. and subject
270	Oct. 19, 1989	O	H.R. 2459: Coast Guard Authorization.
271	Oct. 23, 1989	MC	H.J. Res. 423: Continuing Appropriations.
273	Oct. 24, 1989	C	H.R. 45: Central American Studies.
275	Oct. 26, 1989	O	H.R. 3443: Airline Acquisition Review.
277	Oct. 31, 1989	O	H.R. 1465: Oil Spill Liability.
278	Oct. 31, 1989	C	H.R. 2710: Minimum Wage.
289	Nov. 13, 1989	O	S. 974: Nevada Wilderness.
290	Nov. 15, 1989	C	H.R. 3660: Ethics Reform Act.
295	Nov. 19, 1989	MC	H.R. 3743: Foreign Assistance Appropriations.
309	Jan. 30, 1990	MC	H.R. 2190: Voter Registration Act.
338	Feb. 20, 1990	O	H.R. 2570: Arizona Wilderness Act.
355	Mar. 7, 1990	MO	H.R. 3581: Rural Economic Development.

Code: A completely open amendment process is provided by an open rule (O). Restrictive rules are those which provide for less than a completely open amendment process and include: closed rules (C), modified closed rules (MC), and modified open rules (MO).

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL], the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule providing for consideration of the bill, H.R. 3581, the Rural Development Act of 1989. This rule waives section 303(A)(1) of the Budget Act because the measure contains $1 million of new budget authority effective in fiscal year 1991, and Congress has not yet adopted a budget resolution for fiscal year 1991.

The Budget Act does not allow consideration of measures providing new direct spending or revenue changes for a fiscal year prior to the adoption of a budget resolution for such fiscal year. Otherwise spending decisions can be made outside of the control of the budget process. In a poll of Budget Committee members I did not support waiving this section of the Budget Act; however, the Rules Committee decided to grant such a waiver.

Furthermore, in addition to the $1 million in direct spending, which results from the Farmers Home Administration lending money to rural health care facilities at more preferable rates, the bill authorizes large sums of money for new programs and expansion of existing programs. In fiscal year 1991 the bill authorizes $540 million in budget authority which expands to a 5-year total of $2.5 billion. The bill also creates a new bureaucracy by establishing a new rural development administration within the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The administration strongly opposes enactment of H.R. 3581 because of its costly provisions, because it provides additional Federal subsidies to financially healthy telephone borrowers, and because it allows REA borrowers to defer scheduled debt payments if

they made loans for rural development purposes.

I must agree with the administration's position. I oppose this bill because it violates the Budget Act and is much too costly. Congress should be thinking of fiscal restraint rather than expansion. Members who vote for H.R. 3581 can be assumed that they are helping to increase the deficit.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSTAMANTE].

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge your support of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act of 1989. This bill addresses the very real and immediate needs of rural areas across the country. Of particular importance to my district is a provision to make available $60 million in direct grants and loans to residents of colonias. Colonias are poverty-stricken rural subdivisions found along the Texas-Mexico border, many of which lack basic human services such as water and sewage. These moneys will enable colonias residents to gain access to a clean water supply and sanitary waste disposal services. I thank Chairman DE LA GARZA for his hard work in getting this provision into the bill. I must express here my distress with the administration's opposition to this and other provisions in H.R. 3581. A statement from OMB says that the moneys for the colonias are not necessary. Water and sewage hookups are not necessary? Basic services for the poorest people in the richest nation of the world are not necessary? I strongly disagree. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3581. Not only will you be helping all rural residents, you will be helping the poorest of America's poor as well.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to hear my seatmate from the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSTAMANTE], talking about his district.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in opposition to this rule. The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentlewoman from Illinois have pointed out many of the objections that I have to this particular rule, but I think we do need to raise the question of why in the world this bill had to come out under a closed rule.

□ 1540

It seems to me that this is a piece of legislation where there is no earthly reason for preventing Members from having an opportunity to amend the bill on the floor, if that is their want. Why have we had to have a provision such as that in the rule, and I read:

No amendment to said substitute, except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate, shall be in order except those printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration

The problem with that is that that left Members with very little time to get a copy of the final version of this bill and write amendments which were then in order on the floor. I just do not see any reason why on a bill where there is considerable controversy about individual provisions that we had to have such a closed rule.

I hope that this is not precedent setting. I hope that the Committee on Rules is not moving toward more and more restriction of the means of debate on the floor and the ability of Members to amend bills.

The bill was not available for early consultation, and so therefore many of the objections of the administration were really not known by the Members until yesterday. Now the administration has come forward with almost a page full of paragraphs indicating objections to the bill. It would be very, very well I think for Members to have an opportunity to amend those.

It is my understanding that a good portion of the administration's objections have not been committed to amendment, and therefore will not be eligible to be debated on the floor today. I think that is a shame. I think it would have been very, very useful to have this bill out here under a complete open rule and have an open discussion.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. This is to assure the gentleman, as the gentleman well knows, that this is not the practice of the Committee on Agriculture. Ordinarily we have an open rule.

The problem here was that there are areas with amendments of a highly technical nature, not necessarily generated from within our committee, but by Members outside the committee. For the protection of other committees, such as the Committee on Ways and Means and/or the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for example, that we would not have on the floor a Member just writing in his own handwriting at the last minute something in a highly technical area.

It is in cooperation with them and for their protection, as well as ours in those areas. Otherwise my statement to the Committee on Rules was it is not a matter of life and death for us. Ordinarily we ask for it. But there could have been amendments and will be of a technical nature that need to be worked out, and we have.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] will allow me to reclaim my time, I understand his point. But if amendments are not germane there are already rules in the House to stop nongermane amendments from being offered. If the amendments are germane to the bill and can be offered on the floor, I see no reason why we ought to pay more attention to the sensibilities of committees than we do to the ability of individual Members to bring an amendment to the floor.

There are already plenty of protections. If a Member offered an amendment that was not germane, it seems to me we ought to protect the Members. In this particular instance what we are failing to do is protect the individual rights of Members to offer amendments that they would regard as in order.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Both sides of the aisle asked and requested the Committee on Rules to provide for the opportunity to have notice of amendments. The only way we can do that is to require them to be published in the RECORD. The reason for that is that this bill really hits on a number of sections of current law that are really technical in nature. If one does not know and does not have the opportunity to see some of these things in advance, one could really do much greater harm than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] thinks might be done by this procedure, because some of them would trigger some very large expenditures or movements within current law.

I am not saying other things we bring here are not complex. But to answer the gentleman's question about the concern of the administration, the administration has been involved in this whole process. I know that they have some objections, and I have noted those. The thing is if they want to provide those changes, they can go ahead today and find Members to introduce them.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, under this rule Members cannot introduce those amendments. That is exactly my point. The administration does have these objections and they brought them forward. There is no way under this rule those objections can be brought to the floor today other than as part of the motion to recommit. They would have to include probably the entire package, which probably means the motion to recommit fails.

This gives us a process for us to have an opportunity to bring those out as

individual amendments, is the point I am making.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we had up through yesterday to do that. The administration, I do not believe they are pushing some of their objections, if one wants to know the truth.

Mr. WALKER. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his opinion on it, but the point is there are objections which are on the record. Under any orderly procedure in the House that makes any sense, there should be open debate on some of these things, which are good objections. That is what Members are prevented from doing.

I just do not understand why we had to have a closed rule in this instance. I would suggest to Members that voting against this closed rule would be very appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN] for yielding the additional time.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, in my earlier remarks I should have said, as was stated by another Member, the Committee on the Budget did request a waiver of the Committee on Rules, so I cannot lay the blame at the feet of the Committee on Rules for providing us with what I think is a rule that should be opposed.

I would further state that while I must disagree with the rule, I do not want to do so disagreeably. Because like the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN], I have noted the new spirit prevailing in the Committee on Rules this year. We on the Republican side appreciate the camaraderie and openness with which that committee has approached its work this year. I am considering this a temporary aberration, and that the Committee on Rules will return to its normal good sense and clear direction as soon as this rule is completed.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], who wishes to make a correction.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. In our discussion a moment ago the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] rightly pointed out this bill is going to be taken up tomorrow under the 5-minute rule. Therefore, amendments could yet be presented in the RECORD today that would be eligible for consideration tomorrow. I am very happy to correct the RECORD in that regard.

It still strikes me that we would be better off to be able to bring the amendments to the floor as we want to tomorrow. But the gentleman is absolutely correct with the schedule that has now been outlined.

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for his remarks.

I want to say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] that the Committee on Rules is always very, very appreciative of any little crumbs of recognition that we might receive, and we thank him for that.

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 SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUCOIN). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FRENZEL. 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 315, nays 99, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—315

Ackerman	Coleman (MO)	Frost
Akaka	Coleman (TX)	Gaydos
Alexander	Condit	Gejdenson
Anderson	Conyers	Gephardt
Andrews	Cooper	Geren
Annunzio	Costello	Gibbons
Anthony	Coyne	Gillmor
Applegate	Crockett	Gilman
Aspin	Darden	Glickman
Atkins	Davis	Gonzalez
AuCoin	de la Garza	Goodling
Barnard	DeFazio	Gordon
Barton	Dellums	Gradison
Bates	Derrick	Grandy
Beilenson	DeWine	Grant
Bennett	Dicks	Gray
Bereuter	Dingell	Green
Berman	Dixon	Guarini
Bevill	Donnelly	Gunderson
Bilbray	Downey	Hall (OH)
Boehlert	Duncan	Hall (TX)
Boggs	Durbin	Hamilton
Bonior	Dwyer	Harris
Borski	Dymally	Hatcher
Bosco	Dyson	Hawkins
Boucher	Early	Hayes (IL)
Boxer	Eckart	Hayes (LA)
Brennan	Edwards (CA)	Hefner
Browder	Edwards (OK)	Hertel
Brown (CA)	Emerson	Hiler
Bruce	Engel	Hoagland
Bryant	English	Hochbrueckner
Bustamante	Erdreich	Holloway
Byron	Espy	Horton
Callahan	Evans	Hoyer
Campbell (CO)	Fascell	Hubbard
Cardin	Fazio	Huckaby
Carper	Feighan	Hughes
Carr	Fish	Hutto
Chandler	Flake	Inhofe
Chapman	Foglietta	Jacobs
Clarke	Ford (MI)	Jenkins
Clement	Frank	Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)	Murphy	Skeen
Johnston	Murtha	Skelton
Jones (GA)	Myers	Slattery
Jones (NC)	Nagle	Slaughter (NY)
Jontz	Natcher	Slaughter (VA)
Kanjorski	Neal (MA)	Smith (FL)
Kaptur	Neal (NC)	Smith (IA)
Kastenmeier	Nielson	Smith (NE)
Kennedy	Nowak	Smith (NJ)
Kildee	Oakar	Smith (VT)
Kleczka	Oberstar	Smith, Robert (OR)
Kolter	Obey	Snowe
Kostmayer	Olin	Solarz
LaFalce	Ortiz	Solomon
Lancaster	Owens (NY)	Spratt
Lantos	Owens (UT)	Staggers
Laughlin	Oxley	Stallings
Leach (IA)	Pallone	Stangeland
Lehman (CA)	Panetta	Stark
Lehman (FL)	Parker	Stenholm
Lent	Parris	Stokes
Levin (MI)	Pashayan	Studds
Levine (CA)	Patterson	Sundquist
Lewis (GA)	Payne (NJ)	Swift
Lightfoot	Payne (VA)	Synar
Lipinski	Pease	Tanner
Lloyd	Pelosi	Tauke
Long	Penny	Tauzin
Lowey (NY)	Perkins	Taylor
Luken, Thomas	Pickett	Thomas (GA)
Machtley	Pickle	Thomas (WY)
Madigan	Poshard	Torres
Manton	Price	Torricelli
Markey	Quillen	Towns
Martin (IL)	Rahall	Traficant
Martin (NY)	Rangel	Traxler
Martinez	Ray	Udall
Matsui	Richardson	Unsoeld
Mazzoli	Ridge	Valentine
McCloskey	Roberts	Vander Jagt
McCrery	Robinson	Vento
McCurdy	Roe	Visclosky
McDade	Rose	Volkmer
McDermott	Rostenkowski	Walgren
McEwen	Rowland (CT)	Walsh
McGrath	Rowland (GA)	Washington
McHugh	Roybal	Watkins
McMillen (MD)	Russo	Waxman
McNulty	Sabo	Weber
Mfume	Saiki	Weiss
Michel	Sangmeister	Wheat
Miller (CA)	Sarpalius	Whittaker
Miller (OH)	Sawyer	Whitten
Miller (WA)	Scheuer	Wise
Mineta	Schneider	Wolf
Moakley	Schroeder	Wolpe
Mollohan	Schuette	Wyden
Montgomery	Schumer	Wylie
Moody	Sharp	Yatron
Morella	Shuster	Young (AK)
Morrison (CT)	Sikorski	
Morrison (WA)	Sisisky	
Mrazek	Skaggs	

NAYS—99

Archer	Fields	McCollum
Armey	Frenzel	McMillan (NC)
Baker	Gallegly	Meyers
Ballenger	Gallo	Moorhead
Bartlett	Gekas	Packard
Bentley	Gingrich	Paxon
Bilirakis	Goss	Petri
Bliley	Hancock	Porter
Broomfield	Hansen	Pursell
Brown (CO)	Hastert	Regula
Buechner	Hefley	Rhodes
Bunning	Henry	Rinaldo
Burton	Herger	Ritter
Campbell (CA)	Hopkins	Rogers
Coble	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Combest	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Conte	Hyde	Roth
Coughlin	Ireland	Roukema
Courter	James	Saxton
Cox	Kasich	Schaefer
Craig	Kolbe	Schiff
Crane	Kyl	Schulze
Dannemeyer	Lagomarsino	Sensenbrenner
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Shaw
Dickinson	Lewis (FL)	Shays
Dorgan (ND)	Livingston	Shumway
Dornan (CA)	Lowery (CA)	Smith (TX)
Douglas	Lukens, Donald	Smith, Denny (OR)
Dreier	Marlenee	Smith, Robert
Fawell	McCandless	

(NH)	Thomas (CA)	Weldon
Spence	Upton	Williams
Stearns	Vucanovich	Young (FL)
Tallon	Walker	

NOT VOTING—17

Bateman	Ford (TN)	Ravenel
Brooks	Hammerschmidt	Savage
Clay	Kennelly	Stump
Clinger	Leath (TX)	Wilson
Collins	Mavroules	Yates
Flippo	Nelson	

□ 1610

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

Mr. WEBER and Mr. MILLER of Washington changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Pursuant to House Resolution 355 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. 3581.

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. 3581) entitled the "Rural Economic Development Act of 1989," with Mr. TRAXLER 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 Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, the economic condition of many towns in rural America was summed up a year ago in a Time magazine article entitled "Small-Town Blues." The subheading of the article was equally depressing, it read: "The trains don't stop anymore, jobs are vanishing and young people are moving away. Now America's rural hamlets are fighting to stay on the map."

Rural development has become a matter of economic survival for many towns in rural America. Rural America did not share in the economic recovery of the 1980's. In fact, over the past decade, the Federal Government has neglected the problems faced in rural America.

Five million people left rural areas during the past decade. Many were young people—bright, well-educated hard-working men and women.

These former rural residents go to our cities overburdening urban transportation systems, schools, and other public facilities. Individually, they left for many reasons. But collectively, they left for one basic, overriding reason—they were in search of a job—of economic opportunity—of personal advancement.

For those who remain in rural areas, the current situation and the future prospects are not good.

These Americans face higher rates of unemployment, poverty, malnutrition, and are on average less educated than their city cousins.

Rural America's infrastructure is crumbling as roads and bridges go unrepaired for lack of funds. Rural America's tax base shrinks each time a Main Street business or a small factory closes. The quality of education and health care are deteriorating.

It is time to turn this around. It is time to change these alarming trends. It is time to reinvest in rural America. It is time to give rural communities an opportunity to survive.

Some equate rural development with farm programs. They say, the farm economy has recovered, why not rural towns? The fact of the matter is the economic health of American agriculture can no longer be viewed as synonymous with the health of rural America.

A quarter of our Nation's population live in rural areas, but less than 3 percent derive their livelihood directly from farming. More than 50 percent of the Nation's farm families derive more than half of their income from off-farm jobs.

This means farm programs cannot solve the problems of rural communities. In fact, farm income is no longer the dominant source of income in most rural counties.

We need to provide a spark to ignite new economic activity in the Nation's rural areas. We cannot stand by and watch our rural communities turn into ghost towns.

Yes, America's rural towns are fighting to stay on the map. It's time Congress recognized their situation and begin to help them get back on their feet.

Unfortunately, we do not have any new money to plow back into rural America—investment which is needed so desperately.

But we can give residents the tools and the opportunities they need to help improve the quality of rural live—to increase investment in rural America. That is the least the Federal Government should do.

This bill, the Rural Economic Development Act of 1990, renews our commitment at the Federal level to help bring economic opportunities and development to our rural communities.

This legislation recognizes that rural economic development is a local process of seeking local opportunities. The Federal Government cannot mandate where jobs are to be created.

But the Federal Government can, through a cooperative effort with other levels of government and with the private and nonprofit sectors, create a more favorable environment for economic development.

I want to acknowledge and commend the work of Mr. ENGLISH, the chairman of the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit and Rural Development, and Mr. COLEMAN, the ranking minority member on that subcommittee, for the many hours of hearings, study, and work put into H.R. 3581.

I would also commend all the members of the subcommittee and the full committee who contributed to this bill.

Government can and should support efforts to spur rural economic development.

This bill provides the seed money needed to create jobs and income opportunities for rural Americans. It will consolidate the USDA rural development programs and facilitate the delivery of resources and assistance.

This bill is cost effective and will not create duplicative services. And most importantly, this bill recognizes the need for program flexibility. It seeks to meet the needs of the individual States, within regions of States, and at the local level.

It's up to this Congress to ensure the rural development legislation we are considering does the best possible job of directing our limited resources to meet the economic development needs of rural America. Our collective goal today is ensure that the legislation does this in as fair, equitable, and workable manner as possible.

The Federal Government has a long history of concern for rural America. It dates back to President Theodore Roosevelt who set up the Rural Life Commission in 1908.

The work of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Nation's rural electric cooperatives since the 1930's are also evidence of the Federal Government's efforts on behalf of rural America. I have in the past and will continue to be a strong supporter of our rural electrification programs.

Today, we have an opportunity to renew our commitment to preserving rural communities and giving them the opportunity to grow and prosper in the 21st century.

The Office of Management and Budget says the administration strongly opposes H.R. 3581. But earlier this year the administration sent this Congress a budget that said we must invest in our future.

This bill follows up on the President's commitment to invest in our future. More importantly, this bill says there is a future in rural America.

We cannot turn our backs on the 25 percent of our population living in rural areas.

This bill may not be perfect—seldom will legislation in our democratic process satisfy each and every person. But this bill on balance is reasonable, it recognizes the need for budget restraint, and most of all it sends a message of hope to the people living in rural towns throughout the Nation. I once was told by a lady from Colorado who was losing her farm and wanted to stay—"Mr. Chairman, we can't all move to Denver."

This bill makes the commitment to reinvest in rural America. I urge my colleagues to support the committee during consideration and final passage of H.R. 3581.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, all of the members on the subcommittee, and the members of the committee that have worked so diligently and so hard. We will have some amendments down the line, none that we will not be able to work out; with Members' support, we will handle them satisfactorily so that they may not in any way destroy or alter the thrust of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH], chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the committee pointed out, over the past decade we have lost some 5 million people in rural America. This is coming at a time when the rest of this Nation has been growing. Unfortunately, that loss has come from the most vital element—namely, rural America's young people. This is a tragedy, not only for the 1980's, but certainly does not bode well for the 1990's and beyond, for our future.

It underscores the fact that the rural development bill, the rural development legislation as it exists today has not been working and needs to be changed. In response to this fact, the Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, and Rural Development held some 14 hearings. Many of these hearings were in various regions across the country, and we heard from over 242 witnesses, many of whom were local rural development people, people involved with growth in rural America.

The questions that were asked, What is it that we need for success for rural America? Of course, the first response was, "We need money, and we need a lot of it." We all recognize that the reality is, it is highly unlikely we are going to see huge amounts of money available for rural development or any other program through the 1990's. That is the budget reality that we are facing. They came back and said, "If you can't help us with large amounts of new money, then at least give us flexibility to deal with the problem as it exists today." Certainly, we found that in moving across the country, rural development means different things to different people. Different States have different needs. When they spoke of flexibility, that is what they were pointed to. We have a program today that straitjackets the entire Nation, all of rural America, into one set program. That set program does not work for most areas of rural America. Flexibility will allow people involved in rural development, involved in rural communities, to make the best possible use of every rural development dollar.

The heart of the legislation that we are considering today focuses upon the involvement of local people. It sets up panels in each and every State, to work with what will be the Rural Development Administration, that portion of the Farmers Home Administration that deals with rural development. These panels consist of Federal, State, and local elected officials, as well as people from rural water, from rural telephones, from power, from health, from banking, and from rural development. It covers the entire spectrum of each and every State, of statewide organizations involved in the success of growth in rural America.

The charge of these panels is to prioritize the various projects that are being applied for. The processes that we are following today would continue to be followed as far as the requirements of the law, the qualifications for approval. However, the panel then will look at the projects on the basis of merit, and where they think we can get the greatest amount of growth, rather than existing on a first come, first serve, whatever application happens to be on the top of the stack as being the one that is approved. It would be up to this panel to determine where is it that we can get the most for every dollar. It would allow targets, it would allow areas to be built up, and it would allow the focus of the resources of not only Federal dollars, but also those of the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, the allocations of the Farmers Home Fund fall into the categories of rural, water and sewer grants, community facility loans, rural water and sewer loans, business and industry loans.

All of these programs need to work in concert, as opposed to the scattergun approach we have been taking over the past number of years. Under this legislation, for the first time we bring all the resources together; we concentrate on and focus on where we can get the most for every dollar and where we can get the greatest amount of growth.

Without question, Mr. Chairman, this Nation needs a new approach. We need a new rural development bill. We need to make the most of the very scarce resources we have, and, Mr. Chairman, this legislation sets us on that road.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure to work with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rural Development, Mr. ENGLISH, in constructing what we firmly believe is the blueprint for a more stable, prosperous rural America. This legislation represents years of work, not only by me and Congressman ENGLISH, but by many others who know and are committed to our Nation's small communities. It represents some of the best thinking ever given to the challenges that face the people who work and live in rural areas.

We have had a patchwork history of rural development policy. We know that rural development efforts have waxed and waned, mostly with the economic conditions of our farmers. During the good times, few voices for rural development could be heard; during bad times, many in Congress thought that traditional commodity programs would address rural development needs.

Of course, they didn't. Traditional support programs do not encourage the job development, knowledgeable rural development leadership, modern infrastructure, or technical know-how essential to promoting economic diversity.

H.R. 3581 will do those things, and more.

I believe this legislation represents an historic opportunity for this Congress to put aside the old way of doing things for a fresh, new approach to addressing the issues that will shape rural America well into the next century.

I believe this because H.R. 3581 is a well-thought-out bill that is comprehensive in scope while recognizing that the Federal Government doesn't have all the answers. This legislation neither overpromises nor denies the hard choices to be made. But it gives those most affected—rural Americans—the tools they need to focus our resources on the problems they deem to be priorities for their communities. This legislation recognizes that just as there are many different rural Americas there must be many different approaches to solving their problems.

I believe that if we make this bill Congress' consensus on approaching rural development we can forge a strong, working relationship with the administration.

Recently, the President's Economic Policy Council Working Group on Rural Development, at the direction of the President, released its report, Rural Economic Development for the 90's. The report promotes an approach

very compatible to the thrust of the bill we are considering today. Its basic points are:

Rural America needs help;

Federal rural development programs must look beyond traditional farm programs;

Rural development is essentially an economic issue;

Economic stress hurting most rural communities is primarily nonagricultural in nature and global in scope;

Rapid change in rural America demands tighter coordination of Federal rural development programs; and

Local community leadership is at the heart of any successful rural development program.

Clearly, we agree with the administration that rural America needs help, and do not think we need more studies. Clearly, the time for studies has passed. Let's take what we know and act on it.

First, building on what we have known for years, our bill recognizes that the crisis in our rural communities does not end at the farm gate. Because an effective rural development policy must address problems traditional farm programs were not intended to solve, our bill will institutionalize rural development policy as a major function in the Department of Agriculture. We do this by creating a Rural Development Administration to bring focus and direction to Federal rural development policy.

Second, like the administration's report, this bill recognizes that rural development is essentially an economic issue. My rural constituents want to stay in their communities to live and raise their families. But to do this, they need the jobs that mean being able to support themselves, local services, and good schools for their children. This bill encourages incentives for maintaining and attracting rural businesses and job training programs to provide them a supply of skilled workers.

Third, this bill would harness modern technology to address the problems of rural America. It recognizes that technology is a primary tool in overcoming the barriers of time and distance that have in the past handicapped small communities in competing for development and jobs. In providing for rural data sharing and technology transfer centers which would develop and apply new ideas for rural businesses and markets, this bill will help smalltown America become more competitive in today's global economy.

Fourth, H.R. 3581 was far ahead of the task force report in calling for a more focused Federal rural development policy. Our legislation does that, but goes further to ensure that local communities and local community leaders have the major role in determining development priorities. Our bill will to a certain extent pool rural development funds to allow available resources to be tailored to local needs. We would correct the situation where funding levels decided in Washington for particular programs handcuff those who have to set local priorities. Those priorities would be established at the local level and decisions be made according to local and State rural development priorities. This approach will promote cooperation at all levels of Government and between Government and the private sector. It will promote cooperation rather than competition between local communities, and encourage regional approaches to addressing rural problems.

Fifth, H.R. 3581 and the administration both strongly agree that effective local community leadership is the key to successful rural development programs. We know that whatever we may do here in Washington, rural development depends on local leadership for success. That is why a very significant provision of our bill establishes a national leadership program for rural community development leaders. This program will cultivate rural development by providing local leaders knowledge of entrepreneurship, small business creation, self-employment, advanced management techniques, and financial planning.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act, is the right approach at the right time. I urge my colleagues to act today to shape America's rural communities for tomorrow.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, Chairman DE LA GARZA, and members of the committee for including provisions which are so important to me and our fellow colleagues whose districts include impoverished areas.

At least two of these provisions are very similar to legislation I initially introduced back in the 100th Congress and again in this Congress to assist these poor communities along the United States-Mexico border.

There are people in our country living in Third World conditions because they lack a simple necessity—water.

Lack of an adequate water supply and wastewater disposal system exposes the residents of these colonias to health risks and disease.

Section 806 of H.R. 3581 would authorize $30 million in grants, and $30 million in loans to assist communities that do not have a decent water supply.

I find it a shame that in this great country we cannot find a way to ensure that our citizens have just the barest essentials.

Perhaps, in the form of H.R. 3581 we can find relief.

I urge my colleagues in joining me in supporting the Rural Economic Development Act and hope that this will be the first step of many that will address the growing problems of poor health care and disease located along our border.

□ 1630

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, which can bring needed help to communities that depend on national forest timber for their economic base.

Years ago I worked as a logger, and I know the people who work in our forests and our sawmills. Many of them have built their lives around the forest products industry. Sometimes their employers have cared a lot more about profit than about either the forests or their own employees.

Washington's timber communities went through a devastating recession in the early 1980's, when interest rates squeezed the housing market and lumber prices dropped. Unemployment in some of our rural communities rose above 20 percent and stayed there for years.

Now the rural Northwest faces another crisis—the realization that past forest management policies have fragmented the last remaining old growth areas, to the point where major harvest level reductions have become inevitable. The short-term compromise in this year's Interior appropriations bill can only postpone—not prevent—the inevitable decline in timber harvest from our Northwest national forests.

No one in my State wants to see logging and mill communities suffer because past management policies were irresponsible. The environmental groups that have insisted on ancient forest protection are among the most active in working for economic help to these distressed communities.

No one understands the need better than my friend and colleague, SID MORRISON, who has worked so hard for the economic diversification program in title 9 of this bill. I am proud to have cosponsored these provisions as separate legislation along with the rest of our delegation.

As we work to resolve the environmental and economic conflicts over Northwest old growth forest, legislation like this will be critical to real solutions. I urge Members who care about forest protection to support this bill.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rural Economic Development Act of 1990 in its original, unamended version.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a colleague from the other side

of the aisle whose work I greatly respect, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON] has taken a bold step. I speak of his legislation, title IX, the National Forest-Dependent Rural Community Economic Diversification section of the act.

We in the Northwest have had a crisis caused by a timber shortage. The economic consequences are wreaking havoc to families and communities. Anyone who has followed this issue knows that the wave of the future must bring economic diversification, and what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON] has done is to allow those communities to make that first gradual step toward this necessary diversification.

Mr. Chairman, I am saddened, but not surprised, that the administration has strongly opposed the National Forest-Dependent Rural Communities Economic Diversification Act. Strangely, the reason given by the Office of Management and Budget for its opposition, is not the cost, but the notion that the role of the Forest Service is strictly to manage land.

I disagree and assert two facts in opposition.

First, one of the original Forest Service missions was to protect communities from the ruinous cutting practices of early timber companies who cut wide swaths through our forests—and then left communities behind, stranded and without resources.

Second, currently, today, right now, the Forest Service is at work promoting community stability through a program entitled "Pacific Northwest Strategies." One of the goals for this Forest Service program is, and I quote, "to reaffirm our traditional partnership role with people living in and using the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest."

Title IX, like the Forest Service's ongoing program, can help the people of Northwest ease away from strict timber dependence and toward a more diversified, balanced, and sustainable economy.

We arrive at this place in Northwest history after last year's action when this body forged an historic compromise for management of Northwest National Forests. This compromise protected large, contiguous stands of old growth timber, while assuring a sustainable level of harvest for our forest communities.

We created this compromise because in a time of crisis, long-term solutions to the timber shortage remained elusive. We recognized the agreement was only a small Band-Aid stretched to cover an enormous injury—an injury we knew we would have to address in the near future.

That near future is upon us. We must resume talks and come together in support of our timber dependent communities. Mr. Speaker, we saw the need to encourage community diversification and development and we funded it—to the tune of $495,000. The Forest Service's "Pacific Northwest Strategies" is an excellent start in implementing economic diversification.

The Strategies Program draws on a wide range of talents, interests, and leaders at the Federal, State, and local levels. It appears to be a bold, creative approach by the Bush administration to help communities adjust to changing Forest Service resource policies. Yet just as it is getting off the ground, the administration changes its mind. No, the Forest Service does not, should not, and will not keep its commitments to communities dependent upon national forest lands, claims the administration.

I take exception to that abdication of responsibility. Members of each party, legislators and adminstrators, environmentalists and timber companies, local officials, and Federal officials, all see the need. Now we have a proposal in front of us. His legislation has won the support of the Sierra Club and the Wilderness Society. They, too, want to support jobs in our beleaguered timber communities. Title IX would provide some vital "light at the end of the tunnel" for desperate communities.

Specifically, the National Forest-Dependent Rural Communities Act would enlist Forest Service expertise in assisting dependent communities to diversify their economies, thereby lessening their dependence upon national forests. The bill creates action teams who, at the request of communities, would prepare technical assistance plans to assist communities in utilizing Federal, State, local, private, and nonprofit economic development programs. In addition, the bill requires the Secretary of Agriculture to establish loan programs which would provide assistance in the development and implementation of the newly created action plans. These programs would be funded with 5 percent of the receipts received for the sale of timber and other national forest products.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to help provide assistance and hope for these communities. This economic development proposal is just a piece, but an important piece, of a package of legislation needed to protect communities and forests in the Northwest. Other pieces of the package must include real protection for old growth ecosystems, redirected log export policies, incentives for private landowners, and, of course, new directions for Forest Service timber management.

Mr. Chairman, for now I urge my colleagues to support title IX, the National Forest-Dependent Rural Communities Economic Diversification Act of 1990's ongoing program, and let us move into the future with diversification.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the English-Coleman (H.R. 3581) rural development package. This bill will provide much-needed flexibility to States and localities in the administration of rural development programs, and I wish to commend Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. COLEMAN for their fine work on this measure.

It is no secret that rural development programs have never commanded more than a few scattered crumbs of the budetary pie. For many years it was simply assumed that if you pumped enough money into agriculture, rural development would take care of itself.

Recent history, however, has shown that the problems of rural America are not so easily solved. Even with farm production up by some 43 percent and farm income up by 133 percent this decade, rural America continues to face serious economic difficulties.

The rural development bill introduced by Representatives ENGLISH and COLEMAN recognizes this essential fact. In addition, the bill recognizes a more essential fact; that our current budget situation combined with the President's no new taxes pledge effectively means no new help for rural America.

Given this unfortunate situation, the English-Coleman rural development bill seeks to put our current rural development funds to the best possible use by providing States with greater flexibility in the oversight and disbursement of these limited funds.

Under this bill, State economic review panels will be established to help address each State's unique rural development priority needs.

While the State panels will continue to receive funds under the three main rural development programs—water and sewer, business and industry, and community facilities—these panels will now have the authority to move funds between these accounts as demand and need dictate.

I see this flexibility as a great boon to our current rural development efforts. Under current law, funds sent to a State must stay within the rigid formula set by the USDA.

The English-Coleman package will allow States to respond to demand within their States, and makes the best use of our limited rural development funds.

In closing, this package is a crucial first step in recognizing the diverse

needs of rural America. The framework established in this bill will greatly enhance our current development efforts, and will prepare us for a future when rural development commands enough respect to earn not just crumbs, but a small yet significant piece of the budget to call its own.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, as we have heard from our distinguished leader of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], a lot of Americans are leaving the rural parts of our country, moving to the big cities. Those big cities are getting bigger, and of course we see more and more problems which cost more and more money. We think it is time to reverse that trend with this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have a very special interest in title IX which I would like to share with members of the committee. Our concern is for national forest-dependent communities, and they are a separate package in this particular bill. I think these are often the least sophisticated of the communities that we seek to help through rural development.

Mr. Chairman, these communities face now a very special economic problem, and that is that there are changing attitudes in this country toward the harvest of old-growth forests and concern about endangered species that are really sending economic shock waves through these communities. These communities, by the way, have served the United States very effectively. They have harvested, they process, national forest timber which returns billions of dollars to the U.S. Treasury.

The title IX provisions utilize the U.S. Forest Service. These are the people that should be involved in these communities. They know what the forest plans are for the future. They can best predict what is going to happen, and under our plan they work with local, and Government and State government leaders. They come up with an action plan at the request of the communities involved, and it utilizes a number of tools with which we are familiar in economic development, partnerships, cost-sharing loans and grants, all subject to approval by the Secretary of Agriculture. The goal is to understand their future and the options. to retool local mills, if that is in their future, and it is the most efficient step in encouraging the development of new industries and new job opportunities and provide retraining.

Mr. Chairman, this measure brings its own source of funding to rural development by utilizing some of the timber revenues actually generated by these communities that do not overlap with the remaining features of the bill. In other words, we are not tapping the same source of funds twice.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is high time that we provide recognition to these timber dependent communities that have served our country so well. They perform a vital service, as I have indicated, and now they desperately need help, and I am pleased with the leadership we have seen in the Committee on Agriculture in giving us this opportunity.

The U.S. Forest Service has had rural development packages and authority in the past. Those are terminated in the 1991 budget, so this plan steps in to take the place of that particular loss.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to express these views and thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DYSON], a valued member of our committee.

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act of 1990. I want to commend my colleague from Oklahoma, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit and Rural Development, for his leadership on this important issue.

As the Representative from the largest rural district in Maryland, I have witnessed the hardships experienced by rural Americans in the 1980's. While most of the United States has experienced unprecedented economic growth in the last decade rural America by and large has been left behind. Even rural regions which have experienced reasonable growth have been disadvantaged by a deteriorating and neglected infrastructure.

The reality of this inequity is that many rural communities have not been able to share in the Nation's economic recovery of the 1980's. In the First District of Maryland, Dorchester and Somerset Counties are two regions in need of Federal assistance. Both of these counties have annual unemployment rates in excess of 8 percent. However, the sad fact is that almost 40 percent of all rural communities in the United States have unemployment rates of 8 percent or greater. Most Federal funds are in the form of transfer payments and only 6 percent of Federal research money goes to rural America.

Without the most basic of public work improvements required to sustain continued economic growth, the Dorchester and Somerset Counties of our Nation find themselves in a catch-22 situation: the communities must provide the infrastructure necessary to create expansion; but they must first find a way to expand the tax base in order to pay for its infrastructure improvements.

Obviously, many of our struggling rural communities need a "kick start" to get back on the road to prosperity. I believe that H.R. 3581 serves this purpose. Through the establishment of the Rural Development Administration, H.R. 3581 will allow America's rural heartland to catch up with the rest of the country, and at the same time increase U.S. competitiveness in the global economy.

This legislation also encourages greater State and local participation and flexibility in determining how Federal funds should be allocated. Delegating this authority is a means of granting State and local governments the autonomy to decide for themselves how to spend the Federal funds to best suit their individual needs.

By harnessing funding already available in existing water and sewer development programs, this bill requires little in new funding, thus respecting America's need to resist new spending as we work to reduce the budget deficit.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the First District are a hardworking people who possess a proud tradition that dates back to the earliest days of our Nation's settlement. While they may not have as many funding opportunities as our urban areas have, the limited funding that is available to the rural areas must be spent in the most beneficial manner.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3581. Passage of this bill will ensure that America's rural population continues to make a positive contribution to our Nation's economic growth.

□ 1640

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] in order that he might ask a question and participate in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas on clarifying some language in the legislation.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee for the fine leadership he has provided in bringing this bill to the floor, which if passed will provide some of the neediest individuals in the United States an opportunity to live with basic necessities of life most of us take for granted, such as potable water and sewage collection.

I would appreciate the chairman clarifying an issue that may arise in the implementation of section 804 of this bill, the section providing water

and waste facility loans and grants to alleviate health risks. As we know, Mr. Chairman, a characteristic of colonias as we understand them along the border, is their unincorporated status. As such, it does not make much difference whether communities are 10 miles from an urban center or 100 miles from an urban center, they still do not have the resources to install water or wastewater collection systems. One of the most important aspects of this legislation is that it would allow individual colonia residents to receive funds for their residences to be hooked up to any existing systems.

As this issue has been addressed over the last couple of years, we have tried to impress upon the Farmers Home Administration and other administrative agencies that as used in colonias legislation, the terms "rural" and "rural area" include any unincorporated area outside the city limits characterized by substandard housing, inadequate roads and drainage and a lack of adequate water or wastewater facilities.

Is it the understanding of the Chairman that insofar as appropriated funds allow, and as long as the county in which these communities are located meet the income and unemployment criteria set forth in this title, all colonias are eligible for assistance under this legislation?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Texas makes a good point. In the Southwestern United States, for example, hundreds of thousands of people live in colonias. Some of these are truly isolated areas, while others are outside the city limits of major cities such as El Paso, in the gentleman's district. Because they are unincorporated, and are not actually part of the cities or towns, however, they are not provided services by adjoining municipalities. This title seeks to provide assistance to all identified colonias which have substandard housing, inadequate roads and drainage, and a lack of adequate water or wastewater facilities. In addition, this provision will benefit the individual colonia residents by allowing them to borrow funds for badly needed hookups into existing water delivery and wastewater collection systems.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to once more commend the chairman and thank him for his participation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of a section in this legislation that is very important to the people in my congressional district and all people along our country's southwestern border.

During the last 3 years, I have addressed this House several times and have introduced legislation attempting to improve living conditions in unincorporated communities along the border commonly known as colonias. These residents live in homes without running water or sewage collection facilities, necessities of life which most of us take for granted. This situation has been the result of a growing population and a continued scarcity of housing. Colonia residents are thus forced to drink, cook, and bathe without safe water, and as a result experience high rates of diseases that have been eradicated in other parts of our country. A study of a community in my district, for example, found that 67 percent of the residents in the area have been infected with hepatitis A, commonly caused by poor sanitation, contaminated food and water. Furthermore, since lots are typically small and residents are not aware of the consequences of doing this, many residents do not adequately separate their septic systems from their wells and end up contaminating their ground water with their own sewage.

The conditions in the colonias have existed since the 1960's, when developments were established outside the city limits as developers sold lots at low monthly payments to poor individuals eager to own their home. Unfortunately, many of these people bought land believing that adequate water and sewage systems would eventually be furnished, which did not occur. Often colonia residents could not afford rents within the city limits and found no hope of public housing because of swelling waiting lists for these units. They opted instead to purchase lots outside the city limits and move into communities where they would be able to raise their children as they sought. In my congressional district alone, it is estimated that 53,000 people live without sewage disposal facilities and 28,000 live without running water. According to estimates by the Congressional Research Service, hundreds of thousands of people—predominantly Mexican-American—live in these deplorable conditions along our country's southwestern border.

Some progress has occurred in improving the lot of colonia residents since this issue first came to the forefront, but for those of us who represent border States, it is clear that a great deal remains to be done. Aside from the inadequate water supply and wastewater collection systems found in colonias, residents suffer from intolerable health conditions, experiencing exorbitant rates of disease that have played a role in preventing children from achieving good attendance records in school.

This bill would provide assistance to colonia residents to alleviate these health risks. Additional assistance is necessary because existing Federal programs have not been sufficient given the extent of the need found in the area and because of administrative limitations to the application of these programs. When constituents of mine who are colonia residents contacted me about Federal assistance for their plight, they realized that commitment to improving their homes was also necessary from the State and local governments. For its share, the State of Texas passed legislation last year which resulted in the passage of a bond issue to provide funds for colonias. The county of El Paso, which I represent, has attempted to curb the growth of colonias by enforcing requirements on developers before land is sold in lots.

The bill under consideration today utilizes existing programs under the Farmers Home Administration by providing a $30 million grant program and a $30 million loan program for colonia residents. It also corrects a regulation that has prevented some residents in the area from participation in this program. An important component of this legislation is to make eligible for this assistance all colonia communities that have been identified by the Secretary as having significant health risks, regardless of whether they technically meet the "rural" or "rural area" definition under FmHA programs, which in the past has served to prevent colonia residents from participation in FmHA programs. I would like to thank my colleague, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, for including this language, which will be particularly helpful to colonias in my congressional district.

I also want to commend my colleagues from Texas, SOLOMON ORTIZ, JOHN BRYANT, and ALBERT BUSTAMANTE, who have contributed a great deal to passage of assistance for colonias. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], who is a leading proponent of rural economic development in the committee.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking both our chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee for their work and cooperation in this area. Anyone who has watched rural America in the last 10 years certainly knows that there has been a major transition in rural America.

Very frankly, we do not have as many farmers today as we did 10 years ago, for a lot of different reasons.

Without reflecting on the past, however, we have a chance here today to focus on the future, and as we focus on that future we can talk about rural development, and as we talk about rural development one of the main foundations of this legislation is that we will work within the USDA to have a rural development administration which has that separate unique focus on those elements which are geared toward economic development.

The second key part of this legislation which I think is so important is the flexibility that follows that focus, flexibility that allows the Department of Agriculture and their respective State agencies to pool money when it becomes necessary, to move money back and forth from various programs to meet the needs of that particular State.

Now, in order to get that funding, something else is required that becomes important. As a result of this legislation, people will no longer simply be applying for funds by themselves. You will need a plan, an economic development plan. That is a requirement. That is a good investment.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. COLEMAN for their excellent work in

refocusing our rural development efforts in the Rural Economic Development Act of 1990. Through your efforts, our rural development delivery system will be enhanced with more local control in charting rural development.

I am confident this new delivery system will encourage new employment, improved infrastructure of water and waste systems, electricity and telephone services, health care service, and education for rural America.

Included as part of this package is an amendment I offered which makes it possible for rural development to take place on a regional basis, by making regional development organizations eligible to apply for rural development funds. This compliments the local delivery efforts as the basis of this legislation.

The diversity of rural conditions in the small towns and communities of the United States is reflected in the paths they set for economic and infrastructure development efforts.

No two communities are the same; therefore, communities will choose diverse paths for their own economic viability. Some communities will seek to transform and diversify their economics from goods producing to services. Still, other communities may specialize in residential and consumer service activities, while others may stress health care services and education. Other communities will take advantage of natural resources and cultural diversity.

Regardless of what path communities choose, the fact remains that increasingly, rural communities are more and more interrelated. A regionalized approach to revitalizing the communities of western Wisconsin, the State of Wisconsin, and of all rural America is a concept whose time has come.

Western Wisconsin, like other regions of rural America, face numerous challenges in the future. With western Wisconsin's population expected to grow 9 percent in the next 10 years and 19 percent by the year 2020, we will need to not only continue to enhance the agriculture economy, we will need to diversify employment opportunities and provide reliable and adequate water and sewer systems, expand power service, enhance job training programs, stabilize health care institutions, and expand educational opportunities.

The overall challenges western Wisconsin and the whole State face are different than the rest of rural America, with the needs of each community, each county, each region, differing. We will strengthen the role of our local and State organizations in charting their future and we also allow for regional efforts as well to capitalize on our human and natural resources, to diversify our economies so rural America can share in prosperity.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] for bringing this bill to the floor early in this session as promised. Of course, that would not have been possible were it not for the diligent efforts of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], for all the good and diligent work they put into this piece of legislation in the first session of this Congress. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] are to be commended very highly for producing an exceedingly good work product out of their subcommittee. I think we all owe them a debt of gratitude.

Mr. Chairman, rural America now stands at the threshold of a new decade brimming with both great promises and crucial challenges. Concerns surrounding the improvement of our rural infrastructure and the need to generate more local businesses and investment capital have given rural America cause for concern.

H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act gives rural areas some necessary tools that will allow infrastructure and business development to occur—development that is so vital to the future of our rural towns and communities. This bill also creates a more systematic, prioritized approach to rural economic development by requiring and supporting State and local planning processes. Through the local planning process, the priorities of communities can be more effectively identified, and this will facilitate statewide prioritization of local funding needs.

This rural development initiative is a positive move in the direction of allowing local communities to develop their full potential. By providing incentives for that growth, we will help spur the recovery of rural areas and create new opportunities by which rural families and businesses can prosper. I urge my colleagues to suport this measure and put rural America on a positive growth course for the future.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], a Member who is exceedingly interested in this subject matter as well.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I rise in support of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act of 1990. I commend Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. COLEMAN for presenting the full committee with such a fine bill. I commend Chairman DE LA GARZA for speedily bringing this bill to the floor.

I support this bill for several reasons. It addresses the needs of our poorest communities which are not served by the most basic necessities as running water and sanitary facilities within their homes. Those from more urban areas probably cannot imagine life without these basic necessities. Yet, there are pockets of devastation within our country that will be helped by this bill. Furthermore, meaningful rural economic development is nearly impossible without infrastructure funds for projects like sewer and waste water treatment facilities. For these reasons, I will be also supporting the upcoming Rose amendment.

Budgetary concerns are certainly noteworthy and deserve our attention. However, these basic human needs require that we spend some money to save money in the future dues to sickness and disease.

The other important point in this bill is a compromise worked out in the report language, redefining "rural" to include areas such as Madison County in my district in New York State, as well as many other rural areas within my State and the northeast region. We were careful to allow for membership on the rural development panel from rural areas without dominating the board with members of more urban areas. The panel is crucial in determining priorities for the distribution of rural development funds. This compromise protects all interests.

With these thoughts in mind, I urge my colleagues to support this rural development initiative and help those segments of our country who are relying on this assistance.

□ 1650

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here to support rural development legislation before the House today. I am glad that the Agriculture Committee has recognized the unique needs of rural America, and decided to address this issue separately from the 1990 farm bill.

Last summer, the House Agriculture Committee began a series of hearings on the needs facing rural America. Needs and problems such as:

Rural unemployment levels 33 percent higher than urban unemployment;

Rural poverty levels 33 percent higher than urban poverty; and

Rural income per capita 25 percent lower than urban income.

These hearings began with testimony of Members of Congress concerned about rural America. I was pleased to participate in these hearings. I stated that we must act now to address the identified needs, or perhaps lose the chance altogether. The approach I stressed was that we must first examine the effectiveness of current Federal programs affecting rural development—before authorizing new Federal programs. During the hearings, the

committee heard from many quarters that the current array of Federal rural development programs could be improved, especially in light of the budgetary restraints.

The committee also heard from many witnesses on the need for more flexibility at the State and local level to determine priorities for Federal rural development assistance.

I applaud the committee for its innovative and responsive approach to the needs and suggestions it heard during the hearing process. As the centerpiece of this bill, the committee proposes consolidating the Agriculture Department's rural development programs under the umbrella of a new Rural Development Administration, and brings local input into the funding process for these programs.

I agree that the people most affected by rural development programs should help decide where that money would be best spent. I also agree that rural development functions of the Department of Agriculture should be separated from the agricultural credit functions. It has been apparent for some time that the prosperity of all rural America does not necessarily coincide with the status of agriculture enterprises.

I also applaud sections of the bill which would increase the capital available for very small businesses located in rural America, that would turn the Rural Information Center of the National Agriculture Library into a one-step shop for information on rural development programs and initiatives, and that would enhance Cooperative Extension's existing work on behalf of rural communities and individuals.

Furthermore, I urge every Member's support for the amendments of my esteemed colleague from Minnesota, Representative ARLAN STANGELAND regarding the establishment of 100 rural enterprise zones. I am a proud cosponsor of Representative STANGELAND'S freestanding bill to authorize HUD to establish 100 rural enterprise zones, and strongly believe that this type of Federal incentive would greatly encourage job creation in rural areas. I urge all supporters of the enterprise zone concept to vote in favor of the amendments I understand Representative STANGELAND will offer tomorrow.

I must say that I am concerned that certain elements of the bill detract from the committee's desire to centralize rural development efforts. Not all of the Department of Agriculture's rural development programs are incorporated into the new Rural Development Administration, and the need for authorizing newly duplicative programs is questionable. I am also concerned that the State review panels may not be able to process proposed business development loans quickly enough, and would hate to see funding decisions based on anything other than addressing the needs of rural America.

Despite some reservations about certain aspects of this bill, I am pleased to rise in support of addressing the needs of rural America. Hopefully, the House and the Senate will address some of these shortcomings during the conference on this bill. I know that all the supporters of rural America hope that a final rural development bill will be signed into law sometime this year. Favorable action on this bill will help to make the 101st Congress remembered as a banner session for rural America.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], who is interested in this subject.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of rural America and H.R. 33581, the Rural Economic Development Act. I thank the distinguished committee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] and the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN], and the subcommittee chairman the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] for their diligent efforts to bring this legislation before the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years those of us who represent rural districts have seen a rise in unemployment, as well as a lack of quality telecommunication facilities, and health care facilities. Though in the Congress we have set up numerous programs aimed at improving infrastructure and enhancing economic development in rural America, the fact remains that little coordination exists among Federal efforts to create a comprehensive plan for assisting our Nation's rural communities. In fact, much of the current assistance offered to rural communities has been inflexible and has lacked necessary local input, leaving many critical projects necessary for our local areas to be unfinished and unfunded.

Mr. Chairman, we in Congress often legislate grand policies at the Federal level to assist our local communities; however, many times the ultimate affect is less than expected.

We are now about to embark upon a new policy to revitalize rural America, yet we lack a provision which will allow Congress to follow up and view how well we have done.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I offer my support to an amendment offered by my Republican colleague, Mr. SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, of New York. This amendment will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a modest competitive grants program to land-grant colleges and universities, research foundations, State agricultural experiment stations, and all colleges having rural development research capability, to evaluate the impact of Federal and State economic policies and programs on rural economies.

Mr. Chairman, though the legislation before us today offers a new and enlightened policy for revitalizing rural America, I believe it necessary to point out that today we are not going far enough. If we are truly interested in battling the unfortunate plight of our Nation's rural communities, it will be necessary to generate more capital to assist these economically struggling areas.

Mr. Chairman, today's legislation is an important step in the right direction. For this reason, I urge my congressional colleagues to support, H.R. 3581.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, before I yield back the balance of my time, we will take up the 5-minute rule tomorrow, and Members will have an opportunity to have several amendments placed before us.

While this sometimes is an esoteric subject because we are getting into some programs that have some wide-ranging ramifications, I hope the Members will listen to the debate tomorrow and recognize that we have worked on this proposal for several years and hope to expedite things tomorrow. But we may have some amendments that will take some time.

I think we have a good work product. I think it is different, and it is nontraditional, which may breed some interest by people, because we are doing something different. We need to do something different, because the circumstances require that we do.

I am delighted with all the positive things that were said today. I did not hear a negative thing said about our bill. I am thankful for that. I appreciate those positive comments toward myself and, I am sure, the other gentleman as well.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I echo and associate myself with the words of our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], who has done very diligent work on this issue, and I repeat what he has stated that tomorrow the House convenes at 11 a.m., and as soon as the leadership allows us, we will commence the 5-minute period on this legislation.

There are some amendments. We hope that the membership would support the committee. Some we can accept. Some deal with other committees that they are trying to work out

some agreement, and others that might just deviate the thrust of this legislation that I would hope the Members would cooperate with and sustain the actions of the committee.

We hope that we might be able to accelerate the process, that we may not have votes, if not necessary, and that hopefully we would finish the deliberations before 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

That is basically the plan for tomorrow.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act of 1989. This is a great day for rural America. Today, the House will help forge the future of the rural areas of our country. The last major rewrite of rural development policy and implementation elements of that policy was completed in 1972.

I want to commend my colleague and friend from Oklahoma, Chairman ENGLISH, ranking minority member Mr. COLEMAN, and Chairman DE LA GARZA and all the other members of the Agriculture Committee who have worked to bring this legislative package to the Floor.

The last 10 years have been devastating to rural America. The facts are that over 5 million Americans have left rural America. The undercommitment of resources to rural areas has resulted in out-migration to more populated areas already plagued with socio-economic problems, thus exacerbating such problems for rural citizens. Rural unemployment rates which were historically lower than urban rates, are now higher. The gap between rural and urban incomes has widened and rural poverty rates are now substantially above metropolitan area rates. And, most important—the necessary principal and gap financing for industrial and economic development to produce off-farm jobs are non-existent in most rural areas.

After 10 years, the Department of Agriculture and others have focused on the fact that off-farm jobs are crucial even to production agriculturists in rural areas. And, the proportion of people living in rural areas who do not derive their livelihood solely from producing agricultural commodities, but who also have part-time off-farm jobs is growing.

The 1972 rural development package dealt primarily with basic infrastructure necessary for a good life in rural areas and emphasis in basic infrastructure for rural industrial economic development.

Today we are crossing a new threshold. A new dimension if you will. We have laid most of the basic framework to now work toward applied rural industrial economic development. The foundation has been poured and the house has been framed. It is now ready to be finished. Make no mistake, there is a difference between rural development and rural economic development. While the 1972 act principally focused on rural development, H.R. 3581 as does S. 1036 focus on building upon the foundation that has been laid.

I am optimistic that as a result of this legislation we will move forward and go beyond only planning and policy development. Whatever package this body should adopt now or later as reconciled by both chambers should have the principal focus of off-farm jobs, anything less sells rural America short.

I'm encouraged that the committee has adopted many of the provisions that I have advocated for most of the 14 years that I have been in Congress.

Among those things that have been adopted include the streamlining of the Department of Agriculture's rural development activities and the establishment of a new Rural Development Administration [RDA] within the Department. This will provide for direct accountability, responsibility for the mission of urgency to build rural areas and a more effective delivery of rural programs.

I'm hopeful that the new RDA under the restructured Department will place additional emphasis on key growth centers with identified resources that can be expanded, such as with regional industrial airparks. Targeted investment into these areas and similar areas can provide for the maximum return in off-farm jobs. These sites will provide for a jump start for rural America in economic development.

Title IV of the bill builds upon H.R. 4331 (Public Law 99-409) which I authored and got passed in the 99th Congress. The language within this section focuses on rural technology transfer centers and actually utilizes language from the bill I originally introduced where the concept of rural technology centers was first proposed. The purpose of this authorization is to help new or expanding business and industry to build off-farm jobs in economically depressed areas.

Utilizing title V of the bill that focuses on the Extension Service and the use of the Service for more involvement in hands-on applied assistance to business and industry can be coupled with rural technology centers. Rural technology and innovation centers at a land-grant college and university may be directly associated with the Extension Service for delivery of information in a progressive push manner to rural areas. The centers may be tied to the network of Federal laboratories, universities, voctech schools, and technology education classes, and available technologies and existing technology transfer efforts.

The county level of the Extension Service can help implement under the new structure of the RDA. Assistance needed or new products and processes to be evaluated from local people at the county level would be feed back through the chain to the rural center where a response would be generated. I believe the authority gives the Service the flexibility to take the active role of pushing rural development and the creation of job opportunities that will result in the growth and preservation of rural areas.

Existing non-profits, not related to the university can continue as well to provide the same assistance as well in the creation of jobs through technology assistance to new or expanding industry.

While I cannot cover every segment of this bill, I will conclude by saying that I believe that we have the basic elements for helping rural areas in this bill. I believe that the elements of this bill combined with the financing elements in the Senate rural development bill will result in a positive, progressive legislative package.

While the package before us today falls far short of the Marshall plan for the 65 million Americans living in rural areas, which I have advocated, I'm encouraged nevertheless with the progressive steps in that direction. I would like to think that this is to assist in continuing the basic and industrial framework for rural areas and that as part of a Marshall plan at a later date we will help detail and furnish the house we have built.

Mr. ROBERT F. (BOB) SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3581—the Rural Economic Development Act. I believe the best way to ensure a healthy rural economy is to provide for sound Federal agricultural policy. We will all have an opportunity to play a role later in the session when we take up the Food Security Act of 1990, or farm bill. In my hometown in eastern Oregon the people are fighting for the survival of the only hospital in the county. Moreover, Oregon has given back 62 percent of its available rural development moneys to the Federal Government over the past 3 years under the three categories included within this legislation—water and sewer; communities facilities; and, business and industry. Many of our Nation's rural areas are staring into the face of economic disaster. Hospitals are closing, businesses are failing, jobs are being lost, and citizens are packing up their belongings and moving to the big city in search of the American dream. Why should rural folks have to leave their homes and change their lifestyles to find prosperity? The answer is, they shouldn't have to.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the House Committee on Agriculture have worked diligently to attempt to remedy this situation. Although I retain some concerns about a few provisions in H.R. 3581, this legislation should provide States' the needed flexibility to set their own rural economic development priorities.

As my colleagues on the committee know, I supported a committee amendment to the bill that would have maintained current Farmers Home Administration loans and grants for water and sewer projects—which are essential to the survival of rural communities. After all, a business or hospital cannot function if life-giving drinking water is flowing with muck. The committee's action to increase the authorization for water and sewer from $155 million to $500 million, as well as a separate water and sewer pool of $34 million is at least a step in the right direction.

My second concern with this bill dealt with the new rural development panels that will set each State's priorities. As I expressed to the Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit and Rural Development—I wanted to assure that rural representatives do indeed serve on those panels. After lengthy deliberation on both the subcommittee and full committee, we reached an agreement that voting panel members shall come from cities with a population less than 17,500. This report language is based on the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, which Farmers Home often utilizes.

Finally, I would like to thank my colleague from Washington State, who put forth a provision in the bill that will encourage timber-dependent rural communities to diversify economically. This provision authorizes the USDA to establish "action teams" that would provide technical assistance to assist these communi-

ties by utilizing up to 5 percent of the general fund moneys from timber receipts. The Pacific Northwest should benefit significantly from this proposal.

In all, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3581 will provide the mortar needed between the cracks to spur economic growth in rural areas largely unaffected by America's economic recovery. I rise in support of this legislation.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important initiative for rural Americans. I believe that this legislation takes an important step in identifying and addressing the issues affecting successful rural economic development.

I commend the work of the members of the Agriculture Committee for their efforts in drafting legislation which takes a new and dynamic approach to rural economic development. The old approaches to this problem have not worked—it is time that we try a new approach that allows rural Americans to move forward and to determine their own future.

H.R. 3581 significantly expands the role of the States in establishing funding priorities for rural assistance projects. It establishes the Rural Development Administration within the U.S. Department of Agriculture which would be responsible for the overall coodination of rural development programs. Furthermore, by requiring States to establish an advisory review panel, the States will be able to review development plans and applications for assistance under rural economic development programs and to establish coordinated funding priorities. In addition, H.R. 3581 recognizes that priority must be given to projects that will benefit the public health. H.R. 3581 also will increase the authorization for water and waste disposal grants from $154.9 to $500 million annually.

These are important steps toward improving our commitment to rural Americans. However, this is only a step and the real test of our commitment will be our willingness to provide the resources to achieve the necessary improvements in our rural communities. We must provide the financial assistance that will allow rural towns to protect their drinking water; to install, expand, or improve their sewer systems; and to allow small businesses and industries to expand or open business ventures in these towns.

In the State of Maine, many rural communities are faced with budgetary burdens that prevent them from addressing such pressing problems as the expansion or improvement of their sewer systems. Federal funding for rural waste water improvements has been cut in half during the eighties while the regulation of waste water systems has steadily increased.

As we seek to improve the health and quality of life of rural Americans through the Rural Economic Development Act, I believe that we must also look toward providing greater Federal assistance to this segment of society.

Mr. Chairman, I know what Maine's rural communities can achieve. I have seen the economic successes that come with carefully planned and supported economic development. I know the pride that my rural constituents feel in their communities and I know the degree to which they are willing to work to make these towns healthy and prosperous for their families. They have been denied the additional Federal assistance and improved coordination that will allow increased rural economic development. I hope that my colleagues will join me in support of H.R. 3581 and I hope that they will view this legislation as I do: as the first step in our renewed commitment to rural America.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act of 1990.

Consideration of this legislation on the floor of the House represents the culmination of years of effort. We meet today to attempt to finally reach agreement on a mechanism to more effectively marshal the resources available to us into developing our rural economies and enhancing the quality of life in our rural area.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking minority members of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit for the long, hard work they have put into the development of this bill, and for allowing me to cosponsor it with them. I would also like to note the efforts of the former chairman of the committee, Representative Ed Jones of Tennessee, for his own, past efforts on behalf of rural development.

This bill is not perfect, and it is not the bill I would design on my own. But I will support it because it does provide us with the means of focusing our efforts in rural America by calling on all of the resources available to us.

This legislation will combine the efforts of the Federal, State, and local governments in a coordinated fashion. It will call on leaders from cooperatives, local businesses, utilities, the communities, the local electric cooperatives, the extension service, local academics and schools of agriculture, and business, to work together in an organized and orderly fashion to identify, confront, and solve problems deterring economic development. And to recognize and seize opportunities to promote that development.

I'm pleased at the interest that has been demonstrated by the Nation's cooperatives as we have developed this legislation. The Wisconsin Federation of Cooperatives, particularly its executive director, Mr. Rod Nilsestuen, has played a real leadership role, and I'm happy to support those efforts today.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has also been a major catalyst behind this legislation, and we should thank our former colleague and former Secretary of Agriculture Bob Bergland for the role he has played.

Over the years, I have been disappointed that the scale of our approach to rural development legislation has been diminished. This bill will allow us to concentrate our efforts by working together in a more organized fashion, but it provides no new resources, it does not increase the magnitude of that effort. It is the product of a compromise between what we would like to do and what we can affort to do. In light of that, I find the administration's continued opposition to it to be most disappointing.

We will pass this bill, and I hope we can improve it when we go to conference with the Senate. But our efforts must not be swayed by the objections of the administration to a bill that has enjoyed so much bipartisan effort and support.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act.

Mr. Chairman, when this bill was first introduced, I started to receive a lot of mail from the rural water groups in my district expressing their concerns over certain provisions in this bill. I am glad to see that these concerns have been addressed and that these groups have now signed off on this bill. I believe that this legislation will provide an innovative and valuable approach in addressing the development needs of rural communities by allowing local areas greater input into the allocation of Federal funds for rural development.

The current economic condition of rural America threatens the stability of our rural residents. Rural unemployment rates are 31 percent higher than the rest of the Nation and rural job growth continues to lag well behind the job growth in urban areas. The quality of health care and education in these areas also continues to suffer.

In my district over 200,000 of the individuals I represent live in rural areas. With many of these areas suffering from a depressed economy, the unemployment rate in my district overall is 8.2 percent, with some of the more rural counties, like Mora, ranging to 27 percent. Although New Mexico as a whole is experiencing some growth, it is predominantly in the urban communities. Industries and services are not moving into the depressed rural communities where they are needed to stimulate the economy; instead they are locating in more economically stable and prosperous areas—urban communities.

While we all may realize the importance of helping our country's rural areas, we also realize that our Federal budget simply does not have the additional funding needed for these programs. In an effort to address the problems being experienced in these rural communities, I agree that what is needed is a reorganization of the current funding process of these programs. That is exactly what the Rural Economic Development Act would do—reorganize the process in which these funds are applied for and provide rural areas with the flexibility needed to use Federal money for projects that are important to the local community. This legislation will give those communities more of a say in how these Federal funds should be spent.

Our rural citizens are trying to cope with their unstable economic conditions. I believe that it is important for Congress to do what it can to help our rural communities by developing a more efficient way of administering funding for these programs. Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this much needed and important piece of legislation.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill, H.R. 3581, the Rural Development Act of 1989. This rule waives section 303(a)(1) of the Budget Act because the measure contains $1 million of new budget authority effective in fiscal year 1991, and

Congress has not yet adopted a budget resolution for fiscal year 1991. The Budget Act does not allow consideration of measures providing new direct spending or revenue changes for a fiscal year prior to the adoption of a budget resolution for such fiscal year. The rule allows this spending decision to be made outside of the control of the budget process. It was a mistake to adopt a rule that violates the Budget Act.

This bill creates $1 million in immediate, direct spending, which results from the Farmers Home Administration lending money to rural health care facilities at more preferrable rates. This is a clear violation of the Budget Act. The bill also authorizes enormous sums of money for new programs and expansion of existing programs. In fiscal year 1991 the bill authorizes $540 million in budget authority which expands to a 5-year total of $2.5 billion.

In addition to adding $2.5 billion to our Federal deficit, the bill also creates a new bureaucracy by establishing a new rural development administration within the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The growth of government goes on.

The administration strongly opposes enactment of H.R. 3581. So do I. It is too expensive; it provides additional Federal subsidies to financially healthy telephone borrowers; it allows REA borrowers to defer scheduled debt payments if they made loans for rural development purposes.

I shall oppose this bill because it violates the Budget Act, and because it is much too costly. Members who vote for this bill can be assured that their efforts will make the deficit rise. This is a time for restraint, not expansion. I urge a vote against H.R. 3581.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I want to lend my support to the passage of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act of 1989. Although I represent an urban district, I believe that if we are to move forward as a Nation, all sectors of our society should move forward together. Rural Americans have just as much desire for economic vitality in their communities as the Americans who live in our inner city neighborhoods.

But today rural America is in trouble. In fact, without Government support, rural America may cease to exist. It is a sector which has been victimized by the farm crisis, increasing urbanization, and dwindling economic resources. Yet, there are many Americans who prefer rural living to life in the big city. Without an infusion of resources, however, it will be impossible to maintain a viable, rural America.

Today's legislation will hopefully bring the necessary resources together to spur a revitalization of this important sector. H.R. 3581, while acknowledging the role that agriculture plays in a strong rural America, also recognizes that there are other elements which are needed for revitalization. Last summer, the Oklahoma rural electric cooperatives sponsored a trip for congressional offices to demonstrate the vital links between the transfer of technology, rural businesses and agriculture. I am pleased that my staff was able to participate in this trip. I certainly gained a greater recognition of the contribution of entities like the rural electric cooperatives in building viable and strong rural areas.

Finally, I am hopeful that the U.S. Department of Agriculture will use this legislation as an opportunity for diverse communities to participate in the revitalization of rural America. One means of ensuring that all of rural America benefits from this legislation is to encourage the participation of 1890 land-grant colleges and universities as well as community-based organizations with established experience in working with economically and socially disadvantaged individuals. If these institutions and organizations participate in the grant programs authorized by this bill, I believe that we will be able to guarantee that economic development will reach all rural Americans. I would urge all of my colleagues to support the passage of this legislation.

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Chairman, the economic problems of rural America are great. Changes in Medicare reimbursement policies have threatened the financial status of hundreds of rural hospitals exacerbating health care access problems in rural areas. Some 5 million Americans have left their rural communities during the last decade. According to the Center on Budget Policy and Priorities poverty levels among working poor families in rural areas are twice as high as those in urban areas. Rural unemployment rates are 31 percent higher than those in urban areas. The per capita income of rural residents is 25 percent lower than urban residents. Rural Americans are five times more likely be uninsured than their urban counterparts.

There is no easy answer to these problems. Through my work on the House Rural Health Care Coalition, I have learned that comprehensive solutions to the problems facing rural America are difficult. However, passage of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act, is a step in the right direction. This bill represents what I have always believed—that local people know best how to solve local problems. The reorganization of USDA programs and the reliance on local citizens to prioritize funding needs in the States should ensure that Federal dollars are spent more effectively and are coordinated with State rural development efforts. The Federal Government's role in initiating economic development in rural areas is limited. However, the USDA does provide $1 billion a year through various grant and loan programs to help build the infrastructure of rural areas. Regrettably, it hasn't been easy for many local communities to take full advantage of these programs in the past. The Rural Economic Development Act provides much needed flexibility to these programs to ensure that states can actually take advantage of these Federal funds.

The bill's provisions increasing the role of rural electric cooperatives and rural telephone companies is also important. Permitting rural telephone companeis and electric cooperatives to make financial investments in small businesses in their communities is a key ingredient to promote economic development in rural America. For rural entrepreneurs finding capital can be difficult. The economic depression in rural areas has affected many commercial lenders ability to finance new business projects.

Even though I support H.R. 3581, I am compelled to comment on one section of the bill which I think sets a bad precedent. Title IX of the legislation provides relief on an industry-specific basis. While I am sympathetic to the economic disruptions in rural areas as a result of declining timber sales, singling out these areas for special treatment ignores the tremendous economic disruptions in rural economies resulting from the downturn in the mining and energy and industries.

Furthermore, the cost of this program will be substantial. Contrary to the Forest Service's assertions, the Government doesn't make money by selling its timber. In fact, the Subcommittee on Energy, Environment and Natural Resources, which I chair, has learned that the Government loses $400 million every year on timber sales because they are priced well below cost. The fact that this program is funded with 5 percent of the receipts from Government timber sales means nothing since the Government doesn't make anything from U.S. timber sales. I hope that the flaws with this provision will be addressed during the conference committee.

My concern over this provision aside, I do support the goals of H.R. 3581 and encourage the members of the conference committee to resolve the differences between the House and Senate version of these bills as quickly as possible.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my views on the bill H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act.

Although there is much merit in the creation of a Rural Development Administration within the U.S. Department of Agriculture, I cannot support the rural development bill as it is written.

I have spent much of my public career specializing in matters as they relate to economic development and our Nation's infrastructure, and feel proud of my record of accomplishments.

I feel strongly, and many of my colleagues would agree, that most jobs are created by small businesses and that most successful small businesses are "home grown". To spur their growth, it is essential that these businesses receive help in a timely fashion. Small, rural business can simply not afford the luxury of time.

Regional development which has been established and promoted by the Economic Development Administration [EDA] deserves our continued support. The EDA created Local Development Districts [LDD's] which serve the development needs of much of our nation. A regional concept makes good sense—local involvement is secured because local governments make up the governing boards of LDD's. Yet, rural governments must work together in establishing economic goals in the interest of the region. Local, political influence is thus minimized. Moreover, unlike at the State level, the region has a better "grassroots" understanding of its development needs and may better provide for these needs with the limited available funds. These LDD's know and understand economic development have still made positive strides despite the constraints of the budget.

Besides organizing USDA's economic development programs under a single roof, this bill provides nothing new to promote the growth of small businesses or to improve our

Nation's rural infrastructure needs; rather, it creates additional layers of bureaucracy which only serve to impede the development process which already exists.

I have worked closely with the Farmers Home Administration's [FmHA] Business and Industry and Community Facilities Programs for over a decade. My rural district has benefited a great deal from the programs and staff of FmHA. Their many programs have been well thought out and have played key roles in providing jobs and improving the quality of life in rural Pennsylvania.

Why our Nation can't used the tools which are already available for development rather than "re-inventing the wheel" is puzzling. We don't need more money for review or study committees—we need more dollars for bricks and mortar. Plain and simple, constructive programs which will give fledgling businesses the funds they need to grow, and small communities the necessary sewer and water assistance are the right places to channel our resources.

I have all too often seen good programs, with good intentions, fail because of the burdening requirements placed upon them. Already, many of the FmHA's programs must process a multitude of papers to meet a variety of considerations. This bill would expand the review process a project must undergo even further. This just doesn't make sense.

To aid rural development, we need to invest real dollars and provide flexibility and speed in the delivery of these dollars. The mechanism is already in place through the LDD's that serve a great majority ot this Nation. If we are serious about economic development, then we should provide the limited funds we have to these LDD's and continue to use the FmHA programs to promote real economic development rather than spend money on more studies or more reviews and more information gathering in an effort to placate all the special interests.

I believe this is a flawed bill, it creates roadblocks that serve only to retard and not promote economic development. I urge all of my colleagues to look closely at this bill and join me in voting against it.

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act of 1990. This piece of legislation is a key component of reviving and strengthening our rural areas. I commend Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. COLEMAN for the outstanding job they have done to address the problems rural areas now face.

At the time our country was founded more Americans resided in the country than in cities and towns. This trend continued throughout 150 years of our history. In the early 1900's the number of Americans living in rural America was the highest it had ever been and it looks as though that record will hold. Today the numbers of rural residents are dwindling rapidly. In recent years, nearly 400,000 people have left rural America to seek better opportunity and advancement in urban areas.

The continued deterioration of our rural areas needs to be addressed as soon as possible. H.R. 3581 has responded to the cries of those rural communities which are desperately seeking assistance from the Federal Government as never before. We have, as Members of Congress, the responsibility to provide monetary, technical, and moral support to those trying to develop their communities and towns. The next few years are critical to rural areas of America.

Current programs assisting the rural communities of America haven't necessarily kept pace with particular State or local community needs. Federal Government involvement comes in the form of those in Washington deciding what Ovid, MI, should do with its schools, health care facilities, and other infrastructure projects. What does the administration here in Washington know that the rural citizens in Ovid don't? Those citizens in Ovid should be able to determine how the community can become a strong and viable place to live and decide their own destiny.

Rural communities will be much more productive if plans and decisions are made at the local level. Reorganizing USDA to establish a new Rural Development Administration and consolidate Department activities with regard to rural development is critical. Additionally, the powers currently held by the Farmers Home Administration [FmHA]—such as the water and sewer, business and industry, and community facility loan and grant programs—will be transferred to the Rural Development Administration.

Creating State review panels will facilitate the involvement of local participation whereby the rural communities prepare local or regional economic development plans to address their most critical needs. Projects to achieve the goals of the local or regional economical development plans are submitted to the State review panel for approval. Funding is then assigned based on how a particular project ranks compared to others that were submitted. This method of deciding a community's future could not be any better. Allowing the State and its localities to set their own agenda and work towards achieving it is definitely the right step in the right direction.

The bill increases the amount of funds that will be available to communities to improve or create new rural water and wastewater systems. Capital for State revolving loan funds that would make loans to support very small business ventures is included in this bill. Health care and related facilities would receive interest rates based solely on the income of the area that will be served by the facility. A technical assistance unit within the Rural Electrification Administration [REA], which would provide advice and assistance to rural electric and telephone borrowers, will be established. In addition REA will have the authority to allow borrowers to defer payment of principal and interest on certain loans for up to 10 years. However, to defer payments the borrowers must invest the loan proceeds in rural development projects.

Another provision which is definitely important to the northern region of Michigan is the Forest-Dependent Communities title. Encouraging economic diversification in rural communities that are economically dependent on forest resources, particularly those areas adversely affected by Federal land management practices. Technical assistance is what many of these timber dependent communities need to diversify their economic potential. So-called Action Teams would be the avenues used to provide those timber communities with the needed technical assistance.

In conclusion, I strongly support the bill as it now stands and will also support a few possible amendments that would address the very few things what it doesn't already. H.R. 3581 will give rural America the booster shot needed to survive the ailments brought on by urban expansion.

Now having the benefit of hindsight I would like to add a few remarks regarding the amendment that basically gutted H.R. 3581. I will agree with Chairman DE LA GARZA that many Members voting in favor of the Rose amendment were given misleading information with regard to what H.R. 3581 is intended to do for rural America. I urge the Chairman to reconsider H.R. 3581, if the differences between the opponents and proponents of H.R. 3581 can be resolved. Rural America is running out of time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to work with my colleague GLEN ENGLISH on H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development and Education Partnership Act of 1990. As he knows, I would have preferred adding a rural education component to this package, but the rule didn't allow me to offer it.

Nevertheless, were I not on important business in Montana, I would be joining Mr. ENGLISH, both in working and voting for this bill.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1700

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TAUZIN) having assumed the chair, Mr. TRAXLER, 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. 3581), entitled the "Rural Economic Development Act of 1989," had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3581, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on the rule to H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, had I

been present, I would have voted "present" on rollcall 23 and "aye" on rollcall 24.

NATIONAL PREVENT-A-LITTER MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 229) to designate April 1990 as National Prevent-a-Litter Month, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the House is considering today House Joint Resolution 441, which will designate April 1990 as National Prevent-a-Litter Month.

This resolution will call attention to the nationwide crisis of pet overpopulation, promote responsible pet ownership, and focus on the primary solution to this problem—the spaying and neutering of pet dogs and cats.

Today, 70,000 dogs and cats will be born in the United States. Sadly, before the day is over, more than 20,500 dogs and cats will be destroyed because there is not enough homes for them.

The annual cost of our Nation's communities for animal control and animal shelter programs approaches $800 million.

If pet owners would take the safe and humane step of spaying and neutering their pets, this overpopulation problem could be substantially reduced.

I would like to thank my 229 colleagues who cosponsored this resolution, making it possible for the House to consider designating April 1990 as National Prevent-a-Litter Month.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 229

Whereas the irresponsibility of some dog and cat owners in allowing uncontrolled breeding of their pets has created a pet overpopulation problem in the United States;

Whereas the pet overpopulation problem results in the destruction of millions of dogs and cats each year;

Whereas the pet overpopulation problem results in other cruelties to pets caused by neglect, such as abandonment, starvation, and injury;

Whereas the cruelties inflicted on pets result not only in lost animal lives but also in lost resources spent by thousands of communities to shelter neglected and displaced pets;

Whereas the pet overpopulation problem can be solved only by active promotion of pet owner responsibility programs that include spaying and neutering of pets, proper care and sheltering of pets, and compliance with animal control regulations; and

Whereas the people of the United States should commit themselves to preventing the needless destruction of pets by practicing responsible pet ownership and by spaying and neutering pets as a means of combating the problem of pet overpopulation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 1990 is designated as "National Prevent-A-Litter Month", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY: A NATIONAL DAY OF CELEBRATION OF GREEK AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 243) to designate March 25, 1990, as Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but would simply like to inform the House the minority has no objection to the legislation presently being considered.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 243, to designate March 25, 1990, as Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy.

Greece and the United States share a rich history. We are indebted to the Greek nation for bestowing on us such a liberating philosophy as democracy. To quote Pericles in an address made in Greece 2,000 years ago, "Our Constitution is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the whole people." Clearly, our Founding Fathers relied heavily on the Greek philosophy of democracy when drafting the Declaration of Independence.

That is why I am honored to recognize the Greek struggle for independence through this resolution. After all, it is the same principle for which our forefathers fought so vehemently 200 years ago. And in the 1820's, it was the United States that served as a role model for Greece during its fight for independence from the Ottoman Empire. The Greeks translated our Declaration of Independence and used it as their own.

Since our pioneering years, Greece and the United States have come to enjoy close, friendly relations, which is evident in world affairs and the growth of the Greek-American community in this country.

In every walk of life, we find Greek-Americans making invaluable contributions to the maintenance and advancement of our own society. All of us who share the common bond of the understanding that we as a nation are bound together, not so much by common blood but by common belief, have reason to celebrate this very special independence day this month, because to the degree that we are all bound by that common faith in the rule of law, we are all Greek-Americans in one sense or another.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congressman BILIRAKIS, who is the sponsor of the House companion measure, for providing us with an opportunity to display the appreciation that we all share for the longstanding relationship between the United States and Greece.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I too would like to rise in support of the measure. March 25, 1990, marks Greek Independence Day. We should bear in mind that 1990 is the 2,500th anniversary of the birth of democracy. Our Founding Fathers drew heavily upon the political and philosophical experiences of ancient Greece.

March 25, 1990, also marks the 169th anniversary of the beginning of the revolution that freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire. So I think it is appropriate that we recognize both of these events, as well as celebrate Greek and American democracy.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, as the principal sponsor of the House companion measure to this bill, I, would like to express my deep gratitude to TOM SAWYER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, to TOM RIDGE the ranking Republican on that subcommittee, and to Chairman FORD of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for moving so expeditously to bring this bill to the floor.

March 25 is a very special day in the hearts of Greek-Americans—and to all freedom-loving Americans. It heralds both the anniversary of the independence of Greece and its role as the cradle of democracy for the entire world.

This year is an especially relevant year in this regard—a year in which the Berlin Wall is being torn down and freedom is spreading throughout Eastern Europe, it also marks the 2,500th anniversary of the practice of demo-

cratic government, first seen in Athens in 510 B.C.

Indeed, the spirit of March 25 lives on in defense of the principles for which so many of the free world's people have given their lives. These principles are embodied in the Greek words "eleftheria I thanatos"—liberty or death.

The ancient Greeks forged the very notion of democracy, placing the ultimate power to govern in the hands of the people themselves. Of course, our Founding Fathers drew heavily on the political and philosophical experience of ancient Greece in forming our Government, and I thank all of my colleagues here today for passing this legislation in commemoration of the democratic heritage shared by the United States and Greece.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 243

Whereas the ancient Greeks developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas 1990 marks the 2,500th anniversary of the birth of democracy;

Whereas the Founding Fathers of the United States drew heavily upon the political and philosophical experience of ancient Greece in forming our representative democracy;

Whereas March 25, 1990, marks the 169th anniversary of the beginning of the revolution that freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire;

Whereas democratic ideals have forged a close bond between our two nations and their peoples; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable to celebrate our ideals with the Greek people, and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which our two great nations sprang: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 25, 1990, is designated as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate Joint Resolution 243 and Senate Joint Resolution 229, the Senate joint resolutions just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ANTI-SEMITISM ON THE RISE IN THE SOVIET UNION

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

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the Congressional call to conscience vigil for Soviet Jews, I rise to voice concern about the current situation for Jews in the Soviet Union. I would like to note that in the past I have participated in this event to speak out on the plight of a single Jewish individual or family. However, at this time, circumstances are such that I believe it is imperative to discuss the threats facing the entire Soviet Jewish community.

In 1990, more Jews will be allowed to leave the Soviet Union than during any previous year. While this is certainly good news, it has become clear that the conditions that have long made life difficult for Soviet Jews are now deteriorating further. For some Soviet citizens, glasnost only represents an opportunity to practice a long suppressed hatred toward Jews. Virulently anti-semitic nationalist groups like PAMYAT have grown and prospered as the Soviet economy has declined and as the disaffected have searched for scapegoats.

Recently, Vitalii Goldanskii, a member of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of People's Deputies wrote in the Washington Post of the very real dangers posed by the hate groups. Mr. Goldanskii noted that PAMYAT and similar organizations have wholeheartedly endorsed the perverted goals and violent tactics of the Nazis. Most alarmingly though, Mr. Goldanskii explicitly warned of the possibility that these groups are preparing a wave of pogroms across the Soviet Union similar to the infamous Kristallnacht.

In fact, one Russian nationalist group has been so bold as to publicly announce its intention to launch a pogrom on May 5, 1990. The world and the beleaguered Soviet Jewish community now wait for prompt and positive action by Soviet President Gorbachev to head off these threats.

However, if the Soviet government's suspension of an agreement to begin direct flights between the Soviet Union and Israel is any indication of what is to come, there is every reason to be fearful. Like many, I had hoped the direct flights would greatly reduce the 1-year wait emigrating Jews face as they seek leave the Soviet Union. The suspension decision sends the entirely wrong message to the hate groups and will only encourage their nefarious activities.

I urge my colleagues to join me in calling on President Gorbachev to forcefully denounce anti-semitism, take all legal action against neo-Nazi groups, and expedite the departure of Jews wishing to emigrate by implementing the direct flights agreement. President Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders should know that the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union is and will continue to be a deep concern to the American people and to their representatives in this institution.

SUPPORT ESTONIAN DEMOCRACY AND MOVES TOWARD INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, only a few months ago, I met in my Washington office with Mr. Tunne Kelam, an Estonian intellectual, and Veronica Tarm, an Estonian-American from Hutchinson, KS. Mr. Kelam told me about his dream of independence for his country. It seemed at the time, that he was, indeed, dreaming. Last year, when I traveled to the Soviet Union and asked a government official whether the Baltic States would be granted independence, he treated the question as almost laughable. Today, the issue of independence for Lativa, Lithuania, and Estonia is one that Soviet President Gorbachev can't ignore any more.

I want to salute Mr. Kelam, who, since his visit to the United States last year, has been elected chairman of the Estonia Citizens' General Committee, and a member of that country's new congress which met this week for the first time. The members of the Estonian Congress were democratically elected by 590,000 citizens of Estonia, over 90 percent of the eligible voters, on February 24 of this year. The drama and importance of this event may have been overshadowed by other incredible world events of the last few months. The Congress of Estonia will provide its people with their first independent voice in nearly 50 years of Soviet domination.

Lithuania has received more news coverage than Estonia, because its Congress has boldly declared itself independent of the Soviet Union and its delegates to the Soviet Congress of People's Deputies have refused to participate in recent votes on presidential powers. Estonia, however, has tried to facilitate negotiations with Mr. Gorbachev by cooperating with his efforts to enhance his presidential powers and by not unilaterally seceding from the Soviet Union.

I believe it is wise, given the pace of change over the last 6 months, to not promote a confrontation with the Soviet President as long as he remains willing to begin to discuss the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Estonia and recognition of the new congress. Gorbachev may be looking for a way to save face while offering some form of independence. As the last countries still occupied since World War II, independence for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania should be a top priority for Gorbachev's program of perestroika. The loud and persistent cries for freedom from the

Baltic States ensure that the issue will not go away.

The struggle of the Baltic States to reclaim their independence has only begun, and they need the support of the United States. The illegal 1940 pact between Stalin and Hitler annexed the Baltic States to the Soviet Union overnight, but it will take considerably more difficult and complicated efforts to unravel it in a legal and peaceful manner. I ask my colleagues to take note, and salute the bold, peaceful, efforts of the Estonian people to find democracy and regain their lost independence.

COST-SHARING IS THE RIGHT APPROACH FOR CLEAN AIR BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I'm here again today to urge compromise in the clean air bill to avert what will surely be a disaster in Southern Illinois and about six other States if we don't.

I do not oppose clean air legislation in principle. I do oppose legislation in form that forces one area of the country to shoulder the burden for the entire country.

There is a tremendous historical context for a cost-sharing approach.

It's the foundation of our system. We know that what affects one of us most likely affects all of us.

Let me point out Monday's Roll Call magazine. On the second page is an ad by the Coalition for Acid Rain Equity which eloquently states the case for cost-sharing.

Let's look at a recent example referred to in this ad—the Financial Institution Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989—which we're learning will need another huge infusion of cash.

We see this as a national problem, requiring a national solution, even though the situation at its worst is isolated in a few States.

According to the coalition for acid rain equity—if the savings and loan bailout had been parceled out proportionally—taxpayers in California would pay $2,000; Texans $4,400; Arizonans $7,000 each in the rescue of these failed institutions.

It was a problem clearly identified as being most serious in several regions of the country—often a result of lax State regulation.

But instead of accountability being taken on a regular basis—each American taxpayer is being billed roughly $1,100 for the rescue. The great majority of that money goes to only a very few States.

How is it that a savings & loan bailout, centered in only a very few States is a national problem requiring a national solution, while cleaning up coal, which is our most abundant national energy source is a regional problem to be borne by the eight or nine States where high sulfur coal exists?

My district was the recipient of assistance for what might be seen as a regional problem but was considered a national problem—the farm crisis of the mid-1980's.

When the farm belt was reeling from foreclosures and bankruptcy President Reagan came to a town in my district, Du Quoin, IL, to announce a package of relief. We don't see auctions and sales at the barn door these days and that's a refreshing change.

A change made possible by our willingness to approach this problem on a national level. When the farm economy is in danger it affects all of us, so we took prudent steps to correct the situation. We should do the same to provide clean air for all of us to breathe.

The outstanding Senator from Ohio, Senator METZENBAUM, made some of these same arguments quite expertly during debate in the other body January 31.

You can find his remarks at S624 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day, and I urge you to examine his arguments. They speak volumes to the point I urge my colleagues to consider.

When the earthquake rocked the bay area, we didn't question how much it would cost so much as how quickly we could help. When Hurrican Hugo turned lives upside down in Charleston and surrounding areas people in Southern Illinois didn't say "too bad, that's their problem."

That's because my area has been there. In 1982 the Marion tornado killed 10 and did millions of dollars in damage. We were helped by generous support from across the country. That made a difference. We knew that somehow we mattered—that people we'd never met felt close to us—and were willing to help. I assume the same will happen for the victims of yesterday's tornados in Kansas.

That's the American spirit. And when those things happen we don't say "that's the risk you take living next to the sea—in a fault zone—near a volcano—or along the banks of a river." When disaster strikes we move as a nation to help.

Don't turn to the people of southern Illinois or western Kentucky or southern Ohio and say "that's too bad you live on top of all that high sulfur coal. We're going to shut you down."

The coal miners and electric rate payers of southern Illinois are just as deserving of your support as the lakes and forests of the Northeast we seek to protect.

We are not islands of good fortune or pits of despair in the United States. We work for the common good of each other. Please don't abandon that principle. Fairness and justice demand at least that much.

□ 1710

UNITED STATES SHOULD IMMEDIATELY ASSIST LITHUANIA

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the recent events in Eastern Europe are a triumph for the human spirit and democracy. Our Nation must be prepared to offer these fledgling democracies the assistance they need in their transition from command to market economies. Nowhere is my belief is assisting these reform-driven countries stronger than in the newly created Republic of Lithuania.

On Sunday, March 11, 1990, the Lithuanian legislature voted by an overwhelming majority of 124 to 0 to pass a measure declaring independence from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has illegally occupied Lithuania for some 50 years, and the time has come for Lithuania to reestablish sovereignty. Newly elected Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis, a non-Communist, has said that by declaring independence "we are acting on our own will, according to the dictates of our own consciences." I fully support President Landsbergis' statement for no other reason than if it is the will of the people to be free, Lithuania must be allowed to secede from the Soviet Union.

Unlike a secessionist movement of 130 years ago in the U.S. Civil War, the Lithuanians never asked to join the "union." The Lithuanians were crushed by Stalin's armies in 1940. Lithuania has established the illegality of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, the nonagression accord between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany under which the Baltic States were incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1940, and therefore, Mr. Gorbachev should respect their wishes.

The Lithuanians realize that in the months ahead, there will be intense pressure from Moscow urging them to fall back into line. President Landsbergis has said that the act was intended to establish Lithuania's legal position and popular will along with the Republic's ability to write its own laws and conduct its own foreign policy. I firmly believe that the Lithuanians will not succumb to this pressure and they will ultimately break off from the Soviet Union.

Although the United States should be cautious in dealing with the Soviet Union, there is no question in my mind that we should recognize and support the Republic of Lithuania. The United States, as the global leader in democratic ideals, has the duty and responsibility to help the new Republic in any way possible.

Similarly, the United States has a duty to support the Baltic Republics of Estonia and Latvia, which are also demanding independence and relief from Soviet occupation. Movements toward independence are gaining momentum in several other Soviet Republics, including Georgia and Azerbaijan.

The United States State Department has called for Moscow to respect the wishes of the Lithuanian people, but I do not think that

the message is nearly as clear and direct as it should be.

There is no time to waste in declaring our formal position. Therefore, I strongly urge the Bush administration to clearly and concisely declare that the United States will recognize and support the independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

Like the Americans struggling for independence two centuries ago, Lithuanians should be able to live free while democratically governing themselves. I hope, however, that the Lithuanians will not be forced to fight for their freedom like our ancestors. Bloodshed should be avoided and peaceful solutions that are based on democracy and freedom should be sought.

A 50TH ANNIVERSARY SALUTE TO ALAMEDA NAVAL AIR STATION

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer my congratulations to the civilian and military employees of the Alameda Naval Air Station. Throughout its 50 years of service, Alameda NAS has offered a high level of professionalism to the defense of the Nation.

On this, the 50th anniversary of its commission, it is appropriate to reflect upon the accomplishments of the people that have served and worked at the station.

During World War II, the station was the doorway to the Pacific theater. In that time Alameda was the home for some of the great names in U.S. naval history. The U.S.S. *Midway*, U.S.S. *Coral Sea* and U.S.S. *Enterprise* all had Alameda as their home port. The base was also the original staging area for Colonel Doolittle's famous mission to bomb Tokyo.

Perhaps the greatest contributions that the station had to the war effort were the repair of aircraft and the shipment of materials. By the war's end the station was responsible for the repair of 53 types of aircraft and 21 varieties of engines. The station also shipped countless tons of supplies.

In 1967, the station was officially proclaimed Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda. From this time until the present, the station has continued to maintain its reputation by asserting the same characteristic—quality work.

The technology and art of aircraft repair has moved along with the times. In the years 1967 through 1987 the P-2V Neptune, A-1 Skyraider, F-1 Fury, A-4 Skyhawk, C-118, A-3 Skywarrior, P-3 Orion, A-6 Intruder, EA-6B Prowler, and the S-3 Viking have all been customers at the reworking facilities.

Recent history has shown that the station will continue to be a vital member of the Navy team. In the first quarter of fiscal year 1990, Alameda NAS posted a 98.9-percent rate of perfection in the quality of work they do on aircraft and other systems. That's an even more impressive statistic when one considers the volume of work done at the base. For example, last year 54 aircraft, 1,069 missiles, and 362 engines were reworked at the station. The base was recently awarded the T. Blair Evans Quality Enhancement Award by the San Francisco Bay Federal Executive Board for the establishment of a total quality management program.

The contribution that the station makes for national defense makes its own statements about high standards. Little more needs to be said about the commitment that the personnel of NAS have to the continued pursuit of excellence.

The station has shown itself to be a full time partner in the area of community service. The Partnership in Education Program has involved the station with local schools and is just one successful example of community-base relations. The interest that the station shows in the community is reflected in the numerous awards it has garnered in the past years. Alameda NAS has been the recipient of awards from the Alameda Unified School District Workability Program and the Center for Independent Living for its hiring of the handicapped. The station's involvement with the homeless and disabled in the Alameda area also merits praiseworthy attention.

I wish everyone at Alameda Naval Air Station continued success and good fortune as they continue to contribute to the defense of our country.

CLARIFICATION OF FAIR USE DOCTRINE UNDER THE COPYRIGHT LAW

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to resolve a serious issue relating to copyright and the first amendment. This issue arises because of a series of cases decided by the U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Last month, the Supreme Court denied certiorari in New Era Publications versus Henry Holt, a copyright infringement case involving the use of the late L. Ron Hubbard's unpublished writings in an unflattering biography. The case the High Court refused to hear involved a dispute between two authors. The first author—Scientology head Hubbard—wrote certain materials that his estate did not want publicly released. The second author sought to use those materials in a biography critical of Mr. Hubbard.

The Court refused to review a decision of the second circuit, in whose jurisdiction most of the publishing community is based. The second circuit found that the materials used were unpublished within the meaning of the Copyright Act. Its opinion suggests that an author's copyright in unpublished materials is infringed by subsequent uses, such as in histories or biographies, that those uses are not fair use under the 1976 Copyright Act, and that an injunction is appropriate to prevent publication.

Hubbard's representatives lost the case because they waited too long to sue, but the Supreme Court's failure to disapprove the lower court's language has caused an uproar in the academic and publishing communities. It has led distinguished authors to raise the spectre of outside censorship, or worse, to predict unwillingness even to take on controversial but important critical writing. Scholars across the country fear that the copyright laws will be used to prohibit them from quoting primary sources, the basic building blocks of history and biography, that their ability to fully explore controversial topics will be limited, and that in the end the public will be the loser.

The second circuit's decision in New Era was only one of a series of cases dealing with the appropriate uses of unpublished works. These cases implicate important copyright, first amendment, and privacy concerns. The Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Administration of Justice, which I chair, has jurisdiction over all of these issues.

I am deeply concerned about the situation arising out of the New Era case. In particular, it appears that the second circuit has adopted a virtual per se rule against fair use of unpublished works and has, moreover, treated unpublished work in a monolithic fashion.

In addition, it appears that the court has also established a similar rule requiring that an injunction be issued when unpublished material is used. This raises troubling questions of prior restraint on publications, which may well violate the first amendment.

My bill is intended to give the courts sufficient flexibility in making both a fair use determination and a decision about whether injunctive relief is appropriate. Some of the difficulties courts have had about the application of fair use to unpublished works may stem from a conflict between the statutory fair use language and the legislative history to the 1976 act.

New Era's genesis was the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Harper & Row versus Nation, where the Nation magazine published excerpts from President Gerald Ford's memoirs just before Harper & Row was scheduled to publish them in book form. The Court concluded that:

[I]t has never been seriously disputed that "the fact that the plaintiff's work is unpublished * * * is a factor tending to negate the defense of fair use." Publication of an author's expression before he has authorized its dissemination seriously infringes the author's right to decide when and whether it will be made public, a factor not present in fair use of published works. * * * We conclude that the unpublished nature of a work is "[a] key, though not necessarily determinative, factor" tending to negate a defense

of fair use. * * * The obvious benefit to author and public alike of assuring authors the leisure to develop their ideas free from fear of expropriation outweighs any short-term "news value" to be gained from premature publication of the author's expression.

The second circuit expanded upon the opinion in the Nation case in Salinger versus Random House, which involved the use of the author J.D. Salinger's unpublished letters in a biography. The court concluded that if a biographer "copies more than minimal amounts of (unpublished) expressive content, he deserves to be enjoined." It therefore preliminarily enjoined the galleys of the biography.

In New Era, the second circuit once again extended the high court's Nation opinion, finding that:

The fair use doctrine encompasses all claims of first amendment in the copyright field [and that, citing *Salinger*] copying of 'more than minimal amounts' of unpublished expressive material calls for an injunction * * *.

In a denial of a rehearing in New Era, its author did clarify his original opinion, stating that an "injunction is not the automatic consequence of infringement and that equitable considerations always are germane * * *." He amended the opinion so that it now reads:

* * * *under ordinary circumstances* the copying of "more than minimal amounts" of unpublished expressive material calls for an injunction * * * [added words italic.]

In addition, the author of the Salinger opinion used the same opportunity to clarify that opinion. The original language he used was: "If [the biographer] copies more than minimal amounts of (unpublished) expression, he deserves to be enjoined." Instead, he wrote, the latter phrase should have read "he deserves to be found liable for infringement."

While these clarifications are important, they have not stemmed the controversy. The concerns continue to be ardently expressed.

At its core, these cases implicate important societal conflicts. In the Nation case, the Supreme Court noted that

The Framers intended copyright * * * to be the engine of free expression [and that it] is intended to increase and not impede the harvest of knowledge.

The constitutional mandate to create copyright laws represents a careful balance between the rights of authors, publishers, and the public. That mandate, and those laws, encourage free and open expression, and the fullest possible public access to that expression. Sometimes these goals are inherently in conflict, and those conflicts are seemingly irreconcilable. Moreover, we cannot ignore cherished rights of privacy that may also be affected.

The approach to the fair use doctrine taken in this series of cases appears to be at odds with Congress' intent in codifying the fair use doctrine in the 1976 Copyright Act. Copyright law encourages creativity by granting authors a limited monopoly in their works. Through the "fair use" doctrine, however, some copyrighted material may be used despite the wishes of the copyright owner. Fair use (17 U.S.C. 107) is an equitable doctrine, promoting society's interests by encouraging a second author's use of reasonable portions of a first author's work. Its application is to be decided case-by-case, taking into account various, and often conflicting, interests, including the nature of the work and its subsequent use, the amount used by the second author, and the harm to the first author's market.

At the heart of the controversy is the struggle to formulate a flexible yet articulate standard of fair use. We want fair use to be broadly defined so that judges can apply it to fit the facts of a particular case. Yet the laws must also give citizens a concrete idea of what is permissible behavior and what is not. In the current controversy, authors claim that the courts have been too rigid in excluding unpublished works from application of the fair use doctrine. There is a fear that the uncertainty engendered by this series of cases will lead to self-censorship to avoid lawsuits and restraints on publication.

I understand that a broad consensus within the publishing community has developed in support of the legislation I am introducing today. Individual authors, and representatives of PEN, the Authors League, the Association of American Publishers, and others similarly situated, have joined together to urge an amendment to section 107. This amendment would clarify that section 107 applies equally to unpublished as well as published works. It does not mean that all uses of unpublished works will be considered fair use, just as not all uses of published works are now considered fair use. It does, however, mean that the same guidelines, set forth in section 107, will apply to published works and to unpublished works, and that these factors apply equally to all such works.

While I have heard from a great many members of the publishing community, I have not heard from all parties who might have an interest in this legislation. Therefore, I am introducing this legislation not only because I believe that these decisions warrant legislative review, but also because hearings will permit the Congress to hear all views and to consider many important questions. For example, should the term "unpublished" be specifically defined? How does this proposed amendment square with the Berne Convention, the international copyright treaty to which the United States adhered just last year? In what instances is injunctive relief appropriate, especially when the first amendment is implicated? Most importantly, how do we balance the interests protected by the copyright laws with legitimate privacy concerns, and with the dictates of the first amendment?

James Madison once noted that "knowledge will forever govern ignorance. And a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives." We can all agree that free access to information is essential to democracy. I believe that this country's long held tradition against publication restraints is well founded and that limits on access to information are hallmarks of totalitarian societies, not of democracies. While there is no specific first amendment exception to the copyright law, there are important first amendment interests, and other equally important equitable principles, that must be considered in deciding whether to enjoin an infringing publication.

Whether or not the laws have been correctly interpreted, the chilling effect of the New Era decision is obvious and it is real. My subcommittee will soon hear from all sides in this matter to determine how best to protect and encourage scholarly efforts, while still acknowledging the copyright and privacy interests involved. We cannot condone a situation where our finest writers are deterred from doing what they do best, and from what we, as a free and self-governing country, want them to do. I introduce this legislation to start this important debate, and I look forward to hearing the views of all interested parties.

FIDEL CASTRO'S TYRANNY

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I read an article in the Indianapolis Star on Monday of this week by a Ms. Mona Charen regarding Cuba, and I think it needs to be read to the entire American people. It goes like this, Mr. Speaker:

The progressive isolation of Castro's Cuba entered a new stage last week when former communist allies Hungary and Bulgaria, with Poland and Czechoslovakia joining as non-voting members, supported a United Nations resolution condemning Cuba's human rights record.

The balding Fidel Castro was splenetic, hurling curses at Moscow and the Eastern Europeans "traitors" who are "slandering socialism, destroying its values, discrediting the party and liquidating its leading role, doing away with social discipline and sowing chaos and anarchy everywhere."

Those in the smart set tend to regard the falling out between Fidel Castro and Mikhail Gorbachev as amusing. Castro is seen as the quaint embodiment of a bygone era. That's not the way it seems to Cubans.

And I will bet right now that when Cuba blows—as she will within 12 months—the stories that emerge from our close neighbor will chill us to the bone. The model will be Romania, not Czechoslovakia. Those who never quite overcame their romantic image of the bearded tyrant will fall silent at the stench that will rise from those ashes.

In 1986, an eon ago, the human rights group Resistance International convened a "Tribunal on Cuba" in Paris. Survivors of Castro's prisons came forward to tell their stories.

Teresa Mayans was a star of Cuban television and radio. After attempting to leave the country she was arrested. "I was put in a cell with a criminal who had murdered her own mother with an ax. * * * This murderer had been instructed by the Political Police to terrorize me. I thought I would go mad with fear. Of the 32 prisoners where I was, many had syphilis, tuberculosis and parasites. * * * It was useless to ask for medical assistance. Suicide was constant. The poisonous liquid for killing the lice was used."

The use of mad prisoners to terrorize the sane is a trademark Castro technique. In 1980, when thousands fled to the United States in the Mariel boatlift, it was Castro's idea to send criminals and the insane along too.

Another survivor, Tony Bryant, had an ironic tale to tell. He is an American, a former member of the Black Panthers. In 1969, no doubt furthering the revolution, he hijacked a plane to Cuba. But once there, he was arrested and charged with espionage. "I was put in a cell built to hold about 80 men. We were 230 prisoners heaped together there. A hole in the floor in which to defecate was the only sanitary installation. The water was rationed to such an extent that we often spent up to two days in appalling thirst. We were harassed by plagues of lice, cockroaches and mice.

"We spent 23 hours a day shut up, only going out to eat a little rice, bread and soup. They moved me to a hard labor camp called Aguica * * * I shall never forget the night when the guards came in with dogs which they let bite the prisoners while beating them savagely."

Other choice tortures included biological experimentation—prisoners were denied certain nutrients to test the effects on the human body—electric shock, rape, sexual mutilation, starvation and machete attacks. Dr. Ana Lazara Rodriguez recalled that the women prisoners would be beaten in front of their mothers on visiting day.

But the world is seeming Alice in Wonderland-like now. On the Soviet evening news program Vremya, Castro is all but labeled a Stalinist. Moscow News, another official organ, mocks his claims to socialist orthodoxy. "Such categorical attitudes coexist with a system of rationing coupons on all merchandise. Cuban women are in no danger of replacing revolutionary consciousness with mercenary spirit as long as they are allowed a choice of one bra or two pairs of underwear (but not both, and only the size available at the moment)."

The clock is ticking. More than 15 dissident groups—that we know of—have formed in Cuba. The Soviet subsidies are draining away. The only question now is: When the inevitable day comes that Castro orders his troops to fire on his people, will the soldiers, remembering Ceausescu, obey?

Mr. Speaker, I hope every American reads editorials like this and realizes what a horrible tyrant Fidel Castro is, and we ought to do everything in our power to liberate that island, to make sure those tyrannies end.

□ 1720

A REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S TRANSPORTATION POLICY IN THE NINETIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAUZIN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our special order this evening is going to be on President George Bush's national transportation policy.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined tonight in this special order by three of my colleagues from the State of Illinois, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SANGMEISTER].

The first up to speak, Mr. Speaker, this evening will be the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD], and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague, Congressman LIPINSKI, taking this special order and allowing me to participate in it on the national transportation policy.

Mr. Speaker, transportation policy in this country for the next decade is a real challenge, because we will have to meet expanding demands in our cities, and match them with demands for a more livable environment. Congress should be ready to deal with that.

One thing I don't want us to forget is the reliance rural areas also have on mass transit. I know that may sound a little puzzling, mass transit in rural areas, but it exists, and people rely on it.

I talked with Betty Green who operates the Rides Public Transit System in the southeastern part of my district. I wanted to let you know a little about her service because it represents what's going on in rural transportation programs.

Rides serves people in Pope, Hardin, Gallatin, Saline, and White Counties, a total of about 60,000 people over 1,500 square miles.

This is not a specialized service. Rides operates under section 18 of the Urban Mass Transit Act to provide mass transit in rural areas.

The general public uses this service and the agency also contracts with a host of local programs and organizations for transportation services. And when they do that they create another route for the general public to ride. Slowly but surely Rides is creating a rural network of bus routes through the villages and towns of southern Illinois.

The greatest need for this service is helping people get to work. In Pope and Hardin Counties where unemployment is well into the double-digits, 25 percent of the riders are people getting to jobs.

In that part of my district, if you have special skills or a particular profession, if you can't get to your job, you cannot just walk across the street to the next office building and catch on there. In my area if people can find a job they keep it and if it's several miles away they have to find a way to get there. That's where rural mass transit plays a vital role.

Rides also works with general assistance recipients who are required to work out part of their grant with local service agencies. This transit system helps people who need a ride, or who are without the means to have a car, to make their appointments. In one case a person on general assistance performed so well they were hired on full time. The Rides Program helped make that happen.

Rural areas are under a tremendous medical emergency. In southern Illinois you may have to go 70 miles to find a doctor to deliver your baby. Patients needing specialized cancer or surgical treatment need to go to regional medical centers which are miles away. This is really a lifeline for people in southern Illinois, more than just a convenience.

Students at Southeastern Community College are making four trips a day and would fill up a fifth if Rides could afford another bus and driver.

But it can't.

And that's where the Federal Government needs to recognize the importance these rural systems play. We send money to the States to administer these programs.

But in Illinois money is running short, freezes are in effect, and an increase in the local matching share of this transmit money is under consideration. That's difficult for transit authority employees who work all day to provide service and are then working at night to raise the local money needed.

I appreciate Secretary Skinner's commitment to developing a superior transportation system in the United States. To stay competitive that will have to be a priority.

But I want us to remember the important part transit plays in rural areas and what it means to have that service available. As a Member from a rural district I am interested in helping our urban friends provide for the transportation they need. I very much hope they will do the same for us.

Again let me thank my colleague for allowing me to participate in this special order.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD], participated in this special order. I think the information he brought to our attention this evening about rural transportation is

very insightful and thank him for his contribution to our special order.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from western Illinois [Mr. EVANS], my very good friend.

Mr. EVANS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from Illinois in bringing attention to these important issues concerning the Bush transportation policies.

Mr. Speaker, while one bridge collapses every 2 days in this country, and Americans deal with increasingly inadequate highways and airports, President Bush has announced that his administration plans to reduce the Federal Government's commitment to our transportation system—a system that is already sadly deteriorated from the neglect of the past administration.

Today on the House floor, we debated the rural development bill. I can tell you that nothing is more important to rural development than adequate transportation. The area I represent in west central Illinois is beginning to recovery from the recession of the eighties. I cannot tell you what kind of boast that area would get from a project like the Avenue of the Saints, a proposed highway from St. Paul, MN, to St. Louis, MO.

At the same time that President Bush says "read my lips" on taxes, he would increase user fees that are already accumulating in trust funds that are masking the Federal deficit rather than being spent on projects for which they were intended. The highway trust fund has a current surplus of $10 billion and the aviation trust fund has a surplus of $7.6 billion. These funds should be used for the purpose for which they were established not to balance the budget. I believe that we should keep our transportation user fees where they belong—expanding and improving our transportation network. This network links our Nation's cities, farms, mines, and manufacturing, and it is crucial that we protect this important component of our infrastructure from neglect. How can our businesses and industry hope to be able to operate efficiently and compete internationally if our transportation system is crumbling around us.

We have the opportunity to recover from years of neglect and prepare our country for the future. I hope that we will reject President Bush's proposal and put our transportation projects at the top of our national priority list where they belong.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have joined in this special order with the gentlemen from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank Congressman EVANS for joining us this evening. Many of the points he makes I agree with categorically.

Mr. Speaker, the next gentleman I would yield to is my very good friend from a district near me, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SANGMEISTER].

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Speaker, last week it became very clear to me why the President does not refer to himself as the transportation president. The national transportation policy statement unveiled at the White House on March 8 by the Secretary of Transportation Samuel Skinner, demonstrates that the President does not believe it is a priority to improve the Nation's infrastructure. I do not find any encouraging signs from this statement which would lead me to believe that areas like mass transit are going to be seriously addressed. From what I have been able to decipher, the President's so-called solution to transportation problems is to shift the entire responsibility of solving them back to the State and local level. It is unfortunate that a distinguished Illinoisan such as Secretary Skinner has been put in a position where he has to defend this policy. Secretary Skinner has been given a car with no wheels and told to drive. If the Congress accepts this proposal, hope for a better national transportation system will go about as far as a car with no wheels.

What makes this situation very difficult to accept, is that the administration's own 1991 budget cited a $19 billion uncommitted balance in the highway trust fund and $7 billion in the aviation trust fund. Mr. Speaker, these are the same sort of games that have been going on for some time with the Social Security trust fund. This Government has a habit of raising money for one thing and spending it on another. Now I ask you, is this the way a responsible government should operate? Because the President has refused to display the leadership which is necessary to tackle and solve the problem of the budget deficit, he continues to take advantage of this disguised method of financing the deficit through the transportation and Social Security trust funds, of which I'm sure most taxpayers are not aware. The President is telling us that he has no new tires for our car when he has a stack of them stored away and is giving them away to others.

I would like to cite just a few of the Department of Transportation's own statistics; 42 percent of the Nation's highway bridges are structurally deficient or obsolete; 65 percent of peak-hour travel on urban interstate highways was congested in 1987; 11 percent of the 1.2 million miles of principal highways—these are the highways that handle over 87 percent of all highway traffic—are deficient; and 21 primary airports have more than 20,000 hours of flight delay a year. Added to all these problems, we must begin to seriously deal with bringing the cost of transportation down and to clean up our air. We must act now to have a cost-effective, environmentally clean national mass transit policy implemented in this decade. I fail to see how the President's plan to take away all Federal funding for the Amtrak national passenger railroad is a step toward improving our mass transit system.

This new national transportation policy just does not make any sense and I believe it is time for the President to rethink his position and get down to the serious business of creating a national transportation policy that fits the needs of the 21st century.

□ 1730

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation eager to begin the reauthorization of our national aviation and highway programs, I anxiously awaited the administration's national transportation policy which was announced last week.

First, I think it is important to commend my good friend Sam Skinner for the Department of Transportation's ambitious and important project of creating a national transportation policy. The Secretary conducted an exhaustive series of field hearings throughout the country, allowing every local government and interested party to participate in the planning process.

I also trust that the Secretary truly understands the many varied needs of our national transportation system, and knows these problems demand high priority by our administration. The safety and efficiency of our transportation infrastructure, our highways and airports, directly affects every American as much as any Federal program can. Secretary Skinner's report reflects these realities. Unfortunately, it also reflects another reality in the White House: The OMB, in its refusal to commit resources to the country's needs, has effectively undermined the potency of the national transportation policy.

The transportation policy which President Bush outlined last week is all too familiar: It is completely consistent with his other policies we have seen since he took office. The "Moving America" report adequately points out the crisis of the American transportation system—crumbling bridges, traffic congestion, airport delays, the need for clean air, the increasing costs of infrastructure maintenance. Next, the report offers a much needed call for action—a call to place competitive transportation on the top of the national agenda. But in the end, the policy statement turns its back on any serious commitment. The administration calls for transportation to top the national agenda, but then proceeds to remove transportation from the Federal agenda.

At a time when transportation needs are admittedly growing, the administration has taken a dangerous turn in direction. Rather than recognize the need for national leadership with a serious commitment and serious funds, the administration calls for increased local and State responsibility as well as increased privatization of transportation services.

Above all else, I find the logic of this report staggering. It seems remarkable that the administration could spend months compiling the transportation needs of our country, determine that those needs are tremendous, and then proclaim the answer lies in scaling back the Federal role. Transportation should remain a national priority for precisely the reasons Secretary Skinner conducted his review—it affects every American's quality of life, every businesses' efficiency, and our Nation's global competitiveness. Virtually everyone agrees that the Interstate Program launched by Eisenhower in 1956 has been a fantastic success. Now we are faced with new highway needs, and the President sees no Federal role.

Instead, the national transportation policy claims that the Government need only concentrate on "roads of national significance," such as interstates and highways vital to national defense. The interstate system guaranteed the passage of people and products between major population centers. Faced with gridlock in our cities and suburbs, why shouldn't the government have a similar Federal focus on transportation to, from, and within our cities. I believe the Department of Transportation will run into some problems when they tell the 80 percent of the American population which resides in urbanized areas that their highway projects are not worthy of funding because the roads are not of national significance.

The call for a greater local and State role in transportation funding is not surprising from a Republican administration. However, it too is completely inconsistent with a real commitment to national transportation. The reason transportation infrastructure needs have reached crisis proportion is precisely because Republican administrations have increased State and local funding responsibilities through the 1980's. The State of Illinois does not have the billions necessary to address 370 miles of congested highways in the Chicago area. A national policy statement calling for State responsibility and State taxes will not make things better. In Illinois we have already passed a 6-cent gasoline tax increase to meet existing needs. If the Federal Government turns its back on our highways, those needs will be much greater.

Finally, the grand vision of privatization as the answer to our transportation needs is particularly frightening. But it also may be the one provision which ensures that this OMB version of a national transportation policy does not gather steam. I am convinced that the American people will not stand for toll booths at every exit ramp. Furthermore, mass transit run by the free market will soon be no mass transit at all. Yes, I agree that unleasing private resources can play a significant role in a national transportation policy, but it should not be the cornerstone of that policy.

Overall, Secretary Skinner should be commended for his extensive effort to create a national transportation policy. The report highlights the need for action and will raise the country's conscience level regarding transportation needs. But instead of real commitment and real solutions and real funding, it offers a shirking of Federal responsibility. It is obviously up to Congress to determine the real solutions. I look forward to doing so and I look forward to working with Secretary Skinner in implementing those policies.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, although this statement is a disconnect.

I wanted to raise the point that the gentleman agreed a couple of minutes ago, in criticizing the administration for not fully utilizing the highway trust fund and using that as a way of helping to deal with the deficit. I think within the last couple of days the gentleman's colleague from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] has come out for a substantial increase in the gasoline tax. I think he wants to take the gasoline tax up to 25 cents a gallon.

Now, if we are going to criticize the administration on that, I assume the gentleman is ready to criticize Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI because he was talking about this as a way of bringing down the deficit. There is only one of two ways we can do that.

□ 1740

Either the 25-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax he proposes will no longer go into the highway trust fund or we will have the additional money piling up in the highway trust fund as a balance against the deficit. So while the gentleman certainly is welcome to criticize the administration for whatever they are doing in that regard, it seems to me that there is also a problem with some of the proposals that are coming forth from the Democratic leadership that propose to do exactly the same thing.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his participation.

First of all, I would like to say that as far as I know, the Democratic position is and will continue to be to draw down on the highway trust fund and the airport trust fund as rapidly as possible because those needs are out there throughout this Nation.

Second, I would like to say that as far as the call by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] for an increase in the gasoline tax is concerned, he has been calling for that for quite a long period of time, and that goes along with other numerous areas he has talked about, just as he did last Sunday, with regard to balancing the budget and the deficit. I do not know that he has said anything about utilizing that money to help the budget deficit. As far as I know, his particular aim in regard to the gasoline tax is to suppress consumption so that we are less and less dependent on foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

RECOGNITION SOUGHT FOR SURVIVING VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

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

Mr. Speaker, throughout the past year, Americans have watched unbelievably as unprecedented social developments have restructured the entire political landscape of Europe. For the first time since World War II, the world can envision a free and sovereign continent. These fast-paced developments remind all Americans that peace has not come easy and generates a renewed sense of appreciation for the brave young men and women who have fought and died there in behalf of our country. Just five decades have passed since Americans were last asked to do battle on the fields of Europe to rid the world of a monstrous evil.

It was a point in time when the world was not so certain, America's place in it not so ordained, and the future of mankind hung in the balance. We are just beginning to see the kind of Europe these men fought to establish. Appropriately, this year will offer numerous occasions to reflect back on their efforts with pride and honor.

However Mr. Speaker, I have come before this honorable body today, not to belabor how deserving the veterans of World War II are of our respect, for that goes without saying. Rather, I stand before you to bring to your attention the plight of an equally brave and dedicated group of men and women whose selfless actions and gallantry under fire precipitated that of those in the Second.

Though their commitment to the task at hand was unswerving and their sacrifices just as great, these American soldiers, sailors, and marines, were never adequately honored, recognized, or compensated for their unceasing efforts to restore peace to a world shattered by war. They received no education benefits, no home loans, or small

business loans that veterans of later wars would receive, but instead, found themselves penniless and jobless in the heat of the Great Depression with no pension whatsoever for their services. In light of their victory this was not fair at all.

President Abraham Lincoln, in his second inaugural address, summed up his commitment to the veterans of the Civil War, and in a sense all wars, by declaring that this Nation should "care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan". In the spirit of those beautiful words, I firmly believe the United States has an obligation to care and provide for the men it sends to war. Our veterans are one of this country's most precious resources and we should always be sensitive to their needs. They exemplify the highest degree of devotion to this country that we Americans admire and respect.

That is why in January 1989, as I have the past several Congresses, introduced H.R. 1918, to reverse the injustice done to the World War I veterans and to recognize the debt this country owes to them by awarding them a small monthly pension. Please realize that in 1984 when the last cost evaluation of this bill was done, there were just 397,000 World War I veterans still alive. Today, there survives only 90,000 with the majority being cared for in hospitals and nursing homes. Is this how we choose to repay these men for risking their lives in behalf of their country? When the final World War I veteran passes away, you can bet he will be laid in "State" in the rotunda and accorded full military honors.

Yet eloquent words, emotional speeches, and pomp and circumstance cannot atone for decades of neglect, nor justify to the country why Congress failed to take action on behalf of our oldest warriors.

Recently, H.R. 1918 has grown stagnant in committee. I understand the budgetary constraints that may prohibit the enactment of this legislation. I am also aware that the bill's opponents have argued that funding is unfeasible. However, let me reiterate the declining numbers of veterans. H.R. 1918's total cost for implementation has decreased by millions of dollars since it was first introduced. Further, the cost of maintaining this program will drastically reduce each succeeding year for the next few years. H.R. 1918 accomplishes far more than distributing pension awards for the deserving veterans, it sends a clear signal to all our veterans that we as a country appreciate what they did and we will live up to our historical responsibility to them.

I would also like at this time to urge the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, who himself has felt the sting of battle in Europe, to reevaluate H.R. 1918 and proceed to hold hearings on this bill. Time is of the essence so I would ask the chairman to adjudicate this matter as expeditiously as possible.

Why do I feel so strongly about this bill? Because I have had the privilege of meeting and talking with many World War I veterans and have listened to their story. Their bodies may be aged but their minds still recall when as young boys they marched off to France to fight someone called Kaiser Wilhelm. They speak candidly of longs days and longer nights, of wet mud and insufferable periods of waiting shattered by moments of sheer fright and the attacking enemy, but most of all, they speak of their love of country and their steadfast conviction to the cause for which they fought.

When they returned home after the war, they found the United States much how they had left it, only their perceptions of it had changed.

The experiences of war had taken their toll, and for many veterans readjusting to civilian life and making up for lost time proved difficult. Without pensions or proper medical services, they were left up to their own devices to survive.

Of the 4,477,000 troops that served during World War I, 90,000 are still alive. Some died from their wounds, some died during the Depression, some survived the First World War only to be killed in the Second. Accidents, illness, and age have claimed the rest. By the time Members of Congress are sworn into office next January, that number will half. It is imperative that Congress take action now. When this Nation needed its best at places like the Argonne Forest, Bellau Wood, Aisne-Marne, they answered our call. The question I would ask my colleagues is, are we going to be there for them now that they are calling us?

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you a short story if I may. The story is about Gunnery Sgt. Dewitt Weible, a "Marine's Marine" from St. Louis, MO. Almost 2 years ago, the citizens of Long Beach, CA, got together and held a public ceremony to dedicate a beautiful stone monument paying tribute to the marines and sailors who were killed in fighting at the island atoll of Tarawa during World War II.

Sergeant Weible, one of the oldest surviving marines from World War I, was asked to attend as a guest. In the most emotional point of the ceremony, Sergeant Weible marched in front of the vast crowd wearing his original World War I uniform. You could see the tears in his eyes when the "National Anthem" and "Marine Hymn" was played and he saluted the flag with a sense of loyalty we all wish there was more of today. He was so proud to be there and he looked so grandiose with all his medals pinned on that old uniform. Sergeant Weible would later call the ceremony "the finest military event I ever attended". Sadly, 2 months later, Sergeant Weible passed away. He leaves but a few remaining comrades behind.

It is for them and all the Sergeant Weibles no longer with us, that we must pass H.R. 1918. I urge my colleagues to please cosponsor H.R. 1918 and work with me to see that it is enacted during this session.

□ 1750

STUDENT LOAN DEFAULTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, last November, when Congress adopted several unnecessarily harsh measures to deal with something that only had the appearance of a problem, I predicted that the action would have tragic effects.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I was all too correct.

Let me explain what I mean. Last year, there was concern that the Supplemental Loan for Students [SLS] Program was growing too fast and might produce the same kinds of defaults that currently exist in the Stafford Loan Program, formerly the Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

In response to that perception, the Congress chose not to address the underlying reason of why students default; namely, the gross imbalance of grants to loans.

Instead, the Congress decided to limit eligibility for the SLS Program. It was decided that applicants for SLS loans have to have a high school diploma or general equivalency diploma [GED], that applicants could attend only those institutions that had a student loan default rate of less than 30 percent, and, finally, that the amount of the SLS loan would be directly tied to the length of the educational program.

All three of these limitations reduce access and choice to postsecondary programs and are specifically targeted at students in an extremely vital sector of higher education—career training.

Probably the most harmful of these limitations is the 30-percent cutoff. It is arbitrary, discriminatory, and, worst of all, completely ludicrous.

Before I go any further, let's understand two things. First, the default rate is calculated by the Department of Education from information it receives from the lenders, servicers, and the agencies that guarantee the loans, and, second, these rates may not be as accurate as they could be, or should be.

Let me tell you about one school—American Transportation Education Centers [AMTEC], for example. Virtually 85 percent of the defaults charged to them, by the Department of Education, are listed as being in repayment to the guarantor of the loans.

AMTEC sent me a copy of an intra-school memo from their loan repayment department that further exemplifies a serious lack of communication between all of the people who service the loans before they go into repayment.

Out of 64 students that were reported to the school as being 45 to 70 days delinquent in their loan payments—

Eleven had canceled checks or other physical evidence proving the payments were made and their accounts were not delinquent.

Thirty-four had received between four and six different loan coupon books.

Thirteen had circumstances which entitled them to deferment but were told to make full payments instead.

Two had requested forbearance but the servicer could not find any record of either request.

One requested forms to consolidate his loans but was told he couldn't. Later the school called the servicer and the servicer said he would put the forms in the mail immediately.

And another student was denied an unemployment deferment because the servicer said he was more than 180 days delinquent. After this last student's account was researched, it was found that the account was 90 days delinquent at the deferment receipt date so the student now has to send the entire bundle back to the supervisor's attention.

This is only one of many schools whose students have these same problems. To me, this shows a terrible lack of communication that makes me hesitant to swallow the Department's default calculations hook, line, and sinker.

The amount of inaccuracy is truly pathetic. My sympathy really goes out to those students who are put in the position where they have to make some sense out of their loan history when their accounts are riddled with errors. But while these students are trying to straighten it all out, the people who made the mistakes to begin with are taking steps to destroy the students' credit records.

Can you imagine what a nightmare it would be to go to your mailbox one day and see four or five coupon books from different mortgage companies or banks with a note from each one saying they are the sole owner of your home loan and telling you to remit your first payment immediately? Or, even worse, can you imagine finding four or five letters from different financial institutions saying that you are extremely delinquent on your mortgage payments and you must pay the full balance, pay a penalty, or face legal proceedings?

For years too many students have been pulling their hair out trying to figure out who owns their loans and where they are supposed to send their payments. It's a living nightmare for them, their parents, and their financial aid counselors.

The problem has been getting steadily worse because the number of loans has continued to climb as loans continued to replace grants and higher eduction gets increasingly more expensive.

Perhaps the most striking example of this can be seen in the Department of Education's most need-focused grant program—the Pell grants. Assuming education costs have increased by an average of 8 percent over the past 14 years, the maximum Pell grant should be more than $4,000. Instead it is $2,300, so even the most needy students must rely on loans to finance most of their educational expenses.

Students today have had to go farther in debt than their fellow students of a few years ago in order to receive any education past the high school level. By the time they graduate, most have accumulated thousands of dollars of debt.

For most, it is their first loan experience. The process, at best, can be very intimidating and confusing, but for many of these students it is even more so because of all the problems they are running into with the people who are supposed to be keeping accurate track of their loans.

The inspector general of the Department of Education made several points in his recent testimony about the people and organizations we have entrusted to services our students' loans—lenders, third-party servicers, and secondary markets.

Let's talk about the secondary markets first. According to the inspector general, secondary markets held $18.4 billion in outstanding loans—or 40 percent of all outstanding loans as of September 1988.

Despite the overwhelming presence of secondary markets in the student loan programs, the Department of Education has not systematically received audits of the secondary markets administration of the program, nor has it provided systematic program review of these organizations. The fact is, the Department of Education doesn't even know how many secondary markets exist or whether anyone is evaluating their performance.

When discussing third-party servicers, the inspector general raised the concern that many servicers are affiliated with guarantee agencies. He went on to say that because of this relationship, their exists a very real potential conflict of interest in guarantee reviews of servicers.

The inspector general outlined three risks involved with not accurately monitoring servicers: One, payment of inaccurate interest and special allowance billings; two, reduced collectability of loans; and three, reinsurance payments on ineligible claims and wrongful harm to borrowers' credit ratings.

When talking about lenders the inspector general highlighted concerns related to performance of due diligence requirements and payment of origination fees to the Department of Education.

Although due diligence requirements have been in effect for 3 years, lender reviews performed by guarantee agencies show a high level of noncompliance especially in repayment and collection of loans. The Inspector General's Office analyzed results of 101 lender reviews conducted by 13 guarantee agencies during 1987 and 1988 and found that 87 percent of lender files reviewed contained due diligence exceptions.

To think that the Department of Education calculates a school's default rate and pays out subsidies and special allowance based on often mistake-riddled information it receives from these organizations is scary. To expect that information to be accurate enough to establish a policy whereby students who attend schools with a default rate over a specific percent are not eligible to participate in the SLS Program is totally outrageous.

But that is exactly what we've done.

As a result, according to the best estimates available, students at over 1,000 schools are now ineligible to participate in the SLS program because the student default rate at those schools is over 30 percent. As of January 24, the Department of Education said 80 percent of those schools are career training schools.

This means students not only continue to have to deal with the nightmare of trying to find out who owns their loans so they know where to send their payments and trying to correct mistakes in their accounts. Now, they also have a bad policy that dictates which schools they can go to to receive higher education and what types of educational programs they can pursue.

The Department has said that these numbers may change, but they also say they can't predict if the figures are going to change upward or downward. From what we've seen so far, I'll bet they will change upward and the future will be even more grim for even more Americans who would like to rise above their circumstances.

Although no one can say for sure exactly how many students are no longer eligible to participate in the SLS Program because of the default rate

cutoff, we can assume the number is in the hundreds of thousands.

From talking to just three of the eight organizations that accredit career training schools who helped my staff establish some figures by using default rates published by the Department, we know that at least 218,000 students are now ineligible to participate in the SLS Program.

The National Association of Trade and Technical Schools [NATTS], at last count, said 147 of their 1,283 schools, or about 11.5 percent, have default rates over 30 percent. NATTS estimates about 90,000 students are no longer eligible to participate in the SLS program.

The Association of Independent Colleges and Schools [AICS], at last count, said 164 of their 1,000 schools, or 16.4 percent, have default rates over 30 percent. Because the average AICS school has 680 students, we estimate about 112,000 students are no longer eligible.

The National Accrediting Commission of Cosmetology Arts and Sciences was able to arrive at a rough estimate that 149 of their schools, or 8 percent, have default rates over 30 percent. NACCAS estimates roughly 16,000 students dependent on SLS loans are no longer eligible.

Targeting these schools and cutting financial aid to students at them was a grave mistake for three reasons. First, students who attend career training schools instead of other institutions of higher education are more likely to complete their coursework and find jobs. Second, career training schools are easier on the taxpayers' pocketbooks. And, third, career training schools play an important role in keeping American businesses in business.

Students who attend career training schools are more likely to complete their coursework and find jobs than students who enroll in any other sector of postsecondary study because career training schools have the highest completion and placement records of any other sector of higher education—61 percent of career training students successfully complete their coursework compared to 33 percent in the Job Corps, 43 percent at public community colleges, and 58 percent at 4-year colleges.

The placement rate of career training schools is 81 percent. This rate is not only higher than any other sector in higher education, but is also more reliable because it is considered to be a "hard" figure.

Career training schools have been required for some time now to track their graduates in order to document their placement rates and, as of December 1, 1989, have been required to put them on paper, notify their students of them, and have the students sign the paper. In addition, most of the training schools are required to prove their rates to their accrediting bodies.

Starting December 1, 1989, vocational programs in the community college sector were required to begin tracking their graduates to develop hard figures for their placement rates. Right now, this sector's best guesstimate for placement, of nearly 80 percent, is still lower than the career training sector's documented figures.

The placement rate for 4-year colleges, at 70 to 75 percent, is not only another soft figure, but may even be a little misleading due to job titles.

To calculate their placement rates, most 4-year colleges look at what jobs their students have 2 years after graduation. A graduate is considered placed if he has a job considered to be on an appropriate level for students with degrees.

Who decides what jobs are considered to be an appropriate level and what criterion are they basing it on? Are they getting in touch with each graduate 2 years after graduation and asking each one what his specific job duties are, or are they using job titles provided by the graduate to the alumni association?

Career training schools are easier on the taxpayers' pocketbooks than any other sector of higher education.

Using figures calculated from a National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs report, it is estimated that for 1 year of education in a private career school, taxpayers save $2,975 compared to the costs of educating a student in a 4-year college for the same time period and $1,119 compared to the cost of educating a student in a community college for a similar time period.

A 1989 report done by Shearson-Lehman-Hutton argues that taxpayers save $17,938 per student per year for every American who finishes a training program and gets a job earning $15,000. They say the money is saved through programs such as welfare, food stamps, women and infant care, housing, health care, and taxes on that $15,000-a-year job.

Career training schools play an important role in keeping businesses in business.

Students choose the shorter career training programs as opposed to longer programs that combine academic and training courses because they want to enter the work force as fast as possible and they want more hands-on training.

These same two reasons of why students choose career training schools are how businesses benefit tremendously by hiring recent training school graduates. Businesses can fill their employment openings faster and not have to spend as much time and money to train them compared to hiring recent graduates from other sectors of higher education.

I have received many letters from businesses who regularly hire career training school graduates praising the graduates and the schools who educated them. These same business men and women also tell me how much they rely on the schools to provide them with a continuous supply of readied workers, and, frankly, some of the businesses don't know where they are going to find skilled people to fill the new job slots that are opened up in their industries every day.

Department of Labor statistics indicate that in the near future all types of businesses will be needing an even more technically skilled labor force. Three out of four jobs already require technical skills and the three fastest growing occupations, percentagewise, to the year 2000—paralegal, medical assistant, and physical therapist—all require some form of career training.

By knocking career training schools out of the picture through these recent policy changes, we are seriously hurting our businesses and lowering the overall quality of our Nation's labor pool.

This is especially true in the trucking industry. There already is a shortage of drivers and the industry needs an additional 450,000 new drivers every year, according to the Hudson Institute.

A projected estimate calculated before the policy changes were adopted indicated the driver shortage would exceed 300,000 by the year 1991, but, so far, no one has been able to tell my staff what the driver shortage will look like now because it is too soon to tell what the full effects of the policy changes will mean.

George Beaulieu, president of the National Association of Truck Driving Schools [NATDS], says the driving schools that have been able to survive so far are struggling under the new changes and the trucking industry as a whole is already feeling the effects of them. He predicts the driver shortage will become alarming over the next 1½ years as companies scramble to find enough drivers to keep their trucks on the road.

Too many transport companies already have trucks sitting idle. They have plenty of customers, but are having an increasingly harder time finding qualified people to drive them. Some people in the industry are becoming very concerned that as the problem gets worse, companies will be either forced out of business because they don't have enough drivers, or will be looking to hire any warm body to sit in the driver's seat regardless of that person's ability to safely operate the vehicle.

Each one of the three policy changes, taken separately, is having

terrible effects on all of the training schools, but the three combined seem to have been custom-designed to destroy the trucking industry.

Now let's consider the other two policy changes—the GED requirement and prorating the amount of the SLS loans—and relate them to just the truck driving schools.

It has been estimated that at least 45 percent of students who attend truck driving schools don't have a high school diploma or a GED. They are no longer eligible for SLS loans.

Out of all of the Americans who want to better themselves through higher education, these are the ones we should be encouraging the most. Instead, we are telling them we don't have enough faith in them, or their abilities, to better themselves.

These men and women have deliberately chosen to attend a career training school instead of pursuing an academic education. For whatever reason, they don't want an academic education. They want to learn a skill, get a job, support their families, and find a productive place in our society.

Instead of encouraging their drive and ambition, we condemn them to only academic programs. The same programs they have already dropped out of.

This sure doesn't make sense to me because most researchers agree these are the very students who benefit the most from career training.

And, as if we don't have enough with the first two policy changes to spell disaster, we now also prorate the amount of the SLS loan, for those few students who are still eligible, depending on the length of the educational program.

I don't know which bright star thought this one up, but this is almost as discriminatory and ludicrous as the 30-percent cutoff.

It costs much more to operate a 6- to 8-week truck driving school with behind-the-wheel training and a low pupil-teacher ratio than it does to have one teacher stand in front of as many as 100 students and give lectures on philosophy or English for a year.

It costs about $40 to $50 an hour to operate a truck and the industry recommends that each truck driving student have an average of 45 to 50 hours of behind-the-wheel driving time. This adds up to $1,800 to $2,500 per student. That's before the instructor is paid, and the initial cost of the tractor-trailer is considered. Then you have to figure in the cost to insure the trucks being used by these student drivers who have no driving experience. Keep in mind also, we have to add in room and board because most truck driving schools are located far enough off the beaten path to give the students plenty of room for error so they don't end up taking out street signs and toppling electrical poles. Their locations make commuting impossible for most of the students.

Do you think a bank would lend more money to someone who wants to buy a blue Dodge and less to someone who wants to buy a red Mercedes simply because they decided to base their policy on colors instead of actual costs?

The very idea is completely absurd, but that's exactly what we've done by tying the amount of the SLS loan to the length of the program.

The botton line is, despite generalized accusations and perpetuations of those accusations based on isolated instances, the majority of career training schools work and can lay invaluable foundations on which many talented individuals have already based careers, and which many more can if we only give them the opportunity.

Let me tell you about some career training school graduates who demonstrate what I mean.

When Beverly Currin graduated from high school, she wanted to pursue a career in interior design.

Ms. Currin worked two part-time jobs to pay tuition at the Art Institute of Atlanta. After she graduated in 1973, she worked for smaller design houses before joining an architectural firm in 1978.

Today, she is a partner in the firm and enjoys a reputation as one of the leading interior designers in the Southeast.

Craig Belmondo said his education at a career training school "provided the basic knowledge and initial training that assisted in my growth in the ever changing and exciting airline industry."

Mr. Belmondo graduated from Washington State University with a major in business administration, but found he still lacked the necessary skills to get into the airline business. He attended the International Air Academy in Vancouver, WA. After completing the Airline Reservations and Airport Service Program at the academy, he was hired as a reservations clerk for an airline, was appointed to develop the sales and marketing department of one of the company's daughter airlines, WestAir Airlines, and was later named vice president of sales and marketing in 1983.

Today, he is president of North Pacific Air and is chief operating officer responsible for flight operations, ground operations, maintenance, customer service, marketing, sales, finance, and administrative functions of the airline.

Joseph Casey said his training at a career school, "Whet my appetite for electronics * * * I was eager to learn more."

Mr. Casey was a young man from Chicago's inner city when he graduated with honors from a radio/TV repair course at Coyne Electrical Institute in 1956, after which he attended a junior college and served in the U.S. Air Force. He left the Air Force as a captain and then continued with his education, receiving a bachelor's degree in physics and a master's degree in engineering.

Today, he is principal engineer for Equipment Corp. and is responsible for providing technical consulting in marketing and logistics and providing corporate support for a staff of 15,000 field engineers.

After Frank Fanto received his aircraft engine mechanic license from the Pittsburgh Institute of Aeronautics in 1948, he began working as production assembler and flight line mechanic.

Today, he is director of production operation for Lockheed Aeronautical Systems Co. in Georgia and is directly responsible for production of the C-5B program which is an airlift system of vital importance to the country's national security.

Joseph Leroy Williams, one of nine children in a sharecropper's family in Arkansas, had to quit school and go to work at the age of 17 when his father died.

He went to St. Louis and performed several menial jobs while sending money home to his family, but, at the age of 30 he had to quit his job of 9 years due to health problems related to his work. He continued to support his family by housepainting and light hauling while he completed a course at Vatterott Educational Center.

After studying building systems repair, plumbing, heating, and air-conditioning, he started his own business—J.L. Williams Contracting Co. Although his first year's revenue was only $13,000, he continued to work hard.

Today, Mr. William's company grosses more than $1 million annually and is bonded up to $600,000. He was also named the "most successful minority contractor of the year" for 1987 by the Minority Enterprise Networking Association.

George Husar, Sr., was 46 years old when an injury made it impossible for him to continue operating heavy equipment. He went to the Refrigeration School in Phoenix, AZ looking for a new career.

After graduating, he wanted to be self-employed. So in 1974 he and his wife, Genie, started Genie Aire—an air-conditioning, refrigeration, and heating service company.

Mr. Husar was so impressed with the education he received at the school, he sent four family members there. Sons, Earl and Ernie Duskey graduated in 1974 and 1976, respectively, and 10 years later, they started their own company, Duskey's Heating and Air-Conditioning. In 1981, son-in-law Laurence Chausse graduated and joined

Genie Aire, followed by George, Jr., in 1985.

In the meantime, Mr. Husar had started another company, Cryo Refrigeration, in 1980. The new company deals with the ultra low temperature techniques of cryogenics.

These are just a handful of graduates who have benefited tremendously from career training school.

I am not saying that every American should attend a career training school instead of any other type of post secondary institution, but career training schools have an extremely valuable place in the higher education community. The schools and the students who attend them should not be made targets for bad policy decisions.

□ 1820

DO NOT DESTROY SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAUZIN). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER, Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago the President of the United States came to this Chamber and delivered his State of the Union Message. The President said a number of things which focused on our needs in this country for the future. One of the points that he made, which received the loudest applause in this Chamber that evening, was when he implored this body not to mess with Social Security.

When the President made that statement, it was in light of the fact that a senior member of the Democratic Party on the other side of the body had come forward with a proposal that aimed at breaking the agreement of 1983 designed to shore up the Social Security system and preserve it into the next century.

Mr. President, having heard those remarks, came to this Chamber and told us that we ought not break that agreement, that we ought to hold Social Security inviolate for our future.

The reaction in this body was stunning. Immediately the Members on the Republican side of the Congress rose in a standing ovation for the President's position. After a moment of hesitation, and then realizing that there could be a political downside to also not being seen as supporting what the President was saying, the Members on the Democratic side came to a standing ovation, including Senator MOYNIHAN himself, who had originally made the proposal to break the 1983 agreement.

The problem is that despite that standing ovation on the House floor that night, and despite the President's eloquent plea that we not mess with Social Security, there has been a whole lot of messing going on. Because since that time we have moved ahead in several quarters in the Congress messing with Social Security.

Despite the President's call for us not to break the 1983 agreement, not to mess with Social Security, the Senate held hearings on the Moynihan proposal. The Democratic majority in the Senate decided to go ahead and hold hearings, and they did so.

There are still people in this town talking about proceeding with what Senator MOYNIHAN proposed, or some version of the Moynihan proposal. Understand, the Moynihan proposal was that we would reduce the taxes for Social Security this year in order to bring down the surplus, which MOYNIHAND says is going to pay off the deficit.

Well, while there are snatches of truth in what was proposed there, the problem is that the solution is all wrong. What Senator MOYNIHAN would do to Social Security is he would break the contract with retirees of the future. What he was really saying was we will go on a pay-as-you-go basis, assuring that some time in the next century that the people who retire, those who are working now, who are going to depend upon that system in the future, will not have sufficient funds to meet the obligations. That is a terrible decision for us to make, that we are going to destroy Social Security for future generations, and that is the essence of the Moynihan proposal that worries many Members of Congress.

□ 1830

It is true, Senator MOYNIHAN says, that the money that comes into the Social Security trust fund at the present time is utilized to buy government bonds. There was a special issue of Government bonds that was created for us to purchase.

The question one has to ask is if that is not something which is appropriate to do, how would we build reserves for future use by the Federal Government? Would we have to take the money and go immediately into the market? That could have disastrous results, and the Federal Government would literally control the purchases in the stock market, plus the fact that we would be in the position of perhaps losing all of the money at some point. We by law have said that we are going to buy Government bonds with the money in order to put the money into the safest investment that the world knows.

Why do people around the world want to invest in Government securities? It is because it is the world's safest investment. That is what we do with our Social Security trust fund money, we put it into the world's safest investment.

The fact is that the Government is running on a deficit, and those bonds are used to pay the bills of the Government, sure. But the reason for doing that is not to cover up the deficit. The reason for doing it is to put the money in the safest possible investment.

Senator MOYNIHAN says he does not like that way of trading off on the deficit. There is one way around that. Let us just take the whole Social Security trust fund off budget and make it real, buy down debt that presently exists for all of the money we put into Social Security bonds. That way we would not have the penalties that Senator MOYNIHAN claims are inherent in the system, and at the same time would be preserving the security of the Social Security system that we anticipated in 1983. That is one way in which we were messing with Social Security at the time the President spoke. We continue to have people who think it would be a good idea to mess in that way.

However, it goes beyond that. We have now the proposal being brought forward by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the single most powerful man in the House in terms of making decisions about Social Security, who has now proposed that we eliminate for at least one year the cost-of-living raise for Social Security recipients. That is messing with Social Security. The problem with that particular proposal is he does it in a proposal where he also anticipates raising the cost of inflation to those very same Social Security recipients.

What do I mean by that? For example, the Rostenkowski proposal calls for raising the gas tax to 25 cents a gallon. In other words, taking the gasoline prices back to Jimmy Carter rates.

What would that mean? That would mean massive inflation in the economy. One of the problems with the gas tax is that it spreads across the entire economy immediately. When we have a gasoline tax increase, it affects all of transportation. All of transportation means that it goes into every good that we buy. It means that it has a broad-based inflationary impact. If inflation goes up, guess who gets hit? It is people who are retired and living on fixed incomes.

What else does the Rostenkowski proposal say? It says that we are not going to give them cost-of-living increases, we are going to freeze them as part of the proposal. That I would say is messing with Social Security, and messing in all the wrong ways.

But that is not the only thing that has been going on. We do not just have the Moynihan plan to destroy the 1983 compromise on Social Security. We do not just have the Rostenkowski plan to eliminate the cost-of-living raises for Social Security recipients. We also have a series of Demo-

crats coming to the floor who are delivering the leadership message of the day.

The leadership message of the day has not talked about Social Security. Funny that it has not, because what they are saying is a Social Security message in code. What they have been talking about is something called tax fairness, and what they have been saying regularly on the House floor is that if we look at what happened during the 1980's that taxes on middle-income America actually went up, not down, and so somehow President Reagan and President Bush have been prevaricating with the American people when they talk about tax reductions.

The only way that we can get to these statistics is to include the Social Security tax increases. It is true that Social Security taxes went up during the 1980's, and that had an impact on middle-income America, on low-income America, no doubt about it. But I would remind my colleagues that the reason why they went up was as a result of the 1983 compromise, which was a bipartisan compromise, which was hailed by both President Reagan and Speaker O'Neill, and was done in a way to preserve the Social Security retirement system. We decided that those increased taxes were in fact necessary for the future of the program.

Now we have Members, evidently speaking for the Democratic leadership in the Congress, who are coming to the floor of the House and are raising questions about those tax increases that were meant to preserve Social Security. That has to raise questions in our minds. Did they not mean it in 1983? Did they not really want to preserve the Social Security system in 1983? Was that all a political ploy that now 7 years later that they want to back out on? Or are they just attempting to play some games with the figures here in order to get themselves out of the tax mess that they now find themselves in?

It is true, the American people have now figured out that there is one party around here that likes to tax them for nearly everything, and that is the Democratic Party. So the Democrats are trying to find themselves a way out of the tax box. So they have come up with the so-called tax fairness issue.

If in fact they mean what they are saying, that what they want to do is to do something about the problem of rising taxes for the middle-income and the low-income people, and the way in which they are arriving at those figures is using the Social Security taxes as a part, one has to assume that they have a plan there which is ultimately going to come forward that would reduce the Social Security tax in some way, going back to the Moynihan plan.

There is a problem with that, however. Social Security is not truly a tax. Social Security was meant as an insurance system. It is a payment that one is making now, much as they would do in a pension system in order to receive benefits somewhere downstream. And what has happened in recent years is that the payments downstream are more, on the average, than the money that was paid into the system. So the people who are paying the so-called Social Security tax today are paying with the idea of anticipated benefits at some later date.

That is the insurance compact that has always been a part of the Social Security system. Do the people who are now talking about changing that want to break that compact? Do they want to make this something other than insurance, because what it sounds like they are saying is that they want to begin for the first time to differentiate between what some people pay into Social Security and what other people pay into Social Security. It is beginning to sound as though they want to lower the taxes on some or lower the payment by some and raise the payment on others.

Remember, what one gets back from Social Security depends upon the earnings history. Your earnings history is based upon what you paid into the system. If we begin to differentiate the numbers, we will have some people eligible for lower, much lower payments, and some people eligible for higher payments.

It is true of the system today that some people get more than others, but it is based upon their real earnings history.

One reason why we cap the amount of money on which we tax for Social Security is to assure that there is not a great disparity, because remember, under the present system if we had everybody pay on every dime of income, we could have millionaires paying on all of the money that they made, and thereby being eligible for thousands of dollars a month in Social Security payments at the end. That would make no sense, and that is one reason why early on in the Social Security system we capped the amount of income that you paid your Social Security on, and we also assured that everybody paid in equally. That was so that when you began receiving payments, they were received equitably and evenly.

Why did we do that? Because we wanted Social Security to be an insurance system, not a welfare system. We did not want Social Security to become just another welfare system, a differentiated payment. We wanted to have people collect Social Security with the honorable understanding that they had paid for this insurance themselves, that it was something that they had a right to, it was something that was theirs by virtue of the fact that they had paid in during their working lives, and it was based upon their earnings history that they were getting back the money.

Now we have people who are beginning to talk as though they are willing to differntiate the payments. When we do that, we convert Social Security into just another welfare system.

□ 1840

I am beginning to hear people who sound suspiciously like they are willing to have Social Security become just another welfare system, and I have got to tell you it worries me. It ought to worry the other Members in this House that there are people who are beginning to talk about differing levels of payments which thereby would make for a means-tested program somewhere at the end. That is a welfare program.

Social Security should not be allowed to become another welfare program. We ought not let the Democrats and the liberals in this body, on the idea of tax fairness, convert Social Security into another welfare program. They are already seen by the American public as wanting to convert everything into welfare programs. We ought not let them do it to Social Security.

They do not want to talk about it in those terms, but that is what they are really saying when they come to the floor and talk about this level of taxes that somehow is going up during the 1980's. They have got to use Social Security as a part of that calculation, that is the only way it works. And when you start differentiating, you convert Social Security into a welfare program. That would be wrong.

The President again told us, "Don't mess with Social Security." Now maybe you understand why the President thought we ought not mess with Social Security, because you have the Rostenkowsi proposal to eliminate the cost of living, you have the proposal by Mr. MOYNIHAN to destroy the 1983 compromise and now you have people evidently speaking for a leadership proposal that is being cooked up somewhere on tax fairness, talking as though Social Security is going to be made into just another welfare program. We ought not be messing in that way.

There are a couple of other scary things that retirees ought to be concerned about, too. The majority whip last night, in speaking to a group, made a statement that worried me a little bit. He suggested that one way that we could begin improving the infrastructure in this country, rebuilding the infrastructure was to take the money out of pension funds. What he suggested was, and he did not use these terms, I am using the terms, that we raid the private pension funds

for—I am sorry—raid the public pension funds for certain amounts of money so that we could improve the infrastructure. In other words, converting pension money into pork.

I think retirees ought to be very worried about that.

If we are going to destroy Social Security and then in addition we are going to destroy the pension programs in this country, that could get very worrisome for retirees in the future.

Well, I am worried. I am afraid what is going on in Congress endangers a whole generation of present retirees; I think it could well endanger several generations of future retirees. I think we ought to go back to what the President said earlier this year. We ought not mess with Social Security. We ought not mess with these programs that are vital to the needs of retired Americans and future generations of Americans who hope to retire in dignity.

It is time, I think, to take Social Security off the table. We hope, I hope we can follow the President's advice: For the rest of this Congress, "Don't mess with Social Security."

JERUSALEM MUST NOT BE DIVIDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAUZIN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the Speaker, and at the outset of this special order I would like particularly to thank our colleague from Indiana, Congressman BURTON, who has joined me in organizing this special order this afternoon and spoke with many of our colleagues, many of whom had hoped to participate, thinking that the special order would have been conducted somewhat earlier in today's schedule. But because of the wide interest in a number of topics, we were not able to do so.

I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to just mention two of our colleagues who have been instrumental in organizing this special order and were very eager to participate but because of the lateness of the hour were unable to do so.

One is the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE], who has been a very active member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, particularly the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East in dealing with the wide range of complex issues in the fashioning of American foreign policy in the Middle East. He is submitting an extension of his remarks at a later date.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to mention a colleague of ours who serves on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], who also wanted to participate today. I will be submitting his lengthy statement into the RECORD. He is someone who has been of enormous help and tremendously responsible in helping us to fashion an appropriate American policy.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 23 years—since 1967—there have been certain hallmarks in U.S. Middle East policy that have remained constant. One has been that any peace agreement involves mutual recognition and secure borders for Israel. Another has been that in exchange for full peace and recognition Israel might have to yield some of the territory that was won after the Arab States attacked in 1967. A third was that the city of Jerusalem must remain united and would not be returned to the divided status of the pre-1967 period.

However, on March 3, President Bush seemed to break with the consensus that had existed since 1967 when he stated that his administration opposed new Israeli settlements "in the West Bank or in East Jerusalem." Initially, it was thought that the President misspoke and that he had meant to say "the West Bank and Gaza." It seemed unlikely that the President would have intended to put Israel's capital city in the same category as the administered territories.

But, as Tom Friedman pointed out in the New York Times of March 9, that was his intention. "Officials say," Friedman wrote, "that Bush intentionally added East Jerusalem to make sure that the Israelis understood that it was still viewed as occupied territory by the United States * * *." The President stated just yesterday that he stands by his March 9 statement.

The President has made a blunder, one that is already reverberating throughout the Middle East. The first mistake was in the timing of his remark on Jerusalem. At the time he made his statement, the administration was trying to convince the Israeli Government to enter into negotiations with the Palestinians—negotiations that would lead to elections in the West Bank.

The Shamir government was resisting, in part because of the administration's insistence that Arab residents of Jerusalem be allowed to participate both in the negotiations and in any future election. Israelis feared that allowing residents of Jerusalem to participate—as if Jerusalem was just another part of the West Bank—might lead to a situation where Israel was being pressured to relinquish sovereignty over its own capital.

This fear was only fueled by the President's statement which is a departure from traditional U.S. policy. The United States has always made a distinction between Jerusalem and the territories. American policy on the West Bank and Gaza is governed by U.N. Security Council Resolution 242 and the Camp David accords, both of which envision at least partial Israeli withdrawal in exchange for full peace and security.

However, neither of those documents makes reference to Jerusalem and deliberately so. The United States Ambassador to the United Nations at the time 242 was drafted stated that "Resolution 242 in no way refers to Jerusalem * * * Jerusalem was a discrete matter, not linked to the West Bank." As for Camp David, the accords drafted there include separate letters stating the Egyptian, Israeli, and American positions on Jerusalem. These separate side letters were included simply because the three sides could not reach agreement on Jerusalem's future.

Subsequent United States administrations have made clear, over and over again, that the land for peace formula does not apply to Jerusalem. Israelis would not be asked to accept the redivision of Jerusalem.

Nor should they. Jerusalem is Israel's capital. The concept of settlements in Jerusalem is nonsensical. Israelis do not settle in their capital. They live there. Jerusalem is not occupied territory.

The Bush statement reveals a troubling aspect to United States policy toward Jerusalem. In his March 9 statement the President indicated that the administration considers East Jerusalem to be occupied territory, that is, territory that Israel would be asked to give up in the context of peace negotiations.

In a March 13 letter to Mayor Teddy Kollek of Jerusalem he stresses that Jerusalem must "never again be a divided city," but at the same time states that it is "our view that the final status of this most special of cities should be decided by negotiation * * *."

The logic here is inescapable. The administration believes that Jerusalem must remain one city but that its final status is up for grabs. Israel will be asked to negotiate not only over the future of East Jerusalem—the part of the city that was gained in the 1967 war—but also over West Jerusalem, which has always been part of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's policy toward Jerusalem is precisely half right. Jerusalem must never again be divided. However, it is most certainly not up for grabs. Jerusalem, East

and West, will remain Israel's capital. Now and forever.

This is not to say that there can be no negotiations over Jerusalem's final status. At the end of the day, when the other outstanding issues dividing Israelis and Palestinians are resolved, there should be discussions over the holy places and other sites of particular historic or religious interest.

However, raising the Jerusalem question at this time is counterproductive. It unnecessarily alarms the Israelis and raises the expectations among Palestinians and other Arabs that the United States will join in the effort to wrest Jerusalem from Israel. That is not going to happen. And it shouldn't happen. It's President Bush who should convey this message to Arabs and Israelis alike. Only then will this needless controversy be laid to rest.

□ 1850

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] who has joined me this afternoon in calling for and organizing this special order.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am a very strong supporter of President Bush, and I think many of my colleagues are. However, we believe, I think many Members believe, that an unfortunate error was made by the President recently when he made the statement that "We do not believe that there should be new settlements in the West Bank or in East Jerusalem."

Jerusalem, the ancient capital of Israel, represents the heart and soul of the Jewish people. It has been the focus of Jewish national and religious yearning for 3,000 years. Jews have always lived there. And, since the 19th century, a plurality of its residents have been Jewish.

Ever since King David established Jerusalem as the capital of the kingdom of Israel, Jerusalem has been close to the heart of the Jewish people.

Through all the years of exile, Jerusalem was the focus of Jewish prayers. At Passover, Jews have always prayed "next year in Jerusalem." One of Judaism's most fervent prayers reads like this:

> If I forget thee O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its cunning. Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I do not remember thee, if I do not raise Jerusalem above my highest joy.

We must remember Jerusalem was divided for 19 years because of war imposed by Arab neighbors, and Jews were not allowed into East Jerusalem for that time, even to pray at the holy shrines. Jewish gravestones were desecrated, and some used for latrines, and some used for road construction. Israel pleaded with Jordan not to enter the 1967 war. Jordan, instead, chose to enter the war started by Syria and Egypt. As a consequence, Israel found itself in control of all of Jerusalem and the West Bank. In order words, these were areas seized in a war of self defense. The very fact that Israel is being asked to relinquish those territories is a reflection of the hypocrisy of the world community. What other country in the world is expected to give up land it won in a war? Especially a war of self defense. Can Members imagine the United States giving Texas back to Mexico? Can Members imagine Poland returning territory to Germany? I think not.

How could anyone who has been to Israel not be awed and impressed by what the Israelis have done in Jerusalem? It is a free city, where Jews, Arabs, and everybody else enjoys freedom. Mayor Teddy Kollek, a great statesman, has done a tremendous job in unifying that city. The Arabs who live there are entitled to full citizenship and have all benefited from a higher standard of living, better education, better health care, better job opportunities and so forth. Most Arabs in any other country in the Middle East do not enjoy anywhere near the same advantages. Anyone who has been to Israel who has seen the West Bank knows how vulnerable Israel is, how narrow the country is at the waist. A person can fire a rocket from the West Bank all the way across the country into the Mediterranean Sea. It is surrounded by hostility. We ought to have maximum understanding for Israel's situation.

However, Jerusalem is in a category by itself. Recently, unfortunate statements have been made about the Israeli settlements in Jerusalem, which I alluded to, by the President, a few moments ago. Let all Members make it clear that we do not understand that language, on both sides of the aisle. Jerusalem is the eternal, indivisible capital of Israel. As a matter of principle, we really should move our Embassy to Jerusalem. Israel is the only country in the world where the United States Embassy is located in a city other than its capital, and Israel is our strongest ally in the Middle East. But at the very least, let Members speak with one voice concerning our feelings about Jerusalem. Let no one, be it friend or foe, doubt our strong support for Israel, and our strong conviction about the centrality of Jerusalem as Israel's eternal, united, and free capital city.

I would just like to end by saying since 1967, successive administrations have been sensitive to the special status of the city. According to Arthur Goldberg, one of the drafters of the U.N. Security Council Resolution 242, that resolution "in no way refers to Jerusalem, and this omission was deliberate * * * Jerusalem was a discrete matter, not linked to the West Bank."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the President, whom I support almost 100 percent of the time, will reevaluate his position on this issue so that this Congress can speak with one voice with the administration in helping preserve, protect, and defend Israel, our allies, work with them and work with their capital city, Jerusalem.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for his forceful statement this afternoon, and again for his participation in organizing today's special order.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, who has been one of the most effective and responsible voices on American foreign policy in the Middle East.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for arranging this special order so that we may be able to comment on the status of Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, for over 3,000 years, Jerusalem has been the center of religious, historic, and political identification for Jews throughout the world. The people of Israel and both major Israeli parties are united in their conviction that Jerusalem is and will remain the undivided capital of the State of Israel, just as it has been for more than four decades.

Jerusalem is the heart and soul of the Jewish people. For thousands of years it has been the focus of Jewish national and religious yearning. Jews have always lived in Jerusalem, and since the 19th century, a plurality of its residents have been Jewish.

On December 5, 1949, David Ben Gurion, first Prime Minister of Israel, declared in the Knesset that:

> * * * Jewish Jerusalem is an organic and inseperable part of the State of Israel, as it is an inseparable part of the history of Israel, of the faith of Israel, and of the very soul of the Jewish people. Jerusalem is the heart of hearts of the State of Israel * * *.

Those words, so articulately spoken by Ben Gurion, loudly proclaimed to the entire world that Jerusalem is the only religious and national center that Jews have ever had. If all of this is so obvious, and so critically important to Israel and her citizens, I question why our administration has not been more sensitive to this issue?

It is inconceivable for any Israeli Government to agree to the redivision of Jerusalem under any circumstances. In 1967, a Labor government was responsible for reunifying the city and a labor controlled Knesset legislated Israeli jurisdiction over all parts of the city. This commitment was reaffirmed when the Knesset enacted the basic law on Jerusalem in July 1980, which

declared that "Jerusalem, united in its entirety is the capital of Israel."

Since 1967, successive administrations have been sensitive to the special status of Jerusalem. It is significant to note that according to Arthur Goldberg, one of the drafters of U.N. Security Council Resolution 242, commented on the omission of Jerusalem in that resolution, stating: "that resolution in no way refers to Jerusalem, and this omission is deliberate * * *. Jerusalem is a discrete matter, not linked to the West Bank."

The 1980 Republican Party platform called for Jerusalem to "remain an undivided city with continued free and unimposed access to all holy places by people of all faiths."

President Reagan on a number of occasions voiced support for keeping Jerusalem "undivided under Israeli rule."

I believe that President Bush is dearly committed to the important strategic relationship with our one stable, resolve any in the Middle East: the State of Israel. In fact, President Bush's 1988 Republican Party platform was the most pro-Israeli political document ever produced by a major American party.

Lately, however, something appears to have been lost in the translation and most recently there has been a plethora of mixed signals with respect to United States policy toward Israeli Jews living in east Jerusalem.

Earlier this month, President Bush stated "we do not believe that there should be new settlement in the West Bank or in east Jerusalem."

By departing from a longstanding United States policy regarding the special status of Jerusalem, President Bush has raised doubts about our Nation's credibility at an extremely sensitive time in the peace process.

Jerusalem's mayor, Teddy Koller, observed that the administration's recent statements "have harmed the peace process and have caused a furor throughout Israel" and I might add throughout the American Jewish community.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I call upon our President to review and clarify the official United States position with regard to Jerusalem and particularly with regard to the Jewish population in east Jerusalem, as a further demonstration of our commitment to and support for Israel.

Mayor Teddy Koller noted there have been no Jewish settlements in Jerusalem.

A.M. Rosenthal, in his comments in the NY Times on March 8, 1990 stated:

> The very use of the word "settlement" to describe Jews moving into Jewish neighborhoods in Jerusalem is insulting. Should Israelis declare a Jewish quota for the eastern part of their capital?

Mr. President, you have been a staunch supporter of peace in the Middle East. Do not allow your recent east Jerusalem comments to undermine all of your good works.

□ 1900

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very thoughtful and scholarly presentation on this issue.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank both the gentlemen from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for taking this special order.

If President Bush's comments were not so serious, if his misstatement of U.S. policy were not so severe, one could almost find a humorous aspect to what he has done. With the Israeli body politic, which is so divided and so split up and so fractious and tumultuous right now, he has managed to unify Israelis from the left to the right and from Labor to Likud with his very, very unfortunate comments.

The sad part of this and the thing that takes the humor away is the serious repercussions and implications which will come from all of this. The President has misstated U.S. policy toward Jerusalem. Jerusalem has always, under Republican administrations and Democratic administrations, been considered a separate issue from the question of the West Bank and Gaza. Jerusalem has been accorded a special status by the U.S. Government, at least until last week. The United States has always until last week been very careful to refrain from taking a position on the final status of Jerusalem. But always the U.S. position has been that Jerusalem is to be a unified entity.

The separation between 1967 and post-1967 was not to apply to Jerusalem. The green line did not run through the middle of Jerusalem.

The irony of the President's statements implying that Jews should be restricted from living in certain areas of the Holy City, in addition to being deeply offensive to Israelis of all political persuasions, Jews of every nationality, and many other Americans, is that Jerusalem is one city where the residents, be they Muslim, Christian, or Jew, Arab Israeli or Jewish Israeli, could live anywhere. No one has ever suggested restrictions on the ability of Arab Israelis who lived in what was known as East Jerusalem before 1967 to move anywhere within Jerusalem or anywhere within Israel as it existed before 1967. This has never been a question for Muslims or for Christians.

Now President Bush all of a sudden suggests and raises the question that it should be an issue of where Jews can live in Jerusalem. Each year at Passover, Jews worldwide pray, and they pray next year in Jerusalem, remembering that particularly in recent years Soviet Jews were unable to conduct services for themselves. For 2,000 years the return to the Holy City has been the highest spiritual aspiration for Jews.

That is why the President's statements are especially distressing to Soviet Jews. Having finally escaped decades of persecution in the Soviet Union, they discover now that our Government is seeking to discriminate against them on the basis of religion. As we applaud the collapse of the Berlin Wall, it might be intolerable for us to support the erection of a similar divisive edifice in Jerusalem.

I have been one who has been supportive of the administration's efforts in pursuing the peace process in the Middle East. The administration has played a very useful role in trying to implement the Shamir peace initiative, and in doing so, I think, has given hope to all of us that we may bring this spiraling escalation of hatred to an end, turn this around, and move forward in the peace process. But when they raise the kind of issue like the final status of Jerusalem in such a fashion as President Bush just did, it is the kind of ill-considered, hasty action that brings negotiations of such sensitivity to a standstill.

There are three theories for what the President has done. One is that it was a misstatement. If it was a misstatement, he had ample opportunity to correct it, but he chose instead to reiterate it. Another suggestion has been that he is trying to make a purposeful change in our position with respect to Jerusalem. If that is his intent, he should put it forth as such, defend it as such, and explain why what he is doing serves our national interest.

Finally, it is the view of some that this is the result of pique or irritation at some Israeli action in the peace process. That is not an appropriate response for the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, moving the peace process backward by this kind of comment is a very terrible responsibility for the administration to bear, and I hope they do everything they can as soon as they can to rectify the situation.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] for his remarks and for joining us this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON].

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to thank and commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] who have taken the time this evening to ask us to come over and talk about an issue of very great importance and personal interest to me.

Last August I had the opportunity to visit Israel for the first time. While I was there, I spent several days touring the ancient city of Jerusalem, the center of Jewish history. Although the short time I was there was not nearly enough to fully experience life in Jerusalem, I was able to speak to many people, not just leaders of the government but ordinary citizens as well.

I was told by these men and women of the days when Jerusalem was a divided city, when the city, held sacred by not only Jews but by Christians and Muslims as well, was divided by walls and barbed wire, machine guns, and mines. My friends in Israel, those old enough to remember, told me of the pain they felt knowing that they could not go to East Jerusalem to visit the many places holy to them and to their religion.

After the Jewish sector of the partitioned city came under attack in the Six Days War in 1967, the Israelis were able to reestablish control and order in all parts of that Holy City.

□ 1910

Mr. Speaker, when the Israelis reunited all parts of Jerusalem, they undertook measures to guarantee that in the future all holy places would be protected from desecration and that access to them would be free to all members of all faiths, and, my colleagues, that has been the case ever since, regardless of religious background.

On that afternoon of the reunification of Jerusalem in 1967, standing at the Western Wall, Defense Minister Moshe Dayan said, "We have returned to our holiest places. We have returned, never to be parted again."

Mr. Speaker, when I was in Jerusalem, I went and prayed at that Western Wall myself. I joined with others in our group and from all over the world at that wall to pray that Jerusalem never again would be divided. I prayed for a just and lasting peace in Israel and the Middle East.

However, my colleagues, now I fear that these prayers and these concerns of myself and so many others might go unanswered. The United States policy toward the division of the city of Jerusalem and Israeli sovereignty over Jerusalem as expressed in recent days by our administration is at very best unclear. We must explore every opportunity for achieving peace, and we must demonstrate our unwavering commitment to Israel with a unified Jerusalem as its capital.

I have been a strong supporter for the State of Israel for a very long time, for Israel is our only real democracy and our only real ally in the turbulent Middle East. But I have also been among the strongest supporters and friends of the Bush administration in this House. As a result, I today urge my friends in the administration to carefully reflect on the issue of Jerusalem and then join with us in standing up for a united, free, and strong Jerusalem and Israel.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON].

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues Mr. FEIGHAN and Mr. BURTON for reserving this time to discuss President Bush's policy toward Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to voice my deep concern about President Bush's recent statement that the administration is opposed to new Israeli settlements in East Jerusalem. The President's remarks are troubling to me and to friends of Israel everywhere because they signal a complete shift in United States policy toward Israel. No other United States president has ever challenged the rights of Jews to live in Jerusalem, the ancient capitol of Israel. The President's statement also represents a complete reversal of his own previously stated policy on this issue.

One reason I am concerned about the President's remarks is that they seem to represent a lack of understanding of Israel's history. I am troubled that the President linked the very different issues of the West Bank and Jerusalem. It is inappropriate to refer to the Israeli community in Jerusalem as a settlement because Jerusalem is part of Israel, and has been since 1967.

During his news conference yesterday, President Bush said he did not regret his remarks about Jerusalem. He added that the political situation in Israel was so sensitive and emotional he would not talk about it further. I think we need to urge the President to change his mind. These statements need to be talked about. We need to know what other departures from longstanding U.S. policy the President has in mind with regard to the Middle East.

Although the President's policy toward Jerusalem remains ill defined, the effect of his statements is painfully clear. In a single remark, the President has done a great deal to undermine confidence in his administration's intentions regarding the Middle East peace process and in political stability in Israel.

Mr. Speaker, the outlook for peace in the Middle East looked bright 2 weeks ago. Both the Likud and Labor Parties seemed poised to agree to begin peace talks with Palestinian representatives in Cairo. Unfortunately, things have changed a great deal in 2 weeks. Today, Likud Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir fired his Vice Premier, Labor Party Leader Shimon Peres, thereby signaling the end of Israel's coalition government. Regrettably, President Bush's introduction of the Jerusalem issue into the peace talks debate precipitated this breakdown.

When asked a question about the Soviet Union at yesterday's news conference, the President said that he stayed out of the internal affairs and deliberations of the Soviet Union. Yet the administration has shown no such constraint in making pronouncements about Jewish neighborhoods in the Israeli city of Jerusalem. I only wish the President felt that his administration owed Israel the same courtesy he feels is due the Soviet Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN].

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for yielding, and I would like to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for having the energy, and the foresight and everything, the dedication of putting this special order together, and it is a real privilege and an honor for me to be able to participate tonight in this very important discussion.

Mr. Speaker, today we are at a point where one could envision peace in the Arab-Israeli conflict as a result of this new world.

Congress continues to debate many issues of concern to Israel. Policy regarding Soviet refugees, terrorism, foreign aid, and the Middle East peace process justifiably demand our complete attention.

There is, however, a more pressing issue on our collective agenda, an imperative concern to the ongoing search for a lasting peace—it is Israel's capital, Jerusalem.

Jerusalem is the embodiment of Jewish history, the heart and soul of the Jewish people. For 3,000 years, Jerusalem has been the focus of their national and religious yearning. It is a city in which Jews have always lived. However, it is a city that Israel has granted freedom of access to all.

Jerusalem is worshiped as a holy city; a well of spiritual opportunity for Jews, Christians, Moslems, and other religious groups. The Israeli Government guarantees each religion the authority to oversee their own holy places. The history, culture, and tradition of this land are unparalleled and give one an understanding of why so much of man's past and present existence has been focused in this part of the world. Israel recognizes Jerusalem's special significance and has made great efforts to preserve this multiple identity. One can therefore not help but have an intense love for this land and her people.

In the year 1000 BCE [before the common era] King David established Jerusalem as the capital city of the Jewish state, serving as the symbol

and most profound expression of the Jewish people's identity as a nation. The return to Israel has continued throughout the centuries, and 78 years of nation-building, beginning in 1870 culiminated with the reestablishment of a Jewish state.

History has demonstrated the need to ensure Jewish security through a national homeland with a national capital—Jerusalem.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to our very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the initiative of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] in taking out this special order. It is very important because our purpose here is not simply to reaffirm what I believe is the policy overwhelmingly supported by the Congress of the United States; that is, the recognition that Jerusalem united is the capital of Israel.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat puzzled when the President said at one point that he agreed that the Jewish people should be united, but they apparently only were not sure that it should be part of Israel. I do not know whether the implication is that Jerusalem is supposed to move entirely someplace else. I think that illustrates the lack of thought that went into the President's position.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are here to reaffirm our commitment to the legitimacy, indeed the essentiality, of Jerusalem as Israel's capital. We are here to once again praise Israel because only under Israeli rule have all of the holy places been fully opened to all. Prior to Israel taking over, in all of Jerusalem Jews were denied access. The Jewish people running Jerusalem have not denied access to anyone, as they should not have.

□ 1920

But it was a particular disaster for the President to have gratuitously injected the sensitive issue of Jerusalem into the political arena at this point.

American policy for some time has been trying to advance the peace process in the Middle East, and I have agreed with some aspects of that policy. I was one who believed that it was in the interests of peace and justice when Prime Minister Shamir came forward with an electoral proposal, which was quite a good proposal. I was sorry that it seemed to be bogging down. I was hoping that we would get an agreement with Israel and Egypt and the United States so that the talks could begin leading to an election so that there could be an elected autonomous body in the elected territories to see whether out of that could evolve a true peace. At that point, when this government was asking elected democratic leaders in Israel to take political risks and to take risks to some extent with the security of their state, for the President to have called into question Israel's right to Jerusalem was the biggest diplomatic gaff I can remember having been made since I have come to Congress.

What the President did was not simply to call into question something that should not be questioned, but he did it at a time when it was guaranteed to retard the very peace process that he was apparently trying to help, because what has he done? He has given those in Israel who are resistant to any degree of compromise the argument that if you give in to the Americans, you are going to be calling Jerusalem into question. I do not think that is accurate.

I think it is very important that we here show overwhelmingly that the United States Congress does not agree with that, that we are not asking Israel in any way, shape or form, to sacrifice their control over their sovereignty over all of Jerusalem; but the President of the United States has given some credibility to those who would argue that putting the peace process forward would somehow call Jerusalem into question. The President's objection to Jerusalem at this point undoubtedly contributed to the political crisis in Israel, and it is not just a political crisis, it is a political crisis which may lead to an election in which some will be portraying an American initiative as one which calls Jerusalem into question as the capital of Israel. It cannot be the interests of anyone who wants peace in the Middle East. It cannot be in our interests, so what the President said was not simply wrong, factually wrong, politically wrong and morally wrong in doubting Israel's right to have a united Jerusalem as its capital. It was as I guess Tallyrand said, even worse than a crime. It was a stupidity. It was an error of a very grave sort, compounded the other day when the President was asked if he wanted to take it back, he said, "I don't want to take it back because it is too sensitive to discuss it. It is too delicate."

Mr. President, if it was so sensitive and so delicate, why did you bring it up in the first place?

He was the one who injected this bomb into the process. Then he pleads the delicacy of the subject as a reason not to clarify what he said.

The President has got to understand, it is not simply that we believe as a matter of right that Israel can have Jerusalem as its capital. If the President continues to allow there to be doubts about America's recognition of Israel's right to a unified Jerusalem, he will be putting a serious obstacle in the way of the peace process that he says he wants.

The President at this point, as I say, has created an enormously difficult diplomatic situation. We are trying to minimize the damage. Only he can totally undo it, and I hope that he will, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] whose recent visit to Israel and the region I think underscores his experience and perspective on this issue and the whole range of issues regarding the peace process.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me. I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for having had the leadership and thoughtfulness and sensitivity to arrange for this important special order, and I would like to thank the broad range of our colleagues who have spoken before me. They really said it all. There is really not very much for me to add. I have enjoyed their remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I was asked this afternoon in various conversations with the press, did President Bush mean to upset the peace process? Did he mean to sabotage the negotiations? Did he mean to cut Prime Minister Shamir down to size with this monkey wrench or this bomb that he threw into the negotiations, Of course not. Nobody thinks that. Nobody questions President Bush's essential decency, his essential honor, his bona fides; but this was an awful gaff. This was an awful boomer.

To link Jerusalem with settlements is a non-starter in the first place. I just got back from Jerusalem 60 days ago. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] was there on a mission. We met there. Anybody who has ever been in East Jerusalem would be appalled by the application of the word settlements to East Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, East Jerusalem is a very densely occupied urban place. Settlements are placed on rocky mountainsides. Settlements are placed in empty fields. Settlements are not placed in densely occupied urban areas, and this is an urban area that has been densely occupied by Jews and Arabs, living together amicably for most of the last 3,000 years.

There is a difference, though. Jews look upon Jerusalem and always have as the centrality of their ethos, of their morality, of their religion, of their body and soul. A united Jerusalem is totally central to the Israeli persona, both as individuals and the persona of the Israeli state. It has been the capital of Israel for the last 42 years, and for several thousand years Jews have been saying every year on the occasion of Passover, "L'Chaim." "Good health. Next year in Jerusalem."

And we say, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand lose its cunning." And we have been saying that for 3,000 years.

It is totally central to the Jewish being.

Now, I guess Jerusalem is of significance to Arabs, to the Arab culture. It is never mentioned in the Koran, not once, while Jerusalem is mentioned in the Bible, in the Torah 700 times. There has never been an Arab state of which Jerusalem was its capital, and indeed over the years Mecca and Medina have been the two central cities that are most holy to the Arabs, with Jerusalem coming in a poor third. Not so with the Jews. Jerusalem was the one and only holy place, the one and only capital, the one and only center of the heart and the mind of the Jewish people, extending back 3,000 years.

Now, I do not think President Bush, I do not believe President Bush meant to disrupt the peace process, but it was his thoughtless act—I credit him with bona fides, but this was a thoughtless, ill-considered act, and it was mischievous. It was destructive. It spread confusion and doubt and chagrin and dismay throughout the Middle East. It was very painful for the Jewish community and it was very confusing for the Arab community, because the Arabs are going through a very traumatic situation now. Their friends and mentors and suppliers and financiers of 40-odd years are disappearing into the morning mist. Russia, the East European states, the central European states, who have supplied arms to the Arabs, who have provided intelligence for the Arabs, who have been giving training to the Arabs, they have totally departed the Arab camp.

□ 1930

Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Romania, all in the last few weeks, have recognized the State of Israel. Incidentally, so have eight African states.

No longer can Syria look to the Soviet Union for state-of-the-art armaments of all kinds, no longer can the PLO look to the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries for assistance, financial underpinning, advice, counsel, training in terrorism and so forth. That is all a thing of the past.

It has been a very difficult period for the Arabs. The Arabs are reaching for straws, understandably. It is a painful period for them. So when the President threw this little bomb into the negotiation process and talked about no settlement in Jerusalem, the Arabs understandably grasped at that straw; understandably they felt that America was sending very mixed and confused signals about America's support for Israel and America's support for Jerusalem as the centrality of the Jewish existence. So it is going to take some time for a new equilibrium to be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that in the fullness of time this little contretemps, this little confusion will be viewed as a blip on the radar screen, but now it is not.

The very reasons that President Bush used not to apologize or the reason that he used as not having regrets over this was because it was a sensitive and an emotional subject. My colleagues, this is precisely and exactly the reason why President Bush never should have made the comment in the first place, why it was so wholly ill-advised. It was blurted out. I am sure that the President would not make that statement again, nor would the Secretary of State.

We will get negotiations back on an even keel when a new government in Israel is established. We all hope and pray that they will be open-minded, open-hearted, and magnanimous in dealing with their Arab brothers. They are all Semites under the skin. They are a bunch of scorpions located in a bottle; they must learn how to live together, and we all pray that that process will be sooner rather than later.

Surely this ill-considered episode did not add anything to the process.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the short length of time remaining, I am going to ask the subsequent speakers if they could confine their remarks within a 2-minute timeframe.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER].

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, President Bush stated his opposition to new settlements "in the West Bank or in East Jerusalem." The administration has confirmed that the President's remarks were intended to make it clear to the people of Israel that administration policy still viewed East Jerusalem as occupied territory.

I want to take this opportunity to clearly state my disagreement with the President's statement. I think that it is unfortunate that the President has forsaken his strategy of sitting on the sidelines of world events just in time to disrupt the prospects for negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians living in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

In the past, the United States has stated that it supports a united Jerusalem whose final status would be determined by negotiations. The status of Jerusalem, the capital of the State of Israel, has always been considered a separate issue from the treatment of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip—territory which came under the control of Israel after the Six-Day War in 1967.

The separation of Jerusalem into east and west portions was the result of the battle lines existing at the end of Israel's war for independence in 1949. Prior to this, the United Nations parition plan, accepted by the Zionists and rejected by the surrounding Arab States, had called for Jerusalem to become an international city under U.N. control. Instead, the Arab countries attacked the newborn State of Israel and at the end of the fighting, the Kingdom of Jordan controlled a portion of the city of Jerusalem.

Over the next 18 years, the city of Jerusalem grew up around the battle lines. New communities grew up on all sides of Jerusalem to house the hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees and immigrants who came from all over the world. In 1967, after a number of belligerent acts by President Nassar of Egypt, Israel launched a pre-emptive attack against Egypt. Armies from Jordan and Syria joined Egypt in the fight against Israel. In the ensuing battles, Jordan lost control of its portion of Jerusalem.

The Six-Day War allowed the reunification of the city of Jerusalem. Since that time, the city has continued its growth in all directions. Today, it is impossible to clearly delineate what is east or west Jerusalem. It has grown as a single city. It should not be considered as a part of the West Bank.

When I visited Israel in 1988, I had the opportunity to talk with an American citizen who was living in Jerusalem. This person had recently tried to register his newborn son as an American citizen at the United States consulate in Jerusalem. At the consulate, when filling out the appropriate forms, this person came to the question, "place of birth." He filled in the answer "Jerusalem, Israel." A consulate official told him that that was not an acceptable answer—essentially, the consulate officials said there was no such place. This must have come as a great shock to this individual and to his friends who has been successfully sending letters to this address that the United States was claiming did not exist.

United States refusal to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel denies the reality of the situation and continues debate on an issue that never should have begun in the first place. President Bush, in equating Jerusalem with the West Bank and Gaza Strip has only served to break up the government of national unity which had been working toward negotiations with West Bank and Gaza Palestinians and strengthened the hand of groups such as the PLO which have no interest in a resolution of this conflict.

Jerusalem is the capital of Israel. This fact should be recognized by the administration. It is an odd fact that Israel, one of our most loyal international allies, is the only country in which the United States purposely

does not locate its Embassy in that nation's capital. I think it is time to change that.

I hope that President Bush will reconsider his position and clearly state United States support for a unified Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Indiana for taking out this special order and their leadership.

Much of what has to be said has already been said. This was a cosmic blunder. This united the American community and the community in Israel behind a very justifiable and worthy goal that I believe just about all Americans would support, and that is that Jerusalem be united, Jerusalem be Israeli.

Many of us cannot forget the time between 1947 and 1967, or 1948 and 1967, when the Jordan Arab League pushed the Jews out of East Jerusalem. Was there an open city as there is today where Arabs and Christians and others can come and worship and even run their own shrines? No way. No Jew was allowed. Jews could not visit the Wailing Wall, Jews could not visit the old temple, Jews could not visit vital parts of their history, and in fact in 1967 when the areas were finally liberated, what was found was that many of these holy places had been desecrated.

Jews and many others throughout the world said after discovery of this desecration, "Never again." We say to the President, "Perhaps you did not know the chord you were striking. Perhaps you did not understand how the centrality of Jerusalem is to Jews throughout the world as well as in Israel. Perhaps it was, indeed, a slip of the tongue. Unfortunately, the damage has been done. The clocks cannot be turned back. The peace process has been at the very least temporarily derailed and, Mr. President, the only thing that I can think of that you can do to change, to undo, this slip of the tongue that had such terrible consequences is once and for all do what the Republican platform says ought to be done, and that is that there ought to be one city, a unified city of Jerusalem under Israeli control with international guarantees of the holy places so that all religions can be there."

□ 1940

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his participation this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DYSON].

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in voicing our concern over alarming deficiencies in the Bush administration's position on Jerusalem. I wish to thank my distinguished colleagues from Ohio and Indiana for arranging time today for this purpose.

All of us are by now aware of the dismal chain of events which began on Saturday, March 3. Breaking with the policy of his predecessors, President Bush included East Jerusalem as an area in which he opposed "new settlements" of Jews.

In the days preceding that unfortunate remark, the prospects for peace in the Middle East looked brighter than they had for some time. The resignation of hard-line Cabinet Minister Ariel Sharon gave the Israeli Government room to maneuver. Prime Minister Shamir seemed ready to lead the moderates in his Likud Party to join with their coalition partners from the Labor Party and launch a viable peace process.

With his ill-considered remarks, President Bush destroyed this promising opportunity and seriously jeopardized the chances for a U.S. brokered solution in the region. Today, the Israeli Government stands on the verge of collapse.

What troubles me the most about the President's statement is his apparent failure to recognize its consequences. President Bush denies having misspoken and has stood by his remarks. At the same time, his administration refuses to acknowledge the drastic shift in U.S. policy which they portend.

Ten years ago, when the Carter administration voted for a U.N. resolution opposing all settlements "including Jerusalem," they were severely criticized by a Vice Presidential candidate by the name of George Bush. President Carter had the courage to repudiate this vote, and Secretary of State Cyprus Vance publicly apologized for "the breakdown in communications" which led to this lapse in judgment. I ask today how President Bush can justify a refusal to do the same.

Recent events only underline the need for a fundamental reassessment of U.S. policy toward Jerusalem. How much longer will we ignore the reality that Jerusalem, as the spiritual capital of the Jewish people, is and must remain an integral part of the sovereign State of Israel? The sooner the United States recognizes this reality by moving its embassy from Tel Aviv and ending the futile and counterproductive debate over the status of Jerusalem, the sooner we can address the real issues which span the Arab-Israeli divide.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strongest opposition to the stance Mr. Bush and the administration has taken on the issue of Jerusalem. Jerusalem is the heart and soul of Israel and, as previous administrations have maintained, should under no circumstances be divided. Mr. Bush's recent statements have cast serious doubt on this longstanding American policy and have come at a very delicate time in the peace process. At this juncture the Israeli Government needs assurances of solid and unambiguous American support, not unnecessary and destructive equivocations about the status of Israel's capital city.

Mr. Bush's statements have also cast doubt on the administration's commitment to freeing Jews still trapped in the Soviet Union. The Israeli Government has provided assurances that no American funds will be used for the settlement of Soviet Jews in the territories and that American funds will not be used to expand shekel-funded programs either. There is no reason to link further United States funding to Israeli settlement policies. With rising anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, the administration must do all it can to expedite resettling of these Jewish refugees and not hinder this effort.

The PLO is delighted at the current turn of events. Instead of the United States clearly supporting our ally Israel, the PLO sees the administration applying heavy handed pressure. This is a time for solidarity with Israel, not a time for pandering to the interests of a terriorist organization that has for years and years committed itself to the complete annihilation of the state or Israel. The Israelis know best what is necessary for the security of their homeland and should not be coerced into accepting unreasonable negotiating positions by irresponsible American rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker I urge the President and my congressional colleagues to support Israel during this critical time as it moves toward the peace process. Further statements of the President or the administration to pull the rug out from under the Israelis regarding Jerusalem, will only make it more difficult for the Israelis to negotiate and take real risks for peace. The future of Israel cannot be jeopardized by a thoughtless and inconsistent shift in American foreign policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAUZIN). The Chair is obligated to caution all Members that under the rules it is impermissible to direct comments directly to the President of the United States. All comments must be directed to the Chair.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make clear tonight this is a bipartisan concern and that we clarify Ameri-

can policy with regard to the citizens of Jerusalem.

In 1947 it was the Arabs who rejected a plan to internationalize that city. A year later when Israel became independent, Jordan moved in troops and occupied what is known today as East Jerusalem. For 20 years thereafter, Jews were not free to travel to East Jerusalem.

In 1967 that ended when the war occurred after Jordan invaded Israel and Israeli forces drove out the Jordanians. Ever since that time Israel has granted to all religions equal access to their holy shrines in Jerusalem.

A year ago this month I had the privilege of being in Israel and going to Jerusalem. The only thing I can describe is a city not unlike Washington, DC, a city of industry, of hotels, of residences, an urban area where you cannot tell the difference between East or West Jerusalem any more than you can tell the difference between northeast and southeast Washington, DC.

East Jerusalem is not Arab. It is part of the united capital of Israel and is home to an equal number of both Jews and Arabs, and the Jews and Arabs are equal citizens in that city.

Our own government has always made a distinction between Jerusalem and the terroritories. For instance, West Bank policy is governed by United Nations Resolution 242 and Camp David, both of which envision some kind of Israeli withdrawal in exchange for peace and security down the road. But we have indicated over and over again that while there may be play in the joints and negotiation in what is called the West Bank, and I happen to disagree with that policy, but assuming there is some play in the joints there, it is very clear: Jerusalem is one city. It is Israel's capital.

Therefore, Jews who go to Jerusalem are not engaged in settlements, they are engaged in moving into neighborhoods. I think that is what we have to clarify. That is what I urge, that it be clarified as soon as possible. Anyone who has been to Jerusalem clearly knows that it is one city, indivisible, and Jews and Arabs equally should be free to move and live in that city, which is the capital of the nation of Israel.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY].

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlemen from Ohio and Indiana for bringing this important issue to our attention and giving Members the opportunity to address and focus on Jerusalem.

There are those who might use their time to dilute the importance of Jerusalem, to criticize or to discuss this on a partisan basis. But let it be clear that there is bipartisan support for not only the greater security of Israel, but for a united Jerusalem.

It is in that vein that I wish to use my time to persuasively and passionately argue that, first, we should have a renewed commitment for the greater security of Israel, and, second, that we must recognize that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel and that the Jewish people have inextricably committed themselves to that issue.

From King David, Jerusalem has in fact been the symbol of the Jewish people. It has been the profound expression of the essence of the Jewish people. It has been their identity.

During the time from King David there have been many foreign rulers who have ruled this city, but only the Israelis, the Jewish people have made Jerusalem their capital.

In August I visited Jerusalem, and in the early morning I ran through its streets, streets that knew no division, streets that were in a united city, streets that were filled with the history of the Jewish people. As my heart pounded running through the streets, I came to the conclusion that I no more could run through the streets without a heart than Israel could exist without its capital. In fact, Jerusalem is more than just a thriving city. Jerusalem is more than just the capital of Israel. Jerusalem is Israel, and let us pledge that Jerusalem, as a united city shall remain the capital of Israel.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last December, I made my first visit to Israel, which included several days in Jerusalem. Through my entire stay in Israel, I was struck repeatedly by how little room the Israelis have to maneuver in terms of their own security. This was made especially clear to me during my stay in Jerusalem, a densely populated area lacking any surrounding buffer zone to protect its inhabitants from hostile or unstable neighbors. If, as the President seemed to suggest, we were to begin negotiating away Israeli sovereignty and jurisdiction of any portion of the Jerusalem area, we would be guilty of bringing an extremely dangerous and rampant form of instability to this historic and glorious city.

The current status of Jerusalem has benefited its Arab inhabitants, as well as Jewish residents of the city. A unified Jerusalem allows for a more normal flow of commerce and people that has benefited all Jerusalemites. Under Israeli administration, religion shrines of all faiths have been protected and maintained, and access has been granted to all—which is much more than can be said of the years of Jordanian control, when Jews were prevented from going to the Western Wall, the holiest site in Judaism.

Last year, we all rejoiced when the wall separating East and West Berlin came down. We should not be in the position of rebuilding the wall that separated East and West Jerusalem during those dangerous years when a highly militarized "green line" cut through the heart of ancient neighborhoods. Furthermore, the administration should not be reversing years of American diplomatic practice, which has recognized East Jerusalem as distinct from the West Bank and Gaza. Israel continues to be one of our staunchest and most reliable allies. We owe it to the Israelis to speak up for their security concerns. And we owe it to them not to abruptly surprise them with sudden and unwise policy shifts.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in this very important discussion of the Middle East peace process and the status of the city of Jerusalem.

It is the responsibility of the United States to do what we can to help achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East that preserves the security of our close friend and ally, Israel.

However, the statements and actions of the Bush administration in recent days have harmed, not helped, the peace process.

In the midst of delicate negotiations designed to get the peace process moving in the Middle East, the Bush administration made ill-timed, counterproductive statements about the status of the city of Jerusalem. Not only did these statements derail the peace process, but they also represented a dramatic departure from previous U.S. policy on this question. They have raised serious questions about the Bush administration's commitment to provide strong support for our closest ally in that region of the world.

Previous U.S. administrations have always considered Jerusalem's status a subject that will be raised after most other outstanding issues have been resolved. By raising this delicate issue before negotiations have even started, the Bush administration unnecessarily complicated the peace talks. The result has been the collapse of the Israeli coalition government, which will substantially delay any actual peace negotiations.

In addition, these statements—which President Bush has confirmed are an accurate portrayal of his administration's position—represent a dramatic departure from previous United States policy on the status of Jerusalem. No administration has ever questioned the right of Jews to live in Jerusalem, and no administration has ever equated the status of Jerusalem with the status of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. In fact, every U.S. administra-

tion has repeatedly insisted that Jerusalem must remain united under any final peace agreement.

The Bush administration's position in this regard is unfortunate and ill-advised. Jerusalem is the holiest site and the spiritual capital of the Jewish people, and the right of Jews to live anywhere in Jerusalem should not be questioned by the United States.

That notwithstanding, this issue should not even be on the bargaining table. Nor should the Bush administration ever have suggested that the political capital of the State of Israel is simply another piece of territory to be bargained once such negotiations begin.

Rather, the United States should focus on the more immediate steps that can be taken to achieve real progress toward peace in the Middle East. And we should express our strong support for a united Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Bush administration has taken this counterproductive stance toward the Middle East peace process. Those of us who are strong supporters of a secure Israel believes deeply that this path will not contribute to a solution of the Middle East conflict. Rather, I urge the administration in the strongest possible terms to reverse its position, express strong support for a united Jerusalem, and get on with the task of reinvigorating the Middle East peace process.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of bringing this special order to a conclusion, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio and congratulate and compliment the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for making it possible for all of us to express our views on this very important issue. It has been restated here many times this evening that President Bush's statement, "We do not believe that there should be new settlements in the West Bank or in East Jerusalem," is a mistake, plain and simple.

By raising questions about Israel's claim to East Jerusalem at this very sensitive point in the negotiations, the President may have helped torpedo early prospects for an Israeli-Palestinian meeting on elections for the West Bank and Gaza.

Such an outcome would be a tragedy. The administration has worked very hard over the last year to help move the Middle East peace process forward. All of us applaud Secretary of State James Baker's efforts to bring the Israelis, Egyptians, and Palestinians together to devise an elections plan that can produce a Palestinian leadership able to negotiate a peaceful resolution of the Middle East conflict. Unfortunately, the President's statement on Jerusalem has served to undercut all of these efforts by raising sensitivities over one of the most difficult and sensitive issues to be resolved in future negotiations.

While United States policy has not officially recognized Israeli control over East Jerusalem, no other President has ever before challenged the right of Jews to live in the historic capital of Israel. Since the late 1960's, successive American Presidents have been sensitive to the special status of the city. It is for this reason that the United States has long emphasized that it favored an undivided Jerusalem, whose final status would be decided through negotiations. Jerusalem is not the same as the West Bank and Gaza, and a United States policy which equates Jewish settlements in the territories and Jewish housing in East Jerusalem is wrong-headed.

Mr. Speaker, in the last few months the world has watched in wonder as the wall which divided Berlin was finally torn down—signaling the end of the cold war and the division of Europe. The last thing we should be doing is raising fears about new walls and dividing other cities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a terrible mistake has been made, and the administration should reverse its position so that it can be clear that the historic position our country has taken on Israel remains intact.

I again congratulate the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes our special order. I want to thank the Speaker personally for his patience and generosity in presiding over this special order tonight, as well as the patience of our professional staff.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker. I was very dismayed by the gratituous comments that President Bush made about East Jerusalem recently. I was hoping they were made in error, especially since most of us who know the history of East Jerusalem know that there are no settlements there. The unfortunate impression that is left by those untimely remarks is that United States policy is against Jews living in East Jerusalem.

I have never before heard a President suggest that Jews were not welcome in all parts of Jerusalem. In fact, the freedom of Jews to live anywhere in Jerusalem had not been an issue until Jordan annexed East Jerusalem in 1950. Until then, and prior to the creation of modern Israel, Palestinian Jews lived alongside Moslems and Christians in the eastern part of Jerusalem. During the war of 1948, many of these Palestinian Jews fled to the western part, leaving property they had owned for generations. It was only when East Jerusalem was liberated in a defensive war in 1967 that the former Jewish residents of the eastern part of the city could return to their homes.

East Jerusalem is an intrinsic part of Jerusalem and as Israel's first prime minister David Ben-Gurion said, an "inseparable part of Israel." After 19 years of annexation by Jordan, during which time the Jewish quarter of the Old City was destroyed, the sacred burial place, the Mount of Olives, was desecrated, and holy sites were inaccessible to Jews, Christians, and even Moslems, it was the Israeli Government that passed a resolution protecting all holy places. The right of all religions to worship at their respective holy sites was reinstated and is honored to this day.

While United States policy has been unclear as to the final legal status of Jerusalem, leaving its resolution to further negotiation as stipulated in a side letter to the Camp David accords, our Government has distinguished between the sui generis issue of Jerusalem and the administered territories of the West Bank and Gaza.

The one issue on which the major Israeli political parties and world Jewry agree is a Jerusalem undivided. I urge the Bush administration to take note of this fact and to take an approach that will facilitate the commencement of negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians instead of making it more difficult.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, President Bush made a serious political blunder last week when he condemned Jewish settlements in East Jerusalem. Inadvertently, it seems, he enunciated a change in United States policy and precipitated a major political crisis in Israel. The fall of the National Unity Government was inevitable, it seemed to me as 3 weeks ago when I last visited Jerusalem. The real crisis which threatens the peace process, however, was caused by the President's miscalculation of how a simple, unfortunate misstatement could precipitate a seachange in Israeli public opinion.

By calling into question the right of Jews to settle in a unified Jerusalem, the President angered not only Israelis, but supporters of Israel in this country and around the world. Prior to the President's statement, Israel's friends were secure in the knowledge that American policy was unequivocal in its support for an undivided Jerusalem whose ultimate status would be determined by negotiation.

Jerusalem issues are unquestionably the most difficult to resolve and the most explosive in a possible Middle East peace settlement. They must be dealt with only after all others are resolved. Secretary of State Baker's five-point plan was gaining momentum in Israel because Israelis felt that this process would not call Jerusalem's status into question. After all, Baker's plan is simply the implementation of the Shamir proposal of last April.

Much to the credit of this administration, support for Baker's five points has been steadily growing in Knesset, most notably among religious party members who were strongly aligned with Likud. The Shas party, for example, was becoming increasingly disillusioned with the stalled peace process, and was preparing to join a narrow labor coalition. The prospects for repairing the rift in the unity government or for labor gaining a necessary majority to form a coalition may have been fa-

tally jeopardized by Bush's misjudgment. This, in turn, could prove to be a major setback for the peace process.

It must be hoped by all who support peace in the Middle East that the Shamir proposal can go forward. Ironically, it is labor and nonaligned Knesset members who are prepared to carry through with Shamir's suggestion. The double irony is that Baker's plan may have been sabotaged by his well-meaning President.

There is still time, however, to avoid a political catastrophe in Israel if the President will clarify that his statement was not intended to alter long-standing American policy on the issue of Jerusalem. Rather, he should reiterate that he strongly supports the traditional position that Jerusalem must never again be divided. Moreover, he should reaffirm that American policy does not oppose Jewish residences in East Jerusalem, nor does it oppose establishment of homes by Moslems or Christians, or for that matter, Hindus or Buddhists.

It is in no one's interest to deal with this matter in an ambiguous way. It does not even serve the Palestinians' cause, because it threatens the progress toward peace which Baker's activities have achieved. The traditional American policy has not obstructed the peace process, so it should not be interposed as a roadblock at this time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of a crisis within the Israeli coalition government, President Bush has further aggravated the peace process and shocked the American-Jewish community with his remarkable ignorance and insensitivity. The city of Jerusalem is the historical and cultural capital of Israel—and it remains it's strength and spirit. For the survival of Israel, Jerusalem can never be divided. With a few manipulative words of warning on March 3, President Bush seriously damaged United States relations with Israel, perhaps beyond repair. Mr. Speaker, on this matter, the administration can not and will not be allowed to prevail. As Mayor Teddy Kolleck noted, "on Jerusalem, we are united."

Israel is the recognized Jewish state and Jerusalem is the capital. When Jews move to their own homeland, they are not settlers, they are not visitors, and they are not subject to the callous whims of President Bush. The administration responded to the mass emigration of Soviet Jews to the United States by capping the number in absurd disproportion to the amount of Jews being permitted to leave the Soviet Union. President Bush wisely suggested Soviet Jews go to Israel instead. So they did. The Soviet Jews sought their motherland and she welcomed them with open arms. Now President Bush has the gall to declare East Jerusalem off limits to Soviet Jews.

The Israeli coalition government has disintegrated and President Bush provoked the collapse. The Bush administration has departed sharply from traditional United States policy on Jerusalem in an effort to dictate the rules and completely control the peace process. By deliberately overlooking the special status of Jerusalem and by coupling Jerusalem with the West Bank, President Bush has effectively denied the legitimacy of the Israeli capital and linked it to occupied territories. Jerusalem can not be a bargaining chip in the peace talks. Yet this administration seems intent on distinguishing between East and West Jerusalem and on dividing the very heart and soul of Israel.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely appreciate the opportunity afforded Members of the House today to discuss the issue of the status of Jerusalem in the Middle East peace process.

No discussion of Jerusalem can be divorced from the facts of history.

Israel liberated Jerusalem in 1967, in a war that was not Israel's choosing, in response to an attack that was not of Israel's making. The kingdom of Jordan was warned not to enter hostilities with Israel in those fateful days, but King Hussein could not resist, and the eastern part of the city fell to Israel.

Those developments meant the reunification of Jerusalem—the restoration of its normal status. It has been divided since Israel's war of independence some two decades previously. The division of Jerusalem, and the exercise of control by Jordan over the eastern part of the city, should hardly serve as a source of pride or inspiration to Jordanians or Palestinians. Jews were denied access to holy places to worship—denied the ability to visit and pray at sites whose meaning date to bibical times. Holy places were also systematically desecrated. The Jewish cemetery on Mount of Olives still bears the marks of the wholesale destruction of headstones by the Jordanian authorities. Some headstones were used to construct latrines. Slums were permitted to be built abutting the Western Wall of the Temple Mount—the holiest site in Judaism. An alley, with a sewer in its middle, was next to the wall. These were the conditions found by Israel's soldiers on the day of the liberation of Jerusalem in 1967.

Since that time, several important things have happened. First, Jerusalem is a completely open city. Anyone can live there—be they Israeli or Palestinian. Second, anyone can worship there—without any restrictions. Third, all holy sites are open and protected in their sanctity with the full force of law from desecration. Israel has created an environment of respect for the full exercise by peoples of all faiths of their ability to worship in Jerusalem at the places they deem holy.

Jerusalem is the capital of Israel—as it has been since the day of independence in 1948.

Most importantly, Israel has determined, with unanimity, that Jerusalem shall not be divided again. The previous division of Jerusalem meant its spirital and material dismemberment. That cannot and will not be repeated. The city is now an organic whole, rich with the diversity of ethnicity, religion, and heritage of peoples from throughout the world. Its municipal structure, under the leadership of Mayor Teddy Kollek, is truly remarkable. The administration of the city under Teddy Kollek is dedicated to preserving the rights of all who live in Jerusalem.

In recent days, a controversy has erupted, promoted by remarks by the President and the Secretary of State, over the future of Jerusalem and the issue of Israeli settlements and development in the city. These remarks were inappropriate and harmful to the peace at a most sensitive moment. The entire point of the efforts to breathe life into Israel's proposal for elections to establish a Palestinian delegation for dialogue with the Israeli Government was to make the process of peace work—not to immediately grapple with the hard issues involved. By placing Jerusalem front and center, however, not only has the administration exposed the rawest of Israeli nerves, but done so gratuitously.

Again, Jerusalem is one city, and Israelis can and will live throughout that city. If there is a question over Palestinian representation in the governance of the city, or access to holy sites, or some other matter involving fundamental civil liberties and respect for their protection, these matters should certainly be on the table for discussion at the appropriate time.

But no one, including the President, should make a mistake in assuming, for a moment, that it is illegitimate for Israelis to settle in Jerusalem or that there is something unsatisfactory in Israel's governance of Jerusalem.

A small miracle, the reunification of Jerusalem, has been forged by the goodwill of Israelis and Palestinians alike. It is something to cherish—not question. None should doubt the resolve of us in the Congress to do everything in our power to affirm that it is the unequivocal policy of the United States that Jerusalem is and should remain united as Israel's capital.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Ohio, Mr. FEIGHAN, for calling this special order on Jerusalem. I am disturbed by the recent White House statements about Jerusalem, Israel's undeniable and indivisible capital. Jerusalem is no more occupied territory than Texas is. I think our failure to recognize Israel's right to designate its own capital is a shame; our Embassy should be there too, not in Tel Aviv.

I have been to Jerusalem. I have seen the beautiful things Mayor Teddy Kollek has accomplished throughout the entire city for Jews and Arabs, Moslems and Christians. The Israelis have treated that city like the precious jewel that it is to us all—guaranteeing the right of free access to all holy places.

How could President Bush, then, imply that Jews should be prevented from living anywhere in their capital? That was exactly the situation for 19 years during Jordan's occupation, when King Hussein set out to systematically eliminate all traces the city's Jewish heritage. Jews of all nationalities and Israelis of all religions were barred from their holy sites. The vibrant, growing Jewish neighborhoods built since the city was reunited in 1967—when Jordan and the Arab confrontation states failed in their second full-scale attempt to destroy Israel—are a living symbol of the commitment to protect against the severing of Jerusalem from the Jewish people ever again.

The timing could not have been worse. Ten days ago the administration was saying that the national unity government was close to accepting the Baker formula for a tripartite meeting in Cairo; now the Israeli Government is falling apart over this issue. And, the President's remark about Jewish settlement in East Jerusalem was just one more in a series of confidence-eroding statements made by the Bush administration that indicate a dangerous inclination to lean on our ally, Israel, but stroke the PLO. Its time for confidence building measures from this administration—like

holding the PLO's feet to the fire on its commitment to end terrorism and insisting that the Arabs end their boycott of Israel now.

Finally, I am alarmed by the linkage between the question of settlements and the urgent imperative to get Soviet Jews out of Russia. Where do we come off toying with their lives while we tinker with relatively minor differences between Washington and the Government of Israel? The administration should be moving full speed ahead on the Housing Loan Guarantee Program.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the complex political and emotional situation in the Middle East lends itself to many interpretations. And it is not uncommon or inappropriate for Israelis, Americans, and friends of Israel throughout the world to express differing opinions on the proper course for peace negotiations and strategic planning for Israel's future.

But there is one thing upon which virtually all Israelis and their allies agree: Jerusalem is the soul of Israel. Jerusalem is a symbol for Jews throughout the world, and a spiritual center for people of many faiths. As the celebration of Passover approaches, Jews throughout the world will reaffirm the importance of this holy city by proclaiming "next year in Jerusalem."

That is why President Bush miscalculated so drastically when he equated East Jerusalem with the West Bank and said that there should be no new settlements of Jews in either area. That is why the Government of Israel is racked with dissension. That is why Americans who support Israel are in a state of shock.

President Bush, we are all united in our desire to see a lasting peace achieved in this vital portion of the world. And we are disheartened that your words over the last few days may have dealt a severe blow to the painstaking efforts toward peace in the Middle East.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, Israel's coalition government broke up yesterday because of differences over how to proceed with a United States plan to open Israeli-Palestinian peace talks. The major parties are divided over this broad issue, but they are united on the issue of the need for a united Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

Since 1967, the U.S. administration has acknowledged the special status of Jerusalem, and the fundamental need to preserve the status quo. The willingness to move toward talks with the Palestinians rests on that foundation. President Bush has introduced a new, destabilizing factor into the negotiations for peace in the Middle East. Whether the ruling Israeli Government is "Labor, Likud or National Unity," any agreement that leaves open the status of a united Jerusalem is a nonstarter.

I hope the President will reassess or clarify his remarks, and continue to foster a dialog that will achieve peace without undermining the status of Jerusalem. But I wonder, as did the mayor of Jerusalem, "Why did the White House have to bring it up?"

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in expressing my deep concern about President Bush's recent remarks in which he stated his opposition to new settlements on the West Bank and in East Jerusalem.

The city of Jerusalem is not just a territory, and the President's comments alluding to restrictions on the right of Jews to enter and live in the holiest of cities is an affront to most Members of Congress. It signals an unwelcome and totally unacceptable change in U.S. policy. In the text of United Nations resolutions and even the Camp David accords, Israel and the United States have always made a careful distinction between the city of Jerusalem and the occupied territories on the West Bank and Gaza.

Our Government, and especially the State Department, has had a long history of nonrecognition of Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel. Our United States Embassy is in Tel Aviv, and Israel is the only country where our Embassy is not located in the capital city. For years, along with many of the Members in Congress, I have urged the United States to recognize formally the city of Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel, and relocate our Embassy in the capital city. Yet the State Department still has not acted, and the latest statement by the President appears to be a step backward complicating the already delicate peace process.

It was the Arab States in 1947 which rejected a plan that would have made Jerusalem an international city, and after Israeli independence, it was Jordan which forcibly occupied East Jerusalem, throwing Jews out of their homes, and prohibiting Jews from entering this area. As a divided city under Jordanian occupation, what followed was a despicable history of desecration and destruction of Christian and Jewish holy sites by the Moslems. It was not until the Arabs decided to attack Israel during the Six-Day War in 1967 that Israel was able to regain control of the eastern part of Jerusalem, and Jews were able to reoccupy and rebuild neighborhoods in the Jewish quarter and Mount Scopus where they previously had lived.

Under the control of the State of Israel, Jerusalem is a united city, and the Israeli Government has shown the ultimate in respect for all holy sites. Jerusalem is truly an international city with Christian, Moslems and Jewish denominations having absolute control and authority over their own respective sites.

Mr. Speaker, the eastern portion of the city of Jerusalem is not an occupied territory, and cannot be linked and grouped with the West Bank and Gaza in any discussions or peace negotiations. By linking East Jerusalem to occupied territories the President has not only departed from a longstanding United States policy, but also has impeded the already slow moving peace process.

I join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in urging the President to clearly and unambiguously retract his statements, which ignore the history of Arab occupation and desecration of the city of Jerusalem, and are counterproductive to the peace process.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed by the recent statements of President Bush regarding East Jerusalem. On March 3, the President stated, "We do not believe that there should be new settlements in the West Bank or in East Jerusalem." Then yesterday, the President declared that he did not regret expressing this sentiment and questioning the right of Jews to settle in East Jerusalem. I am very concerned about the intent of the administration on this issue. First, I do not believe that settlement in the West Bank and in East Jerusalem is equivalent, and the two should not be linked. Second, I am very concerned about the impact of these ill-thought statements on the Government and the people of Israel as well as the negative impact on the Middle East peace process.

The view expressed by President Bush is a departure from traditional United States policy, which has always made a distinction between Jerusalem and the territories. Every administration since 1967 has been sensitive to the special status of Jerusalem and the need to address this issue with great thought and sensitivity as well as innovative proposals. Policy that may apply to the territories does not necessarily correlate to the policies we need to advocate for East Jerusalem. To make such a parallel is misguided and simplistic at best. West Bank policy is governed by U.N. Resolution 242 and Camp David, both of which envision at least partial Israeli withdrawal in exchange for full peace and security. At the same time United States officials have indicated, over and over again, that Jerusalem cannot be returned to the pre-1967 status quo, that it must remain united.

Likewise, United States efforts to initiate Israeli-Palestinian dialog, which is always an extremely sensitive issue, have been hampered by the President's statements. I am only hopeful that these peace efforts have not been irreversibly damaged. Instead of working to divide, we need to encourage the peace process. The divisions in the Israeli Government following the President's statement leave the peace negotiations in limbo for the present time. Certainly the Israeli people, who stand united in their support for Jerusalem, must also be distressed about the President's treatment of the ancient capital of Israel.

In closing, I want to again express my deep concern for the statements by President Bush on East Jerusalem. I am hopeful that the administration will carefully review this position and clarify its intent. I am also hopeful that the administration will come to the realization that President Bush's statement is both inconsistent with past policy and damaging to the peace process as well as detrimental to our close friendship with Israel. The status of Jerusalem should be an item of final negotiations in the peace process and should not be the subject of simple pronunciations at a news conference. I urge the administration to treat East Jerusalem with the respect and sensitivity that the issue deserves. Furthermore, I urge the administration to think twice in the future about the ramifications of its statements on critical foreign policy issues such as this.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues, Representatives FEIGHAN and BURTON, for calling this special order today. Negotiators seeking peace in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict must not forget the important history which surrounds the special status of Jerusalem.

Jerusalem is the Capital of Israel and Judaism's holiest city. When the United Nations

recommended that Jerusalem be internationalized in 1947, the Jewish Agency accepted that proposal. It was the Arab States who rejected the United Nations decision, choosing instead to attack the Jewish state. From 1948 to 1967, Jerusalem was divided. Jews were denied visits to the Wall, Judaism's holiest shrine, and other holy sites such as the Mount of Olives Cemetery. Christians, too, were often denied access to their holy places. In 1967, after the Arab Legion again attacked Jerusalem, Israel came to control the Old City. Since 1967, the holy places of Jerusalem have been cared for by an Israeli administration which protects religious freedom for all—Jews, Moslems, and Christians alike.

The provisions of United Nations Resolution 181, including the internationalization of Jerusalem, were nullified by the aggression of the Arab States themselves. Only Pakistan and the United Kingdom recognized Jordan's 19-year claim to the sovereignty over Jerusalem.

The United States has always maintained a solid commitment to a united Jerusalem and, since 1967, successive administrations have been sensitive to the special status of the city. In recent weeks, however, President Bush has made disturbing statements regarding East Jerusalem which seriously undermine the integrity of the United States' commitment to a unified city. The President asserts that his recent statements on East Jerusalem are "reiterating United States policy." Surely he recalls that under President Reagan, that administration never viewed Israeli administration of Jerusalem to be in violation of the fourth Geneva Convention, and did not attempt to restrict Jewish settlement there.

In absence of a tenable legal argument, does the current administration really take the position that there are areas in which no Jew should be allowed to live? That would plainly be a violation of the 1968 Civil Rights Act in our own country. In a related issue, Secretary of State Baker's proposal that no housing loan guarantees under existing United States law be made available to Israel to house Soviet refugees unless Israel prevents any Jews—not just Soviet refugees—from settling in the administered territories is very offensive. How can Secretary Baker support that redlining in the administered territories?

The growth of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union makes it more urgent than ever that the United States not throw roadblocks in the way of emigration from the Soviet Union. Since the Bush administration has chosen to limit Soviet Jewish emigration to the United States, it is inexcusable that Secretary Baker should now throw intolerable obstacles in the way of emigration by Soviet Jews to Israel. Because I know Secretary Baker to be a decent, honorable, and unprejudiced human being, I hope that he is reconsidering his position on this issue.

To further the cause of peace in the Middle East, the United States should not call into question Jerusalem's current status as a unified city open to people of all religions.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish people have been inextricably bound to Jerusalem for 3,000 years. There has been a continuous Jewish presence in the city despite numerous conquests and persecutions.

Jerusalem is revered as a holy city by the world's three great monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, but only since Israel gained control of the city in 1967, have worshippers of all faiths enjoyed free access to the holy sites.

Mr. Speaker, the United States should not presume to advise the Israelis what the capital of their country should be. Only the Israelis can make that determination.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, with the increasing peace and unification events occurring throughout the world, it is only sensible that we support the people of Israel in keeping Jerusalem the undivided Capital of the Jewish State.

Jerusalem is the ancient Capital of Israel and it represents more than 3,000 years of national and religious yearning of the people who lived there. The Jewish and Israeli people suffered heavy discrimination and witnessed the desecration of their burial sites. These people must not be denied their right to access their holy sites, which are the foundation of their civilization, nor should they be subjected to what they suffered during Jordan's 19-year occupation.

I ask that we recognize and support the established status of Jerusalem as the undivided capital of Israel; with free access of all holy sites to the people of all religious denominations who live there. I understand their views because we Americans would not tolerate people in other countries telling us where to locate the capital of our Nation.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join those of my colleagues who have chosen today to speak out on the status of Jerusalem, the Capital of the State of Israel. It has been the longstanding policy of the United States to recognize the eastern portion of Jerusalem as separate from the West Bank territories and as a nonnegotiable item in peace talks. I strongly support this policy and believe that it should be a cornerstone of the administration's ongoing efforts to advance the Middle East peace process.

Jerusalem was the ancient Capital of Israel and has always been a central part of the national and religious aspirations of the Jewish people. In fact, next month when Jews around the world observe Passover, their ritual meal will be closed with the hope that it will take place "next year in Jerusalem."

Under the promise of the United Nation's 1948 partition plan, Jerusalem was to become an international city in which all faiths were free to worship. However, the plan was scuttled following the refusal of Palestinian Arabs to recognize Israel and the unprovoked attacks on the infant Jewish state by five Arab armies.

Jerusalem was occupied by Jordan for 19 years during which a vigorous campaign was undertaken to eliminate all vestiges of the city's historic ties to the Jewish people. Jewish cemeteries were desecrated and shrines important to the Jewish people were defaced. However, the suffering during this period was not limited strictly to Jews; people of all faiths were discriminated against and denied access to their holy sites. In response, it is estimated that 20,000 Christians fled Jerusalem between 1948 and 1967.

Jerusalem became a united city in the aftermath of the 1967 Six-Day War. Since the liberation, the rights of all faiths to worship freely have been scrupulously protected by the Israeli Government. Israel has ensured that every religion has access to and can oversee its own shrines.

It would be a grievous error to view Jerusalem simply as a bargaining chip in peace negotiations. To do so would be to jeopardize the hard-won freedoms which all faiths have enjoyed there for the last 23 years. As the Middle East peace process advances, it is imperative that the United States continue to fully support the special status of Jerusalem.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I salute Congressman FEIGHAN's leadership in arranging this special order so that we in the U.S. Congress may address a very important issue: the status of Jerusalem.

More than 40 years have passed since the Arab States and the Palestinian Arabs rejected the United States partition plan, which called for an internationalized Jerusalem. In 1948, five Arab armies invaded the Jewish State, including the Jewish section of Jerusalem. The Arab legion severed the city, separating the Western Wall and the Jewish quarter from the rest of Jerusalem. Those Jews who survived the attack were expelled from the city.

During Jordan's 19-year occupation, King Hussein sought to systematically eliminate all traces of the city's Jewish heritage. Jews of all nationalities and Israelis of all religions were denied access to their holy sites. Jewish cemeteries were desecrated; Jewish gravestones were used to build roads and latrines.

Since the reunification of the city by Israeli forces in 1967, after the Arab States failed in their second full-scale attempt to destroy Israel, Jews have been living in the Jewish quarter, praying at the Western Wall, and attending school at the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus. And since 1967, Christians and Arabs have had the same access to their holy sites in Jerusalem as have had the Jews; in fact, Israel has welcomed religious pilgrimages from around the world.

I am puzzled as to why this issue has suddenly come under international scrutiny. As Israel was poised, some thought, to accept the Baker proposal to move the peace process forward, our own President jumped in with a statement probably designed to force Shamir's hand in accepting the Baker proposal. But what it has done instead is destabilize the Labor-Likud coalition government, and probably caused its collapse.

Since 1967, successive administrations have been sensitive to the special status of Jerusalem. In fact, Arthur Goldberg, one of the drafters of U.N. Security Council Resolution 242, said that that resolution "in no way refers to Jerusalem, and this omission was deliberate * * * Jerusalem was * * * not linked to the West Bank."

Most countries around the world have, at one time or another, annexed land which they took during a war. The United States, in fact, annexed Texas in 1845, almost 10 years after Santa Anna was defeated at San Jacinto. Have I heard anyone ask the United States to give Texas back to Mexico? Why does the

rest of the world hold Israel to a standard that they themselves are unwilling to uphold?

Jerusalem is not up for negotiation. Just as the Moslem world would unify itself should the Israelis ever try to rebuild the Second Temple on the sight of the Dome of the Rock, the Moslems third holiest shrine, so will the Israelis, and their American supporters, react to the division of Jerusalem. On this issue all sides are in agreement; Jerusalem is not a territory and will not be divided.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as the United States plays a central role in the Middle East peace process, it is imperative that we keep in mind the special status of the undivided Capital of Israel. It is important that the United States not sidetrack the peacetalks by interjecting divisive issues. Jerusalem is not an occupied territory. It is the united, political Capital of Israel as well as the spiritual home for Jews across the world.

Contrary to PLO chairman Yasir Arafat's declaration that East Jerusalem is Arab and will be the future PLO state, an equal number of Jews and Arabs live in East Jerusalem. Arab residents are entitled to Israeli citizenship, and are granted the right to vote in municipal elections even if they are not citizens. We must give the PLO the message that the United States Congress firmly recognizes Jerusalem as the unified capital of the Jewish state, and will not support any attempt to bargain it away. Jerusalem must remain the undivided Capital of Israel.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, Jerusalem has always played a central role in Jewish religious and political life. For over 3,000 years, since the time when King David made it his capital, Jerusalem has been home to Jews. The Western Wall in Jerusalem, part of Herod's temple over 2,000 years ago has been the focus of Jewish prayer and veneration. The entire city is central to the Jewish people's religious faith, tradition, and to Israel's historic culture.

In 1947 the United Nations recommended that the city of Jerusalem be internationalized. The Jewish Agency was willing to accept this plan with the hope that the city would be spared from conflict. As we all know, the Arab States were adamantly opposed to the internationalization of the city just as they were to partition.

When Jordan controlled Jerusalem from the year 1948 to 1967, Jews were not granted access to Jewish holy places like the Western Wall or the Mount of Olives. The Jordanian-controlled parts of Jerusalem were not closed to Jews only. In fact, Christians from Israel were allowed to enter the Old City for Christmas and Easter, but Israeli Moslems were not permitted to enter.

Under Jordanian control the Jewish cemetery at Hebron was destroyed, the Jewish Quarter was sacked, and 34 Jerusalem synagogues, some of which were centuries old, were also destroyed. Two great institutions, Hadassah Hospital and the Hebrew University remained idle on top of Mount Scopus for 20 years.

On the second day of the Six-Day War, Jordanian King Hussein ignored Israeli appeals to stay out of the war by firing the opening shots on Jerusalem. They lost the Old City to Israel. Under Israel control all people of all religious faiths are permitted access to holy sites. Religious freedom has thrived since 1967.

A number of times during his Presidency, former President Ronald Reagan expressed his desire for Jerusalem to remain under Israeli authority. I do not often hope for a continuation of Reagan policy, but to President Bush I say, follow the policy of your predecessor.

Mr. Speaker, Jerusalem is the Capital of Israel. Anyone who has ever been there knows that it is the heart and soul of the Jewish state. Although official United States policy recognizes that there be a unified Jerusalem to be the subject of negotiations, to me the issue is as clear as a Jerusalem skyline when the sun sets on the whiteness of the Jerusalem stone and the true meaning of Jerusalem, city of gold, hits home—Jerusalem and Israel are inseparable.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has recently stated that Jerusalem, the ancient capital of Israel, should be considered in the same light as the administered territories of the West Bank and Gaza. This apparent reversal of our Nation's longstanding policy toward Jerusalem ignores the history of that holy city and its importance to the State of Israel.

Since Biblical times, Jerusalem has been the single geographical focal point of Jewish prayer, theology and national aspirations. Until the President's recent statement, U.S. policy has consistently supported an undivided Jerusalem.

The President's recent statements ignore the history of the region and fail to take into account the present day realities of Israel. The belief that Jerusalem must always remain whole and under Jewish sovereignty is a belief that unites Israelis of all political and religious persuasions.

We must remember that turning over any portion of Jerusalem to Arab rule would not be a new experiment but the repetition of a serious mistake, the results of which are a matter of record. Many gross abuses of Jerusalem's holy sites occurred during the years of Jordanian rule from 1948 to 1967. Jews not killed during the Jordanian invasion were expelled from the city. Both Arab and Jew alike were barred from visiting their holy sites. Along with this, Jordan pursued a systematic attempt to eliminate all traces of the city's Jewish heritage.

Since the time of Israel's liberation of Jerusalem in 1967, Arabs and Jews have lived side by side. Arab residents have also been entitled to Israeli citizenship. All residents, regardless of their citizenship, have been granted the right to vote in municipal elections. Israel has granted each religion and denomination the authority to oversee its own shrines. It has also assured complete freedom of access to all people.

President Bush now speaks of Jerusalem and its Jewish residents as simply another West Bank style settlement. Israelis do not "settle" in their capital. They live there. Furthermore, no Government of Israel can consider the renewed division of Jerusalem and expect to survive.

I deeply regret that the President's statement on Jerusalem has endangered the very peace process that his administration, the Israeli Government, and Egypt have been working to promote. I ask the President to consider the danger of a policy that may leave our Nation unable to promote policies that will advance the peace process rather than hinder it.

I was present at the signing of the Camp David Peace Accord. I look forward to the day when a new agreement is signed between the warring parties of the region and its people can live in peace. This peace that can only come if our administration accepts that the city of Jerusalem must remain unified and under Israeli democratic and beneficent rule.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman taking the time this evening. I wish to submit the remarks of Mayor Teddy Kollek who recently wrote President Bush expressing his concerns over the question of Jerusalem's future. I was privileged to meet with Mayor Kollek earlier this year and see first hand the integrated Jerusalem he refers to in his letter. His comments reflect my own and I commend them to the membership.

MAYOR OF JERUSALEM,
March 8, 1990.

Mr. GEORGE H.W. BUSH,
The President of the United States of America, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In these days when all Israelis are united in their deep concern over recent American statements on Jerusalem, I am encouraged to write you as I recall the privilege I had of taking Mrs. Bush and you through the city on your visit in Israel in 1986.

In June 1987, in spite of our messages to King Hussein through your ambassador and through the United Nations that Israel had no intention of initiating hostilities against Jordan, we were unprovokedly attacked from the Jordanian occupied part of Jerusalem, an occupation followed by an annexation that was not recognized by any country except Pakistan. After the war ended, the city was united as it had been for 4000 years and its municipal boundaries were somewhat enlarged, in the main incorporating uninhabitated areas of rocky hills. In the past 22 years, the city has grown considerably. The number of Jews has increased from almost 200,000 to 340,000 and the Arab population has doubled from 75,000 to 150,000. This necessitated a massive effort to build housing for both Jews and Arabs. Homes for the Jewish population were built all over the city including in areas that had been under Jordanian occupation. Over 30,000 families now live in these areas. No Arabs were dispossessed in order to build these homes. Parts of this land had been Jewish owned before. In the northern extremity, within the new municipal borders, Jewish villages existed prior to 1948, when their inhabitants were forced to leave by the invading Jordanian army.

While the Jewish settlers in the occupied West Bank did get considerable incentives, none were given to families who made their homes within the city's boundaries. They acquired their homes under the same conditions as those living in Tel Aviv, Haifa and other parts of the country. A certain number of Russian immigrants, as well as immigrants from other countries, including many from the United States, now live in these neighborhoods. It is a fact that these new neighborhoods have become an integral part of the undivided city and are quite distinct from the settlements in the West Bank, the nearest of which is miles away.

I am aware of the policy of the United States toward the City of Jerusalem, namely "that the city remain united but that its status be determined in the negotiations." In my opinion there is no conflict between this policy and the actual state of affairs. While there is a difference between Israel's thinking that united Jerusalem is and shall remain the capital of Israel under Israel's sovereignty and American policy that leaves the city's ultimate status open, no conflict needs to arise from the existence of the new urban neighborhoods that have gone up in the last 22 years.

The Arab uprising over the last 2 years has also had its repercussions in Jerusalem, but to a much lesser extent than in the West Bank and Gaza. Work and life go on here, the schools are open and tourists and pilgrims are visiting the city. There is a certain amount of Arab strikes and some cars have been stoned or torched, but the level of violence, if at all, is small. To give just one figure, in 1989 there were altogether 11 homicides in Jerusalem, 6 of them of a criminal nature, while 4 Jews and 1 Arab were killed in terrorist acts. Indeed, the number is smaller than it was 10 or 15 years ago. I wrote to Mrs. Bush a year ago about the city's illiteracy program for Arab women. This and many other social and development activities in the city's Arab neighborhoods are going on as before.

There is one further point I would like to mention. Jerusalem is the center of Palestinian political activity. In 1967, before the city was reunited, not a single Arab newspaper was published here. Today there are 4 Arab dailies and a great number of weeklies and monthlies published which are free to attack the Israeli government and, at times, even challenge Israel's right to exist. Palestinians, who in spirit, if not organizationally, represent the PLO, address freely meetings at the Hebrew University attended by Israeli and Arab students and the general public. Similar activities could not take place in Amnan, Damascus or Bagdad, where no criticism of the authorities is tolerated.

Differences over Jerusalem's future status are bound to come to the fore at some stage of the negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. I do, however, firmly believe that this issue should be discussed as late as possible, and only after all other outstanding issues are settled. It would be particularly unfortunate if at this early but critical stage, when Israel must decide whether it will agree to a dialogue with a Palestinian delegation with one or two West Bank Palestinians who also have a Jerusalem address, other much more crucial questions concerning the future of Jerusalem should becloud the issue. In particular, no question mark should be permitted to hover over the new Jerusalem neighborhoods.

I would like to add, Mr. President, that we are grateful for the efforts of the United States government, and to you personally, to promote a peace settlement and to enable Russians Jewry to return to their homeland.

Please forgive me for taking up some of your valuable time, but I do this in the hope that I am contributing to the good relations between our two nations by expressing these thoughts to you.

With best personal regards,

Yours sincerely,

TEDDY KOLLEK.

Ms. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, Jerusalem represents the historic center of the Jewish State. The people of Israel and both the Labor and Likud parties consider Jerusalem the undivided capital of Israel. Since 1967, Jews have returned to historically Jewish neighborhoods in East Jerusalem.

Recent discussions of the status of East Jerusalem may unfortunately complicate the peace process in Israel. At a particularly crucial point in the peace process, it would seem more advantageous to postpone discussion of this divisive issue until the larger issues of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict are resolved.

Although U.S. policy has never officially recognized the 1967 reunification of Jerusalem, previous administrations have always supported a united Jerusalem.

It is my hope that the discussion of the status of East Jerusalem will not unnecessarily complicate the difficult peace process. Secretary Baker and the Bush administration have been stalwart in promoting a constructive solution to end the uprising. I am confident that once the larger issues have been addressed, the sensitive issue of East Jerusalem can be resolved.

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleagues, Mr. FEIGHAN and Mr. BURTON, for holding this special order.

Last weekend, President Bush expressed his opposition to new Jewish immigration to East Jerusalem. As much as I support the President's foreign policy views, I feel compelled to object to this statement. Maintaining a united Jerusalem transcends philosophical differences between the political parties within the Israeli Government and touches the very heart and soul of the Jewish people.

With the recent breakup of the Israeli governing coalition, it is important that statements from the United States not be used to heighten volatility in an already dangerous region. The United States should not stray from its longstanding policy that Jerusalem should never again be divided. Jerusalem should be a free and open city, where people are welcome to live wherever they choose without regard to their religious faith.

As the Israelis have contended, Jerusalem is the rightful capital of their nation. Currently, the United States Embassy to Israel is located in Tel Aviv. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Jerusalem, as the rightful capital of Israel, should be host to our Embassy.

Further, the issue of the division of Jerusalem should not be a factor in the negotiations of the Palestinian-Israeli peace talks. The Israelis have sent a clear message that the division of Jerusalem will never be an acceptable concession—and, I, too, find this unacceptable.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has recently stated that Jerusalem, the ancient capital of Israel, should be considered in the same light as the administered territories of the West Bank and Gaza. This apparent reversal of our Nation's longstanding policy toward Jerusalem ignores the history of that holy city and its importance to the State of Israel.

Since Biblical times, Jerusalem has been the single geographical focal point of Jewish prayer, theology, and national aspirations. Until the President's recent statement, U.S. policy has consistently supported an undivided Jerusalem.

The President's recent statements ignore the history of the region and fail to take into account the present day realities of Israel. The belief that Jerusalem must always remain whole and under Jewish sovereignty is a belief that unites Israelis of all political and religious persuasions.

We must remember that turning over any portion of Jerusalem to Arab rule would not be a new experiment but the repetition of a serious mistake, the results of which are a matter of record. Many gross abuses of Jerusalem's holy sites occured during the years of Jordanian rule from 1948 to 1967. Jews not killed during the Jordanian invasion were expelled from the city. Both Arab and Jew alike were barred from visiting their holy sites. Along with this, Jordan pursued a systematic attempt to eliminate all traces of the city's Jewish heritage.

Since the time of Israel's liberation of Jerusalem in 1967, Arabs and Jews have lived side by side. Arab residents have also been entitled to Israeli citizenship. All residents, regardless of their citizenship, have been granted the right to vote in municipal elections. Israel has granted each religion and denomination the authority to oversee its own shrines. It has also assured complete freedom of access to all people.

President Bush now speaks of Jerusalem and its Jewish residents as simply another West Bank style settlement. Israelis do not "settle" in their capital. They live there. Furthermore, no government of Israel can consider the renewed division of Jerusalem and expect to survive.

I deeply regret that the President's statement on Jerusalem has endangered the very peace process that his administration, the Israeli Government and Egypt have been working to promote. I ask the President to consider the danger of a policy that may leave our Nation unable to promote policies that will advance the peace process rather than hinder it.

I was present at the signing of the Camp David peace accord. I look forward to the day when a new agreement is signed between the warring parties of the region and its people can live in peace. This peace that can only come if our administration accepts that the city of Jerusalem must remain unified and under Israeli democratic and beneficient rule.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STUMP (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today and the balance of the week on account of family medical emergency.

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. GILMAN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAY, for 60 minutes, today and 60 minutes on March 20.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes, on March 20, 21, and 22.
Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 60 minutes, on March 21.
Mr. ARMEY, for 60 minutes, on March 20.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
Mr. MAZZOLI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GLICKMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. POSHARD, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CROCKETT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, on March 15.
Mr. SKELTON, for 30 minutes, March 15.
Mr. GAYDOS, for 60 minutes, March 15.
Mr. OWENS of New York, for 60 minutes, on March 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 60 minutes on April 2, 3, 4, and 5.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. BROOMFIELD.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
Mr. DELAY in two instances.
Ms. SNOWE.
Mr. MACHTLEY.
Mr. PURSELL.
Mr. GUNDERSON.
Mr. DOUGLAS.
Mr. WOLF.
Mr. GALLEGLY in two instances.
Mr. IRELAND.
Mr. MILLER of Washington.
Mr. CONTE.
Ms. SCHNEIDER.
Mr. SCHUETTE.
Mr. GINGRICH.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. MRAZEK.
Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland.
Mr. KLECZKA.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. ECKART.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. SMITH of Florida.
Mr. RANGEL.
Mr. KASTENMEIER.
Mr. WYDEN.
Mr. DYMALLY.
Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.
Mr. PALLONE.
Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.
Mr. TALLON.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. DOWNEY.
Mr. FRANK.
Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. KANJORSKI.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. DELLUMS.
Mr. DIXON.
Mr. PENNY in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.
The motion was agreed to; accordingly, (at 8 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 15, 1990, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2725. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Air Force's proposed letter(s) of offer and acceptance [LOA] to Egypt for defense articles (Transmittal No. 90-28), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 118; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2726. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the 1990 report on allied contributions to the common defense, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928 nt.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2727. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, a copy of D.C. Act 8-173, "Tax Amendment Act of 1990," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2728. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-171, "Judiciary Square Detention Facility Construction Act of 1990", and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia, March 14, 1990.

2729. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-172, "Abandoned Property Amendment Act of 1990", and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2730. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification that the Department provided the defense articles, services and training to Colombia under the authority of P.D. 89-24, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 14, 1990.

2731. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency; transmitting notice of the Department of the Air Force's proposed letter(s) of offer and acceptance [LOA] to Egypt for defense articles and services estimated to cost $120 million (Transmittal No. 90-28), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2732. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Navy's proposed letter(s) of offer and acceptance [LOA] to Korea for defense articles and services estimated to cost $36 million (Transmittal No. 90-27), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2733. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the 1989 annual report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2590; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2734. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report in compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2735. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2736. A letter from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting a report on compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system for fiscal year 1989, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2737. A letter from the Secretary, Postal Rate Commission and Agency, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calender year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2738. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, Postal Rate Commission and Agency, transmitting the annual report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2739. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2740. A letter from the Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2741. A letter from the Director, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report of actions taken to increase competition for contracts for fiscal year 1989, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 419; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2742. A letter from the Special Counsel, U.S. Office of Special Counsel, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2743. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, transmitting a copy of the 1989 activities report to the President and Congress, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 470(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2744. A letter from the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., transmitting the 1989 annual report and financial audit, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(24), 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2745. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of a building project survey on the Pentagon renovation, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 610(b); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DYMALLY (for himself and Mr. FAUNTROY):

H.R. 4257. A bill to create a supreme court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. APPLEGATE (for himself and Mr. MCEWEN) (both by request):

H.R. 4258. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that former prisoners of war are entitled to outpatient care from the Department of Veterans Affairs for any disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 4259. A bill to extend the existing suspension of duty on m-Toluic acid until January 1, 1994; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 4260. A bill to provide for the restoration of H.B. Plant Hall at the University of Tampa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HASTERT (for himself, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. COX, Mr. GRANT, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. HEFLEY):

H.R. 4261. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, relating to motor carrier transportation, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and the Judiciary.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. CRAIG):

H.R. 4262. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the base year applied to determine the amount of payments made to rehabilitation and long-term hospitals under part A of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4263. A bill to amend section 107 of title 17, United States Code, relating to fair use, to clarify that such section applies to both published and unpublished copyrighted works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LONG (for herself, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PENNY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. SHARP, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mrs. PATTERSON):

H.R. 4264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate $1 of their income tax liability for purposes of assisting local antidrug programs; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCEWEN:

H.R. 4265. A bill to restore prior law with respect to the treatment of agricultural workers under wage withholding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MORELLA:

H.R. 4266. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide higher rates of basic pay for Federal employees within the consolidated metropolitan statistical area of which the District of Columbia is a part; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OWENS of New York (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MADIGAN, and Mr. OXLEY):

H.R. 4267. A bill to require new televisions to have built in decoder circuitry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. CARPER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. PATTERSON, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.R. 4268. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to authorize the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to prohibit the payment of any golden parachute by any insured depository institution; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RINALDO, Ms. OAKAR, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WISE, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SISISKY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. JAMES, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. JONTZ, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. DOWNEY):

H.R. 4269. A bill to establish the Comprehensive Preventive Health Program for Medicare Beneficiaries; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 4270. A bill to authorize the reformulation of the Cedar Bluff Unit of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Kansas, to provide for the amendment of water service and repayment contracts; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAUKE (for himself, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, and Mr. GRANDY):

H.R. 4271. A bill to require the construction of a demonstration highway project between St. Louis, MO, and Minneapolis/St. Paul, MN; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. WALGREN:

H.R. 4272. A bill to continue until January 1, 1994, the existing suspensions of duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. NIELSON of Utah):

H.R. 4273. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the program of grants for preventive health services with respect to tuberculosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming):

H.R. 4274. A bill to provide incentives to health care providers serving rural areas, to eliminate the Medicare reimbursement differential between hospitals located in rural and urban areas, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PASHAYAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GEREN, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee):

H.J. Res. 513. Joint resolution designating November 16, 1990, as "National Philanthropy Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H.J. Res. 514. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning May 6, 1990, as "National Correctional Officers Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FROST:

H.J. Res. 515. Joint resolution designating the week beginning September 16, 1990, as "National Give Kids a Fighting Chance Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning June 10, 1990, as "National Scleroderma Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEWIS of California (for himself and Mrs. BYRON):

H.J. Res. 517. Joint resolution designating May 1990 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. LLOYD (for herself and Mr. MACHTLEY):

H.J. Res. 518. Joint resolution designating October 13 through 20, 1990, as "American Textile Industry Bicentennial Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MCGRATH, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FISH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAWKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

H.J. Res. 519. Joint resolution designating April 16, 1990, as "National Sarcoidosis Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LENT:

H. Con. Res. 286. Concurrent resolution authorizing the 1990 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. YATRON (for himself, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. FUSTER):

H. Con. Res. 287. Concurrent resolution calling for a U.S. policy of promoting the continuation, for a minimum of an additional 10 years, of the International Whaling Commission's moratorium on the commercial killing of whales, and otherwise expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to conserving and protecting the world's whale populations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY (for himself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SABO, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. SMITH of Florida):

H. Res. 357. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the owners and players of the major league baseball teams should settle their differences expeditiously, begin spring training, and start the regular baseball season as soon as possible; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. WALSH):

H. Res. 358. Resolution providing for acquisition of telecommunications devices for the deaf for use in offices of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCHUETTE (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. HOLLOWAY):

H. Res. 359. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any funds from spending reductions in the budget for defense should be applied to deficit reduction and taxpayer relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

327. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to textile and apparel imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EMERSON:

H.R. 4275. A bill for the relief of Oscar H. McCormack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLON:

H.R. 4276. A bill to authorize coastwise documentation for the vessel HMS *Bounty*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 39: Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 173: Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WELDON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 182: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 379: Mr. NAGLE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 413: Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 467: Mr. NELSON of Florida.

H.R. 790: Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 815: Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 820: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 855: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SANGMEISTER, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 995: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GEREN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BRENNAN, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1167: Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 1205: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 1276: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1400: Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. UPTON, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 1730: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 2132: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2133: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2209: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 2418: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 2545: Mr. PORTER, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 2584: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 2608: Mr. WOLPE, Mr. ECKART, and Ms. OAKAR.

H.R. 2611: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 2870: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2996: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3004: Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 3051: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 3154: Ms. SCHNEIDER and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 3158: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GALLO, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 3200: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 3243: Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 3267: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 3270: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. COURTER, Mr. RAY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DERRICK, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 3386: Mr. MINETA and Mr. ANDERSON.

H.R. 3401: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GEREN, Ms. LONG, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 3440: Mr. HILER.

H.R. 3475: Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 3484: Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 3498: Mr. COX, Mr. PEASE, Mr. HUTTO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 3501: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3528: Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 3643: Mr. LENT, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 3652: Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. ECKART, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 3656: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 3657: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 3665: Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 3686: Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 3705: Mr. CONTE.

H.R. 3732: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 3734: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 3735: Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 3789: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. UDALL.

H.R. 3817: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 3835: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 3836: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. JAMES, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. COURTER, Mr. ROE, Mr. PEASE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 3852: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 3858: Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 3859: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 3869: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 3880: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. BRENNAN, and Mr. SMITH of Vermont.

H.R. 3889: Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. LENT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FROST, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 3901: Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 3940: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 3961: Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STARK, Mr. HORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr.

PALLONE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WALSH, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. ROE, Ms. LONG, Mr. HYDE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. RAY, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 3980: Mr. LANCASTER and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 3992: Mr. EVANS, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. LONG, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 3998: Mr. PAXON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GREEN, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 4004: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 4025: Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 4026: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PENNY, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. ESPY, Mr. ROE, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4031: Mr. ASPIN.

H.R. 4032: Mr. ASPIN.

H.R. 4033: Mr. ASPIN.

H.R. 4042: Mr. GREEN.

H.R. 4064: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 4065: Mr. WALGREN.

H.R. 4075: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 4083: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 4098: Mrs. PATTERSON and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 4106: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 4131: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 4132: Mr. MCCLOSKEY and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 4146: Mr. HILER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 4157: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BARNARD, and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 4177: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 4208: Mr. KASTENMEIER.

H.R. 4233: Mr. RAHALL.

H.J. Res. 15: Mr. HOLLOWAY.

H.J. Res. 156: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.J. Res. 364: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HILER, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. BATES, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. LENT, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MICHEL, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.J. Res. 406: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. VALENTINE, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. SLAUGHTER or New York, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.J. Res. 417: Mr. FRANK.

H.J. Res. 431: Mr. FISH, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. GRANT.

H.J. Res. 441: Mr. BUNNING.

H.J. Res. 467: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. HILER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FRAZIO, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. HAMILTON.

H.J. Res. 473: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MOODY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. STARK, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DELAY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LENT, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. FROST, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. COURTER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. PRICE, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WISE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. FISH, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.J. Res. 482: Mr. RUSSO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WALSH, Mr. YATRON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HILER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LENT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. WELDON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ROE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FROST, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. MCEWEN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. DOWNEY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.J. Res. 495: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. AKAKA.

H.J. Res. 500: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GALLO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. MCEWEN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. REGULA, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MADIGAN, and Mr. BLILEY.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. BRENNAN.

H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. MCDADE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PORTER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FROST, and Mr. JENKINS.

H. Con. Res. 123: Mr. PAXON.

H. Con. Res. 149: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H. Con. Res. 246: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ESPY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H. Con. Res. 249: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ROE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MADIGAN, and Mr. WISE.

H. Con. Res. 261: Mr. KOLBE.

H. Con. Res. 264: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HEFLEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LENT, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WOLPE.

H. Con. Res. 265: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. UPTON.

H. Con. Res. 281: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, and Mr. WEISS.

H. Res. 159: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mrs. BENTLEY Mr. MINETA, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 354: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. GREEN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2584: Mr. BALLENGER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3581

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

—(1) On page 11, line 10 strike "on the first day of the fiscal year immediately following the enactment of this Act" and insert "October 1, 1991".

—(2) On page 15—

(A) line 11, insert "(A) REQUIREMENTS.—" before "The term";

(B) strike line 12 through line 14 and insert the following: "means, with respect to a fiscal year, a State with respect to which

all of the following apply not later than the first day of the fiscal year:"

(C) line 15, strike "(A)" and insert "(i)";

(D) line 20, strike "(B)" and insert "(ii)";

(E) line 23, strike "(i)" and insert "(I)"; and

(F) line 24, strike "subparagraph (A)" and insert "clause (i)".

—(3) On page 16—

(A) line 1, strike "(ii)" and insert "(II)";

(B) line 7, strike "(C)" and insert "(iii)";

(C) line 11, strike "subparagraph (A)" and insert "clause (i)"; and

(D) after line 12, insert the following:

"(B) GOOD FAITH EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding the requirements of subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Agriculture may determine, no later than the first day of the fiscal year, a State to be an eligible State under this paragraph for the fiscal year if the Secretary determines that the State has made a good faith effort to meet, and has substantially met, such requirements.".

—(4) On page 18—

(A) line 19, strike "and"; and

(B) line 25, strike the period and insert ";" and

"(8) appoint a member to the State rural economic development review panel as provided under section 361(c)(1)(P).".

—(5) On page 32, after line 24, insert the following:

"(4) FAILURE TO APPOINT PANEL MEMBERS.—The failure of the Governor, the Secretary of Agriculture, or an association or organization described in subparagraph (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (K), (L), or (M) of paragraph (1) to appoint a member to the panel as required under this subsection shall not prevent a State from being determined to be an eligible State as defined under section 360(b)(3).".

—(1) On page 17, line 20 strike "great weight" and insert "consideration".

—(2) On page 18, lines 4 and 5, strike "not assisting any project ranked higher in priority by the panel" and insert "that determination".

—Page 64, strike line 8 and 11 and all that follows through line 17 and insert the following:

"(2) in evaluating the feasibility of a telephone loan to be made to a borrower for telephone services, use—

"(A) with respect to items for which the regulatory authority with jurisdiction over the provision of such services has approved the depreciation rates used by the borrower, such approved rates; and

"(B) with respect to other items, the average of the depreciation rates used by borrowers of telephone loans made under this Act;

"(3) annually determine and publish the average described in paragraph (2)(B); and".

—Page 64, line 18, strike "(3)" and insert "(4)".

—Page 67, line 18, strike "is made" and insert "application if submitted".

—Page 81, line 19, insert the following:

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking "paragraph (1) and (2)" and inserting "paragraphs (2) and (3)";

—Page 81, line 18, strike "(2)" and insert "(3)".

—Page 81, line 22, strike "(3)" and insert "(4)".

—Page 82, line 17, strike "and".

—Page 82, after line 17, insert the following:

(vi) in paragraph (d), by redesignating subparagraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

—Page 82, line 18, strike "(vi)" and insert "(vii)".

—Page 83, strike lines 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 and insert the following:

"(f) SECTION 343(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 343(a) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)) is amended—."

—Page 83, line 19, strike "(h)" and insert "(g)".

—Page 83, line 22, strike "(c)" and insert "(C)".

—Page 84, line 16, strike "(i)" and insert "(h)".

By Mr. GINGRICH:

—Page 81, redesignate section 807 as section 808 and insert after line 6 the following:

SEC. 807. INDUSTRIAL HOMEWORK.

Effective on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, industrial homework in the women's apparel industry may be performed without regard to the requirements of the regulations of the Secretary of Labor issued under section 11(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 C.F.R. 530 et seq.).

—At the end of the amendment, add the following:

CHAPTER 4—ALTERNATIVE TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL CERTIFICATION

SEC. 1061. ALTERNATIVE TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL CERTIFICATION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1991. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—From the amounts appropriated to carry out this section, the Administrator is authorized to enter into grants with States to assist in supporting programs, projects, or activities that develop and implement new, or expand and improve existing, alternative teacher and principal certification requirements for teachers, including part time teachers, and principals located in rural areas in the State.

(c) STATE APPLICATIONS.—Any State desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information, as the Administrator may reasonably require.

(d) Effective October 1, 1992, this section is repealed.

By Mr. GRANDY:

—At the end of title VIII, on page 84, after line 18, insert the following new section:

SEC. 808. NONPROFIT NATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND FINANCE CORPORATIONS.

Section 1323 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1932 note) is amended as follows—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting "or directly to an affiliated statewide rural development and finance program" after "programs";

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new paragraphs:

"(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, lenders that have provided loans that are guaranteed under this subsection shall have limited reporting responsibilities, as determined by the Secretary, concerning such loans, and the National Rural Development and Finance Corporation or its State affiliate shall be primarily responsible for the issuance of final reports concerning such loans.

"(7) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, loan guarantees provided under this subsection shall be for a period not to exceed 15 years."; and

(3) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking "from funds transferred under paragraph (2)";

(B) by inserting "or expanding" after "establishing"; and

(C) by adding the following new sentence at the end thereof: "Such grants may also be made directly to affiliated Statewide programs if the corporation certifies to the Secretary that they are able to establish effective, ongoing State programs on rural development and revolving finance."; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Nonprofit national rural development and finance corporations and affiliated Statewide programs that receive grants under subsections (a) or (b) may use an amount, not to exceed 10 percent of the amount of such grants over a 2-year period, for program operation and administration costs."

By Mr. ROSE:

—(1) On page 19, line 10, strike "LIMITED TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—(A)".

—(2) On page 19, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 21, line 6.

—(3) On page 21, line 7, strike "(3)" and insert "(2)".

—(4) On page 34, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 38, line 7.

—(5) On page 45, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 308. LIMITATION ON CONDITIONS FOR WATER AND SEWER GRANTS AND LOANS.

Section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)) is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"(20) In making or insuring loans or making grants under this subsection, the Secretary may not condition approval of such loans or grants upon any requirement, condition or certification other than those specified under this Act".

—(1) On page 19, line 10, strike "LIMITED TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—(A)".

—(2) On page 19, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 21, line 6.

—(3) On page 21, line 7, strike "(3)" and insert "(2)".

—(4) On page 34, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 38, line 7.

—(5) On page 45, insert after line 9 the following:

SEC. 308. INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

There is authorized to be appropriated, in addition to amounts appropriated under any other provision of law, $34,500,000 to be used for programs carried out under section 306(a) or subsections (a) through (f) and (h) of section 310B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act or under section 1323 of the Food Security Act of 1985.

SEC. 309. LIMITATION ON CONDITIONS FOR WATER AND SEWER GRANTS AND LOANS.

Section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)) is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"(20) In making or insuring loans or making grants under this subsection, the Secretary may not condition approval of such loans or grants upon any requirement, condition or certification other than those specified under this Act".

By Mr. STAGGERS:

—Page 35, line 4, insert ", and business incubators," after "business".

—Page 38, after line 7, insert the following:

(h) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "business incubator" means a facility or management system which functions as an umbrella organization to provide new small businesses with shared support serv-

ices, overhead expenses, and technical assistance.

By Mr. TALLON:

—Section 201 of H.R. 3581 adds a new section 361 to the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act. That section is amended by inserting at the end of section 361(c) (on page 32 of H.R. 3581 as reported by the House Agriculture Committee) the following:

(4) INVESTMENTS IN RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BY STATE GOVERNMENTS.—(A) Not later than fifteen days after the end of each fiscal year, the Governor shall submit a report to the Secretary including the amount of State funds expended to assist rural economic development projects that would qualify for assistance under designated rural development programs as defined by section 360(b)(2), including direct contributions of funds to be available for applications considered by the State Rural Economic Development Review Panel, and funds not available for consideration by such review panel.

(B) Notwithstanding any other provision, the State Rural Economic Development Review Panel for a State during a fiscal year shall not include the members listed in subsection (c)(1) (A) and (B) if—

(i) during such fiscal year, the State does not contribute an amount equal to or greater than 10 percent of the total federal funds available for the consideration of the State Rural Economic Development Review Panel and permit such funds to be available for the consideration of such panel in funding designated rural development programs; or

(ii) the total amount of expenditure by such State as specified in paragraph A shall be less during the preceding fiscal year than the lower of the amount of such expenditure during the second preceding fiscal year or the amount of such expenditure for the average of the second, third and fourth preceding fiscal years (except that such conditions shall not apply if the amount of such expenditure by such State for such fiscal year shall be equal to or greater than the amount of federal funds available for the consideration of such review panel).

(C) The Secretary may waive the requirements of paragraph (B) if, upon receiving a request for such waiver from the Governor, the Secretary finds that the expenditures required by such paragraph would create a hardship for such State.

—At the end of title VIII of the bill insert the following new section:

SEC. . EXTENSION OF QUALIFIED SMALL ISSUE BONDS.

1(a) EXTENSION.—Section 144(a)(12)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 144(a)(12)(B)) is amended by striking '1990' and inserting '1995'.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE END OF THE FEAST

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, David Halberstam has written an article in the Business Quarterly entitled, "The End of the Feast."

It is a masterful description of the financial excess of the 1980's and is an appropriate antidote to the "What, Me Worry?" Charlie Brown syndrome that has gripped so many here in Washington, DC. The article by Mr. Halberstam is printed below:

THE END OF THE FEAST

I have a friend who has done very well off the economy in the last 10 years. He is an arbitrageur with a nice touch, a good sense of humor, and an inherent belief that in the end, arbitrage, is just a game that by chance he plays well. He has consistently been a winner in the decade of the Great Casino, and if I were venturing estimates of his wealth, I would begin at around $400 million.

I have always thought, based on some of my friend's own description of his work habits, that essentially he has been a skilled and nimble predator working over the tired carcass of an ailing economy. "I got here at a moment when the place was filled with remarkable bargains," he once said. "It was luck." A healthier economy would have provided fewer easy targets and much slimmer pickings. The bargain hunting would never have taken place. In better days the ruling class of America's financial houses might not have tolerated a stock market designed more for the pleasure of arbitrageurs than for manufacturers.

A few weeks ago my friend and I had dinner, and he, to my surprise, seemed even more pessimistic about the American economy than I. He did not like any of the current trends; they seemed, more than ever, aimed at short-range exploitation of companies' assets. In recent years it had simply been the arbitrageurs and the bigger companies who had fed the takeovers. Now, he added, it was even worse. In the last year or so, the ailment had gotten into the management of the companies.

He cited the RJR Nabisco fiasco, where the greed of the management team had opened the door to a hostile takeover. The fever is in the bloodstream of management now, he said; management wants in on a good thing. In his phrase, the greed today was like a genie that had escaped from the bottle; there was now an institutionalized vested interest in the country in continuing the way we are going, destructive or not. He said this entirely without irony, and perhaps there is no irony to it; it was inevitable, I suppose, that managers with limited loyalty to their product and to their employees, and with greater loyalty to themselves than to their stockholders, had looked around, had seen what was happening, and had gotten in line for their share.

Others of my fellow Americans are also getting rich, yet I remain pessimistic about the economy and its future. I should be more specific: not the economy as a near-term game that one can play and manipulate—I suspect it remains a wonderful free-fire zone—but the economy as part of the long-range social contract of the nation; as a next-century successor to the dynamic economy I knew growing up, and which, when I was a young man, generated a kind of broadly based wealth never seen before in the world.

I realize that the past decade is one in which a great many people have made astonishing amounts of money (I suspect more wealth has been taken out of the economy in a shorter time in stock deals and put aside for personal use by men who are essentially speculators, not investors, than at any other moment in history).

But when I hear the official optimism about the economy, I feel oddily as I did some 27 years ago when I was a young reporter in Saigon, being bombarded every day by the American military headquarters with statistics proving that we were winning the war. Everything I knew and sensed told me that we were losing it, indeed were barely fighting it; everyone whom I personally respected told me, when we were talking off the record, that the war was a disaster. I have the same sense today about the economy.

Certainly a great many people are making excessive amounts of money off the economy, amounts that dazzle the mind. But underneath the surface, almost everything I sense is negative. Many of those who benefit from this unparalleled windfall talk privately of the darkness just around the corner, of the vulnerability of a nation that has made itself so dependent upon the support of foreign investment. Sometimes they are extremely critical of the very things that enrich them. While true productivity and performance lag even more behind, there is more pressure than ever on companies for paper performance.

That means that the premium action still lies from power and the price of oil nearly quadrupled. By the end of the war we were the new superpower, fueled by cheap oil, protected by two oceans in an age when weaponry could not cross an ocean. We ended the war far more powerful, far richer, and far more confident than when we began it.

The rest of the world was in ashes. Our allies and adversaries alike had been ravaged in some way or another by the war. Britain emerged a victor but still bore the burden of its losses in World War I upon those it suffered in World War II, and it was about to shed its colonies. France was a victor, albeit a humiliated one; it too was about to lose its colonies. Germany was a loser, devastated and divided, with millions dead. The Soviet Union was a ravaged victor, losing five times as many people as Germany, and burdened by an economic system that demonstrably did not work. For Japan the defeat in the war was as much a psychic loss, a loss of faith, as it was one of men and materiel.

We were more confident than ever, more economically (and educationally) democratic than ever, thanks to the war, the New Deal, and the GI Bill. Our richness was so great, a richness caused by historical forces largely outside our doing, that it was like a giant tide lifting everyone in our society. Everyone was both worker and consumer, living in a society where, with the powerful new commercial television networks, there was the most ferocious pressure to consume ever known to man. Perhaps the most miraculous thing of all came in the mid-1950s: we were a nation so rich that even our children became a formidable part of the consuming economy. By the end of the '50s we had not one or two cars in our suburban garages, but often three.

There were two things that came out of that great moment: first, an abiding belief that whatever it was that was going to be manufactured, America would set the standard and would do it first and do it best; and second, because the period last so long, a belief that our hegemony would go on forever—a belief that God takes care of America. We as a nation did not see that remarkable period as the result of a confluence of historical forces far outside our own control; we saw it as our due, something we had earned by dint of being Americans. As such, we thought that which was a historical fluke—America's great affluence and unmatched economic growth after the war—should be a permanent condition.

That explains a good deal about our current inability to adjust to changing circumstances in a changing world. Forty years of immunity to all the normal crises and vulnerabilities creates a kind of arrogance of entitlement. The pre-World War II wariness of our grandparents and parents, raised as they were in harder times and touched by the Depression, have lapsed from family memory. Our parents hated to owe anything; our children get credit cards in their teens. Now, facing an uncertain future, we intend to live as we always have; it is nothing less than our due. Ours has become an economy governed not so much by need as by expectation.

We took that period of remarkable affluence for granted. Because of our wealth, we became a nation that felt it never had to make choices or sacrifices. Most notably, when Lyndon Johnson gave us both the Vietnam War and the Great Society during the '60s, we were confident that we could pay for both.

Since the end of World War II, we have been like a nation racing through our inheritance. What is troubling is not so much that we went through it so quickly, but that we cannot discipline ourselves now that it is over. Our economy today—with the leveraging of money and unfriendly mergers—is based not on productivity, but on exploiting a moment when the society is declining, or at the very best, stagnant.

What is even more chilling about our condition is our political paralysis in the face of these changed circumstances. There were signs 20 years ago that we were facing fierce competition in a number of critical areas—most prominently from Japan, with its

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

39-059 O-91-42 (Pt. 3)

system of state-guided communal capitalism. Japan had pulled ahead of us in the shipbuilding and steel industries by the late '60s. During the '70s, American consumers increasingly bought the high-quality cameras, cars, and television sets that Japan was sending over. All those warning signals were going off, but few paid attention to them.

Now in the '90s, we remain politically and socially paralyzed by events around us. We live in a world where those who are our competitors are now more disciplined than we and perceivce us as a nation of people spoiled by its good fortune. We consume more than ever, and because we increasingly prefer foreign products, we consume foreign goods and thereby export our dollars. We have gone in a stunningly short time from creditor nation to debtor nation. The Reagan years, in keeping with an age given more to successes in marketing than in production, were more about the triumph of image than they were about the triumph of substance. The most interesting thing about the Reagan years is that Reagan turned out to be such a poor conservative. By that I mean conservative in the classic derivation of the word *conserve*.

His policies, such as they were, fueled an almost reckless spree of indulgence. If there was an essential message to his presidency, it was that nothing was really wrong with America; all we had to do was feel better about our country (and about him as president of it) and about being Americans. Millions did; they felt better about him and their country, and he left office more popular than when he arrived in it, and the trade deficit grew, and the national debt grew.

IGNORING THE WARNING SIGNS

In the most basic way, our political system failed to keep up with the changed circumstances of our economic realities. That which we should have been reevaluating underwent no scrutiny. We lived by televised platitudes. There was no attempt to measure ourselves against our competitors to define our strengths and vulnerabilities. It is true that a great many people who call themselves conservative in America applauded Reagan's election, and in many cases benefited significantly from changed tax laws, and indeed would quite gratefully have voted for him again.

Reagan seemed to have little sense of the historic forces that were at work and that had catapulted him into the presidency. He cut sharply federal aid to our best science graduate students. He had little interest in pinpointing those forces that were undermining the strength of the American economy or in recognizing new challenges. In Clyde Prestowitz's book *Trading Places*, there is a particularly chilling story of the Reagan years. in fall 1985, some of the senior people in the Commerce Department were trying to get the president to aid the American semiconductor industry, then hearing the brunt of a fierce, and to some unfair, Japanese trade assault. That is, the American manufacturers were competing with Japanese manufacturers whose domestic market was protected from us, but they were treating the U.S. market as a free-trade zone. This gave the Japanese a protected base where they could lower costs.

To many in the Commerce Department, the situation was symbolic of that aspect of Japanese trade policy that is so unfair, and it was taking place against one of the best, most modern, and least inflated of American industries, one critical to American national security. Neither anyone in the president's inner circle nor the president himself seemed very concerned about the quantum difference between free trade as defined by most Western nations and free trade as defined by the Japanese. "If our guys can't hack it," Prestowitz quotes a high-level Reagan adviser as saying, meaning the inability of the American chip manufacturers to compete, "we ought to let them go." (That is, die.)

Those years are now gone: at a time when the nation needed to make choices and to make sacrifices, it made neither. It was, as Senator Pat Moynihan has said of the '80s, a moment when we borrowed a trillion dollars from the Japanese and gave a very good party for ourselves. Not surprisingly, a decade later the Japanese remain the symbol of our frustration. They irritate us, but we are dependent upon them to buy our Treasury bills and to keep us from hitting the wall. Their protectionism infuriates us, but the more we make our economy dependent upon theirs and upon their liquidity, the less forceful both politically and morally we are in getting them to open up their markets and end those practices that are most demonstrably unfair. There is a lesson here: we cannot discipline others if we cannot discipline ourselves.

What is astonishing is how little debate there is on so crucial a subject. It is here that we seem so numbed. Three presidential elections have come and gone, and none of this has really been an issue. It is as if the idea that the easy times are over is so alien and threatening that to raise it in an election is to seem anti-American and to guarantee a loss of votes. Our last election, at a time when economic issues should have been at the forefront of our national debate, was a farce; that which should have been a major issue—the crisis in our economy—was barely mentioned. During the prolonged 1988 primary battles and general election, it struck me that the election would have been better focused if one of the endless debates had been held in Tokyo or Seoul.

Regrettably we are now part of a world economy where our competitors bring a long-range view of what success and failure represent. The ascent of the new Confucian nations of Asia, Japan, and the little Japans is the most obvious reflection of the new international economy; but Western Europe too is preparing for greater economic unity and anticipating genuine growth created by genuine energy. My instincts tell me that if the changes in the Soviet Union continue, and if there is the continuation of increased political freedom with attendant economic freedom, then the prime beneficiary will be the West Germans, and West Germany might become the Japan of the next decade. If the Russians retreat politically and economically and the vacuum they leave behind is filled, I suspect that it will be the West Germans who will fill it. They have been quietly, carefully, dutifully seeding the terrain for some 30 years, and they still have a primacy of making things in their companies, not marketing through television.

We by contrast will watch something happen that we always wanted to take place: the growing political and economic integration of Europe and the concurrent decline of Soviet political influence. And we may end up bit players instead of true participants.

WE NEED TO CLEAN OUR AIR

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in my home of Houston, there is a brown haze that often hangs over the city's skyline. We have an air pollution problem—one of the worst in the country.

In fact, Harris County rivals the infamous Los Angeles in smog pollution. Recent studies show that even New York has better air quality than we do.

These are hard facts. A recent Environmental Protection Agency study fund that between 1986 and 1988 Houston ranked sixth out of 101 cities in exceeding maximum ozone standard laws.

This creates many problems for our area. Ozone—the major component of smog—is harmful to human health. Respiratory diseases like emphysema, bronchitis, and lung cancer are on the rise, and the chronic effects of repeated exposure inceases the susceptibility of respiratory infection and can cause respiratory ailments in young children.

Such health problems are very expensive. A recent study from the American Lung Association says that auto pollution is responsible for between $40 and $50 billion in annual health-care costs.

Beyond the health risks, such pollution also threatens Houston's ability to attract new industry. Companies looking to relocate will think twice about moving to an area which has brown air 6 months out of the year.

Solving this problem means looking at the source. Studies show that more than 50 percent of our urban smog comes from vehicle emissions—from our cars, buses, and trucks. Since we are not about to stop driving—in fact, our driving miles are expected to double in the 1990's—we need to reduce the pollution our cars are producing.

One way is to tighten Federal emission standards for cars already on the road. To a large extent, we've already done that. In addition, our refining industry is working to develop cleaner burning gasoline called reformulated gasoline.

But to really make a dent in our air pollution problem, we must take an even bigger step. That means using the technology we have today to run our vehicles on significantly cleaner alternative fuels.

We're not talking about bizarre-looking autos from some low-budget science fiction movie. Technology for alternative fuels has jumped far ahead in the past decade. Today, alternative fuel vehicles are indistinguishable from their gas-powered counterparts and may require even less maintenance. I believe our energy future will have a more complicated infrastructure. Vehicles powered by different fuels will share the same roadway. Natural gas, electricity, ethanol and other sources will play a role.

In fact, the only significant distinction between the alternative and conventional fueled vehicles is that alternative fuel cars don't pol-

lute as much as their gas-powered predecessors.

For example, the Department of Energy says natural gas vehicles produce 50 percent less carbon monoxide and similar nitrous oxides emission than gasoline.

And last June, the Library of Congress released a study showing that natural gas reduced carbon dioxide emissions 30 percent over gasoline. The EPA even estimates that running a vehicle on natural gas reduces ozone-causing emissions by 50 to 80 percent.

Think what those reductions would mean to the air quality in Harris County and other metro areas around the country.

But the benefits don't stop there. We would greatly enhance U.S. energy security through the use of domestic alternative fuels. My home State of Texas is a major producer of natural gas. Texas' reserves—along with those in the rest of the country—comprise a significant domestic supply of this abundant fuel. Tightening emission standards to the levels attainable by natural gas would give our State's economy a much-needed boost. In fact, some estimates say increased demand and production of natural gas could easily bring between 10,000 to 20,000 jobs within a few years.

Not only that, but nearly half of the oil burned in this country comes from overseas. Increased use of a domestic fuel like natural gas will certainly break this dependence on foreign oil producers and go a long way to assuring U.S. energy independence and security.

As these points illusrate, we definitely need a plan that emphasizes alternative fuels while taking steps to clean up our air. The best opportunity to do so is the Clean Air bill now before Congress.

While the Clean Air proposal the President presented is essentially good legislation, it needs a stronger commitment to alternative fuels like natural gas. More importantly, it needs to resist the attempts of some who want to drop auto emission standards so low that air quality in areas like Harris County would continue to grow worse.

As we in Congress work on this bill, we should not lose sight of what we are trying to achieve—cleaner air for America, in both the short and long term.

With that in mind, there is another essential piece of the Clean Air puzzle that needs to be addressed. Economic incentives are imperative to getting a widespread alternative fuels program off the ground.

As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, which is in charge of all revenue proposals, I have introduced a bill providing tax incentives to those who convert to alternative fuels.

My Alternative Fuels Incentive Act would provide a 20-percent tax credit for equipment to convert a vehicle to run on a clean-burning fuel, a 20-percent credit for alternative fuel refueling station equipment, and a 20-percent credit for the fuel system of a new alternative fuel vehicle.

Not only would this provide a badly needed alternative fuel infrastructure in this country, but it would encourage fleet truck owners and mass transit systems to convert to clean-burning fuels. This is a key area. Houston, for example, has the largest private van-pooling system in the country. Converting much of this fleet to clean-burning fuels would greatly reduce our air pollution problems.

To be honest, I'm tired of driving along my city's freeways and seeing the thick brown haze that is damaging our health and the health of our economy. It is especially frustrating to know that we have the technology to make ourselves energy independent, create thousands of new jobs, and give us the clean air we desperately need.

After all, the air we are breathing is the only air we've got.

INTRODUCTION OF HOUSE RURAL HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENTS ACT

HON. LARRY E. CRAIG

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, rural health care is facing a financial crisis.

In Idaho, three hospitals have already been forced out of business, and others are struggling to survive due to inequitable reimbursement rates from Medicare. That number may not sound so terrible until you consider how many lives are affected by those hospitals, and the great distances that must be traveled to obtain health care without them. Many of these small hospitals are located in remote areas, hundreds of miles from other health care facilities.

Because of inequitable reimbursement rates to rural areas, there are shortages in physicians and other health care providers. The health care professionals working in rural areas now work long, hard hours in order to make up for staff shortages. These people are dedicated to their work and the rural communities they serve, but relief is desperately needed. If rural hospitals are going to be able to continue to compete in the same labor pool as their urban counterparts, for the limited number of health care providers, then we must even out the inequities in this system that favors urban areas.

Mr. Speaker, Idaho is not alone; these problems have had an impact on other States as well. Rural hospitals across the United States are struggling to survive. Many of these hospitals and their communities are facing the prospect of closure, holding on to the hope that Congress or the administration will hear their voices and somehow correct the Health Care Financing Administration's Medicare inequities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make their voices heard.

Last summer, President Bush sent Secretary of Health and Human Services Louis Sullivan to my Rural Health Care Conference in Idaho. The Secretary agreed there is a rural health care crisis, and I know he is willing to assist us.

I am happy to join my colleague, Congressman WYDEN, in introducing the Rural Health Care Improvements Act, companion legislation to S. 2214, introduced in the Senate by Senator PACKWOOD of Oregon. This legislation contains a variety of provisions, some of which are already under consideration in the House of Representatives, that will offer a comprehensive solution to the many problems rural health care providers are facing. I want to impress upon my colleagues that this legislation is not an idealistic, or whimsical attempt to solve this serious problem. It is a carefully thought out and realistic piece of legislation that is targeted to resolve specific problems that have contributed to the rural health care crisis.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, rural hospitals and health care providers are more than just health centers—they are an important thread in the fabric of rural society. America's rural hospitals and the dedicated workers in the health care profession are facing an economic crisis—one that threatens not only their existence, but also the existence of the communities they serve. I hope you will all join Congressman WYDEN and myself in supporting the Rural Health Care Improvements Act.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL HICKS

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with Mr. Michael Hicks' colleagues in congratulating him on his 20th anniversary at Strake Jesuit College Preparatory in Houston.

More than ever, Americans are turning to our educational system to enhance our domestic prosperity and our international competitiveness. If we are to succeed in this task, we will require many individuals with the same selfless sense of dedication which Mr. Hicks has demonstrated to his students for the past 20 years.

Mr. Hicks' program has graduated many students that have gone on to such fields as: education, foreign services, law, medicine, policy research, engineering, business, and others. Their success in such diverse fields is certainly related to the fundamental skills of public speaking, logic, analysis, and organization which he has taught them. Through his coaching and the fire of competition, they have emerged as the leaders of tomorrow.

Once again, I would like to offer my congratulations to Mr. Michael Hicks and best wishes for his continued success in the years to come.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RURAL HEALTH IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1990

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, today my colleague Congressman LARRY CRAIG and I are introducing comprehensive legislation to salvage the health care system in our rural communities. This legislation is a companion measure to legislation introduced in the Senate by Senator BOB PACKWOOD.

As many of my colleagues know, rural communities are losing desperately needed hospitals and providers every day. In my own State of Oregon, over half of the hospitals are in rural areas. Two Oregon hospitals were forced to close last year. One Oregon hospital is teetering on the edge of closure right now. Countless physicians, nurses, and physician assistants have filed the countryside, leaving many rural areas severely drained of qualified health professionals. The problem has reached crisis proportions.

Nationally, over 60 percent of rural hospitals lose money every time a Medicare beneficiary walks through the door, compared to only 46 percent of urban hospitals. One of the biggest reasons for this difference in hospital closures is that rural hospitals today receive an average of 8 percent less than urban hospitals from Medicare. That's just unfair.

This "urban/rural differential" was conceived in 1983, when it was widely believed that rural hospitals had lower costs to meet than urban hospitals. Today, we know that this theory is not valid.

Labor shortages for medical professionals has hit urban as well as rural facilities. And often the rural facility must offer higher wages to lure quality health care professionals away from the prestige and glamour of a big city.

The costs of goods and supplies in rural areas are the same as those in urban areas. Medical supply companies charge rural hospitals the same amount of money for their goods and services as urban hospitals. In fact, because of their small size, most rural hospitals are unable to achieve economies of scale or get bulk discounts which suppliers sometimes offer to high volume urban or suburban facilities.

In reality, the cost of providing health care in Burns, OR, is not much different from the cost in Portland. The unchecked migration of qualified providers away from rural communities and the startling number of hospital closures in rural areas demands congressional action. That is why I am introducing the Rural Health Improvement Act.

Our bill will do the following:

First, speed-up elimination of urban-rural Differential. The legislation would eliminate the urban-rural Medicare hospital payment differential by January 1, 1991 rather than 1995—as called for in the 1989 budget reconciliation bill;

Second, speed-up implementation of RBRVS. The legislation would fully implement the resource-based relative value scale contained in the 1989 budget reconciliation bill by January 1, 1992 instead of 1995;

Third, extend Medicare reimbursement to nurse practitioners who work in rural areas when their services would otherwise be provided by a physician;

Fourth, establish a national payment rate for certified registered nurse anesthetists, which are often the only anesthesia providers in rural communities;

Fifth, increase funding for the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program;

Sixth, increase funding for area health education centers [AHEC's]. AHEC's provide continuing education and clinical instruction for physicians, nurse practitioners, and other health care professionals who practice in or near underserved areas;

Seventh, target public health service funds to county health departments to offer preventive health services;

Eighth, provide tax incentives to physicians, nurse practitioners, and physician assistants for the first 5 years of rural practice. This will provide young graduates with a strong incentive to locate in underserved rural areas;

Ninth, permit primary care physicians to expense up to $25,000 per year for the purchase of basic equipment used for primary services;

Tenth, permit groups of rural hospitals to engage in joint purchasing and contracting for personnel or services; and

Eleventh, require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to review and make recommendations regarding elimination of burdensome and unnecessary Medicare regulations affecting rural hospitals.

I urge my colleagues to express their support for the importance of retaining quality health care in our rural communities by cosponsoring this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO DOROTHY M. McLAUGHLIN AND JUDGE MARTIN P. JOYCE

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mrs. Dorothy M. McLaughlin and Judge Martin P. Joyce, who are from my 17th Congressional District, of Ohio. Mrs. McLaughlin is being honored as "Irishwoman of the Year" and Judge Joyce is being honored as "Irishman of the Year" by the Joseph T. Nalley, Sr., Division 6 of the Ancient Order of Hiberians at its annual St. Patrick's Day Luncheon.

Mrs. McLaughlin is retired from both the Mahoning County Sheriff's Office as well as the Ohio Police Reserves of Struthers. She attended Youngstown State University, Kent State University, and Lake Community College. Mrs. McLaughlin has been involved with various organizations in her community, including the Democratic Woman's Club which honored her in 1978 as "Woman of the Year" of the South Democratic Club of Mahoning County. She has also been involved with the Veterans of Foreign Wars and in 1988 was Veteran of Foreign Wars "Miss Loyalty Day." Dorothy McLaughlin and her husband Robert McLaughlin have 4 sons and 11 grandchildren.

Judge Joyce has been on the bench since 1959 when he became municipal court judge. In 1969 he was elected to the Juvenile Division of the Mahoning County Common Pleas Court, a position he held until his retirement last year. Judge Joyce attended Sacred Heart and East High Schools. A veteran, he served in the South Pacific during World War II. After his honorable discharge he attended Ohio University then earned a juris doctorate from Ohio State University Law School. Judge Joyce played a key role in the construction of the juvenile justice center which opened in 1979 and which now bears his name. He has played an instrumental role in the antidrug campaign in our community. Judge Joyce and his wife Elizabeth will be making their fourth trip to Ireland this year.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribue to Mrs. Dorothy McLaughlin, who is being honored as "Irishwoman of the Year" and Judge Martin Joyce, who is being honored as "Irishman of the Year." Both have a long and distinguished history of service to our community. They are both dedicated individuals who have greatly enhanced our community. I am honored to represent these two outstanding individuals.

A VERMONTER'S REFLECTIONS ON THE VIETNAM WAR MEMORIAL

HON. PETER SMITH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. SMITH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, a Vermont constituent of mine, Ronald G. Latour, Sr., served as a medic in Vietnam between 1967 and 1970. He recently visited the Vietnam War Memorial in Washington and sent me the following reflection. The piece is tremendously moving, and I offer it here so that all my colleagues may read it:

THE WALL

Names, names, names! Why are there so many names here?

Some are short and some are long. Some easy to pronounce and some harder. There are so many panels that one does not know where to start. I suppose you could ask one of the guides that are around the area.

The panels are numbered by year, the first in 1962 and the last in 1976. There are all kinds of names—Spanish, Irish, French, German, English. I know there are all kinds of races and religions represented here. Some were highly educated, however, most were not. Some had families and others did not. Most were young, not even in their prime of life yet. Some were middle aged and a few older. So you see that in their predicament death knew no age, nationality, color, or religion. There were one, two, maybe three or four panels marking the years I spent there.

Flowers were planted in front of every panel. An occasional sporadic line of photographs. In a few cases, decorations. I could not help but wonder who they belonged to. Did some parents or wives bring them along so their loved ones could have the decorations with them, or, was it some of the guys who made it home ok but were angry, disappointed, and confused about this whole thing of ours. I like to think of it as a quiet protest against all the wasted lives here.

I saw many, many people walking around. I had the impression that they were just curious as they didn't stop at any particular panel. I saw others with pencils or pens with paper covering a name and they were trying to get the name transcribe onto the paper from the panel. I gather they were either friends or relatives visiting their son, husband, daughter or brother, a loved one. There were many other guys there, some in wheelchairs or on crutches that would be a

part of them for the rest of their lives. Some that had a arm or leg missing. I really envied them because they had found a way to cope with their losses. They had adjusted themselves and most were living full lives. The ones I felt sorry for were the ones who were there for the same reason I was, all whole, as I was, finally, after eighteen years, mourning for the buddy's they did not have time to mourn for back there. I guess I had it easier that most because being a medic I had learned to harden my feelings. For some reason I had a unique ability to be able to put all the dead and wounded in the back of my head. I think most medics had this ability.

As a medic the first thing I learned was not to get too friendly with the other soldiers. You didn't know if they were going to be here tomorrow or not. The only other real friends a medic had were other medics. Only I found out they were not invincible either. That was what had brought me to Washington, to see if I could find my buddy's name on a panel.

As I walked around I found names I recognized. These were guys that were in the same unit I was. Some I tried to take care of and others I just knew of them. I made a game of it at first. I'd walk around and when I found a name I recognized, would try to think of something good about them. But all I accomplished was to see their faces before they were hit and then after they were hit, which didn't set too well with me. I finally found the panels with the year 1968. As I sat there in front of the panels reading the many names, I finally found my buddy's name. I just kept looking at it as if I didn't believe that it was there. I went so far as to blink my eyes and hope it was gone. I sat there for hours thinking about all the good times we had in the short eight months that we knew each other. There were a lot of good memories, but then the ugly memories started to flow through my brain. I finally got up and started to walk away when a guy in a wheelchair looked at me and I guess, recognized my thousand meter stare. What he said to me was better than any ticker tape parade, or any medal that a general could ever pin on me. He said "Welcome Home." I mean, here's this guy in a wheelchair, one leg missing, his face looking like it went through a meat grinder and he's telling me welcome home. I really didn't know what to say, so I didn't say anything. I grabbed the guy and hugged him. It was the first time in eighteen years that I allowed any emotions about anything that happened over there.

I know that deep down all of us who were there know it was all for nothing, we just don't want to admit that. But I know it was. The only consolation that anybody has is that these brave men did their duty to the end.

RECOGNITION OF EASTLAKE NORTH HIGH SCHOOL

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the excellent initiative being taken in a high school from my district. Upon my visit to North High School in Eastlake, OH, earlier this year, I learned of a survey program that has been started in the school. The North High School administration has designed a set of surveys to assess the current school situation. The surveys were distributed to faculty and staff members, students, and their parents in order to gather the comprehensive data needed to honestly evaluate the school.

During this time in our education system's history when many see only the negative publicity and problems with our schools, it is truly refreshing to hear about a school that cares about the ideas of its community and is truly making an effort to improve itself.

I stand before you today to praise the efforts of North High School and to express my hope that their program is a sign of a positive future for American education.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

HON. LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday we celebrated International Women's Day.

International Women's Day was first proposed by Clara Zetkin, a representative of the Socialist Women's Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark in 1910. The proposal came at the beginning of a period of great political and social transition in the world. In North America the movement for women's suffrage questioned some of our basic assumptions of human relations.

Clara Zetkin and our own U.S. Congresswomen Jeanette Rankin called to women around the world to join forces on behalf of peace, equal rights and social progress.

I have been very pleased, during the past few years, to have been involved in several of our key international efforts focusing on assessing and promoting the role of women. As a United States delegate to the 1985 Conference on the U.N. Decade for Women in Nairobi, Kenya, I participated in the adoption by consensus of a major document entitled, "Forward Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women to the Year 2000." This document was intended to serve as a set of guidelines for governments, international organizations and nongovernment organizations for action to reduce if not eliminate obstacles to women's participation in all sectors of society.

Similarly, the Inter-parliamentary Union has emerged as an important vehicle for followup assessment and energy generation on matters of concern to women internationally. I became involved initially with the organization in 1948 when I accompanied my husband, Hale to an IPU meeting in Rome and was pleased when it established a women's committee.

Since becoming a Member of Congress, I have also served as a delegate from the Congress to the IPU. U.S. participation has offered Members an opportunity to meet and exchange views with their counterparts in other countries on a broad range of common issues. As we recognize that women constitute one-half of the population of our individual societies and the implications of this for public policy, the meetings of the women parliamentarians that began in 1985, are a useful forum to exchange views with other women members of many parliaments on various subjects of mutual interest.

These efforts have resulted in significant progress over the past several years in increasing international consciousness of women and of issues of particular importance to women. With the scope and speed of recent economic and social changes in our society, changes in the workplace, in family structures, these are essential steps for appreciating the existing and potential contributions of women within their own societies and around the world.

Most appropriately on International Women's Day, I was privileged with a visit from members of the Soviet Women's Committee and of the American Women for International Understanding. The Soviet delegates, Galina Galkins, vice president, SWC, Tatjana Bermant, a renowned sculptor, and Galina Negrustuyeva, an SWC staff member enjoy the legacy of their organization founded 50 years ago to foster understanding and peace among nations. The exchanges of suggestions for successful promotion of women's interests among societies will serve all of us well as we explore new avenues of relationships in a rapidly changing world.

AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE HONORS WALLY BARLOW

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, 1990, the Alumni Varsity Club at my alma mater, American International College, will pay tribute to Wally Barlow, one of the college's most precious resources. I want to join in this salute to a true sportsman.

As a trainer, coach, and friend, Wally Barlow has touched the lives of hundreds of student-athletes who have attended American International College. In the process, he has earned the trust and admiration of athletes, coaches, and sports writers across the wide spectrum of amateur and professional sports.

Wally Barlow has led a rich, varied, and exciting life. Born in Great Britain, he developed an early interest in soccer, gymnastics, and physical therapy. An accomplished athlete, he represented his country as a welterweight wrestler in the 1936 Olympic games in Berlin. In the war years and after, Wally answered Great Britain's call to arms, serving as a commando in Germany, France, Belgium, and Holland. After his discharge, he journeyed to Toronto, Canada, where his enthusiasm for sports found an outlet in hockey.

Hockey was the motivation for Wally's move to Springfield, MA. The city boasted an American Hockey League franchise owned and operated by "Mr. Hockey," the legendary Eddie Shore, and Wally enjoyed a 13-year association with the league. After he left the AHL, Wally found a new home at American International College, where he has given truly outstanding service for more than two decades.

Wally Barlow has become one of American International College's most valuable players. This diminutive, gentleman from Great Britain is recognized as the college's ambassador of fair play, good will, and true sportsmanship.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the entire American International College community in saluting Wally Barlow for the many contributions he has made in furtherance of the college's role as a source of learning. They have enriched the life of not only the college, but the entire Springfield area as well.

CARING FOR OUR NEWBORNS

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the true hallmark of a nation's wealth is how it cares for those who are unable to care for themselves. Unfortunately, our country lags in providing that care. That's why America's children—our most fragile and vulnerable resource—are dying every day.

According to the National Center for Health Statistics, the United States ranks 20th—practically the worst—of other industrialized nations of the world. In fact, for every 1,000 children born in our country, 10 are dying.

The United States is facing several disturbing facts surrounding this issue:

According to the President's national drug control strategy, an estimated 100,000 cocaine babies are born each year.

The National Association of Perinatal Addiction Research and Education reports that each year, 375,000 infants are born drug affected.

Black infants are twice as likely to die before their first birthday than white infants.

While the national picture is grim, the Sunbelt story is even worse. Of the 17 Sunbelt States, 11 States have infant mortality rates surpassing the already critical national average. A child born in the South is less likely to see his or her first birthday than a child born in other regions of the United States.

Low birthweight infants, those who are born weighing about 5 pounds, are at the greatest risk. My home State of Texas has an infant mortality rate of 9.1 percent for 1987 which translates into 2,744 infant deaths.

Many of those infants that do survive are likely to suffer from chronic lung problems, sensory illnesses and cerebral palsy. We must continue to make earnest efforts to save these infants. But we should extend our efforts further to ensure that they are born healthy.

The real tragedy of infant mortality is that as many as half of these deaths are preventable. Prenatal care is the key to a healthy birth. According to the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality, it can cost up to $400,000 in health care over the life of a low birthweight infant. Prenatal care, costing as little as $500, can significantly reduce the risks involved for newborn children.

This crisis has not gone unnoticed. Twenty members of the Congressional Sunbelt Caucus, which I chair, have formed an infant mortality task force to develop a strategy to combat this plague. This task force is making the health and well-being of mothers and children a priority. Last month the task force met with Health and Human Services Secretary Louis Sullivan to seek his help in solving this crisis.

Secretary Sullivan, a native of Georgia, understands well the cost of this tragedy. During this meeting, task force members asked Secretary Sullivan that projects and programs be targeted to the Sunbelt region where they are needed most.

As Secretary Sullivan pointed out, we know that this problem is solvable. Pregnant women must have access to health care. The Sunbelt Caucus and its Task Force on Infant Mortality are committed to reducing our regional and national infant mortality rate.

MEDICARE REIMBURSEMENT FOR REHABILITATION HOSPITALS

HON. LARRY E. CRAIG

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I joined my colleagues, Representative NANCY JOHNSON and Representative JIM MOODY, as an original cosponsor of legislation to assist rehabilitation facilities and long-term hospitals in meeting the cost of caring for Medicare patients.

In my own district, the First District of Idaho, the Idaho Elks Rehabilitation Hospital has been struggling over the past few years in order to keep its doors open for the growing number of patients that need rehabilitative or long-term care. The Idaho Elks Rehabilitation Hospital is a freestanding rehabilitation hospital, the only one in Idaho. The Elks have raised considerable private funds to support the work of this institution in helping disabled people. Over the past 4 years, all contributed money and a substantial portion of their endowment has gone to underwrite the hospital's losses due to the inadequate reimbursement rates from Medicare.

The Elks Hospital is reimbursed on a base year of 1983. As we are all aware, the rise in the cost of health care has been astronomical over the past few years. Not only are many of these rehabilitation hospitals working on insufficient funds, but they are also serving more patients as acute-care hospital stays are shortened, due to Medicare cost-saving measures.

Mr. Speaker, this bill offers rehabilitation facilities the opportunity to update their TEFRA cost base year to 1988. This will provide them with a reimbursement rate that better reflects today's health care costs. This legislation is very important if rehabilitation facilities like the Elks Hospital in Idaho are to continue providing essential services to communities across the United States.

TRIBUTE TO ALBERT LOUIS PATTERSON, JR.

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the service of Albert Louis Patterson, Jr., who on Sunday, March 18, 1990, will celebrate his 20th anniversary as pastor of Mount Corinth Missionary Baptist Church in Houston, TX. This is a joyous occasion not only for the Pastor Patterson, but it is equally blessed for the 1,500-strong members who have benefited from his guidance and leadership.

Pastor Patterson has labored in the Word of God with dedication and perseverance and his presentation of the Word has always been with joy, enthusiasm, and conviction tendered with love for the Lord and his congregation.

His accomplishments are many and varied. During his administration, the Soul Winners Action Team was organized and has now helped revolutionize Corinth and much of the Houston community. Among his many accomplishments, its members have visited 60,015 homes, honored 83,694 prayer requests, and visited 1,333 sick and shut-ins. Also, for the last several years under Pastor Patterson's leadership, the Vacation Bible School has averaged over 1,000 registrants each year.

Pastor Patterson was also the daily lecturer of the National Baptist Sunday School and BTU Conference. He was chosen out of 50,000 preachers in the National Baptists Convention, U.S.A., Inc., to preach in the Dr. T.J. Jamison's inaugural sermon at the first national board meeting in 1983. From 1986 to 1988, he preached an unprecedented 3 consecutive years for the National Congress Faculty Banquet and preached an unprecedented 4 consecutive years at Hampton Minister's Conference in Hampton, VA. He also preached in 21 consecutive sessions of the national board, national congress, and national convention.

I am proud to have this honorable gentleman as a pastor for so many years in my congressional district. He has provided inspiration and hope for the many who have joined his flock and has encouraged them and many more to experience a "new level of living" with a great sense of inner satisfaction and joy. His fivefold emphasis on energetic evangelism, worth of the Word, persistence in prayer, Lordship in Christ, and sharing of substance has led many into the fold of security and a sense of self-worth and well-being.

I am honored to send my congratulations to this great man of God, Pastor Albert Louis Patterson, Jr.

ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS SUPPORT A TAX INCENTIVE FOR PRIVATE FORESTRY—MORE TREES WILL BE PLANTED WITH RESTORATION OF A CAPITAL GAINS DIFFERENTIAL

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, the debate in this House concerning proposals to change the Federal Tax Code has focused on two primary issues: Is our code fair, and does the code encourage economic growth and new jobs?

Today, I want to add one more question. Does the Tax Code encourage sound and sustained management of an increasingly important national treasure—our 350 million acres of privately owned, commercial forest lands?

Global warming, tropical deforestation, and the desire to preserve our own dwindling supply of old-growth timber—these have all lead us to reevaluate this planet's crucial need for trees. Even the President made a crash Federal program for planting 1 billion trees part of his last State of the Union Address.

But I am convinced that with equitable tax incentives, this Nation's hundreds of thousands of tree farmers can do that job very well, on their own. Tree-planting on private forest land skyrocketed with the provision of a capital gains differential for that purpose in 1944. And eliminating that differential in 1986 not only endangered this Nation's future supply of timber from those lands, it also jeopardized the future of wildlife habitat, watershed, and recreation qualities inherent in those private forests, placing a further strain on our public forests.

Mr. Speaker, concern about this trend has spread beyond the timber community. Many environmentalists and conservationists also believe that 1986 Tax Code changes will erode private forest management and, eventually, lead to conversion of those lands to other uses.

I'd like to cite for the record several letters I received last month from leading environmental organizations: The Wilderness Society, the National Audubon Society, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and the Sierra Club. As a cochairman and cofounder of the "Congressional Forestry 200 Task Force," a group representing 129 Members of Congress, I asked these organizations to tell me what they thought of two results of the 1986 Tax Act: One, the loss of the capital gains differential for long-term investments such as tree-farming, and two, the loss of deductibility of normal business expenses suffered by many individual woodlot owners through changes in passive loss rules.

Their response was unanimous. They said that these changes will reduce productive private forest acreage in this country.

Let me quote Michael A. Francis, counsel for the Wilderness Society:

We believe that this higher tax burden is reducing the level of environmentally sound, sustainable timber production from private, non-industrial forest lands. There is a significant risk that owners are forgoing reforestation and other conservation measures. The favorable tax provisions for timber that began in 1944 and lasted until 1986 have been widely credited for substantial increases in private timber production and reforestation.

And this from Brock Evans, vice president of the National Audubon Society:

It is unfortunate that the 1986 Tax Reform package removed this differential. We believe that a strong case can be made that forestry in general and reforestation in particular is such a risky business, requiring such long-term care and attention, that some kind of differential tax treatment is required. Unfortunately, since 1986, we have witnessed a resurgence of "cut and run" practices in the Pacific Northwest States.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is part of the untold story of the tax debate. Beyond the effects on businesses, individuals and Federal revenues, adjustments to our code can have critical impacts—positive or negative—on our environment. I think the impact on private forestry should be an important consideration for all of my colleagues, and I would be happy to share with them these letters from leading environmental organizations.

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL E. PECCHIO

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Daniel E. Pecchio of my 17th Congressional District of Ohio. A roast will be held for Danny on March 24, 1990, in honor of his 40 years of dedicated service to Mahoning County.

Mr. Pecchio has a long history of service both to his community and his country. In January of 1941 he volunteered for the armed services and served with the 37th Division in the Solomon campaign and helped liberate the Philippines. For his gallantry he was awarded two Bronze Stars as well as the Philippine Liberation Medal. He was honorably discharged in 1945.

Daniel Pecchio has been employed by Mahoning County since 1947 when he was made deputy dog warden. Besides his work as Mahoning County dog warden, Danny has been involved with numerous church, civic, and political organizations. He is a member of St. Christine's Church, he served on the youth committee for the United Veterans Council, and he is a past president of the 37th Division, Youngstown Chapter. He has also served as past president of both the North Eastern Ohio County Dog Wardens Association as well as the Ohio County Dog Wardens Association.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend Daniel Pecchio on his many years of outstanding service. Danny is a brave and caring individual who has made significant contributions to our country and community. I am proud and honored to represent this extraordinary man.

IN MEMORY OF DAWN AND KRISTEN WINFIELD

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, death under any circumstance causes great sorrow. But when someone dies while in the spring of life, it is even more tragic. Two young women in my district have recently been taken from our midst by a disease called globoid leukodystrophy, which occurs when an enzyme deficiency attacks the central nervous system. Dawn and Kristen Winfield were 18-year-old, identical twins and best friends. They should have been normal high school seniors growing into mature adults, having a good time, going to the beach and to the movies. Instead they were losing a battle against a painful and debilitating blood disease.

The twins needed bone morrow transplants in order to survive. They themselves opted for this risk surgery because they had watched the disease cripple, blind and eventually kill their older brother. The fate of the twins became of paramount concern for many of the residents in south Florida. Fundraising efforts raised close to $400,000 for the twins' transplants. Meanwhile the search for a compatible donor was tedious, expensive, and gruelling. Finally, beating a 15,000 to 1 odds, a donor was found. The feeling of hope that enveloped the entire south Florida community was astounding and heartwarming.

On September 25, Kristen, the older twin, went to the University of Minnesota Hospital in Minneapolis, MN, and had her transplant operation. Sixteen days later, Dawn underwent her operation. However, on November 18, Kristen died quietly in her sleep when her body rejected the healthy marrow. Dawn, close to 2 months later, on January 16, died from similar complications.

Although we cannot bring the Winfield twins back, an important lesson should be learned from their tragic deaths. Every day in the United States, 25 people will die because they cannot obtain a marrow transplant. What few people realize, however, is that registering in a marrow donor bank is as simple as donating a pint of blood.

Public awareness regarding marrow transplantation and donor motivation must be increased. First, we need to recruit and test donors. Second, we need to raise the funds necessary to pay testing costs. My colleague, Representative VIC FAZIO, will be introducing legislation of which I will be an original cosponsor, which will seek to authorize $15 million for the National Donor Marrow Program for the purpose of testing potential bone marrow donors.

I commend the efforts of the caring and hard working people in my district who made it possible to raise the money needed for the twins' operations. Led by Yolanda Keating of Hollywood, a family friend and the Winfield fund-raising organizer, the community united to help. Friends such as Jeff Nelson of Pembroke Pines organized a boat row to Bimini; Ron Rothstein, coach of "Miami Heat" partici-

pated in many fund-raising efforts as did past and present members of the "Miami Dolphins"; Principal Larry Insel and the students at the Winfield Twins' school, Hollywood Hills High School, raised money; and Rose Lizana of Dania, where the twins grew up, also spearheaded fund-raising efforts. There were so many helpful hands in our community and I wish to applaud the efforts of all of the people who worked so hard for the twins. These caring people and the twins themselves made all Floridians proud.

I urge my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the memory of the courageous Winfield Twins by supporting the proposed legislation. I extend my deepest sympathy to the Winfield family and to their friends. South Florida fought alongside them and south Florida mourns them.

SHOWING THE FLAG: BOLD UNITED STATES ENVOY CAPTIVATES GREEKS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call to your attention the following article which appeared in the international edition of the Miami Herald on January 4, 1990, about our Ambassador to Greece, Mr. Michael Sotirhos. Since assuming his post in September, he has caught the eyes of many and has won the approval, respect and wonder of the Greek public. Ambassador Sotirhos has done much to improve what have been tense relations between Greece and the United States. Often mingling with a crowd, his open, enthusiastic and down to Earth style and charisma have helped create a better image and acceptance of Americans and the United States. He also practices and encourages better communication and openness among diplomatic leaders. Proudly showing the American flag nearly everywhere he does, he is the first Greek-American to serve as Ambassador to Greece.

SHOWING THE FLAG: BOLD U.S. ENVOY CAPTIVATES GREEKS

(By Paul Anastasi)

ATHENS, GREECE.—Reversing America's low-profile diplomacy in Greece, he insists upon braving the threat of terrorism by displaying the American flag wherever he goes.

He does not hesitate to step into the crowd to cheer at basketball games, and he jokingly reassures Greeks that he, like most of them, is an islander—from the island of Manhattan.

After 15 years of strained relations between the United States and Greece, both members of NATO, easing tensions between the two nations well may have a lot to do with the unorthodox tactics of a Greek-American New Yorker: Michael Sotirhos, the American ambassador to Greece.

Sotirhos, 61, arrived in Greece in September and, much to the dismay of the traditionally hostile Greek press, has plunged into a public relations campaign that his predecessors never would have attempted. In several cases, he has left his Greek audience crying for more.

Greece first got a hint of the ambassador's new approach when he turned up at the funeral of Pavlos Bacoyannis, the chief spokesman in Parliament of the conservative New Democracy Party who was killed by terrorists in September.

For the first time in years, the American flag flew from the ambassador's armored limousine. Mourners broke ranks and burst into applause at the sight.

Similarly, it was front-page news when the ambassador scored another first by visiting Communist Party headquarters to talk with the party leader. He next turned up at a hastily summoned town hall reception for Boris Yeltsin, the maverik Soviet legislator, while the Soviet ambassador failed to appear.

Not only has the ambassador been shaking up the political status quo with his maneuvering, but he also has managed to capture the public's attention with his style.

Recently, Sotirhos broke with protocol by strolling into the court to greet the stars of Greece's best basketball team. On another occasion, he mingled with fans at a heated soccer game. In both cases he was applauded and even embraced by fans.

As evidence of his adherence to the Greek Orthodox faith, Sotirhos attends Mass every Sunday at churches in Athens and sometimes sings along with the choir. Always, he wears an American flag pin in his lapel.

"We're going to take every necessary security precaution, but we're not going to hide," a diplomat recalls the ambassador telling staff members. "Having armored cars and bodyguards, that's security. Not flying the flag is hiding."

The ambassador's new approach differs considerably from diplomatic practices adopted since 1974, when simmering anti-Americanism and terrorist attacks compelled most Americans to maintain a low profile.

Now, Sothirhos has ordered that the American flag fly on all occassions. He has encouraged diplomatic personnel to widen the circle of leaders whom they meet to include Communists and seek contact with the general public.

At meeting with American servicemen, he urges them to emphasize rather than hide their official American status. "Go out, go to the countryside, find the mayor and introduce yourself as an American," he told personnel, according to the diplomat.

"Anti-Americanism has been declining for the past few years," another foreign diplomat said.

"But the new ambassador is accelerating the gradual decline of anti-American sentiment and taking it one step further to revive traditional pro-Americanism among Greeks."

While developments in Eastern Europe and the decline of Communist domination might be one coincidence explaining Sotirhos' warm reception, the ambassador also enjoys the advantage of being the first Greek-American in the post.

His wife, Estelle Manos, also is Greek-American, and both speak Greek fluently.

The advantage of language and the ethnic connection is evident.

One witness recounted an incident when Sotirhos, questioned by an elderly couple in the streets of a small town, informed them that his father was from the island of Kythria and his mother from the island of Milos.

"So you are a *nisiotis*, an islander, like us?"

"Yes," the ambassador replied, "I'm from Manhattan."

TUFTONIA'S WEEK

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I share with you the news that April 19, 1990, marks the beginning of the sixth annual observance of "Tuftonia's Week."

It is a special time for the more than 60,000 alumni of Tufts University, myself included, to turn our thoughts to Tufts and to get together with fellow Tuftonians, reminiscing with old friends.

In addition to a formal ceremony on campus, hosted by President Jean Mayer, local observances range from small gatherings in restaurants to champagne receptions in museums, art galleries, and private homes; from a block party to a group trolley ride to a singular ride on a jumbo elephant in India. Alumni from Medford to Melbourne, from Hartford to Hong Kong, and from San Diego to Sao Paolo come together to think Tufts, thank Tufts, and toast Tufts.

As a proud graduate of Tufts University, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Tufts on its sixth annual "Tuftonia's Week" celebration and to honor the thousands of Tufts alumni who are living and working in our districts contributing to the betterment of society.

INDIANA EARTHQUAKES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, March 14, 1990, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

INDIANA EARTHQUAKES

Many Hoosiers were startled by a series of three minor earthquakes that struck Indiana's Harrison and Crawford counties earlier this year. No damage or injuries were reported, but the quakes were strong enough to rattle dishes, windows, and doors. These events are a reminder that the Midwest is vulnerable to periodic earthquakes.

According to the U.S. Geological Survey, the eastern half of the U.S. has a low probability of having major earthquakes, but a high probability of suffering extensive damage and loss when they do occur. Some of the most powerful earthquakes in U.S. history have occurred in the Midwest and along the East Coast.

Causes: Earthquakes are triggered by natural disturbances deep beneath the earth's surface. The earth's crust is made up of twelve separate plates, which represent the continents and the ocean floors. These plates normally float unhinderd on top of the molten rock surrounding the earth's core. Earthquakes result when a plate's natural movement is altered. If two plates lock together, a fault line is created and pressure will then build until the plates uncouple and produce an earthquake. Last fall's

major California quake, for instance, occurred because of slippage along the San Andreas Fault, which marks where the Pacific Plate and the North American Plate meet.

While West Coast quakes tend to occur because of friction between colliding plates, Midwestern earthquakes occur at fault lines located within a single plate. These fault lines may represent weak points in the plate, where pressure is released as bordering plates press against the North American Plate.

Midwestern earthquakes differ from West Coast quakes in other respects as well. Midwestern earthquakes are more difficult to predict. Measurement of pressure buildups along West Coast fault lines helps scientists to predict the location and severity (but not the timing) of a potential earthquake. In the Midwest, the fault lines are much deeper, and measuring and predicting their activity is more difficult. Midwestern quakes also occur less often. Earthquake pressures build up 100-1000 times faster in California than in the Midwest. In addition, soil and bedrock conditions in the Midwest strengthen earthquake tremors, causing them to travel farther and take longer to subside. Experts believe a Midwest earthquake could affect an area up to 80 times larger than a similar quake in California.

Indiana Quakes: Several dozen earthquakes have originated in Indiana. In general, these quakes have been concentrated along river valleys. The southwestern corner of Indiana is at the greatest risk of earthquake activity. The most powerful of the recent Indiana quakes hit 3.8 on the Richter scale. By contrast, last October's northern California earthquake hit magnitude 6.9. (Each one point increase in the Richter scale means that about 30 times more energy has been released.) Most of the Indiana-centered earthquakes have caused little damage.

Historically, Indiana has suffered more damage from earthquakes originating outside of the state. An earthquake centered in New Madrid, Missouri 180 years ago produced the greatest intensity felt in Indiana. It exceeded 8 on the Richter scale, and devastated the Evansville area.

Three areas of concentrated seismic activity are located in the Midwest. The New Madrid Seismic Zone, stretching from Evansville to northern Arkansas, poses the greatest risk of earthquake activity in the eastern United States. It has produced major quakes felt as far away as Canada. The Geological Survey projects a 40-63% chance of a magnitude 6 earthquake striking the New Madrid Zone by the year 2000. The Wabash Valley Zone contains active faults in both eastern Illinois and western Indiana. Experts believe the Wabash Valley may be susceptible to a moderate earthquake every twenty years. A 1987 earthquake of magnitude 5.2 did not cause extensive damage. The Anna, Ohio Zone is less volatile than the others. Since 1876, 23 tremors have occurred near Anna, located in the west central part of the state; three of the quakes have been around magnitude 6.

Earthquake Preparation: The federal government sponsors the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, a nationwide effort to measure and predict earthquake activity, promote awareness of earthquake risks, inform the public of how to minimize damage, and develop emergency response plans before earthquakes strike. Funding for the federal research and preparation programs in 1990 will be $20 million. A bill moving through the Congress would expand this program, particularly for the New Madrid Zone, and mandate a review of building codes and construction guidelines.

At the state level, Indiana and other Midwestern states sponsor several research centers to improve measurement of potential earthquake activity. Starting this year, Indiana's building code requires that new structures be earthquake-resistant. (This code does not apply to roads and bridges, farm buildings, and one- and two-family dwellings.) Certain essential facilities, including hospitals, fire and police departments, and schools, are subject to more stringent standards. Some experts have also suggested mandatory retrofitting of older structures, especially unreenforced masonry.

Hoosiers can take a number of steps to protect their homes against earthquake tremors. Experts recommend strapping down water heaters, keeping buildings in good repair, storing heavy objects on the floor or lower shelves, and fastening bookshelves and cabinets to the wall. Earthquakes occur without warning, and the shaking lasts no more than 20-60 seconds. Because most injuries are caused by falling debris, the recommendation is, if indoors, to stay there temporarily and turn away from glass, cabinets, and fireplaces; and if outdoors, to get into an open area away from buildings, power lines, and trees. Buildings should not be reoccupied soon after a quake, because of possible strong aftershocks. For additional information about Indiana earthquake threats and preparation efforts, Hoosiers can contact the State Emergency Management Agency, Department of Civil Defense, 100 N. Senate Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46204. The phone number is (317) 232-3830.

NATIONAL PASTIME PRESERVATION ACT

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the owners and players of the major league baseball teams should settle their differences expeditiously, begin spring training, and start the regular baseball season as soon as possible.

At present, there appears no end in sight to the major league baseball lockout. As our national pastime, baseball enjoys preferential Federal antitrust treatment. Thus, major league owners and players have an obligation to their fans and communities to reach an agreement and get the season underway. How many times, and for long, must fans sit idlely by while the owners and players violate a sanctity of summer.

The outlook isn't brilliant for the Mudville nine today; despite the best intentions, there'll be no ball to play; a pallor's wreathed the features of the patrons of the game, for Casey and his owner are too busy pointing blame. Oh, somehwere in this favored land the Sun is shining bright, baseball's playing somewhere and somewhere hearts are light. And somewhere folks are laughing, and somewhere children shout, but there is no joy in Mudville—mighty Casey is locked out!

The text of the resolution follows:

H. RES. —

Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the owners and players of the major league baseball teams should settle their differences expeditiously, begin spring training, and start the regular baseball season as soon as possible

Whereas the spring training lockout in major league baseball has continued for several weeks;

Whereas cities with major league baseball franchises and spring training facilities face serious economic losses as a result of the inability of owners and players of major league baseball teams to resolve differences and begin the season in a timely manner;

Whereas major league baseball enjoys a unique and privileged treatment under Federal law;

Whereas people in the United States have a strong and abiding interest in seeing spring training and the regular season of the national pastime;

Whereas, while representing the interests of owners and players of the major league baseball teams, the negotiators in the baseball dispute also have an obligation to basefall fans; and

Whereas fans, through enthusiasm, attendance, and willingness to pay to view baseball games, provide significant benefits to owners, players, and host communities; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives the owners and players of the major league baseball teams should settle their differences expeditiously, begin spring training, and start the regular baseball season as soon as possible.

HAYWARD, CA, CELEBRATES EARTH DAY, 1990

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the city of Hayward on its Earth Day and Recycling Week celebrations. The city has set April 22 as Earth Day and April 16-21 for Recycling Week.

Cooperative efforts are being organized to promote environmental awareness. Programs are already organized for the Hayward area recreation district at Sulphur Creek and Hayward Shoreline. Discussions have begun with the Chamber of Commerce, Hayward Unified School District, Chabot College, California State University Hayward, and Scout groups. The city of Hayward hopes all these cooperative efforts will promote environmental awareness.

The Chamber of Commerce and city of Hayward will sponsor awards to recognize environmentally sensitive local projects in such categories as energy conservation, recycling and solid waste management, water conservation, traffic mitigation, air quality, toxic waste, and land use.

The city of Hayward's promotion of Earth Day includes displays in conjunction with other activities, media coverage of the daily theme topics of Recycling Week, handouts, recom-

mendations for sister city efforts, tours of the treatment plant, and green ribbons for publicity. Daily theme topics will tie into city programs and will be as follows:

Monday, April 16: Energy efficiency;

Tuesday, April 17: Recycling and solid waste management;

Wednesday, April 18: Water—ground water, waste water, conservation programs;

Thursday, April 19: Transportation management;

Friday, April 20—Toxic waste management—industrial and household;

Saturday, April 21: Land use.

The city of Hayward plans to introduce the following environmental bill of rights resolution:

ENVIRONMENTAL BILL OF RIGHTS

Whereas in the past 19 years since Earth Day 1970 (when most Americans learned the meaning of the term "environment") the health of the environment has continued to decline; and

Whereas at the current rate of consumption, 80% of all the oil that will ever be burned will have been used during the lifetimes of people who are now alive; and

Whereas we are more then ever a throwaway society, discarding about 5 pounds of garbage per person per day; and

Whereas we are adding millions of tons of hazardous wastes to the environment every year with 2.4 billion pounds of toxics pumped into the air in 1988 alone, and

Whereas most scientists now agree that, because of the increasing proportion of carbon dioxide and other gases in the atmosphere, significant global warming will occur which may have serious consequences to many forms of life—a problem which will become even more severe with continued growth; and

Whereas the emission of CFCs into the atmosphere has led to a dangerous 40 percent drop in the Antarctic ozone level, creating increased radiation and seriously impacting all forms of life including human beings; and

Whereas toxic air emissions are reducing the pH levels of lakes around the nation, resulting in the destruction of many aquatic species; and

Whereas because of all these problems are a result of inefficiency and waste, the solutions to the problems will promote economic efficiency and economic growth; and

Whereas there are many opportunities open to local government to address these critical problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the following Declaration of Environmental Rights and Responsibilities is hereby adopted in recognition of Earth Day, 1990, along with a statement of commitment by local governments to implement programs designed to protect these environmental rights and meet these responsibilities:

ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS

All human beings have the right to clean and healthful air, to clean and healthful water, to the maintenance of productive soils, and to an organization of human activities with respect to the environment, that prevents extinction of forms of life, the degradation of the living and non-living resources of the earth, and the sustainability of the use of the earth's resources, so that ample resources will exist for generations to come.

I would like to commend the city of Hayward and all those who are working to raise citizen awareness about the importance of protecting and improving our environment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS NEED FUNDS FOR CLEAN WATER

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, one of the defects in our Federal policy is our tendency to impose requirements on local governments and then fail to provide adequate financial assistance to them as they seek to discharge these obligations. One of the most glaring examples of this is the area of clean water. Cities which are strapped financially are struggling to meet the high financial burden of providing adequate treatment for sewage. Federal law quite reasonably seeks to prevent pollution of our water systems and requires adequate treatment plants. Unfortunately, the Federal budget does not do what it should to help cities meet this necessary but expensive goal. President Reagan vetoed the last clean water bill and while we were able to overturn that veto by large majorities in both Houses we had to compromise significantly to get the necessary majorities. Recently, I received communications from the mayor of Fall River, Carleton Viveiros, and also from the city council of Fall River. These are officials who are dedicated to improving the environment and who are quite reasonably asking the Federal Government to put some of our money where our legislation is. I think the requests of Mayor Viveiros, the Fall River City Council, and municipal officials all across this country are entirely reasonable. I intend to work as hard as I can to comply with their requests.

Our citizens would benefit if we spent more of their tax dollars on clean water and far fewer on preventing Poland and Hungary from invading France. I congratulate Mayor Viveiros and the Fall River City Council for speaking out so firmly on this important issue and I urge my colleagues to pay close attention to their arguments:

CITY OF FALL RIVER, MA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Fall River, MA, February 5, 1990.

President GEORGE BUSH,
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH: Before getting into my reason for writing I would like to commend you on appointing a former Fall River resident, William K. Reilly, to head the Environmental Protection Agency. We are all proud that Mr. Reilly is serving our nation in this capacity.

I am writing to respectfully request that you consider providing funds for grants to abate combined sewer overflows, which plague many of our nation's cities.

In your State of the Union address you note that your budget provides over $2 billion in new spending for the environment. Sadly, combined sewer overflow abatement has been overlooked, 1,200 communities have combined sewer overflows, commonly known as CSOs, and it's estimated it may cost as much as $100 billion to deal with the national problem. Fall River is facing a $100 million price tag, an astronomical sum for a city its size.

In a federal budget that increases funding for the environment I had hoped there would be something showing a strong commitment to addressing CSOs. At this stage of the budget process that is not the case.

CSOs are on the federal "back burner"; unfortunately, that means our nation's waterways are on the back burner as well.

I respectfully request you make CSOs a priority and join in partnership with states and municipalities in addressing this problem.

I congratulate you on the $2 billion in new environmental monies—but please don't forget the CSOs.

Sincerely,

CARLTON M. VIVEIROS,
Mayor.

CITY OF FALL RIVER—RESOLUTION

Be it resolved, That the City Council support the administration in its efforts to have citizens and environmental groups contact the President, legislators, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency requesting grant monies be included in the federal budget to help address the Combined Sewer Overflow problems in Fall River, and

Be it further resolved, That this Council also contact federal officials and request assistance in this matter.

LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE COASTWISE TRADING PRIVILEGES FOR THE HMS "BOUNTY"

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to direct that the sailing vessel HMS Bounty be entitled to engage in the coastwise trade and be issued a coastwise endorsement under 46 U.S.C. 12106. The HMS Bounty was constructed in 1960 in Nova Scotia for use by MGM in the filming of the movie Mutiny on the Bounty, starring Marlon Brando. This ship is a three-masted, fully-rigged replica of the famous British ship captained by William Bligh and taken over by mutineers led by Fletcher Christian in the 18th century.

The HMS Bounty was purchased by Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. [TBS] in 1986 when it acquired MGM Entertainment Co. The vessel has been used by TBS for public display and in the Turner Television Network remake of Treasure Island, starring Charlton Heston. The *Bounty* will be used for various visits at ports throughout the world, including Seattle, WA, for the Goodwill Games in 1990. It will be operated by a non-profit corporation, available for various public and private events.

Until recently, the vessel was documented as a yacht under Canadian flag. Prior to its public display visits in the United States, the *Bounty* was inspected by the U.S. Coast Guard and given a certificate of inspection as an attraction vessel. However, because of the particular use contemplated by TBS, the Coast Guard has indicated that the vessel is not operating for pleasure only and, for certain

uses, may have to be licensed and inspected as a commercial passenger vessel. However, in order to be used as a commercial passenger vessel within U.S. waters, the *Bounty* must be documented under U.S. law and possess a coastwise license.

TBS has now applied for U.S. documentation for the *Bounty* and is having the vessel inspected by the Coast Guard as a passenger vessel. Because the vessel was constructed in Canada, it will take new legislation to qualify it for coastwise trade privileges. The circumstances requiring legislation are the same as those of the *African Queen,* which was given coastwise privileges in Public Law 101-92 in 1989.

The *Bounty* is a very special ship and will be used in a very unique manner by TBS. The company's desire is to comply fully with U.S. documentation and safety requirements so that the *Bounty* can be enjoyed by as many as possible. The purpose of the legislation I am introducing today is to allow the *Bounty* the ability to operate in coastwise trade under U.S. flag.

TESTIMONY OF MARTIN C. SCHWARTZBERG BEFORE THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

HON. C. THOMAS McMILLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it's been said that "the best ideas don't originate in Washington". Sometimes they come from across the river in my home State of Maryland.

Such is the case with the novel new housing policy being promoted by a friend of mine and fellow Marylander, Martin C. Schwartzberg. Mr. Schwartzberg is a very successful real estate investor, who recently left the business world behind to establish the National Foundation for Affordable House Solutions—an organization committed to the preservation and expansion of affordable housing in this Nation.

Mr. Schwartzberg recently testified before the House Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs in which he advanced the concept of a public-private partnership to ensure that the current stock of low- and moderate-income government-assisted housing be preserved for its intended use instead of being sold off for condominums once the current moratorium on the sale of those properties is lifted.

Preserving that stock of affordable housing is a very real concern, Mr. Speaker. Market forces, combined with tax-law changes over the last several years, have placed many initial low- and moderate-income housing investors into a situation where they would like to unload these properties or convert them into new, for-profit uses. The losers, of course, would be the millions of Americans who desperately need this housing and cannot afford to live elsewhere.

As my colleagues are well aware, students have shown that the current supply of affordable rental housing is insufficient to meet the existing demand. However, what those same studies also show is that unless the current supply of affordable rental housing is preserved for its intended use, and even more units are constructed in the future, the demand for this essential national resource will far outstrip the number of units available for use.

Mr. Schwartzberg founded the National Foundation for Affordable Housing Solutions to battle this problem. Its founding principles were simple and straightforward: Develop and implement creative new strategies for the preservation and new development of affordable rental housing units; do it without massive new expenditures of public money and create a true public-private partnership to work out these solutions.

Martin Schwartzberg's testimony, outlining a new preservation strategy for affordable, government-assisted housing, was delivered recently before the House Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. It won high praise from the committee's distinguished chairman, Representative HENRY GONZALES and the ranking minority member Representative ROUKEMA. Both sides, it seems, were impressed with Mr. Schwartzberg's unique approach to the preservation issue and his willingness to work with Congress to adopt long-term solutions to our housing problems.

That is, indeed, a difficult audience to please, Mr. Speaker, and for that reason I thought my colleagues in the House would like to review Mr. Schwartzberg's testimony, and his new preservation proposal, for themselves.

I insert Mr. Schwartzberg's testimony before the House Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development in the RECORD following my remarks:

PRESERVATION OF EXISTING ASSISTED HOUSING STOCK—"PRACTICAL APPROACHES"

(Testimony by Martin C. Schwartzberg, Chair, National Foundation for Affordable Housing Solutions)

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, thank you for giving me the opportunity to add my voice to this important national debate on housing policy, in particular, on the issue of the preservation of existing subsidized units. My name is Martin Schwartzberg. I am founder and Chair of the recently created National Foundation for Affordable Housing Solutions, an organization committed to working with the Congress and the Administration to ensure the preservation and expansion of affordable housing for people who need it most.

I have come here specifically to offer what I believe is a message of hope and a challenge to you and your colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee to come together and take advantage of an extraordinary opportunity to effect a win-win strategy which will: Preserve existing assisted rental housing; respect individual property rights; and minimize new net costs to the Federal Government.

For the past twenty years I have been intimately involved in low- and moderate-income housing, in my work at HUD on the staff of Secretary George Romney and in my private capacity as a financier, developer and manager of tens of thousands of units. Over the last 20 years we—policymakers and practitioners—have seen programs that were enormously successful in their time, cease to work well.

Twenty years ago, housing programs were created which provided safe and decent housing at affordable rents for 10 million Americans. Today, we see tenants in jeopardy of losing apartments, investors who are no longer interested in continuing their role in low-income housing, and the existing stock of affordable housing at risk of being lost. Today we face a new reality. The old formulas no longer work; we need some new solutions.

From my past experience as a financial intermediary between developers, investors and government, I believe that there is a solution to the preservation question that will both protect low-income households and allow other interested parties to realize some benefit. I also believe that there is an unusual window of opportunity that lies before us now. Not only do we have the tools and the resources to find a solution to preserve our current affordable housing stock, but the concerns of the various parties involved have heightened to the point where they are willing to come to the table and talk.

To that end, I created the National Foundation for Affordable Housing Solutions to develop the test creative and practical solutions to preserve and then create additional decent and secure housing for the poor. Clearly, one of the first issues the Foundation is examining is the issue of preservation.

Our goal is not simply to convene forums and produce white papers. We aim to produce actual "solutions", models for change. Then, using data from low- and moderate-income properties around the country, in different locations, under different assistance programs and properties in a variety of different physical conditions, we will experiment with these models. We ultimately hope to encourage private sector companies to work with communities, developers, investors and tenants to carry out these "solutions".

We bring with us a keen awareness that the models we develop and propose must work within the framework of existing programs and resources. We don't need to reinvent the wheel. Nor are there additional dollars to spend. Rather, we place a premium on simplicity, on using existing systems, and on efficiency. And we believe that now is the time to work toward a comprehensive solution to the preservation problem taking into account *all* programs involving federal assistance, both new and old. This solution should not address solely those projects under ELIHPA; a piecemeal year-by-year approach will no longer suffice.

I want to enlist your support in our effort. I do not come to you today with a solution fully in hand, but I bring some proposed plans of action. My primary goal in appearing before you is to enter into a dialogue with you and your staff as you examine and refine the alternatives on the preservation issue. Today, I will outline the parameters of our approach to model building; in the upcoming weeks I will be glad to furnish the specifics of our various proposals and share the results as we test these models with national data.

KEY PARAMETERS

In developing preservation strategies, there are some basic common sense criteria we believe should govern any solution. We have identified *four* key parameters within which effective solutions can be developed. Reality dictates that they must be within these confines:

(1) *New forms of public-private partnerships.*—A fundamental premise to our work is the belief that the task before us—preserving the current stock of affordable housing for *long-term* low- and moderate-income use—is one that can only be accomplished if both the public and the private sector are willing to be seriously involved. Budgetary restraints dictate that government cannot assume this responsibility alone. It must enter into a joint venture with the private sector.

With respect to ownership of the affordable housing stock, for instance, we believe that the existing stock should be owned by a local entity. This entity could be a state or municipal body, its designee, or a for-profit or non-profit entity, as long as it would maintain the property for low-income occupancy. To assure that the stock be well served the private sector must be heavily involved in its renovation, redesign and management. True competition can promote efficiency and accountability.

If the existing properties are owned exclusively by private owners and left to purely market-driven considerations, these properties would likely be sold or refinanced since investment in many of these entities is no longer beneficial from a tax standpoint for its investors. To compound that effect, real estate appreciation becomes a driving force which virtually guarantees transferring the use of these properties into uses other than continued low-income occupancy.

For these reasons, we recommend that current private owners be encouraged to sell their affordable housing units to entities committed to preserving low-income use. Preliminary calculations show that in this transfer there exists adequate equity, reserves and cash to (1) finance the acquisition and renovation, if necessary, (2) create adequate reserves, and (3) still provide dollars for distribution to owners and investors.

With respect to the administration of this program, we recommend that, while overall authority in the context of ELIHPA continue to be with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the local administration of these transfers be delegated to qualified State Housing Finance Authorities. They are presently administering the Low Income Tax Credit and have demonstrated excellent underwriting on Section 8 projects. These agencies are equipped to handle and adequately underwrite these transfers and have the business acumen, authority and moral commitment to assure long-term low income occupancy.

(2) *Determining a fair value.*—In order to transfer the existing housing stock from private owners to local, publicly-oriented entities, a fair value for sale must be agreed upon. "Fair" is some magical value that provides a reasonable return to private investors and developers while taking into account the public interest inherent in a property. This is an extremely difficult concept on which to gain general agreement because what is "fair" to one party is not necessarily considered "fair" by another. A "reasonable return" should not mean a windfall profit. On the other hand, owner/investors do expect to get some sort of reasonable market-like return.

The on-going dialogue on what fair value would compensate owners for the purchase of their properties has been heightened by the recent moratorium on prepayment. All parties are coming to understand the importance of preserving the current stock of low income housing. I believe that there is a realistic recognition by investors and owners that even if they prevail in the courts (on their right to sell their properties in the open market), they will still face many local obstacles to converting the use of these properties from low-income occupancy. In addition, the current situation is so onerous to investors as a result of some of the 1986 changes in the tax law that investors are more ready than ever to come quickly to a determination of fair value.

Part of our thinking process, which needs input from you, involves the creation of a mechanism for establishing the value of a project—let's call this a "preservation value"—which caps the sale price at less than the free, fair market value. The "preservation value" must compensate owners fairly, while making the debt service manageable to the local entity which buys the property. Preliminary calculations lead us to believe that some form of relief from tax on the non-cash portion of the gain is necessary in order for investors to receive a reasonable return. That calculation should take into consideration the parameters established when the investors made their original investment. I believe that if this tax forgiveness is made available, the prepayment limitations contained in ELIPHA would not be necessary because many owners would take advantage of this tax proposal and voluntarily transfer their properties to entities willing to meet the low-income requirements.

Considering that the production of these millions of affordable housing units were produced with a combination of housing and tax policy, it is reasonable to expect that as we induce private owners to sell their properties into perpetual affordable housing use, that we again use some combination of housing and tax policy. In other words, let's leave the dance with the same partner we arrived with.

Lastly, while investors may sell their properties with the inducement of tax relief upon the transfer of the properties to entities that will meet low-income use restrictions, the developers will need different incentives. For the past eight years (since production of new units fell off), developers have been on the front line of operating affordable housing properties and have built organizations to manage this process in the absence of government production programs. We recommend that these developers be permitted to continue as the management company as long as they meet reasonable standards of performance, subject to a competitive review after a period of years.

(3) *Minimizing new subsidies/unlocking existing resources.*—We firmly believe that, whatever solutions are adopted, existing subsidies must continue, but that we should impose as little additional financial burden on federal, state and local governments as possible. While we firmly believe that housing should have a greater priority of resources in our national agenda, it is not realistic at this time to expect massive new federal expenditures in housing programs. However, we believe that this approach can succeed with minimal additional expenditures.

The less obvious, but equally important, benefit of transferring ownership and creating a permanent preservation solution lies in the potential recapture of some portion of an estimated $2 billion in reserves which have accumulated in current project accounts. The bulk of these reserves lie in the Section 8 portfolio and came about through the creation of project mortgage reserves and limits on distribution to owners.

Many would agree that the reserve balances today are far in excess of what is necessary to insure the safe continuation of the projects. In the context of the transfer, the reserves should be returned to their rightful owners. Where there are Section 8 reserve balances, these reserves would go to the federal government, and where the reserves have been established out of original project mortgage proceeds, the rightful owner would be the owner investor.

(4) *Priorities for use of capital.*—Upon transfer of ownership and the refinancing (or additional financing over and above the existing mortgage) cash resources will become available. In the variety of projects we have examined under various federal assistance programs, cash proceeds exceed mortgage debt. This difference is the amount available to meet project needs and/or distribution to owners. This cash flow difference results from a combination of factors: capitalized project cash flow in excess of expenses, mortgage amortization, and in some instances lower refinancing rates.

We recommend that this resource of cash be applied in the following priority: (a) project improvement (repair and/or rehab); (b) establishment of reasonable project replacement and working capital reserves; and last, (c) distribution to investors and owners.

In properties where significant capital infusion is required to bring them up to appropriate standards of quality, there may be no distribution. We believe, however, this will be acceptable to owners and investors given income tax relief. On the other hand, in properties which had been well-maintained and have established adequate reserves and which have remaining cash flow, such cash flow should be gladly distributed to owners/investors in appreciation of a job well done.

CONCLUSION

In summary, let me reiterate that I believe that there is a solution within our reach. Let me be frank, however, when I say that I believe that coming to an agreement about this solution will require some "horse-trading" in a true spirit of cooperation. No one will be able to leave with a whole loaf. Each part to the negotiation will have to give in a little. But if each is able to give up a little, the overall package can be very beneficial to all. While the interests of tenants, owners/investors, managers, and public entities may seem to conflict at times, the National Foundation for Affordable Housing Solutions is interested in strategies which capitalize upon overlapping interests, minimize differences, and develop broad based coalitions which can support truly effective long-term reform. We ask that you consider the framework we have set before you today and, more importantly, that you work with us in the near future to perfect that win-win implementation strategy.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 4, 1989]

LOW-COST HOUSING SOLUTION IS SCHWARTZBERG'S MISSION

(By Margaret K. Webb)

Martin Schwartzberg wants to teach people in business that they can do well and do good at the same time.

Schwartzberg, the president and co-founder of CRI Inc. in Rockville, an international real estate financial services and asset management company, is leaving the firm to devote his time to national housing problems.

Schwartzberg, 47, is launching a nonprofit foundation—the National Foundation for Affordable Housing Solutions—to "get the private sector back into low-income housing."

Schwartzberg said poor government and private ownership and management of properties designed for low-income tenants is a major social problem. "The government can lead, but it's hard for the government to own and manage," he said. "It just gets too bureaucratic."

Schwartzberg has a three-part plan for improving the situation that includes revamping low-income facilities, many of which are privately owned, with a combination of private and public money. He also wants the government to finance the construction of more low-cost housing, and the foundation to help find competent property managers. There are 2 million units of low-cost housing in this country and an immediate need for 3 million more, he said.

His overall goal behind the individual strategies is getting the private sector involved in low-income housing as managers, not owners.

Tax credits that were abolished in 1986 had lured many private developers into low-income housing. Now private owners work with low-cost housing almost exclusively for the real estate appreciation, he said, often placing little emphasis on quality. In many cases, he said, there is no management at all.

Low-income housing would work better socially and financially, Schwartzberg said, if the projects were "publicly owned, but privately managed by firms that could be hired and fired if they don't do a good job. . . . They would do well financially and do good socially."

Federal support is essential to his plan, he said, but Schwartzberg argues that in the long run, effective management will hold down costs.

Schwartzberg is following his own strict schedule to establish his foundation, beginning with choosing its board members by the end of January. All of them, he said, will be "knowledgeable and well-respected business leaders who are interested in the cause." He plans an aggressive educational campaign and immediate work on finding new owners and managers for properties.

Schwartzberg's own interest in the issue is longstanding: He began his career in 1968 at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, where he worked for three years on housing for families with incomes of $5,000 or less.

When he and two partners formed CRI in 1974, their original intention was to work only with low- and moderate-income housing projects.

"But the government programs for low-income housing began to fade so we had to look elsewhere," Schwartzberg said.

In the late 1970s CRI began diversifying into hotels, international real estate finance and multifamily housing.

"I was less than enthusiastic," he said. "It just wasn't something that I was interested in."

Schwartzberg has $300,000 in start-up capital for the foundation, part of which he saved and part of which was donated by CRI and the other two CRI co-founders.

He will remain on CRI's board, but otherwise is "making a clean break" from the corporate world—which does not worry him.

"I have made a substantial amount of money . . . and it just doesn't run me on anymore," he said.

"You've got to do things that make you feel good."

CONCERNS ABOUT RECOVERY OF BLUE WHALES

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I along with 15 of my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee, are introducing a resolution today calling for an extension of 10 years on the moratorium on the commercial killing of whales.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, which has jurisdiction over global environmental issues, I have conducted extensive hearings on whales and other marine mammal matters. The most recent was in September 1989. Evidence from a wide variety of sources indicates that many species of whale populations continue to decline. A recent survey found only 453 blue whales in an area where 10 times that many were expected. The survey turned up 4,047 humpbacks, when 10,000 were anticipated. I am making available a copy of a New York Times article providing additional details, as well as a copy of the resolution.

In 1982 the International Whaling Commission adopted a moratorium on commercial whaling because catch limits were insufficient to stop the decline in whale populations. The moratorium took effect in 1986 and continues until this year. The IWC also agreed to make a comprehensive assessment of whale stocks to be completed by 1990. At the last IWC meeting in June 1989, it was clear that the comprehensive assessment will not be completed this year. The moratorium will be a major issue at the IWC meeting in 1990, because a few nations continue to kill whales, despite IWC objections. The IWC allowed nations to continue to take whales for scientific purposes, but no country's research plans have been approved. Past and present administrations have strongly endorsed the moratorium and it is official U.S. policy.

In addition to the moratorium extension, the resolution calls for U.S. policy to promote the maximum conservation of whales, to strengthen the IWC, and to use diplomatic channels and appropriate domestic and international law toward these ends.

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1989]

NEW SURVEY RAISES CONCERNS ABOUT RECOVERY OF BLUE WHALE

(By William K. Stevens)

The majestic blue whale, the biggest animal ever to live on earth, appears far closer to extinction than scientists have believed, new findings by the International Whaling Commission show.

The findings are considered devastating because they suggest that the number of blue whales is "just a fraction of what anybody thought was there," said Roger Payne, a biologist who is a member of the commission's scientific committee and a senior scientist of the World Wildlife Fund.

In a decade-long survey off Antarctica, scientists found only 453 blue whales in an area where they had expected to find perhaps 10 times that many. And while the new figures are preliminary, they provoked both surprise and concern at the whaling commission's annual meeting in San Diego last week.

The findings were included in a report by the commission's scientific committee, whose studies are used by the full commission in setting policy on the protection and management of whale populations. In 1986 the commission declared a moratorium on the killing of whales, except for purposes of scientific research. All 38 countries that are members of the whaling commission observe the moratorium, although there have been bitter disputes over whether some scientific killing is legitimate. Some major species considered especially endangered, including the blues, have been protected from hunting for two decades or more.

SOME SERIOUS PROBLEMS

Under this protection, some species seem to be recovering from the brink of extinction. But despite the respite in killing, scientists and environmentalists fear that the blue whale and to a less certain extent the fin whale are not recovering as well as had been hoped.

"If these data are indeed accurate, then we've got some serious problems,"said William E. Evans, a marine biologist who is the United States representative on the whaling commission. The preliminary figures, he said, indicate that stocks of blue and fin whales "are not as resilient as we had hoped they would be."

Past ways of estimating whale populations have lately been called into question, and the new results from the Southern Hemisphere have intensified the criticism. In the past, populations were estimated mostly by keeping track of how many whales were killed each year. This method is now criticized as being so imprecise as to be misleading. More recently, the commission has instead been comducting surveys in which specially commissioned ships cruise the seas and scientists actually count whales.

Using this approach, scientists from a number of nations have been surveying the waters off Antarctica in every Southern Hemisphere summer since 1978–79, systematically covering the area south of 60 degrees latitude. In the summer whales migrate to those latitudes to feed.

DECLINE FROM 225,000

Using the older method of counting the killed wales, experts had estimated that 11,000 to 14,000 blue whales existed in the world, compared with some 225,000 before commercial hunting began. Roughly half the survivors were thought to be in the Southern Hemisphere. Whales generally stay within one hemisphere or the other, migrating between the tropics and the poles.

But the results presented at San Diego found only 453 blue whales, the largest of which are 100 feet long and weigh more than 30 elephants, in the area surveyed. Sci-

entists believe the area south of 60 degrees contains all or nearly all the blues in the Southern Hemisphere during the summer.

The Antarctic cruises also found 2,096 fin whales in the survey area, but not all of the species migrate to the Antarctic in the summer. Earlier estimates placed their global population at about 100,000. The survey turned up 4,047 humpback whales, whose total population has been estimated at 10,000; 1,498 sei whales, whose numbers globally have been estimated at 54,000; and 3,059 sperm whales. The population of sperm whales has been estimated at nearly 2 million, but some scientists believe it is not that high.

Specialists on the whaling commission said the Antarctic count of sperm whales meant little, since only large adult males of the species, a small fraction of the total population, migrate into Antarctic waters. More of the humpback and sei whales migrate there, but large number of them stay in warmer waters, too. Further study will be needed to assess the meaning of the figures on these species, the specialists say.

But for the blues, the results appear unequivocally discouraging to some scientists. The figure of 453 blues must be adjusted, they say, to account for the fact that only two-thirds of the ocean waters south of 60 degrees south latitude were surveyed. Further, they say, some whales were undoubtedly missed because some dive for long periods.

Even so, said one specialist on the commission, the true number is unlikely to be more than about 1,200 to 1,500, and could well be less.

The list of cospoonsors and a copy of the reoslution follows:

H. CON. RES. 287

Mr. Gejdenson, Mr. Porter Goss, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Wayne Owens, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Toby Roth, Mr. Faleomavaega, Mr. DeWine, Mr. Kostmayer, Mr. Lawrence Smith, Mr. Dante Fascell, Mr. Lee Hamilton, Mr. Studds, Mr. Mel Levine, Mr. Fuster.

H. CON. RES. 287

Concurrent resolution calling for a United States policy of promoting the continuation, for a minimum of an additional 10 years, of the International Whaling Commission's moratorium on the commerical killing of whales, and otherwise expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to conserving and protecting the world's whale populations

Whereas whales are a unique marine resource of great esthetic and scientific interest and are a vital part of the marine ecosystem;

Whereas the indefinite moratorium on commerical whale killing adopted by the International Whaling Commission in 1982 to take effect in 1986 is subject to review and reconsideration in 1990;

Whereas this moratorium has not yet resulted in a full cessation of whale killing for commerce,

Whereas there remain great uncertainties as to the true status of whale populations, due to the difficulty of studying them, their slow reproductive rate, and the unpredictability of their recovery even when fully protected;

Whereas whales are subject to grave environmental treats from nonhunting causes such as pollution, loss of habitat, increased shipping, oil and gas exploration, and the use of driftnets and other nonselective fishing techniques, which underscore the need for special safeguards for whale survival;

Whereas the International Whaling Commission has not yet demonstrated its capability for strict and truly international monitoring and enforcement, and for insistence on humane killing methods;

Whereas powerful moral and ethical questions have been raised regarding the killing of whales, for profit; and

Whereas a full decade free of whale killing for commercial purposes is the bare minimum necessary to seek satisfactory answers to the questions, concerns, and uncertainties cited above: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) United States policy should promote the maximum conservation and protection of the world's whale populations;

(2) toward that goal, the United States should work to postpone further review of the International Whaling Commission moratorium on the commercial killing of whales and maintain zero catch limits for all whale stocks for at least another decade, that is, to the year 2000 or beyond;

(3) in addition, the United States should work to strengthen the International Whaling Commission as the indispensable organization for safeguarding for future generations the great natural resources represented by the whale stocks, and should encourage the Commission to establish and carry out long-term programs of nonlethal research and comprehensive assessment for all whale stocks on a global basis, including small cetaceans; and

(4) in so promoting the conservation and protection of the world's whale populations, the United States should make the fullest use of diplomatic channels, appropriate domestic and international law, and all other available means.

TRIBUTE TO PVT. ROBERT JOHN REYNOLDS

HON. CLYDE C. HOLLOWAY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute today to a distinguished young American and resident of the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana serving his country, his State, his parish, and his hometown as a member of the Old Guard of the U.S. Army. The individual to whom I pay tribute today is Pvt. Robert John Reynolds of Plaquemine, LA.

Mr. Speaker, Private Reynolds' service in the Old Guard has certainly brought distinction upon himself. By continuing the great and glorified tradition of service in the Old Guard, Private Reynolds has also made his family, his friends and his Congressman exceptionally proud.

Each year, the Old Guard, a unit of the U.S. Army Military District of Washington, participates in more than 3,500 ceremonies. The Old Guard is responsible for the execution of joint military ceremonies at the White House. Moreover, soldiers of the Old Guard maintain a 24-hour vigil at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, participate in military funeral rights at Arlington National Ceremony and take part in numerous parades and other functions.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to salute Pvt. Robert John Reynolds. It is fitting that he is a member of the Old Guard. He is a committed soldier, he is a devoted American, he takes pride in his service to America and her Army. His contributions to the Old Guard are a credit to all who know him.

A TRIBUTE TO THE OLD WEST

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, the American West and the cowboy are among our most cherished and enduring traditions. In a legend enhanced and polished by the motion pictures, the cowboy and the code of the "Old West" in a way stands for America. The cowboy worked hard and was a good guy. He rode tall in the saddle. He was indomitable, courageous, upright, loyal and—to the chagrin of young boys—romantic.

This year, the Walk of Western Stars in Newhall, CA, part of the new city of Santa Clarita, CA, will enshrine four outstanding representatives of the Old West. The 1990 honorees are Cliffie Stone, Bruce Boxleitner, Lee Horsley and Morgan Woodward. On March 24, these four stars will join other great Western stars who have been honored with bronzed saddles and stars on San Fernando Road.

The inductees have earned their honors. Stone was a TV and radio star, a talented musician, singer, songwriter, band leader, disk jockey and emcee. He starred in "Hometown Jamboree," Gene Autry's Melody Ranch, produced for Capitol Records and now directs the Gene Autry Music Group. Boxleitner is a top Hollywood leading man, having starred in a variety of productions including "Scarecrow and Mrs. King," "How the West Was Won, "East of Eden" and "The Gambler." Horsley starred in such series as "Paradise" and "Matt Houston," and the firm "The Sword and the Sorcerer." Woodward starred in "The Great Locomotive Chase," "The Wyatt Earp Show," "Cool Hand Luke," "Buffalo Soldiers"—for which he earned a Cowboy Hall of Fame Award—and "Gunsmoke." More recently, he has appeared on "Dallas" and "Days of Our Lives."

These heroes of the not-so-wild West are loved by millions for the joy and laughter they have given us, and for the values they represent—honor, virtue and strength.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues join me in saluting the Walk of Western Stars in Newhall, and its 1990 inductees.

THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, these past couple of days have demonstrated once again that you can never say never. Even as recently as the beginning of the 101st Congress I

was a member of the chorus saying that the Germanys would not reunite any time soon, the Berlin Wall was not about to fall, Mr. Mandela would never again live outside a prison cell, and there would not be free and fair elections in Nicaragua. As the months passed events that we thought would never happen in our lifetimes occurred quickly and relatively peacefully. With no end in sight to the triumphs of freedom there appears to be no more chorus of nay sayers, just a world community anticipating the next triumphs.

The most recent lesson learned by the chorus was taught, appropriately, by a professor of music, now the new leader of the Republic of Lithuania. The brave individuals of Lithuania voted Sunday to formally secede from the Soviet Union. Their Parliament unanimously approved a proclamation which stated, "Expressing the will of the people, the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic declares and solemnly proclaims the restoration of the exercises of sovereign powers of the Lithuanian State, which were annulled by an alien power in 1940." It took courage to make this decisive break from the huge military and economic power that has controlled Lithuania for 50 years. But it will take even greater courage and sacrifice to successfully join the world community of free nations. For independence as a matter of political reality is much different than independence as a matter of economic and social viability. If Lithuania is to be truly independent and free, then it will need the cooperation of other nations, especially the Soviet Union, Western Europe, and the United States.

The most common fear faced by the leaders of the newly freed Republic of Lithuania is a wave of economic reprisals from the Soviet Union that could produce fuel shortages and unemployment, threatening the State with chaos. But the leaders stand resolute that a shortage of these material necessities is more tolerable than a shortage of freedom, basic rights, and human dignity. President Gorbachev should be commended on his willingness to negotiate the terms of secession. He has never threatened directly or indirectly that the Soviet Union would use force to halt the move toward independence. He has however demanded that Lithuania pay a heavy price in hard currency if it wishes to secede. This position is both inappropriate and unfortunate. The Lithuanian economy of today could never afford to pay the price Mr. Gorbachev is asking, any attempt to do so would surely ruin their attempts at independence. Mr. Gorbachev may only be demanding such a high price to alleviate some of the pressures he is feeling within his own Government. But whatever the reason, the current economy of Lithuania is not yet strong enough to support independence. This, of course, is not the fault of the Lithuanian people but the result of inefficient policies forced upon them by their invaders of a half century ago. Cooperation and support of both Western Europe and the United States can certainly help strengthen Lithuania's economic base, however, their comparative advantage lies in trade with the East, not the West. I therefore hope that Mr. Gorbachev, who certainly has demonstrated himself as a visionary up to this point, realizes that the Soviet Union and Lithuania will both be better off if they cooperate and support each other.

I must add however that I am concerned our administration is not moving quickly or forcefully enough to support the independence movement of Lithuania. The world watches the United States to see how we, the champions of freedom, react to events around the world. And what they are seeing now is a President hesitant to stand with the Republic of Lithuania and demand economic fairness in negotiations. President Bush says that no real action is needed on our part since we have never recognized the Soviet Union claim to Lithuania. But I, many of my colleagues, and most of the world recognized the unanimous vote this past Sunday as a remarkable and historic event, one that demands special attention. This administration has developed a knee-jerk reaction to world events that favors caution, especially if Gorbachev's power base could be hurt. I, too, hope that Gorbachev remains in power to continue his policy of glasnost, but what I have learned from recent events is that the Soviet President is not primarily responsible for the remarkable movements toward freedom. The oppressed people of the world are tired of their current state and are finally beginning to change it. Hope, freedom, and individual liberties are the driving forces behind the democratization of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. And if the United States is going to have a knee-jerk reaction to world events, we should do so on the side of independence and freedom.

We must urge the Soviet Union to deal fairly with Lithuania. Their promise not to use force is to be expected not congratulated. Lithuania has already indicated their desire to establish, "permanent, good, political, and economic relations with the U.S.S.R." I hope Mr. Gorbachev is willing to do the same. The promise not to use force is not nearly enough. Yegor Ligachev, a Soviet official, said that "tanks will not help this matter," but that is not quite true, the economy of Lithuania will need tanks—tanks of oil, and tanks of food. If Lithuania is to be permitted to build its own fortress of freedom then issuing a building permit is not enough, the Soviet Union must give back the tools they illegally took a half a century ago.

As I said earlier Mr. Speaker I have witnessed some things I never thought I would see. Mr. Ceausescu and Mr. Noreiga are no longer in power and Mr. Tyson is no longer the heavyweight champ. Buster Douglas put Iron Mike down for the count because of his persistence left jab. The people of Lithuania have also been persistent, and now, at the count of 50, 50 years they are back on their feet. In their rise, freedom has found a victor. The true achievement of independence for Lithuania will be a gradual process. But the restoration of independence must not be dictated by Soviet interests but by the ability of Lituania to stand economically on its own feet. The administration must work to ensure that they are helped up. Quitely cheerleading from the sidelines of world events is not enough. To resign ourselves to such a position would belittle our past efforts and ignore the past sacrifices of millions of freedom-yearning individuals east of the Iron Curtain. What is required of this body and this administration is a change from demanding freedom to supporting freedom.

OAK CREEK CELEBRATES CONSTITUTION'S 200TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the city of Oak Creek, WI, for its outstanding achievement in celebrating the 200th anniversary of the U.S. Constitution.

Oak Creek was one of only a few municipalities in the State of Wisconsin to be recognized as a bicentennial community, and it certainly is deserving of this title. The entire community, including elected officials, businesspeople, service organizations, schools, churches, and townspeople, joined together to celebrate the anniversary of the document described as the greatest leap forward for freedom in human history.

The city of Oak Creek kicked off its celebration with an observance of Constitution Day on September 19, 1987. One of the highlights of the opening ceremony was the presentation of two bicentennial flags to the city by the Oak Creek Lions Club and its president, Mr. Erwin Semski. Also, on that day, any resident who visited the Oak Creek Library had the chance to sign a copy of the Constitution which remained on display for the rest of the year.

In May 1988, members of the Bicentennial Committee, with help from local senior citizens and Oak Creek High School students, presented the community production of "The Constitution: Little Short of a Miracle," directed by Ms. Kathy Kaianowicz.

On July 14, 1988, a Bicentennial Recognition Dinner was held to thank the many people and organizations that contributed their time, talents, and enthusiasm during the first year of the celebration. Among those recognized were Oak Creek Mayor Christine Bastian, Bicentennial Committee Chairman Ed Garbe, Program Chairman Gerald Mayhew, and Tammy Schmidt, a junior at Oak Creek High School who received several awards for her school and community involvement and for her essay on the Constitution. Ms. Schmidt was one of 35 winners nationwide in the essay contest, and she was selected as the Oak Creek Bicentennial Queen.

In October 1988, there was a Constitutional Bicentennial Booth at the Oak Creek Ninth Annual Business and Industry Fair. The booth was staffed by "signers of the Constitution," local townspeople dressed in costumes from the 1770's.

One of the crowning events of the celebration was the September 17, 1989, presentation to the city of five plaques commemorating the bicentennial, including replicas of the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. The person most responsible for getting the plaques for the city was Mr. Gerald Mayhew, program chairman of the Bicentennial Committee. Mr. Mayhew first heard about the plaques 2 years earlier at a bicen-

tennial workshop. With his hard work and the generous help of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Meyer Dziedzic Post 8482, and the ladies auxiliary, especially their senior vice president, Ms. Trudy Theoharris, Oak Creek became the first city in the Nation to purchase and display the plaques.

The city of Oak Creek, its elected officials, and its citizens are to be commended for their patriotism and pride in their city, State, and Nation. The Constitution of the United States is the framework for the freedoms we in this country sometimes take for granted. It is gratifying to see a community celebrate those freedoms and the document our Founding Fathers gave us to assure the preservation and continuation of those liberties. I am extremely proud to have this outstanding community in my congressional district.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL OF NORTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA CELEBRATES 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Economic Development Council of Northeastern Pennsylvania [EDCNP] for its 25 years of dedicated and valuable service in our region.

On this occasion of EDCNP's anniversary celebration, I am pleased to inform my colleagues of the integral role this nonprofit group has played in our region's economic resurgence. On a wide range of issues—from transportation and infrastructure enhancement to solid waste management and recycling—EDCNP has helped galvanize local participation and input in the critical issues facing our region and our State.

Through workshops, seminars, and public meetings, EDCNP continues to reach out to local industries, serving both as a source for information and an advisor on new business endeavors. Serving several counties in this corner of the Commonwealth, EDCNP has helped hundreds of companies grow and expand.

EDCNP's team of employees and extensive board of directors operate with one basic and important mission: to help our region and its corporations and communities meet the challenges and opportunities of today and tomorrow. To support this effort, the group assiduously researches available Federal, State, and local assistance.

Not long ago in 1972, Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the damage and destruction caused by Hurricane Agnes, many skeptics predicted that northeastern Pennsylvania would never fully recover. These skeptics assessed the over $1 billion in damages that resulted from the third largest natural disaster in the history of our Nation. They viewed the loss as unsurmountable.

I am pleased to affirm, however, that not only have we proved the skeptics wrong, but we continue to surpass even the most ambitious predictions offered by the optimists. Indeed, with the help of our determined local residents, businesses, and groups like EDCNP, our region is enjoying an economic renaissance.

As we proceed further with this economic revitalization, this same partnership of citizens, industries, EDCNP and others will be working to preserve the high quality of life we presently enjoy in northeastern Pennsylvania.

In fact, if assisting in the economic resurgence of our region is the hallmark of EDCNP's first 25 years, we hope controlled further growth with an emphasis on environmental protection will characterize the group's next 25.

Again, congratulations to EDCNP on its anniversary and I look forward to continuing to work with this determined group on behalf of northeastern Pennsylvania.

DEAF AWARENESS WEEK

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as a congressional trustee of Gallaudet University, I want to take a moment during Deaf Awareness Week to pause and draw attention to deaf Americ a. As a matter of fact this week is a very significant and historic day for American deaf culture and Gallaudet University. For 2 years ago yesterday Gallaudet University selected Dr. I. King Jordan as their eighth president in the 124-year history of the University and more importantly, as the first deaf president of this liberal arts institution for the deaf.

As many may remember, in early March 1988, Gallaudet served as the back drop for a major social protest by the deaf community, their families, and friends. Demanding a deaf president, the silent protests on Florida Avenue and later the Capitol steps dominated the nightly newscasts. At their simplest, the deaf president now rallies, stilled a busy city and gave millions of Americans, perhaps, many for the first time, a glimpse of the aspirations of some 27 million of our hearing impaired brothers and sisters. At their most profound, the events of the ideas of March transformed a people and witnessed their coming of age.

The appointment of Dr. King Jordan as president of Gallaudet was much more than just the naming of an executive officer, although I am happy to report to my colleagues that he has proven to be a resourceful and innovative manager. Dr. Jordan has become an international symbol of achievement. Perhaps you saw him chronicled on 60 Minutes this past Sunday. As he did in that segment, King Jordan continually trumpets the limitless potential of deaf Americans and indeed, Dr. Jordan's ascendency to the Gallaudet presidency has proven that.

But the deaf movement and deaf culture is larger than I. King Jordan and Gallaudet University; it extends far beyond the Beltway and encompasses 10 percent of our constituents. However, unlike the leaders in any new wave of representation, they are less versed in accessing the hearing world and making their needs known. Why is this so? I do not think this is because the majority of deaf and hearing-impaired Americans are less tenacious in their endeavors or untiring in their efforts. Perhaps it has been because they were willing to accept the limits we in the hearing world had assigned them.

It was only in the 100th Congress, for example, that both bodies passed the Telecommunications Accessibility Enhancement Act to provide telecommunications access to the Federal Government. Unfortunately, however, much remains to be done within our own House. Since H.R. 4992 was passed, 70 percent of the Senator's offices have installed a TDD at no cost to their office. In the House, however, only 1.3 percent of Member's offices have purchased and installed a TDD.

Therefore, because I believe the House needs to do its part to encourage direct communication between Members and their constituents, I am introducing a resolution to instruct the Clerk of the House to purchase a TDD for each Member's office. Moreover, the Joint Special Services Offices has volunteered its services to educate our staff on how to use the TDD. Although there are limited ways in which your deaf, hearing and speech impaired constituents can contact you, I believe direct access to us and our staffs is in the best interest of us all; for a representative democracy is predicated upon communication.

We must continue to build on the increased awareness of, and interest in deaf people. We must insist that the enhanced attitudes toward deafness and deaf people become even more positive. We know this, and we can do this only by demonstrating that, given the opportunity, deaf people can do anything but hear.—Dr. I. King Jordan

I know my colleagues realize deaf people can do anything and I would urge them, especially as we pause to commemorate the accomplishments of deaf and hearing impaired Americans, to join me in supporting this legislation and provide an opportunity.

SALUTE TO SHERIFF LLOYD B. JOHNSON

HON. CLYDE C. HOLLOWAY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I salute today Lloyd B. Johnson, sheriff of St. John the Baptist Parish, LA, for developing an innovative drug free incentive program which involves middle school and high school students, parents, and business establishments. The program, known as PASSED—Parish Area Students Systematically Eliminating Drugs—is an example of what every parish and every county can do to create a positive peer pressure program to fight the war on drugs.

Any student may join the program. The only requirement is that a student be drug free, have parental consent and voluntarily pass a drug test. Once a student has successfully completed the test, he or she receives a special card indicating the student is drug free. Area businesses participate in the program by

offering special discounts to those students who possess a drug free card.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Sheriff Johnson, participating young people, families, and the business community of St. John Parish for making this program work. Everyone knows that victory in the war on drugs will not be achieved quickly, easily or cheaply. However, programs like PASSED ensure that the war on drugs will eventually be won. Many people talk about drugs and the threat they pose to our society, our kids and our future. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that the people of St. John the Baptist Parish, because of the initiative demonstrated by Sheriff Lloyd Johnson, aren't just talking about the need to be drug free. Together, they are taking action.

TRIBUTE TO TWO HEROES

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two heroes, Theodore Hansen and Daine Vannett, who risked their lives to save a 4-year-old boy. Tragically, Mr. Hansen gave his life so that the boy could live, but his sacrifice and Mr. Vannett's valor will be remembered on March 22 by the U.S. Coast Guard and the Thousand Oaks, CA, Rotary Club.

Emerson once wrote that "heroism feels and never reasons." That describes how Mr. Hansen and Mr. Vannett reacted on June 17, 1987. Mr. Hansen, his wife, Barbara, and a group of children were fishing from the rocks at Mugu State Park when one of the children, Justin Black, was caught in a riptide and quickly taken out some 100 yards from shore.

As Mrs. Hansen ran to seek help, Mr. Hansen plunged into the chill waters of the Pacific and swam out to the boy. Mr. Vannett heard Mrs. Hansen's calls for help and also entered the water. He found the boy clinging to Mr. Hansen's shirt, rescued him and headed back for shore. A lifeguard from a nearby beach helped them to safety, while other lifeguards searched for Mr. Hansen and soon found him, face down in the water. Despite performing mouth-to-mouth resuscitation in the water, and administering CPR, his life could not be saved.

Mr. Speaker, the word "hero" is used too frequently. Sometimes, a vote for commonsense here in the House of Representatives is labeled heroic by Members and the press. But it's people like Theodore Hansen and Daine Vannett who truly deserve those accolades. And as their brave and selfless action is honored next week, I know our thoughts will be there as well.

HONORING THE UTILITY WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA LOCAL 1-2 AFL-CIO

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the finest and most successful union locals in the New York City area, the Utility Workers Union of America, Local 1-2 AFL-CIO. On March 23 this organization will celebrate its 50th anniversary with a dinner dance at the Sheraton Center in Midtown Manhattan.

UWUA Local 1-2 has long been recognized as a force in the Utility Workers Union and in the labor movement as a whole. It has the largest local in the Utility Workers Union, with a membership totaling 13,000 to 14,000, encompassing the whole of New York City and Westchester County.

The UWUA Local 1-2 has a distinguished history within the labor movement. It was originally affiliated with the Brotherhood of Consolidated Edison Employees, which on April 5, 1940 won National Labor Relations Board representation. The Utility Workers Organizing Committee was established within the Committee for Industrial Organization in February 1938, taking over organizing utilities workers from the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America. At the same time the six original BCEE locals representing BCEE members employed by Consolidated Edison merged to form local 1-2. On August 1, 1945, the Utility Workers Organizing Committee became the Utility Workers Union of America and BCEE Local 1-2 was chartered the same day as UWUA Local 1-2. Ten years later, the American Federation of Labor merged with the new Congress of Industrial Organizations to form the AFL-CIO, placing craft and industrial unions on equal footing. Soon after this date, on August 1, 1955, the UWUA Local 1-2 received its AFL-CIO charter to become the UWUA Local 1-2 AFL-CIO.

In recent times, local 1-2 has had to overcome great tragedy. Last December, one of its members was killed and a number of others injured in a gas explosion at a powerplant in Hellgate, the Bronx. As a result of this tragedy, the local 1-2 has engaged in negotiations for better safety and work conditions, better life insurance and debt benefits for its members. It is also currently involved in negotiations with Consolidated Edison and the New York Power Authority to ensure that its members will not be shortchanged when the Power Authority renews the company's contract. One person who has been especially active in these negotiations is Mr. Eugene Briody, the local's business manager, who has served in this position for 1½ years and as president for 2 years prior to that.

Members of local 1-2 have been very active in their community. At various times they have supported the Boy Scouts, local charities and summer camps. Members have also worked with local little leagues, often volunteering to help with lighting of games; the electricity supplied by Consolidated Edison, of course.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when conventional wisdom declares that union fortunes are in decline, it gives me great pleasure to acknowledge a union local whose vitality and strength are sufficient evidence that conventional wisdom can occasionally be proven wrong. In its day to day negotiations with management, UWUA Local 1-2 AFL-CIO has not shrunk from its responsibility to win for working men and women a decent day's pay for a decent day's work. And so I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Utility Workers of America, Local 1-2 AFL-CIO on its golden jubilee, and to wish it as much success in its second 50 years as in its first.

A VETERAN'S SEARCH FOR WORLD WAR II ARMY COLLEAGUES

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I was contacted by one of my constituents Mr. Manuel Baker of Louisville, KY. Mr. Baker has been searching, unsuccessfully, for several men who served with him in the Army in World War II. He has listed these veterans and their Army serial numbers—and last known location, when possible—which I would like to submit in the event that one of my colleagues recognizes any of the names and could help to reunite my constituent with some of his friends. I hope my colleagues will feel free to call my Washington office if they turn up any information on these veterans.

These names submitted to me by Mr. Baker are listed below:

Abbate, Generosa G., 32183623—NJ.
Billings, Manford C., 39259408—OK.
Davila, Maximillian, 32177297—NY.
Evans, George W., 33311512.
Goodpasture, Wilber, 39132006.
Kokoszka, Edward L., 31052315.
Mahoney, Edward R., 36078201.
Ollinger, Benjamin, 32182969—NY.
Randall, John W., 36743424.
Rosen, Sidney, 31035973—MA.
Struble, Charles E., 37247190.
Thomas, Wm. H., 32214861—NY.
Wallach, Ruel, 6259924—OK.
Alderman, Hiram B., 34240273—FL.
Futterman, Alvin M., 32183821—NY.
Pisano, Vincent J., 12056172.
Syracuse, Angelo, 32672098.

TRIBUTE TO THE LOS ANGELES BENCH AND BAR AFFILIATES, INC.

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the Los Angeles Bench and Bar Affiliates, Inc., for its many years of dedicated service to the predominantly African-American communities of the Greater Los Angeles area. Known formerly as the Wives of the Bench and Bar, the Los

Angeles Bench and Bar Affiliates, Inc., was founded in 1955 by Justice Vaino Spencer and several civic-minded judges' and lawyers' wives.

The organization, whose current membership is comprised of 70 spouses of judges and lawyers in the Los Angeles area, is committed to working in the community through worthwhile programs, and presently participates in and lends financial support to more than 18 community service projects.

The group has implemented numerous programs to acquaint community residents—especially young people—with the various aspects and activities of the legal profession. Since 1977, the group has sponsored tours of the Compton Courthouse for elementary and secondary school students from public and private schools in the Compton, Carson, Inglewood, Lynwood, and Los Angeles areas, with Bench and Bar Affiliates serving as docents.

Each year, the Los Angeles Bench and Bar Affiliates, Inc., observes National Law Day by hosting several schools at various Los Angeles area courthouses where students meet individuals representing every phase of the court system. Students are afforded a unique opportunity to discuss the duties, salary, training and necessary experience associated with various law-related jobs.

Moreover, since 1962, the Los Angeles Bench and Bar Affiliates, Inc., has presented approximately 200 scholarships to deserving local law students. Recipients receive scholarship money through their final year of law school and are then awarded funds to cover bar review course fees.

In addition to its focused activities in the legal area, the Los Angeles and Bar Affiliates, Inc., has contributed generously to a number of other worthy causes, including the United Negro College Fund, the National Association for Sickle Cell Disease, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, Inc., the Southern Area Foster Care Effort, the Young Black Scholars Program, local chapters of the YMCA and the Museum of African-American Art. And, in December, Affiliates assist the Los Angeles County Foster Parents Association by hosting the Dream Tree project located in the Fox Hills Mall. In addition, members give gifts to foster children to help make their Christmas dreams come true.

By exposing elementary and secondary students to the judicial system and to role models in the legal profession, and by providing assistance to aspiring lawyers and gifts to disadvantaged children, Los Angeles Bench and Bar Affiliates have enriched minds, broadened horizons and translated worthwhile dreams into promising realities. Through its 35 years of service, the organization has established a fruitful liaison between the Los Angeles area legal profession and the local African-American community from which hundreds in my district have benefited substantially.

Please join me in congratulating the Los Angeles Bench and Bar Affiliates, Inc., on its extensive community service involvement and generous contributions toward the education and enrichment of Los Angeles area African-American students, and in offering the organization and its membership best wishes for longevity and much continued growth and success.

TOM REED: PIONEER AND COMMUNITY SERVANT

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, seldom do I have the opportunity to talk about a person who, because of his success and his contribution to the community, I admire most highly. I speak in praise of Mr. Tom Reed, the founder, producer, and host of the Los Angeles-based "For Members Only" talk show. Mr. Reed, once known as the "Master Blaster" when he was a prominent figure on FM radio, has forged a place in history because of his efforts to inform the public on issues that are important to African-Americans and the Nation.

Tom's work in the study of black music, his ability to be an enduring figure on top-rated radio shows as diskjockey, and the abovementioned "For Members Only" as, among other things, host, are testaments to his dedication to educating the public to the contributions other African-Americans have made to the music industry, and the community, of which we are all a part.

His work on radio and television has not been a singular act of self-promotion, but served as a means to open doors for other African-Americans. As a role model for success, truth, and respect for all people, it is fitting that the Nation should know about Tom Reed, friend and committed community servant.

OMAR V. GIMENEZ: ALL THE BEST AND SUCCESS

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, by mid-March, Mr. Omar V. Gimenez will have completed his congressional fellowship in my office under the auspices of the Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities [LASPAU].

Mr. Gimenez is a mechanical engineering student at the Universidad Tecnologica Nacional of General Pacheco, Buenos Aires, Argentina. His fellowship stemmed out of my concern for infrastructural development in Latin America and the Caribbean.

It has been indeed a pleasure having Mr. Gimenez as a fellow for these 2 months. His dedication and diligence in search of additional knowledge related to science and technology were especially rewarding to him. He will be returning to his studies at the university in April. I only wish that more time was available for this aspiring future engineer to participate in this program, but I know that the knowledge he had already acquired will supplement and broaden his understanding of his chosen field.

Mr. Speaker, this student has had the chance to observe the legislative process of our democratic system of Government. I am certain, that by allowing international students sponsored by LASPAU, such as Mr. Gimenez, the opportunity to see Congress, first hand, we ensure that the experience they gain of our democratic institutions will prepare them once they become leaders in their own countries.

Mr. Gimenez, I hope this has been a valuable experience for you and one that will assist you in your future endeavors. On that note, the staff and I wish you all the best and success.

SECOND BAPTIST CHURCH OF MATAWAN, NJ, CELEBRATES ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I rise to inform you and my colleagues that the Second Baptist Church, which is located in Matawan, NJ, is celebrating its 100th anniversary.

Under the able leadership of its pastor, Rev. Joseph E. Butts, and the celebration chairperson, Alice E. Elmore, the church will be having special programs on the second Sunday of each month throughout 1990 to commemorate its long and outstanding history.

Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of this House recognizes the important contribution which our religious institutions make to the fabric of American life. We often commend one group or another on their accomplishments, on the service which they provide to our communities and on the many contributions they make.

Clearly, the Second Baptist Church is deserving of such praise. I know that you will join with me in wishing the congregation many more years of faith and service, as they begin their second century of worship in Matawan.

LAJOS KOSSUTH: HUNGARY'S FIRST FREEDOM FIGHTER

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, in this day of falling iron curtains and rising democracies, I take the opportunity to recognize one of Hungary's original freedom fighters, Mr. Lajos Kossuth. On March 15, 1848, Mr. Kossuth became the first Hungarian nationalist to lead that country's Diet in a break from the Austrian Empire. His powerful pen and oratory galvanized the discontent of the Magyar people into the Hungarian nationalist movement.

Hungary had long suffered under the respressive absolutism of the Hapsburg monarchy in Vienna. In a speech to the Diet on March 3, 1848, Kossuth demanded the removal of the dead hand of Austrian absolut-

ism as the only way of securing the liberties of Hungarians and all other peoples under the monarchy.

On this day, March 15, Hungarians around the world remember the ascent to freedom that Mr. Kossuth embodied. The Kossuth Civic Center in Miami, founded in 1954, will celebrate this holiday of the Hungarian people while remembering their brothers and sisters remaining in the homeland. Back in Hungary, the influence of Lajos Kossuth is most assuredly alive.

Kossuth's countrymen are today demonstrating that the human spirit will not long endure a repressive regime before rising up to challenge it. It is important for us to recognize, Mr. Speaker, how the efforts of Mr. Kossuth laid the cornerstones of democracy in Hungary. This foundation was not to be easily uprooted, not even communism has shaken it. The story of Lajos Kassuth and his modern day counterparts should remind us that freedom and democracy must never be taken for granted.

A STORY OF HEROISM IN NORTHERN NEW JERSEY

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we hear stories about heroism, about ordinary people, just like our friends and neighbors, who do extraordinary things in times of crisis. Recently, two of my constituents rose to the occasion to help a total stranger in a time of great need. They turned out to be lifesavers.

Joseph L. DeCosta and his younger brother Thomas E. DeCosta, both from South Belmar, NJ, were driving on a northern New Jersey highway last month when they came upon an accident scene. A car had been struck from behind by a pickup truck, and the car immediately burst into flames. The women driving the car was trapped inside, and a crowd of onlookers—including the driver of the pickup truck—stood by helplessly. The DeCosta brothers immediately took action, helping the woman from the car, dousing the flames with a fire extinguisher, making sure no one else was inside, and administering first aid to the injured woman. The woman survived the accident, with some serious burns, and later thanked the DeCostas. The Wayne Township, NJ, Deputy Police Chief was quoted as crediting the two men with saving the women's life.

Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, particularly proud of what my two constituents did to save the life of another. But I think all Americans can take pride when we see how an emergency really does bring out the best in many of our fellow citizens. While most of us will never be involved in such a situation, it is reassuring to know that there are people like Joseph and Thomas DeCosta who are willing to put their own safety on the line to help another, and even to save a life.

PRESIDENT NIXON RETURNS TO CAPITOL HILL

HON. CHUCK DOUGLAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, today I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a piece published by the New York Post describing former President Nixon's value to our Nation as a statesman and keen observer of international affairs. As the Members know, President Nixon recently returned to Capitol Hill, where 43 years ago he began his career in politics, to discuss the current state of world affairs. He gave an excellent overview of the startling changes that have occurred over the last year and provided powerful insights into how the United States should respond to these changes. Our Nation is fortunate to have the benefit of the views of Richard Nixon, counsel to Presidents and lawmakers, as we work to formulate an effective and responsive foreign policy.

[From the New York Post, Mar. 13, 1990]

RICHARD NIXON, STATESMAN

There may well be people who begrudge former President Richard M. Nixon the warm welcome accorded him on his recent visit to Capitol Hill. But there will always be a few professional Nixon-detractors around—folks who've never forgiven him for coming to national prominence by recognizing that Alger Hiss was lying and that Whittaker Chambers was telling the truth; folks who've never forgiven him for returning from the political graveyard to capture the White House in 1968 and 1972 (the latter victory, of course, took the form of an unprecedented national landslide).

The anti-Nixon element probably thought it had finally won its great battle by driving him from office in 1974. But those who came to this conclusion were mistaken: they'd failed to consider Nixon's strength of character and personal resolve. And they'd failed to consider the fact that his enormous intellectual gifts meant he still had a great deal to contribute.

In recent years, however, the American people, in great number, have come to recognize President Nixon for what he is: a national treasure—one of the world's most distinguished and respected elder statesmen.

The manner in which he has conducted himself during the years since he left office is undoubtedly a factor in his return to wide public esteem. The former chief executive could have accumulated great wealth, bartering the prestige of the presidency to garner seats on corporate boards. He could easily have earned huge sums on the lecture circuit.

Or he could have written kiss-and-tell books, exposing the foibles and follies of friend and foe alike. He might even have pampered himself in well-guarded seclusion—at the taxpayer's expense—never again to surface.

Had Nixon chosen any of these paths, he would have been in distinguished company. Many public figures, former presidents included, have enjoyed plush post-retirement lives by selecting one or more of the options noted above.

Not Richard Nixon. He takes no speaking fees, and voluntarily surrendered the Secret Service protection to which he is entitled; he sits on no boards, maintains a tiny staff and devotes himself to writing serious books about world affairs—books that sell well because they are good.

He doesn't trumpet the fact that incumbent presidents have grown accustomed to relying on his counsel; he makes no great show of the fact that he is received like a visiting head of state virtually wherever he travels.

His judgment—based on first-hand knowledge of the forces at play and the characters involved—remains shrewd. Consider his argument, grounded in both geopolitics and concern for human rights on behalf of President Bush's China policy:

"If the United States does not play a role in China, who does that leave among the major powers?," Nixon asked during his Capitol Hill press conference. "It leaves the Soviet Union and Japan. Does anyone think the Soviet Union is going to export human rights to China? And anyone that thinks Japan is going to export democracy to China must be smoking pot."

His triumphant return to Capitol Hill where he started his political career some 43 years ago, reminds us that historians writing the history of the 1980s and 1990s will note that Richard Nixon arrived at a new plateau of public esteem during this period. They'll also note that he achieved this result the old-fashioned way: He earned it.

TIME TO TAKE ACTION ON AID FOR PANAMA AND NICARAGUA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks, a lot has been said about emerging democracies. The only thing that's emerged in Congress so far is words. It's time for action. It's time to deliver.

Day after day one astonishing event eclipses another. The rapid transformation and emergence of democracies around the globe is without precedent. These remarkable changes provide America with tremendous opportunities and challenges.

President Bush has given us a challenge. Yesterday he outlined his aid package for Nicaragua and Panama. He challenged us to get the aid packages for both countries on his desk by April 5.

Supporting the President's proposal is important for two reasons. First, both Nicaragua and Panama are destitute. Their budding democracies are as fragile as cherry blossoms in a cold March wind.

Building a functioning democracy is challenge enough. To rebuild a functioning economy, they will need some help from their friends.

Second, the people of both countries are taking a real gamble on democratic institutions.

This is a good time to show the Nicaraguan and Panamanian people that legislative bodies can do more than deliberate. We've got to show them that legislators can deliver.

HONORING THE HINSDALE LIONS CLUB

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the finest chapters in the world of Lions International. I am proud to announce that on March 24, 1990, the Hinsdale Lions Club, of Hinsdale, MA, will celebrate the 35th anniversary of its charter.

Their motto is "if it can be done—Hinsdale Lions will do it." And they have. During the past 35 years, the Hinsdale Lions have made and spent in the town of Hinsdale over $200,000, plus many thousands of man hours doing volunteer services. This is in addition to making their annual donations to the Massachusetts Lions Eye Research Fund, the Orthoptic Clinic, the 33Y Emergency Sight and Hearing Treatment Foundation, Clark School for the Deaf, Perkins School for the Deaf and Blind, and WMRRS Radio Station for the blind.

Mr. Speaker, there are many examples that I could expound upon to you and my colleagues here on the House floor but let me give you just a few. Their first major project was to create a beach area for the residents of Hinsdale. They have been maintaining a cottage and a beach since 1958, and they provide a caretaker to keep the area clean. They have also used the cottage to store hospital beds, wheelchairs, crutches, and such goods that are available to anyone who needs them, free of charge. They took on such projects as rebuilding the condemned town hall in 1963, to transform it into a youth center which sponsors the many sports and recreational activities for Hinsdale's youth. They also rebuilt the Old Grange Hall which is in continuous use by the Seniors Home Care, Lions, Lioness', Grange, Boy Scouts, Masons, and bingo players.

The Hinsdale Lions, comprised of 20 members, 14 of which are over 60 years old, have also built a kiddie park and basketball courts, catered picnics, clambakes, ball games, weddings, and chicken barbecues. They have also held raffles, carnivals, circuses, donkey baseball, and basketball, a basketball tournament, and public suppers, to name a new.

The Hinsdale Lions can potentially walk hand in hand with someone through life. They have guided youngsters through their formative years and then helped them in their golden years.

Mr. Speaker, the Hinsdale Lions Club has gone far beyond the call of duty. They've played a vital role in building the community that now exists in Hinsdale. I want to salute the past and present members for their 35 years of service and dedication. I wish them many more years of continued success.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY DILLON WINSHIP, JR.

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, Dillon Winship—native Georgian, great leader in his community and business, ardent patriot, and good friend—died on December 13, 1989, of heart failure.

Born in Macon, on July 28, 1929, Dillon attended Woodberry Forest School in Virginia through his graduation in 1947. He spent 1948 to 1951 at Georgia Institute of Technology, and graduated from the University of Tennessee in 1952, with a B.S. degree in transportation.

Dillon was employed with Transus, Inc. of Atlanta for 37 years, and he served as president and chief executive officer, and also as chairman of the board. Dillon resumed presidency of Transus Motor Carrier Division of Transus, Inc. in September 1987.

Dillon was an energetic and emphatic advocate of the transportation industry to which he devoted much of his life.

Musing over the importance of transportation to the successful functioning of our economy as he assumed the reins of power at the American Trucking Association in 1973, Dillon reflected, "The service utilities—power, communications and transportation—are the spokes in the wheel of industry that make the wheel turn. Any man who is employed in this great transportation industry is important. He moves that lifeblood through the arteries that feed the society."

He was also fond of saying, "Nothing transports itself."

Dillon, noted for his outspokenness, managerial strength, and sense of personal responsibility, was active in many organizations, including the American Trucking Associations, Inc., Georgia Motor Trucking Association, World Business Council, Inc., Business Council of Georgia, Chief Executives Forum, Young Presidents Organization, and the Northwest Presbyterian Church.

Dillon is survived by his wife, Patricia Cortelyou Winship, one daughter, Adrian Pressley, and two sons, H. Dillon III and Blanton C. He is also survived by his mother, Anne Chichester Winship, his sister, Anne Kelleher, and two brothers, Emory V and Wadleigh C. He has six grandchildren.

I have thought of Dillon especially often over the last few weeks.

Recent events in Nicaragua would have pleased him. I know that he is smiling as he watches Violeta Chamorro's progress toward democracy in Nicaragua.

Without the conservative's conviction to the cause of the freedom fighters, that country would not have enjoyed this promise of hope.

The worldwide movements throwing off the chains of oppressive regimes clearly demonstrate that when given a choice and a chance, people will opt for freedom.

Dillon knew this. His conviction helped lead the Nicaraguan people to what we hope will ultimately mean dramatic improvements in their lives.

God bless you, Dillon, for all that you did for so many.

NATIONAL SCLERODERMA AWARENESS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution which designates the week of June 10 to 16, 1990, as "National Scleroderma Awareness Week."

As many of you know, scleroderma literally means "hard skin." Those who suffer from this rare disease experience a thickening and hardening, or scarring, of the skin due to an overproduction of collagen, a protein manufactured by the connective tissues of the body. In the severest forms of scleroderma the hardening process may spread to the joints greatly reducing an individual's mobility and to the body organs causing functioning impairment.

This chronic, and often fatal disease affects approximately 300,000 people in the United States alone. This number is more than twice the number of active AIDS cases currently reported to the Center for Disease Control.

Scleroderma, a noncontagious disease, is not reported to the Center for Disease Control and therefore does not receive the public attention or Federal funding given other serious diseases. Consequently, physicians involved in the research and treatment of scleroderma have experienced only limited success due to limited funding. Although recent research has greatly increased the medical community's understanding of how scleroderma affects the body and has produced helpful treatments for scleroderma patients, much more needs to be done.

Since we cannot appropriate unlimited public funds to put scleroderma research on the fast track, let's do what we can to ensure that the research continues. Over 220 of our colleagues joined me last year in declaring "National Scleroderma Awareness Week" which helped to facilitate successful outreach activities and fundraising events around the country.

I ask my colleagues to please join the effort again this year by cosponsoring this resolution.

THE NEED FOR OUR BATTLESHIPS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Navy recently announced its intention to mothball two battleships, the USS *Missouri* and the USS *New Jersey.* I have made my position known on the need for reasonable cuts in our armed services. As much as anyone, I would like to see this Nation prudently trim our military expenditures, as long as that trimming process

is done with our strategic needs in mind and adequately accounts for present and future military threats. I question whether mothballing battleships adheres to that necessary logic.

I was heartened to see that the Navy was least impacted in Secretary Cheney's proposed 1991 defense budget. As our Nation's historical defender, the Navy has consistently sailed in harm's way, resisting unjust aggression and promoting democracy around the world. We are a maritime power, do not forget. Our future lies in freedom of the seas, and control of those same seas if the need should arise. As world trade becomes a greater and greater share of our gross national product, our reliance on the Navy to protect this country's economic integrity will grow. We also primarily rely upon the Navy to project power onshore. Between the years 1945 and 1990 we used our naval power 187 times. The question for the future is then one of how do we maintain those forces that are most capable and most likely to successfully fulfill our worldwide commitments, responsibilities, and needs. I point to our battleships as uniquely qualified for that mission.

As evidence I would like to quote from Senator MCCAIN's insightful article entitled, "The Need for Strategy in the New Postwar Era," as appeared in the January 1990 Armed Forces International Journal. He writes:

We must be cautious, however, about cutting our four battleships. They cannot simply be dismissed as outdated weapons. They can deliver far more firepower with far more security along most of the world's coast than an air wing. In fact, one battleship can deliver 40,500 pounds of ordnance at ranges up to 23 miles in one minute. Each battleship also has eight quadruple launchers for Tomahawk cruise missiles. This gives it the ability to hit fixed targets with incredible precision at ranges of up to 700 miles. The battleship has an almost ideal surgical strike capability for low-intensity war and is the natural partner of fixed-wing air power because it can use its cruise missiles and guns to suppress air defense sites. It is also important to note that a battleship costs only $45-million a year in operating and maintenance funds. This is less than the $48-million per year for a nuclear cruiser and about one-third of the $124-million cost of a conventional carrier.

I would further add that our battleships represent a very large percentage of the Navy's gunnery support and also carry Harpoon antiship missiles.

I found this article, written by a highly decorated Navy veteran and a distinguished member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, to be greatly informative. I think it puts to rest many questions concerning the cost, capability, and strategic mission of our battleships. I would just like to add that there is no other type of ship in our fleet so ideally suited to playing the crucial deterrent role of showing the flag. Speaking softly and carrying a big stick is easily demonstrated with a fleet of battleships on your side. Finally, when many have called into question the survivability of our carriers, I would like to remind all that there is no ship harder to sink than a battleship.

With these facts in mind, I hope that we will all think long and hard before we decide to mothball these two fine and proud ships.

TORPEDOING OUR MERCHANT MARINE

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I was dismayed to learn last week that the Maritime Administration was considering an application to sell and transfer to foreign operation the U.S.-flag passenger vessel SS *Monterey.* I joined with 17 of our colleagues in a bipartisan effort against the approval of this request. Unfortunately, for our Nation and our merchant marine, the Maritime Administration has decided to conditionally approve the sale of this vessel to foreign interests.

As we stated in our letter to the Maritime Administration, there is no justification from a national maritime policy standpoint for allowing this vital sealift asset to leave the control of the United States. In fact, I am absolutely convinced that the national interest is best protected by keeping this vessel under the U.S. flag.

It is especially dangerous and foolish to explain away any such transfer by asserting that our foreign-owned, foreign-flag and foreign-manned vessels can be counted on to respond to our Nation's needs in time of war or national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, it is not too late for Maritime Administrator Capt. Warren Leback to prevent any further diminution of our Nation's sealift capability. He has it within his power to protect and promote the American merchant marine by keeping the *Monterey* under the American flag and I strongly urge him to do so.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SMITH RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA LEGISLATION

HON. DOUGLAS H. BOSCO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to establish a Smith River National Recreation Area in Del Norte County, CA. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this effort to provide stronger protection for the "crown jewel" of California's wild and scenic rivers.

The Smith River National Recreation Area [NRA] would encompass 300,000 acres of the watershed of the last undammed major river system in California.

The NRA would include all national forest land in the California portion of the Smith River watershed, from the State and national redwood parks along the lower reaches to the Oregon border and the river's headwaters in the Siskiyou Mountains.

More than 310 miles of the Smith River and its major tributaries have been designated as components of the State and National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems.

The Smith River is renowned for its exceptional water quality, trophy salmon and steelhead fisheries. The watershed's spectacular scenery includes huge coastal redwoods along the lower river, deep whitewater canyons, harsh rocky plateaus, rich conifer forests and high mountain peaks and meadows. Wildlife is abundant, and the area supports an exceptional diversity of plant and animal species.

Despite historic mining and extensive logging over the past 40 years, substantial portions of the basin remain wild and undeveloped. More than 46,000 acres along the upper South Fork are included in the Siskiyou Wilderness, and views from the river and major travel routes largely retain their natural appearance.

Local residents and visitors alike have long used the Smith River basin for fishing, hunting, whitewater boating, swimming, camping, hiking and sightseeing, but overall recreation use remains relatively light. The proposed NRA, in combination with the adjacent State and national parks, has the potential to become one of the premier recreation attractions on the west coast.

The legislation would divide the NRA into eight separate management areas and establish general management policies for each area. More specific management direction is contained in the draft Smith River National Recreation Area Management Plan prepared by Six Rivers National Forest.

The draft management plan includes 10-year action plans for recreation development, fisheries, wildlife, watershed rehabilitation, cultural resources, interpretation, and research. Recreation development plans include proposals for a visitor center, new campgrounds and picnic areas, boating access, construction of hiking and horse trails, designation of ORV routes, and improved access for the handicapped.

Under the legislation, more than two-thirds of the NRA's old growth timber, including all stands of old growth redwood, would be permanently protected, and timber harvests would be reduced by more than half. The Forest Service estimates that the allowable cut would be limited to about 10-million-board-feet per year over the first decade.

Logging would be prohibited or sharply restricted in most areas, with timber production focused in the isolated central portion of the watershed where extensive logging has already occurred. Timber management in these areas will be based on emerging theories of landscape ecology, and could serve as a national model for maintenance of biological diversity on timber producing lands.

Subject to valid existing rights, the entire NRA would be withdrawn from new mining claims and patents. Holders of valid existing claims would not be affected, but no new claims would be permitted.

Four areas within the exterior boundaries of the NRA that already have a substantial level of private development—Gasquet, Big Flat, Washington Flat and the Rock Creek subdivision along the South Fork—would be explicitly excluded from the NRA. No additional regulation is proposed for other private inholdings within the NRA.

Former Interior Secretary Cecil Andrus' 1981 administrative designation of Wild and

Scenic Rivers within the NRA's exterior boundaries would be rescinded and redesignated by statute under section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Two streams that were excluded from the original designation—Hardscrabble Creek and Stony Creek—would be added to the system, and classifications of several other streams would be upgraded. Existing designations of streams outside the NRA boundaries would not be affected.

The bill also includes provisions intended to ensure that establishment of the NRA does not result in loss of revenues to local government and authorizes funding for developments of a unified land information system integrating data from Federal, State, local and private sources.

In addition, the bill allows for the county to also receive title to two small parcels of land currently occupied by the Bar-O Boys Ranch, a county facility serving juvenile offenders. These two parcels were historically believed to be owned by the county, but a recent resurvey revealed that the facilities actually encroach on national forest land. The boundary adjustment proposed under the legislation is intended to rectify this situation.

The North Fork Management Area—44,300 acres—includes all of the California portion of the North Fork drainage. A portion of the North Fork's watershed extends into Oregon. A series of harsh, rugged plateaus cut by deep canyons, the North Fork's sparsely vegetated mineral soils support a number of rare plant species and unique botanical communities. Largely untouched since the mining days of the 1800's, this area would be managed for whitewater boating and backcountry recreation while protecting unique botanical communities and historic values. Commercial timber harvest would be prohibited.

The steep slopes of the Upper Middle Fork Management Area—27,400 acres—support rich conifer forests. Although more than one-third of the area has been cut over and is now in young plantations, much of the remainder is covered with old growth timber, including two proposed botanical areas that feature exceptional diversity of conifer species. Management of this area would emphasize protection of biological diversity and maintenance of old-growth ecological values. Commercial timber harvest would be allowed in existing second growth stands.

The Middle Fork/Highway 199 Management Area—30,800 acres—includes the entire viewshed from the highway, which has been designated a national scenic byway. Readily accessible along most of its length, the heavily forested Middle Fork's narrow canyon and broad flats offer abundant opportunities for recreation. Management of this area will emphasize protection of scenic values and enhancement of a broad range of recreation uses, including development of new campgrounds. Commercial timber harvest would be prohibited.

The Upper South Fork Management Area—13,000 acres—is adjacent to the Siskiyou Wilderness and includes the entire west bank of the river up to the ridge line. This portion of the river is designated wild, and most of the area remains undeveloped. Management of the area would emphasize protection of the river's wild character with no commercial timber harvest permitted.

The Lower South Fork Management Area—17,900 acres—includes the entire river canyon from Big Flat downstream to the confluence with the Middle Fork. The river is paralleled by the South Fork Road, which provides ready access for fishing and swimming. Protection of scenic values would be a primary management emphasis in this area, along with white water boating, fishing, swimming, and camping. Limited timber harvest would be permitted.

The Lower Hurdygurdy Creek Management Area—3,700 acres—provides the only significant area of float terrain in public ownership along the South Fork. The management emphasis in this area would be on providing rustic family and group camping facilities on the flats along the creek and protection of scenic values. Limited timber harvest would be permitted.

The Prescribed Timber Management Area—121,900 acres—includes four separate blocks of land that, because of their topography and location, have historically experienced low levels of recreation use. The area is substantially roaded and shows extensive evidence of past timber harvesting. About 20,000 acres, most of it cut over, is in private ownership. About half of the remaining area is classified as commercial timber land. The management emphasis for this will be on production of sustained yields of wood products while maintaining biological diversity. A significant portion of the area would be designated for management as wildlife habitat, with timber harvests either prohibited or limited to extended cutting rotations. Timber management will be based on landscape level ecological strategies using silvicultural techniques designed to maintain biological diversity, including stand-level modifications in species composition, rotation length and stand structure—such as leaving standing green trees, snags, and other course woody debris.

The Siskiyou Wilderness Management Area—46,300 acres—borders the upper South Fork and includes the headwaters of a number of tributaries to both the South and Middle Forks. Marked by steep slopes, thick forests, open mountain valleys and steep rock faces, the Smith River portion of the wilderness remains one of the wildest areas in California. Management of the area would not change under the NRA designation.

The Gasquet Ranger District has historically been accorded the status of a separate market area under the Small Business Timber Sale Set-Aside Program on Six Rivers National Forest. I believe that the establishment of a Smith River National Recreation Area, in combination with the changes in purchase history, sales level and market patterns that have occured in recent years, justify a special recomputation of the small business allocation and review of the need for two separate market areas on this national forest. Under Forest Service policy, it is the responsibility of the forest supervisor to conduct such an analysis, and it is my understanding that Six Rivers National Forest is willing to initiate this process.

TRIBUTE TO THE NANTAHALA 1990 RALLY

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an organization and an event that has helped promote world peace through the sport of rafting.

The Nantahala 1990 Rally is an international rafting event that is being held for the first time in the United States. The event began in the Soviet Union in 1979. There, it was limited to Soviet participants until 1988 when one international team entered the competition. In 1989, the competition was opened to over 300 participants from 17 countries. The Nantahala 1990 Rally will promote international peace and friendship by bringing together outdoor enthusiasts from around the world.

I would like to offer my best wishes to the Nantahala 1990 Rally and all its participants from around the world. I hope that the competition will be a great success.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations on the occasion of its 50th anniversary this month. For half a century, this vital and active group has represented citizens, homeowners, and neighborhoods and made an irreplaceable contribution to the quality of life for all northern Virginians.

In my office hangs a picture of the intersection of Virginia Routes 7 and 123 taken around 1940, the year the federation was founded. The photograph captures a lone truck making its way down a dusty road. On one corner a gas station. On the other a small wooden building called Tyson's Corner Store.

It goes without saying that Fairfax County has grown since then. Forty-one thousand people lived here in 1940. Today over three-quarters of a million people call it home. We are now a worldwide center of commerce with a standard of living that the men and women checking oil at that gas station or waiting on customers behind the counter at that general store could never have imagined.

But even with all the change, our sense of community has been steady. The Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations has played a major role in preserving the most important aspects of our lives. As Fairfax has grown, the federation has made sure that neighborhood concerns were not neglected.

The group twice worked to change the form of Fairfax County government. They led the fight to establish a county executive in 1950 and an urban county executive in 1968. In

1969 the federation conducted the first study of the costs and benefits of residential growth in Fairfax County.

They published the first countywide street map and directory in 1957 as a service to their members. The map was done so well that Fairfax County purchased it both for use by the Government as well as for sale to the public.

The federation reinforces positive community values not only by its actions every day, but also by making a special effort to annually recognize an outstanding individual as citizen of the year.

Members of the federation have been involved in nearly every major study group, authority, commission and board appointed by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors for more than two decades. Their studies and comments on local, county, State, and Federal legislation are well respected and are an important part of the lawmaking process.

The federation also publishes a monthly newsletter, operates eight standing committees, and sponsors leadership training workshops and public policy seminars.

Mr. Speaker, the Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations is a shining example of what people can accomplish by working together for a common goal. The federation's outstanding service is in the finest tradition of American voluntarism and on behalf of all the citizens of Fairfax County, I thank the federation for its 50 years of service and wish continued success in the years and decades ahead.

H.R. 4208

HON. GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, I introduced H.R. 4208, legislation to correct a glaring inequity in the retirement rules for Federal judges. I was very pleased to welcome 29 original cosponsors of that measure.

Unfortunately, due to an administrative error, one very important name was inadvertently left off that list of original cosponsors—that of the chairman of the Courts Subcommittee, my friend and colleague ROBERT KASTENMEIER. I value his support for this initiative, and deeply regret that he was not included in the original list of sponsors.

I am today adding his name to the list of cosponsors for H.R. 4208, and hope he will forgive the oversight.

H.R. 4030

HON. JOHN MILLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I joined in cosponsoring H.R. 4030, a bill to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act.

In 1972, Mr. Speaker, Congress passed the Coastal Zone Management Act to encourage States to voluntarily develop management programs for their coastal areas in accordance with minimum Federal standards. States have two major incentives to participate in this process. First, Federal matching grants are available to help develop and implement programs approved by the Federal Government. Second, States with approved programs have a right to require that activities by the Federal Government in their coastal zones are consistent with these plans.

I am proud that almost 20 years ago, I helped develop Washington State's Coastal Zone Management Program. Back then, I also helped draft a citizens' initiative to protect our shorelines from overdevelopment. Today, Washington and 28 other States have approved coastal zone management plans.

But, Mr. Speaker, in 1984, the Supreme Court ruled that the Department of Interior's sale of oil and gas leases on the Outer Continental Shelf does not directly affect the coastal zone as defined in this landmark bill. H.R. 4030 will clarify this issue. It will reinstate the intent of Congress and restore the ability of States to determine if an offshore oil or gas lease sale is consistent with the State's Coastal Zone Management Act.

In addition to overturning California versus Watt, H.R. 4030 also requires State programs to develop a coastal water protection program to address the problem of nonpoint pollution. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Washington State's Puget sound water quality authority is a recognized national leader in addressing this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also creates a new national interest improvement program which requires States to identify coastal wetlands, so that they can be protected. We need to act to preserve our remaining wetlands and this bill helps us do that.

H.R. 4030 also recognizes our international obligations to help developing countries protect their coastal zones. To this end, Mr. Speaker, the bill states that Congress wants the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Department of State to assist developing countries with their coastal management initiatives.

I know that the leadership of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee supports H.R. 4030. I look forward to prompt consideration of this important bill. And I urge my colleagues to join in supporting protection of our coastal zone.

BEN HILL GRIFFIN, JR.—AN AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who has meant a great deal to the little town of Frostproof, to the State of Florida, and to me and my family. Mr. Ben Hill Griffin, Jr. was my friend, and when he died March 1, it was a sad day for all of us who loved and respected him.

Ben Hill Griffin, Jr. was a self-made man. He was born in the mining town of Tiger Bay in 1910, and moved to Frostproof, FL in time to finish his high school education there. He spent the rest of his life in Frostproof, building a substantial citrus business from the few trees his father gave him as a wedding present.

I met Ben Hill when I was just getting started in the banking business and he was becoming a pioneer in the frozen concentrate market. Bankers were struggling to provide financing for this new commodity, since valuing the product was basically uncharted ground. As one of Ben Hill's bankers, I had the opportunity to participate in establishing the credit standards for financing frozen concentrate. Thanks to his vision and initiative, I guess that I, too, became something of a pioneer in the banking world.

Ben Hill was more than just a good businessman, however. He was tough, quick, and he made you understand why you have to stand up for what you believe in—and fight hard for it. He was a big influence in my decision to run for the House of Representatives in 1976. Ben Hill didn't tell me what to do exactly; he just outlined what was important for America and what opportunity the House seat would provide in helping to promote those ideals. "If you feel strongly," he told me, "you have an obligation to act on that conviction." When he was through, there wasn't much question left in my mind as to what I was going to do.

Ben Hill's friends were many. He gave of himself, of his time and energy to his family and his neighbors. He was kind and encouraging, strong and respected. He was a true American success story and we are all a little better for having known him.

SAVE OUR SHORELINES

HON. PORTER J. GOSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the record I submit the text of a petition being circulated in south Florida urging the Federal Government to ban oil drilling in the environmentally sensitive waters off Florida's coast. The petition has already generated almost 10,000 signatures—and the number continue to grow. I am also forwarding the signed petitions to President Bush for his consideration.

In addition to the thousands of citizens who have taken the time to sign these petitions, I commend Marge and David Ward, whose organization—Citizens Association of Bonita Beach [CABB]—has worked tirelessly to promote public awareness of this issue.

The petition reads as follows:

SAVE OUR SHORELINE

We oppose the future sale of oil and gas leases anywhere off the shores of the State of Florida within 60 miles of shore.

We recommend the permanent postponement of exploration and drilling on any offshore leases already held by oil companies seeking to explore for gas or oil near southwest Florida.

The offshore area is much too economically important to the State of Florida to be opened to drilling. These fragile coastal

areas are of unsurpassed beauty that must be conserved for future generations.

Although we recognize the need for domestic energy, the environmental and economic risks posed by oil drilling near the Florida shoreline is too great to justify any leasing plan.

WALDRON'S IDEAS

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would Ike to share with my colleagues an article which appeared on August 31, 1989, in the Lansing, MI, State Journal. The author, Robert Waldron, former speaker of the Michigan House of Representatives, offers some enlightening ideas on the U.S. education system.

[From the Lansing State Journal, Aug. 31, 1989]

LET'S RESTRUCTURE, EXTEND SCHOOL YEAR

The United States has one of the shortest school years in the industrial nations and it produces achievements—particularly in math and sciences—that rank with the Third World. Despite is short calendar and poor results, the American education system is one of the most expensive in the world, consuming a larger portion of our public expenditures than any other social undertaking, including health and national defense.

Across our nation concern is deepening, yet what answers are being proposed? Most discussion of our educational system revolves around values and wages, with few concrete proposals being made. Some experts think the solution is paying teachers more money, as though higher salaries will improve the skills and strategies teachers bring to the classroom. Other experts call for a core curriculum of subjects, as if teaching different subjects by the same means will meet our nation's educational needs.

No commentator that I have read has even addressed one of the most profound differences between American education and that of Japan, Germany or other societies: our fundamental purpose. Most educational systems (and most recent comments about America's educational system) focus on the aspect of training individuals to work. The primary purpose of the American system was to educate citizens to become capable of governing themselves. Obviously, the ability to earn a decent living is a major factor in a peaceful society but it is not the only factor nor was it the prime mover of public education.

Nor have I read many proposals for any serious restructuring of our educational calendar to fit the tremendously increased body of knowledge necessary for successful living in our republic. The agrarian calendar should be replaced so that the end result will not be a dropout but a fully competent citizen graduating at age 16 after 10 full years of basic education.

I would propose a restructuring of the school year. Our current pattern of two teaching periods of approximately 17 weeks with a three month summer vacation is outmoded. I envision three teaching periods of 15 weeks each, lengthening the school year by 11 weeks. K-10, then, would embody 30 study segments for graduation as opposed to the present K-12 with only 24.

This would appear to increase the burden on teachers, except that I would propose requiring teachers to teach only two out of every three periods. The third period teachers would be free to improve their skills and subject knowledge; to take alternate duties within the school such as administration, counseling, coaching or working with parents and community; or to take time off.

If we established a pool of talent within each school or district that rotated between different assignments, teachers handling administrative duties and administrators returning to the classroom on a regular basis, we could go far in revitalizing the role of educator and building a cohesive teaching unit free of the prevailing division between teaching and administrator.

The extension of the school year increases the demands on the student—but that is precisely where our current system is failing. We need to demand more from our students and give them the time and environment in which to meet and understand the demands of a complex and competitive world.

Rather than end public education at age 16, we should add two more years into the basic educational program. The two years, however, should not be required to follow immediately after high school but could be taken at any point between the ages of 16 and 21, allowing a student to enter the work force and better define for him or herself what his or her personal educational needs are. These additional years of education would have a two-track approach, either to a college/community college program or to intensive training in a specific trade or profession.

Obviously such a program may cost more money but I believe that Americans are willing to spend more on education if they see a concrete program for serious educational restructuring. If they are offered only more of the same with a higher price tag, I suspect they will reject the offer.

DEDICATE DEFENSE SPENDING REDUCTION TO DEFICIT REDUCTION AND TAX RELIEF

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which states that any reduction in defense spending, referred to by many of our colleagues as "the peace dividend," will be dedicated to deficit reduction and tax relief.

As debate begins over the level of defense spending, I believe our first consideration should be the entire scope of our national security needs, while realizing it is the American taxpayer who has borne the burden of producing the initial dismantling of Soviet and Communist repression in Eastern Europe. Therefore, the American taxpayer should be the recipient, in the form of deficit reduction and taxpayer relief, of any reduction in military spending.

OPPOSITION TO GRANTING APPROVAL TO SELL A U.S.-FLAG VESSEL

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I would like to emphasize my strong opposition to the Maritime Administration's recent decision to grant approval to an application under section 9 of the Shipping Act of 1916 to sell the U.S.-flag vessel SS *Monterey* for operation under a foreign flag.

What is most perplexing to me is the fact that the Maritime Administration has a mandate to protect and promote the U.S.-flag merchant marine. This being so, granting approval for the foreign sale of a vessel considered to be a sealift asset of the United States appears to be an abdication of their responsibility.

The only interests being protected and promoted by this sale are foreign interests. The administration has no money to recoup for the American taxpayer. It's a bailout, pure and simple, for foreign interests. What the taxpayer and the U.S. maritime industry are losing include a sealift asset as well as jobs for U.S. merchant mariners and for all the suppliers and support industries who profit from the operation of a U.S.-flag vessel.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in calling for the Maritime Administration to reverse this bad decision.

BAKER'S TRICK

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, what is happening in the Soviet Union and its Eastern bloc satellites is obviously having an impact around the entire globe. Diplomacy in the Middle East is no exception. That is why the United States must maintain its strong position of influence in that critical region.

In this regard, I was dismayed to learn of Secretary of State Baker's recent comments concerning our ally, Israel. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an excellent article written by William Safire.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 9, 1990]

BAKER'S TRICK

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON.—Why do you suppose Syria has finally told its ally Iran that now would be a good time to release the hostages held in Syrian-controlled Beirut?

Why has the demand for an "international conference" to arrange a "comprehensive settlement," so long a central Arab strategy, vanished from all P.L.O. pronouncements?

And why did Arabists get President Bush to confuse bedrock U.S. policy by raising the specter of a divided Jerusalem?

The answers interlock: the Soviet Union's abdication of empire has eroded the founda-

tion of the 40-year war against Israel and caused a panic in the Arab world.

No longer is Moscow its reliable ally. Because the U.S. Congress restricts trade as long as the Soviets restrict emigration. Mr. Gorbachev has been forced to begin to let out Israel's most precious asset: persecuted Jewish families eager to make a new life for themselves.

The prospect of a haven in Israel for a million Soviet Jews in the coming decade ends vain fantasies of driving out the "Zionist entity." But that's not all: Arab leaders see diplomatic blocs crumbling.

If the freed Soviet satellites establish relations with Israel, as they are doing, and if African nations follow, what will happen to the automatic condemnations of Zionism in the U.N.?

If the Helsinki pact of 35 European and Atlantic nations becomes the central arena of international diplomacy, as Mr. Gorbachev apparently hopes, the U.N. General Assembly—long dominated by the Arab-African bloc backed by Soviet bloc votes—will become all the more peripheral.

On top of that is the loss of terrorist training camps and military supply; Syria and Libya can no longer depend on a flow of Soviet-made missiles, tanks and planes. That leads to a strategic stunner: No longer will a superpower be ready to guarantee that Arab aggressors cannot lose a war.

No wonder potentates are panicked; their world has changed, their boycott is undercut, and their monarchies and dictatorships could be engulfed by the world wave of freedom. No longer will they be able to deflect their peoples' anger at deprivation into a dead-end jihad; Arabs deserve liberation, too.

At this pregnant moment, which cries out for a campaign to spread democracy throughout the Middle East, George Bush and James Baker are frozen in the diplomatic Ice Age. They focus on Israel's West Bank; they exploit divisions within Israel's polity and refuse humanitarian aid to refugees unless the Israeli Government accepts their view of what's best for our ally's security.

That's why we see Mr. Bush deliberately calling into question the integrity of Jerusalem as Israel's capital, ordering the Israelis not to let new refugees live there. That's why Mr. Baker—more underhanded than evenhanded—wants an Arab representative from Jerusalem, not from the West Bank, in the negotiations.

Some Israelis understand this trap. Far from nit-picking, the Jerusalem address is central: the Bush-Baker notion is to revisit the issue of an undivided Jerusalem, settled a generation ago, and put it on the negotiating table.

Then Secretary Baker, having created a new difference, will split that difference and grandly propose a "compromise": Israelis keep Jerusalem so long as Arabs can live there, the P.L.O. gets the West Bank and the power to deny Jews the right to live there.

The State Department will not admit it; the Labor Party in Israel refuses to see it—but that's the deal in the cards.

The Baker trick deals dishonorably with an ally, involves the U.S. in a new generation of troubles, and puts manacles on Palestinians of the intifada—whose local leaders are being murdered for challenging the Tunis terrorcrats' claim to be their "sole legitimate representative."

This weekend, the split Israeli Cabinet will decide whether to go down that road. A principled refusal will be roundly denounced by Israel-bashers and don't-make-waves Jews as anti-process; the Bush Administration would threaten to retaliate.

But who in Washington needs to provoke a crisis between democratic allies? Must we compensate for the real crisis among tyrannies? Why, when not even Communist parties lay claim to a monopoly of power, should the U.S. be on the side of unelected "sole representatives" of anybody?

Let Arab dictators panic; let Soviet Jews settle throughout Israel without dictation from Washington; let Israel's offer of free elections to West Bank Palestinians not be corrupted by Baker trickery to rig the outcome.

DESIGNATING MAY 1990 NATIONAL PHYSICAL FITNESS AND SPORTS MONTH

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the benefits of physical fitness are legion. For our children, physical activity builds strong bodies, sharp minds, and a positive self image. Every parent knows the excited happiness and sense of achievement our children feel the first time they make it all the way across the monkey bars. That same sense of accomplishment—the excited "I did it"—comes the first time they stay up on a two-wheeler without crashing. Later, through team sports and individual competition, our children learn the unique blend of competition and cooperation that make up the American spirit. These events occur at the beginning of what should be a lifetime of physical activity.

For those of us who have completed our school years and now face the daily pressures of the working world or of raising a family, physical activity helps us endure the stresses and enables us to release some of the tensions. Afterwork softball leagues at the city ballpark, pickup basketball games on the local high school's outdoor court, aerobics classes at the community center or church—all are but a few examples of adult Americans staying fit and successfully slowing the hands of time.

Older Americans, too, know the benefits of physical activity. Many have been active all their lives and continue throughout their golden years. Countless more, however, discover the pleasures—and benefits—of walking, cycling, and swimming only after their retirement. I think of my own personal inspiration, Hulda Crooks, who 4 years ago at the age of 90 led me to climb Mount Whitney, which at over 14,000 feet is the highest mountain in the continental United States. Subsequently, Hulda went to Japan, where she conquered Mount Fuji.

And on the subject of inspiration, who among us has not been moved by the example of physically and mentally disabled athletes? Who has not been moved by the sight of powerful men in wheelchairs roaring away at the start of a marathon, then pumping with every ounce of energy up a long, lonely hill, and ultimately crossing the finish line in a burst of energy and achievement? Who among us has not marveled at the courage and strength of downhill skiers who compete on but one leg. And of course, who has failed to be touched by Special Olympians, who compete not just with their bodies, but with their entire souls?

Mr. Speaker, in an era of TV's, VCR's, and CD's, the temptation to move from being a participant to a spectator is strong and ever present. So, to support those who are currently fit in their efforts to stay that way, and to encourage those who aren't but who would like to be, today, along with my colleague from Maryland, Mrs. BYRON, I am introducing a resolution designating May 1990 as National Physical Fitness and Sports Month.

AMERICA'S DEBT TO THE IRISH

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, every year the most famous of all St. Patrick's Day parades is held in New York City. This year, Francis P. Beirne is the chairman of the New York St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee. I would like to share with my colleagues the recent remarks of Francis Beirne on the important role Irish-Americans have played in the history of our Nation.

"PEACE WITH JUSTICE AND HONOR:" AMERICA'S DEBT TO THE IRISH

(By Francis P. Beirne, Chairman, New York St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee)

"Peace with Justice and Honor," these words were spoken by John Cardinal O'Connor in his first Saint Patrick's Day homily as Archbishop of New York on March 17, 1985. All of Ireland's exiled children in America join in this prayer for Peace with Justice and Honor for all Ireland.

In each generation of the Irish, whether born in Ireland or descended from Irish exiles, faithful sons and daughters of Eireann have shared this prayer, each in his or her own way, seeking to contribute to the achievement of this bright dream. Believing the occupation or domination of any part of Ireland by a foreign power to be ab initio illegitimate, the faithful Irish can never accept as ligitimate any condition other than the sovereign, indefeasible independence of the Irish nation in control over the entire island of Ireland, her islands and territorial seas. It is the lesson of history that the violation of this principle has led to instability, continued suffering, human rights violations and more "Troubles."

Our prayer is for Peace with Justice and Honor, embracing all of the children of the nation equally, and shared by Ireland's exiled children in America and throughout the world.

While America may yet justify its traditional role as Ireland's (and the world's) best hope, it is important to reflect upon some of the experiences of previous generations of Irish-Americans, experiences which should have earned a consideration no less than the debt redeemed by the United States in France in 1918.

The American Revolution saw Irish immigrant heroes like Commodore John Barry and General Stephen Moylan and, Ameri-

can Irish Generals "Mad" Anthony Wayne and Richard Montgomery and Rifleman Timothy Murphy; historian R. Barry O'Brien points out that, in Washington's Revolutionary Army, the Continental Line was often "the Line of Ireland."

Yet, in spite of the tremendous Irish contribution to the winning and subsequent defense of American Liberty, the United States had no warm and ready welcome for the Famine emigrants.

While an improvement over the oppression of English-occupied Ireland, New York, as found by the victims of the Great Hunger of the 1840's and '50's, bore little resemblance to the dream of Tir na nOg across the Western Ocean. The poverty, disease, discrimination and exploitation which greeted the mid-nineteenth century Irish Catholic immigrant is described with devastating accuracy in Thomas Gallagher's Paddy's Lament.

Even so, America was a free country, that is to say that, under the Constitution of the United States, Irish immigrants were able to improve their lot through their own efforts, in spite of non-acceptance by a "nativist" ascendancy class.

In 1851, the 69th Regiment, New York State Militia, was formed from eight existing "Irish" companies of volunteer militia. One of these companies, "A" Company (which numbers among its alumni Westchester County Executive Andrew P. O'Rourke), had existed since 1775, and fought in the American Revolution and in the war of 1812. While two more came from the former "Irish" 9th Regiment, most of the companies had been formed independently by the Irish Republican Union subsequent to the 1848 Rising in Ireland and were intended as a means of training Irish exiles for the future liberation of Ireland. (The late Very Reverend Patrick D. O'Flaherty, former Regimental Historian of the 69th New York, documented this early involvement in the Cause of Irish Freedom.) In 1857, a group of thirteen Irish exiles met in New York to set in motion the events which would lead to the founding of the Irish Republican Brotherhood in Ireland on Saint Patrick's Day 1858, and of its American counterpart the Fenian Brotherhood (and ultimately to the 1916 Easter Rising). Among those Irish revolutionaries were officers of the 69th, including its former Colonel, the Fenian organizer Michael Doheny of Tipperary, and Michael Corcoran, who as future Colonel of the 69th would lead the Regiment into its first action in the American Civil War and later form and lead Corcoran's Irish Legion in that terrible conflict.

That a man can love his wife and his mother is no mystery, nor is this any conflict of interest. While the filial piety which leads the Irish exile to revere and to seek to aid his motherland is understandable, so should it be natural to develop devotion to the well-being of the new, adopted home which has given him refuge, freedom and opportunity. As Lawrence Kohl points out in Irish Green & Union Blue, the American Civil War held a special meaning for the exiled sons and daughters of Erin; for them a Union victory not only would preserve the great asylum of Ireland's oppressed, it would indirectly strike a blow at Ireland's oppressor, England, which sought to aid and abet the partitioning of the great American republic.

Before Peace with Justice and Honor could be achieved for Ireland, it was necessary to restore Peace with Justice and Honor to the United States. Throughout the North, Irish America entered into the war to preserve the Union, adopting Lincoln's cause as their own. In the 1990 New York Saint Patrick's Day Parade their sacrifice is commemorated by the place of honor for the Tipperary banner, bearing the image of the Rock of Cashel, home of Michael Doheny, and by the Irish Brigade Honor Guard.

"Riabh nar druid o spairn lann" They did not shirk from the clash of arms (motto from the flags of the Irish Brigade).

There were a multitude of "Irish" regiments fighting in that terrible Civil War. Best known were the 69th, the Irish Brigade and the Irish Legion. The Irish sacrifice in the cause of the preservation of the Union is perhaps best exemplified by Meagher's Irish Brigade (69th, 88th and 63rd New York Volunteer Infantry Regiments, the 28th Massachusetts and the 116th Pennsylvania) which sustained losses during the war which were cumulatively greater by far than the full strength of the Brigade. Of over 1,200 of the Irish Brigade who made the famous assault upon Marye's Heights at the Battle of Fredericksburg on December 13, 1862, only some 280 were present and fit for duty at muster on the 15th!

The end of the American Civil War saw the disbanding of the Irish volunteer regiments, many of their members continuing their military service in the Fenian Brotherhood in Ireland, in Britain and in America as so vividly and insightfully described by Peter Beresford Ellis on The Rising of the Moon. (Among the original Irish Fenians was Tom Clarke, who would later be the first signatory of the Proclamation of the Irish Republic in Dublin, Easter 1916. The continuity of Irish-American involvement is recorded in a variety of sources including: Charles Callan Tansill, America and the Fight for Irish Freedom, 1866-1922; Dorothy MacArdle, The Irish Republic; J. Boyer Bell, The Secret Army, the I.R.A. . . .)

The 69th New York State Militia, the 69th New York Volunteer Infantry and the 69th of Corcoran's Irish Legion were all consolidated into the 69th Regiment of New York after the Civil War. With very few exceptions, the regiment which Robert E. Lee dubbed the "Fighting 69th" has been the military escort leading the New York Saint Patrick's Day Parade since 1852 (prior to that date the parade was usually led by the Irish militia company which is now "A" Company of the 69th.) Major General Lawrence P. Flynn, Adjutant General of the State of New York, who marched with the 69th on Saint Patrick's Day, is the great-grandson of Pierce J. Butler who fought in the Civil War as an officer of the 69th of Corcoran's Irish Legion and later as a Lieutenant Colonel with the Fenian Brotherhood. (Pierce Butler was one of four Butler brothers who fought to re-unify this country. His brother, Captain Edward K. Butler fought with the 69th New York State Militia and later with the 69th of Corcoran's Irish Legion. Edward K. Butler was killed at the head of his company at Cold Harbor on the 3rd of June 1864.)

The Irish traditions of the 69th Regiment are preserved by its Veterans Corps, commanded by First Sergeant Bernard B. Kelly, and in the spirit of "Wild Bill" Donovan, Father Duffy and Joyce Kilmer and of the men who fought on Makin Island, by its Colonel, Robert J. Hutter. The "Fighting 69th" not only will lead the 229th New York Saint Patrick's Day Parade on Fifth Avenue on March 17th, they will also join John Cardinal O'Connor and the New York Saint Patrick's Day Parade Committee in leading our prayer for Peace with Justice and Honor for all Ireland.

As the 1980's saw the demise of the "Berlin Wall" and the apparent rebirth of freedom in Poland and other eastern European lands, let not the 1990's pass away without Ireland being once again United, Gaelic and Free. One nation, under God, indivisible with Liberty and Justice for all—please God, let there be Peace with Justice and Honor.

(Note: The Chairman wishes to acknowledge research assistance from 69th Regiment Historian Lieutenant Colonel Kenneth Powers, 69th Veterans Corps Commander Barney Kelly and Hibernian historians John Ridge and Liam Murphy.)

THE ROSTENKOWSKI PLAN

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the deficit, like the weather, has been something everyone has talked about but few have been willing or able to do anything about.

For too long now, we have found ourselves paralyzed by political timidity. Not only unable to act, we have found ourselves unable to even speak out.

For too long now, we have pretended that defense cuts alone could cut the deficit or that we could balance the budget without more taxes, or that—in time—we could simply grow our way out of the problem.

And when the simple solutions did not work, we tried a mechanical solution. We tried Gramm-Rudman. And when that did not work, we tried Gramm-Rudman II. Well, all of the mechanical solutions have not worked and will not work. The deficit has not gone away and the problem remains.

In this matter, there is, quite simply, no substitute for political courage. There is no substitute for telling it like it is. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what the gentleman from Illinois did this past Sunday when he outlined a genuine and credible plan for deficit reduction. His plan is fair. His plan is honest. And his plan is about as good as we are going to get.

MEDICARE COVERAGE FOR PREVENTIVE SERVICES

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join as a cosponsor of H.R. 4269, legislation which would provide Medicare coverage of preventive services on a trial, demonstration basis. This important measure would not only improve the elderly's quality of life, but would also help to restrain the dramatically escalating cost of the Medicare Program.

Over 80 percent of individuals who are age 65 or older have one or more chronic health conditions. As a consequence, they have in-

creased levels of disability and are at high risk for acquiring a fatal illness.

Not only do these chronic conditions have costs in terms of human suffering, but they have monetary costs as well. Although individuals age 65 and over represent 12 percent of the population, they account for more than one-third of the Nation's total health care expenses. At present, the cost of the Medicare Program alone is about $100 billion per year. And these expenditures will increase even further as the population continues to age.

Yet, through the use of preventive services, our elderly's quality of life can be improved and the skyrocketing cost of health care can be restrained. With this concern in mind, I am pleased to join as an original cosponsor of H.R. 4269. This important demonstration project would include preventive health measures under Medicare on a trial basis, and would permanently extend coverage to those services which are determined to be effective.

This legislation would include such important preventive services as: Colon cancer screening examinations, annual physical examinations—including serum cholesterol, blood pressure and vision/hearing tests—and mental health tests. In addition, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services would have the authority to include in the demonstration other preventive services and procedures. This would provide the opportunity to extend coverage to two other extremely critical preventive measures—bone mass measurement technology and mammograms.

Presently 24 million Americans are afflicted with osteoporosis, a disorder which is characterized by the loss of bone mass. Osteoporosis is responsible for more than 1.3 million bone fractures per year, including more than 250,000 hip fractures. Not only do hip fractures increase the rate of mortality, but they also lead to institutionalization. The cost to the Nation for hip fractures resulting from osteoporosis is over $10 billion per year.

Because osteoporosis does not have any symptoms, individuals may not know they are losing bone mass until they fracture. As such, the use of bone measurement technology for individuals who are at high risk of developing osteopporosis is important for controlling health care costs and for reducing human suffering. Most of individuals who are at risk are older women, thus most of the savings from these procedures would go to the Medicare Program.

Mammography is also an essential preventive service that should be covered under Medicare. Each year, 43,000 American women die from breast cancer. Although mammograms are considered the most effective method for detecting this disease, only 17 percent of women age 50 or older have had a mammogram in the last year. Extending Medicare coverage to include this important screening procedure would not only save the lives of thousands of women each year, but would also help reduce the cost to the program by detecting the disease when it is in its early stages.

Preventive health care plays a vital role in reducing disability, morbidity, and mortality. Such services and procedures also have important financial benefits, as they reduce the likelihood of developing diseases, and detect and treat diseases in their early stages.

Given the aging of the population, it is becoming even more imperative that we look toward preventive services as a means of controlling the escalating cost of health care, and improving the quality of life. H.R. 4269, provides an important step in reaching this goal.

THE TELEVISION DECODER CIRCUITRY ACT OF 1990

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1990

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues Mr. OWENS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MADIGAN, and Mr. OXLEY in introducing the Television Decoder Circuitry Act of 1990. Throughout the 1990's and into the next century, the central and essential role television plays in our lives is certain to grow. Americans currently watch 7 to 8 hours of television daily, and rely on the television as their primary source of news, information, and entertainment programming. Technological developments, including high definition television, fiber optics, and high power satellites, further will increase utilization of television in American homes and businesses. As we enter this information age, we must take steps to ensure the full participation of all Americans.

The legislation we are introducing today will help to ensure that the benefits of the video revolution are extended to those who previously have been denied access. In particular, I refer to deaf and hearing-impaired individuals. Although the advent of closed captioned programming has made television meaningful for deaf and hearing-impaired people, access to this technology historically has been restricted by the limited number of set-top decoders in use. The National Captioning Institute estimates the installed base of decoders at 300,000 units, which represents only a small fraction of the 24 million-person deaf and hearing-impaired population.

The limited penetration of decoders into American homes is threatening the long-term viability of the captioning industry. In order to enhance commercial incentives for private funding of captioning services, the audience for captioned programs must be enlarged. This legislation, which would require all new television sets with screens 13 inches or larger to have built-in decoder circuitry to display closed captions, would accomplish this goal and thereby ensure the preservation of the captioning industry.

The deaf and hearing-impaired population is only one of a number of groups that will benefit from this legislation. The potential audience for captioning also includes individuals seeking to acquire or improve literacy skills, including 27 million functionally illiterate adults, 3 to 4 million immigrants learning English as a second language, and 18 million children in grades kindergarten through three, learning to read. A large portion of this audience presently fails to benefit from captioned television because of the cost of purchasing a set-top decoder and the perceived stigma attached to its purchase. These problems also are acute particularly for the estimated 40 percent of America's elderly with moderate or severe hearing loss.

I commend the Caption Center and the National Capitoning Institute for their work in making television accessible to deaf and hearing-impaired viewers. For a small cost—estimated at no more than $15 per television set at the retail level—we can expand the audience for their work, strengthen commercial incentives for the provision of captioning, and enable closed captioning to become a self-sustaining industry. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 15, 1990, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 20

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for military health programs.
SD-192

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
SD-138

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, and the Smithsonian Institution.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the U.S. Information Agency.
S-146, Capitol
Environment and Public Works
Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Public Buildings Program of the General Services Administration.
SD-406

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, and Departmental Offices.
SD-192
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 2088, to extend authority for titles I and II of the Energy Policy Conservation Act (P.L. 94-163), to expand the strategic petroleum reserve (SPR) to 1 billion barrels, and to provide for predrawdown diversion authority for SPR oil.
SD-366
Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
SH-219

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Panama Canal Commission.
SD-116

MARCH 21

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve U.S. agricultural programs.
SR-332
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
SD-192
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the Federal Communication Commission's syndicated exclusivity rules.
SR-253
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2274, to establish a Federal pay system with locality-based adjustments.
SD-342
Small Business
To hold hearings to examine the problems that confront small businesses in complying with the Environmental Protection Agency's regulations on underground storage tanks.
SR-428A

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Food and Drug Administration, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Farm Credit Administration, and Farm Credit System Assistance Board.
SD-138
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the United States Secret Service, and the Internal Revenue Service.
SD-116
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold hearings S.J. Res. 232 and S.J. Res. 233, measures proposing an amendment to the U.S. Constitution with respect to the impeachment of Article III judges.
SD-226

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the National Institute of Building Sciences, the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, and the Selective Service System.
SD-138
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1898, to provide Federal government guarantees of investments of state and local government pension funds in high-speed intercity rail facilities.
SR-253
Finance
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to examine the effects of short-term trading on long-term investments, including S. 1654, to impose an excise tax on the gain of the sale of pension investment assets held for a short term.
SD-215

MARCH 22

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2108, to promote the production of organically produced foods through the establishment of a national standard production for organically produced products and providing for the labeling of such products.
SR-332
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
SD-138
Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 2274, to establish a Federal pay system with locality-based adjustments.
SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on management reforms.
SD-192
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance, focusing on the World Bank and the debt crisis.
SD-106
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, Cemeterial Expenses (Army), the National Credit Union Administration, and the United States Court of Veterans Appeals.
SD-116
Finance
To resume hearings on proposed legislation for deficit reduction and spending initiatives contained in the President's fiscal year 1991 budget.
SD-215

2:00 p.m.
Armed Services
Readiness, Sustainability and Support Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2171, to authorize funds for fiscal year 1991 for military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe military personnel levels for fiscal year 1991, focusing on the operation and maintenance programs, including the impact of the Defense Management Report on logistics programs.
SR-222

MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.
Finance
Private Retirement Plans and Oversight of the Internal Revenue Service Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the Internal Revenue Code rules governing private pension plans and options for simplification.
SD-215
Small Business
To hold hearings on small business opportunities with the Soviet Union and eastern Europe.
SR-428A

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Food Safety and Inspection Service, and Agricultural Marketing Service.
SD-138

MARCH 26

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the outlook for the world oil market in the 1990's and its implications for U.S.

energy, economic, and security interests, focusing on future price and production patterns, the effect of recent events in Eastern bloc nations, the role of OPEC, and implications of new environmental policies.
SD-366

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for military construction programs.
SD-192

MARCH 27

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on manpower and personnel programs.
SD-192

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
SD-138

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1355, to assist private industry in establishing a uniform residential energy efficiency rating system.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Consumer Information Center, and the Office of Consumer Affairs.
S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Indian Health Service of the Department of Health and Human Services, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.
S-128, Capitol

11:15 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on the nominations of L. Joyce Hampers, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, and Brigadier Gen. Arthur E. Williams, to be a Member and President of the Mississippi River Commission.
SD-406

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance, focusing on Central America.
SD-366

MARCH 28

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on S. 2227, to revise the provisions of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (P.L. 80-104) governing exported pesticides.
SR-332

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
SD-192

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 1991 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, focusing on the space station and space shuttle programs.
SR-253

Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances, Environmental Oversight, Research and Development Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the regulation of lawn chemicals.
SH-216

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1398 and S. 1332, to provide for the realignment or major mission change of certain medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs.
SR-418

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Bureau of Public Debt, and the Office of Personnel Management.
SD-116

2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve U.S. agricultural programs, focusing on noxious weeds.
SR-332

Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings on miscellaneous public lands measures, including S. 456, H.R. 1109, S. 465, H.R. 1159, S. 1756, S. 1864, H.R. 76, S. 2059, S. 2208, and S. 1770.
SD-366

MARCH 29

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve U.S. agricultural programs, focusing on research issues.
SR-332

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to reauthorize the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction program.
SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1966, to implement a research, development, and demonstration program for the generation of commercial electric power from nuclear fission.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Army posture.
SD-192

Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the National Science Foundation.
S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the National Institute for Standards and Technology.
S-146, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.
SD-138

Finance
To hold hearings to examine possible causes for the decline of corporate income tax revenues, and to compare the U.S. corporate tax burden with that in other industrialized countries.
SD-215

2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve agricultural programs, focusing on conservation issues.
SR-332

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1880, to revise title VI of the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure carriage on cable television of local news and other programming and to restore the right of local regulatory authorities to regulate cable television rates.
SR-253

MARCH 30

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 639, to establish a research and development program for the development of a domestic hydrogen fuel production capability.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Farmers Home Administration, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Rural Electrification Administration.
SD-138

APRIL 2

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Bureau of Land Management, and the Office of Surface Mining, both of the Department of the Interior.
S-128, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1966, to implement a research, development, and demonstration program for the generation of commercial electric power from nuclear fission.
SD-366

APRIL 3

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the U.S. global change research program and NASA's program, the Earth's Observing System.
SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the Department of Energy's Decision Plan relating to the opening of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in Carlsbad, New Mexico, and on proposed legislation to withdraw the public lands surrounding the WIPP site.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Air Force posture.
SD-192

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance, focusing on U.S. bilateral assistance.
SD-192

APRIL 4

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Foreign Agricultural Service, General Sales Manager, and Soil Conservation Service.
SD-138

APRIL 5

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Navy and Marine posture.
SD-192

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and the Research and Special Programs Administration.
SD-138

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the U.S. Postal Service, and the National Archives.
SD-116

Finance
To hold hearings to examine the security of retirement annuities provided by insurance companies.
SD-215

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
SD-192

Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2117 and H.R. 2570, bills to designate certain lands as wilderness in the State of Arizona.
SD-366

APRIL 18

9:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the AMVETS, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the Veterans of World War I, and the Non-Commissioned Officers Association.
SH-216

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development
SD-138

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, and the National Gallery of Art.
S-128, Capitol

APRIL 19

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Small Business Administration, and the Legal Services Corporation.
S-146, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Federal Railroad Administration and the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak).
SD-138

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Office of Management and Budget, and the Executive Office of the President.
SD-116

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance, focusing on multilateral development banks.
SD-138

APRIL 23

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.
SD-192

APRIL 24

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on the National Guard and Reserves.
SD-192

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the National Transportation Safety Board and the Federal Highway Administration.
SD-138

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance, focusing on refugee programs.
SD-138

APRIL 25

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Office of the Attorney General.
S-146, Capitol

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the General Services Administration.
SD-116

APRIL 26

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
S-126, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for defense intelligence programs.
S-407, Capitol

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of State.
S-146, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the General Accounting Office.
SD-138

2:00 p.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1957, to provide for the efficient and cost effective acquisition of nondevelopmental items for federal agencies.
SD-342

APRIL 30

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for fossil energy and clean coal technology programs of the Department of Energy.
S-128, Capitol

MAY 1

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Supreme Court of the United States, the Judiciary, and the Federal Trade Commission.
S-146, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance, focusing on Eastern Europe.
SD-138

MAY 2

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.
S-146, Capitol

MAY 3

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on strategic programs.
S-407, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Bureau of Mines, all of the Department of the Interior.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the U.S. Coast Guard.
SD-138

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Council on Environmental Quality, the National Space Council, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy.
SD-116

MAY 4

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Resolution Trust Corporation.
SD-138

MAY 8

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on tactical airpower.
SD-192

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance, focusing on U.S. military assistance.
SD-138

MAY 10

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on land warfare.
SD-192

Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Veterans' Administration.
S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Federal Aviation Administration.
SD-138

MAY 14

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for activities of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of Agriculture.
S-128, Capitol

MAY 15

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on seapower.
SD-192

11:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies.
SD-138

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance, focusing on population policy and resources.
SD-138

MAY 16

11:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies.
SD-138

MAY 17

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the De-

partment of Defense, focusing on space programs.
S-407, Capitol

11:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies.
SD-138

MAY 22

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations Defense Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for the Department of Defense, focusing on classified programs.
S-407, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance, focusing on the global environment.
SD-138

MAY 24

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for defense programs.
SD-192

JUNE 5

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of Defense.
SD-192

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance.
SD-138

JUNE 12

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance, focusing on organization and accountability.
SD-138

JUNE 19

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance.
Room to be announced

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1991 for foreign assistance.
Room to be announced

CANCELLATIONS

MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1741, to increase competition among commercial air carriers at the Nation's major airports.
SR-253