

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 21, 1991

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Reverend Dr. Ronald F. Christian, Office of the Bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from whom all thoughts of truth and peace and kindness originate;

Kindle in the hearts of Your people everywhere a burning desire for justice, righteousness, and integrity of spirit;

Give wisdom to those who seek it;

Give comfort to those who call upon You;

Give blessings to those in want;

And give hope for a safer, saner world to all those who pray to know Your will and seek to follow Your command. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WOLPE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Haller, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 55. Joint resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of United States-Portuguese diplomatic relations.

THIS IS NO JERRY LEWIS TELETHON

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the Americans are very proud of the contribution that our men and women in the Persian Gulf are making, and we know what that contribution is. It is visible, and one can see it, but Americans also

want to know what contribution others are making to the Persian Gulf because that is not as visible, and we cannot see it. And yet this is a war that involves many of our allies, involves West Germany, Japan, those that have something to gain, those that also have something to lose.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am supporting the Panetta-Schumer legislation today, because it is time to see first hand what it is that they are contributing. I am greatly concerned that the burden is not being shared equally. I see the administration reporting 40 to 50 billion dollars' worth of pledges, and yet at the same time we see it as less than \$7 billion in hand.

Mr. Speaker, this is no Jerry Lewis telethon where everybody calls in who feels like it and makes a contribution. We want our allies to be full partners. We want them to share, and we want to know and see first hand what they are contributing. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this legislation today.

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS REFORM

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to create a House Commission on Legislative Process Reform, to be composed of 12 Members—8 current House Members and 4 former Members, equally divided between the two major parties.

The Commission would study the structure and operation of the legislative process in the House, and report its findings and recommendations by the end of this year. Its report would be referred to the Committee on Rules, which would hopefully report a reform package for House consideration early next year.

Mr. Speaker, according to an ABC News poll last fall, 77 percent of the American people disapprove of the job that this Congress does. That is a shame. And as usual, Mr. Speaker, the perceptions of the people are on the mark. The evidence is all around us that the legislative process is in a state of, I think, great disrepair and in need of an overhaul.

At least five major bills in the last Congress were crafted outside the standing committee system: The budget agreement, clean air, crime, ethics, and campaign reform. In the current fiscal year, 34.1 billion dollars' worth of programs and agencies are operating

without their required authorizations. We are not doing our job.

Over the last 20 years, the number of subcommittees has increased by 40 percent, and committee staff by 186 percent. And yet, over that same period, the number of measures reported by committees is down 44 percent, and the number of substantive bills enacted into law is down 33 percent. The people expect better than that. Let us get busy and do something about it.

BURDEN SHARING

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud the American people. They have offered their best—our men and women, daughters and sons—to protect the rights of an ally in a time of dire need. No truer test of our commitment to the cause of freedom could be given.

But, Mr. Speaker, the American people can only be asked to give so much. The rest of the world has no right to expect that we also bear all the financial costs of this conflict. Our economy is weak and our deficits are high. Our working families are squeezed at the margins in every way imaginable. They struggle daily with the soaring costs of health care and education and housing.

The fact is that there are other nations who—for whatever reasons—have not anteed up in this cause to the degree America has, with troops and personnel. It's time that those countries—countries with strong economies—are accountable for some of the financial costs associated with the gulf policy.

It is patriotic to demand that the costs of our policy in the gulf are fully accounted for. It is only proper in the free world to demand that the costs associated with protecting freedom are shared among free nations.

It is a sound practice of Government. And it is a fair expectation of our allies. It is the responsibility of the Congress to ensure that this occurs. A new world order cannot happen if it is only American men and women who fall in battle and American tax dollars that finance these battles.

WHY THE LAMPREY RIVER QUALIFIES FOR STUDY UNDER THE NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

(Mr. ZELIFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

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

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce a bill to designate a 9-mile segment of the Lamprey River in New Hampshire for study under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Included on the 1982 National Inventory of Potential Wild and Scenic Rivers, the Lamprey River is a remarkable pristine river in an area of New England that continues to experience explosive population growth. In 1990, the Lamprey River segment proposed for Federal study became one of only five segments designated by the State to its Rivers Management and Protection Program, based on its outstanding statewide and local resource values and characteristics. However, this State program is powerless to protect the river as intended if Federal projects are approved which destroy the very values for which the river was selected.

Today, the beauty of the Lamprey is threatened by a proposed hydroelectric facility. This facility will diminish water quality through soil erosion and fluctuating water levels. The output from this proposed facility will only provide enough energy for 30 homes, yet damage miles of river enjoyed by hundreds each year.

Mr. Speaker, as is the case with the Wildcat Brook and Merrimack and Pemigewasset Rivers studies conducted in New Hampshire, I do not envision Federal land acquisition or management as viable alternatives for the long-term protection of the Lamprey River corridor. Rather, it is my intention that the National Park Service work in partnership with the State and local governments and private landowners to protect the integrity of the river.

It is vitally important that the extraordinary qualities of the Lamprey be preserved for future generations. This objective would be best accomplished through an eligibility study and eventual qualification for listing in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

□ 1110

BURDEN SHARING

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

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 586.

As we approach that chilling moment when brave American troops and their allies in arms are sent into ground combat, let us strengthen our call to those nations who have stayed away from the desert to at the very least pay their fair share of the economic burden of this war.

Over these last few months, we have heard from most of these allies the diplomatic equivalent of, "The check is in the mail." Well, the bill is due. It is time for us to collect.

One way to ensure that collection is for the Congress and the American people to have an accurate, monthly accounting of our allies' economic contribution to the war. This bill, H.R. 586, sees to that.

The harsh, brutal reality of war is that it is ultimately paid for in the currency of blood and human life. Our allies who have decided that that cost is too steep know full well, however, that war also brings a tremendous economic burden.

As Americans, willing to invest the lives of our young men and women in the desert, that's a cost we cannot allow to go unpaid.

TAX EXEMPTION SOUGHT ON ALL SALES OF A PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE

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

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to correct a gross inequity in the tax treatment of Americans selling their homes. Under current law, millions of Americans sell their homes and pay no income tax on the gain due to reasonable rules providing exemptions for taxpayers over 55 or those buying more expensive homes.

About the only people who pay tax when selling their homes, are lower income taxpayers disadvantaged by economic dislocation. While the wealthiest Americans generally pay no tax, Americans who lose their jobs do pay. Divorced mothers who cannot afford mortgage payments, pay. People who become seriously ill, who lose their jobs, or seniors who used up their benefits at age 55, end up paying taxes. My bill solves this inequity by exempting the sale of a principal residence from tax.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join my 50 original cosponsors by adding their names to my bill.

PAYING THE COSTS OF WAR IN BLOOD AND MONEY

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in addressing the costs of war. When we speak of costs, we must remember we speak not only of money. The currency of battle is blood, seldom one's own.

And the currency of the war we fight today in the Persian Gulf could, I fear, be primarily U.S. blood. It is only right

and just that our coalition partners help pay for the war we wage on behalf of all the world's freedoms.

I support our troops and I salute the job they are doing. We will give them whatever resources they need.

The legislation we will consider today introduced by Congressmen PANNETTA and SCHUMER asks only for a fair and full reporting on the costs of this battle. We will see the human costs every night on the news, and we in Congress will hear and will know men and women who lose their lives fighting on our behalf.

But the financial costs, the lost equipment that must be replaced and dollars taken from our national budget already stretched to provide education, housing and other services, those costs will be harder to discern. And it is important that we know the full extent of those costs and to what degree we are being supported by our coalition partners.

We do not ask for this information in order to refuse funding. No one here today is suggesting that we not provide our troops with everything they need. But let's be honest about the costs and let's ask that everyone pay their fair share.

We must remember when we budget for Desert Storm that the men and women fighting for us today will be home with us tomorrow. We owe it to them to provide whatever services they need when they return home. And that means we can't afford to finance this war by ourselves. And we shouldn't have to.

TAKING STEPS TOWARD ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, oft times major advancements in public policy take place at times of crises. The crisis in the Middle East provides us with such an opportunity in energy policy.

The President has presented his proposal for a national energy strategy. There is no question for most Members of Congress that energy security is a critical goal for the country. This crisis we face provides us with a great opportunity to enact some key policies that have too long languished in congressional committees. We possibly could lose this opportunity if we descend into political carping here in the House. Instead, we should insist that the leadership enact expedited procedures very soon to consider a broad energy package.

It is very important that Members on both sides of the aisle recognize this opportunity and carefully examine the President's proposal. The NES is the result of more than 19 months of data

collection and analysis. It deserves our respect and careful examination. Of course the Congress can and will add to it our own ideas.

Mr. Speaker, by working together and setting aside partisan politics, we indeed can take a giant step toward energy security now.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ENSURE DESERT STORM BURDEN SHARING

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the most important consideration with respect to the Persian Gulf war is clearly the cost in human lives at this point, and we pray that that will be over soon and few human lives will be lost. But when the dust has settled and the conflict is over in the Persian Gulf, the question will remain: What are the financial costs and who will assume the burden of paying for them?

Many of us feel very strongly that our allies have a responsibility, a very significant responsibility, and we hope that this talk of a new world order means a new responsibility on the part of our allies to pay their fair share for mutual defense.

I have introduced House Joint Resolution 92, which establishes thresholds that Japan, Germany, and Saudis, and others must meet in their responsibility to help pay for the costs of Operation Desert Storm. If they fail to meet those thresholds, then import tariffs would be imposed on their goods sufficient to reach that threshold of money necessary to pay those costs.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, we believe our allies, many of whom have a much greater reliance on the Persian Gulf oil trade than do we, have a financial responsibility to pay a major share of the costs. The question is not so much what is pledged, although we appreciate those pledges. The question is, how much money is in the bank to fulfill those pledges? We hope again that the new world order represents a new responsibility by our allies to help pay the costs and share the burden.

Mr. Speaker, the United States cannot continue to defend the free world and pay the defense bills for our allies even as we borrow the money from them to do so.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE X, FAMILY PLANNING

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, we stand at the edge of a momentous occasion: the 20th anniversary of something we call family planning. Over the last

two decades Federal taxpayers have socked away around \$2 billion with the hope of preventing teen pregnancies. What have they received for their investment?

All taxpayers have received is more teen sex, more teen pregnancies and more teen abortions. Only the criminally insane could have concocted a better way to disrupt the lives of young Americans.

As the beautiful people converge on Washington to celebrate this noble achievement of teen misery, let me offer them my own award: The award presented to the most delusional, pompous, and misguided cast of characters ever to parade themselves as impassioned liberals.

Mr. Speaker, if we truly want to help America's youth cope with adolescence, we will cut title X and hold hearings on whether to continue family planning and let parents back into the lives of their children.

NATIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY

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

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday after more than a decade with no comprehensive energy plan and 18 months of development by the Department of Energy, President Bush released his national energy strategy. It is a profound disappointment which advances not the national interest but merely the interests of the oil and nuclear industries.

□ 1120

Regretfully, I rise to express my dismay that this strategy does not live up to the anticipation and fanfare surrounding its long-awaited arrival. What the Bush energy strategy lacks is balance: It focuses almost exclusively on energy production, while virtually ignoring the value of energy conservation.

Mr. Speaker, energy efficiency should be the first, not the last, step in any national energy policy, if simply for the reason that a barrel of oil saved is a barrel of oil that we do not have to import from abroad. Improved energy efficiency is the cheapest and quickest means of displacing our dependence on overseas energy supplies. Energy efficiency will stimulate the economy and prove to be far better for the environment.

The Bush administration claims its plan is a free market approach to energy supplies, but this is false advertising. While energy conservation and renewable energy sources are left to fend for themselves on the open market, other energy sources, such as nuclear power, are heavily subsidized.

Over the past decade, the United States has only made itself more vul-

nerable by increasing its dependence on foreign oil. The war in the Gulf is our most vivid evidence of the danger of energy dependence. Sadly, with the Bush formula for a national energy strategy, the United States would continue its dependence on oil imports well into the next century.

CASTRO REACTS TO HUSSEIN WITH BROTHERLY EMBRACE

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, in case it has slipped anyone's attention, we should note that not only does Fidel Castro continue to treat the Cuban people with brutal cruelty, but he also wishes that the Kuwaiti people continue to suffer under the subjugation of the ruthless Iraqi dictator, Saddam Hussein.

Cuba has voted against, or abstained from voting, for the six pro United States, United Nations resolutions, which implement the removal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait. Cuba has also announced that its advisers and 200 medical personnel will remain in Iraq and its embassy there will stay open throughout the war.

Those of us who have experienced Fidel Castro's oppression are not surprised by his behavior. How else would Fidel Castro, who has blatantly violated human rights in Cuba, react to Saddam Hussein, but with a brotherly embrace?

WESTERN HEMISPHERIC ENERGY POLICY IS THE WAY TO GO

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

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing the American people understand, it is that we need to get it together where our energy policy is concerned.

The volatility in the Middle East and its inability to maintain a peaceful coexistence makes it absolutely necessary that we create a viable Western Hemisphere energy policy.

From a resource standpoint, the Western Hemisphere is completely self-sufficient. This hemispheric energy policy is well within our grasp—all that has been lacking is the political will.

The nations of our hemisphere are richly endowed with energy sources. We have proven oil, gas, coal, and hydroelectric reserves, as well as solar, wind, nuclear and geothermal possibilities. We need to create a plan that maximizes the resources of this hemisphere and frees us from the tangle of the Middle East.

This Western Hemisphere energy policy would have several benefits. It would at long last end the debt burden of Latin America. It would open a door to unprecedented prosperity in these nations. New markets would open to the United States, and the Western Hemisphere energy policy would also provide us with a counterweight to the European Economic Community.

For the nations of our hemisphere, we could usher in a new era of peace, economic security, and growth. The western hemispheric energy policy is the way to go, and it's time to get on with the job.

OPPOSE H.R. 5

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, let us take 1 minute and think about the effect of the strike replacement bill if applied to our own congressional offices, which are really small businesses.

Say that two of your staffers decide to seek a 50-percent pay increase and are turned down, these staffers walk out. Under H.R. 5, this is a labor dispute or strike. Let us suppose one staffer runs the computer and the other is a legislative assistant. Their jobs are not available on a permanent basis to anyone, so you find that no one wants the job. Your congressional office would find in short order how difficult it is to work without two chief employees. You would be forced to recall the staffers and give in to their demands.

Can you imagine what this would do for the relations with your nonstriking staff? And their pay? Also, think of the impact on your clerk hire budget.

This is what H.R. 5 is, a guaranteed no penalty prostrike bill. It must be defeated.

IT'S TIME TO SEE THE CASH

(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, it is time to see the cash. Where is the money? Where is all the money from the allies? Japan pledged \$11 billion, and Japan gave \$1 billion. Where is the other \$10 billion? Did they send it over on a Stealth bomber? Because we cannot even detect it on radar, Mr. Speaker.

I want you to think about it: While Americans and troops are protecting Japan's assets, they are picking our pockets. Japanese banks are foreclosing on American companies, and Japan continues to buy America, from sundown to Sunday silence.

I say it is time for Congress to tell Japan, come up with the cash, and everybody else to come up with the cash, or we are going to put some tariffs on your products in this country, because the American taxpayers are tired of the one-way joy ride overseas.

REPUBLICAN ENERGY STRATEGY WILL LEAD WORLD INTO NEXT CENTURY

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, while the cassettes of the left wring their hands about the lack of a national energy policy, President Bush and the House Republicans have put together a national energy strategy that will be leading the world into the next century.

My constituents and yours cry out for a meaningful national energy policy, and President Bush has delivered, and delivered on time.

Some 20 months ago, long before the events in the Middle East caused a great deal of consternation about the lack of an energy policy in this country, the administration very carefully and methodically put together a series of hearings throughout the country, led by the Secretary of Energy, James Watkins, to put together something that the American people could agree with and could get behind.

That policy, after 20 months, was delivered to the Congress yesterday. I think it behooves all of us to take a solid look at how balanced and effective an approach this is.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any Member can argue that if we go home and talk to our constituents, that our constituents are not telling us we need a national energy policy. The only national energy policy I have seen before us is what the President has put forward. I ask all Members to take a solid look at that proposal, and then get at it in crafting a policy that this Congress can be proud of and that we can lead this Nation and the world into the next century with.

PRESIDENT'S ENERGY STRATEGY LACKS CREATIVITY AND IMAGINATION

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

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, in this exciting time of discussing the emergence of a brave, new world order I am sorely disappointed by the President's attempt at carving a new national energy policy. It is neither brave, new, or aimed at reordering the priorities in a way that will dramatically benefit the future of this Nation and the planet.

What we have been handed by the President is a blueprint that describes our energy future in terms of maintaining the status quo. There is little in this plan that is creative and catches the imagination of the public.

For the last 10 years we have squandered our resources and wantonly dismissed our ever-increasing dependence on foreign oil. It is shameful to realize that, had a fraction of the costs incurred by Desert Shield and Storm been invested in the pursuit of alternative energy sources and conservation, the United States would not have needed to purchase oil from Kuwait at all.

It is the time to recognize that the solution to our energy dependency problems lies not in the opening up of oil fields in precious wilderness areas but first in utilizing technology that maximizes conservation and the use of alternative renewable resources. The diversification of our fuel base will create new jobs and provide an exciting frontier for our young scientists to explore that can have an immediate and positive impact on the future of our country and world.

□ 1130

DEATH PENALTY FOR TERRORIST MURDERERS WHO KILL AMERICANS AT HOME OR ABROAD

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, we all know that Saddam Hussein considers terrorism a legitimate weapon with which to attack his enemies. Since the Gulf war began, he has repeatedly fired missiles on civilians in Israel, beaten coalition POW's and used them as human shields, and threatened to bring his war of terror home to the United States.

Yet, if Iraqi terrorists followed through on this threat and murdered civilians in the United States, under current Federal law the death penalty could not be imposed by the Federal Government for these diabolical crimes.

On February 5, I introduced a bill, H.R. 826, that would change that. My bill, which is the same as a bill introduced by Senator THURMOND, will allow for the death penalty to be imposed on terrorist murderers who kill Americans either at home or abroad.

By a 74 to 23 vote yesterday, the Senate approved legislation with the same goal. Now, it's the House's turn. I urge the House to move quickly and pass legislation that would hold terrorists fully accountable for their crimes. That means applying the death penalty on terrorists who commit crimes against Americans. Saddam can't win the war militarily, and we should send

this firm message that he can't win it by terror either.

COLLECTING DESERT STORM PLEDGES FROM OUR ALLIES

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, two of the great statements in English literature are: "I gave at the office," and "The check is in the mail."

We are here today on the floor with the bill about to come up referring to checks that are "in the mail," something like \$30 billion of checks that are in the mail from our allies and coalition partners in Operation Desert Storm. The bill requires estimates of the war's cost and reports of payment or nonpayment of burdensharing pledges.

I think that it is important that we have coalitions. They certainly augur well for the new world order: New coalitions, new grouping of nations. But, each member of a coalition has to pay its fair share of the costs of war.

I just observed a bit of television a few minutes ago, and it appears that the statements from Baghdad are anything but promising toward some extrication of the Iraqi troops from Kuwait without a land war, which means that the United States may experience heavy casualties. Lives are not quantifiable in dollars. But certainly the responsibility of our coalition partners is to pay up what they have promised to pay and then be with us when it comes time to construct the new world order in the Middle East.

So, Mr. Speaker, the bill that we will take up today is one solid step in this whole program of making sure that those checks not only are in the mail, but they are actually received.

PRAISE FOR PRESIDENT BUSH'S REJECTION OF SOVIET PEACE PROPOSAL

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

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the President of the United States for his principled and firm rejection of the Soviet proposal to appease Saddam Hussein in the ongoing war in the Persian Gulf.

The President is correct in insisting upon the unconditional withdrawal of Saddam Hussein's military forces from Kuwait. There should be no backing down from the resolutions of the United Nations and of this Congress. There should be no deals with this ruthless dictator.

There is no such thing as an unconditional withdrawal with conditions. That is what the Soviet offer was.

Nothing but appeasement for a vicious aggressor. That is not the path we want to take.

Everyone wants the war to end—including the President. Nobody wants to risk the lives of our brave, young service men and women for a single day longer.

But we cannot sell out our principles. If we compromise now, we only encourage aggressors in the future—and endanger the lives of our military personnel down the road even more.

I trust that my colleagues will join me in supporting the President in his sound decision.

PRESIDENT'S ENERGY STRATE- GY IS ENERGY TRAGEDY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker we have waited 2 years for the administration to offer a sensible and rational national energy strategy. Yesterday it was finally unveiled. And what did we receive? An oil and nuclear industry wish list, with hardly a word about the cheapest, fastest, easiest, and most environmentally benign path toward energy independence—conservation.

The administration's plan should have been a ringing declaration of energy independence. Instead, it was an unconditional surrender to continued foreign dependence and overconsumption.

It is time for the Bush administration to go back to the drawing board. Today, I am introducing a bill that would require the administration to develop and present to Congress a plan for energy independence by the year 2000 with a priority on conservation, renewable energy resources, and alternative fuels.

During the 1980's, the Federal Government backtracked on its commitment to energy independence. Spending for energy conservation and renewable technologies declined. Automobile fuel efficiency standards peaked and then fell as the Reagan administration encouraged a return to wasteful fuel consumption. The Nation abandoned energy efficiency for an emphasis on production for production's sake.

I still remember when Interior Secretary Hodel came to the Congress to argue for opening the Arctic refuge and pronounced energy conservation a "draconian" measure.

In the Pacific Northwest, we began an experiment in 1980 in planning for clean, efficient energy resources. Reeling from the collapse of a gargantuan nuclear construction program, we won enactment in Congress of a regional electricity planning and conservation act that had as its cornerstone the concept of least cost planning.

Simply put, the legislation called for identification of the full range of energy generating resources and their array on the basis of full cost. The costs were to include transmission, distribution, and disposal, as well as simple acquisition and construction. The legislation enacted the pioneering concept of conservation as an energy resource, and we had faith that a fair comparison of cost-effectiveness would reveal conservation to be a bounteous resource for the Pacific Northwest.

In fact, the Northwest's public power marketing agency, the Bonneville Power Administration, has identified conservation as the least expensive available source of new energy—cheaper by far than new nuclear, coal or gas fired generating plants—especially when the true costs of environmental cleanup are calculated.

My bill will require the same kind of planning effort on a national scale. It requires an inventory of the energy resources available to meet this Nation's future needs and calls for a plan to sponsor the acquisition of these resources. Such a plan would have to be submitted to Congress and approved before the Interior Department could undertake new oil and gas leasing off of our coasts or on our Nation's most prized public lands.

We need an energy policy that benefits the consumer, not the big oil companies. I'm afraid that the administration's energy plan is more than result of well-financed lobbying efforts and Reagan-era economic dogma than rational planning.

Mr. Speaker, energy independence should be one of our Nation's top priorities. And I'm convinced we can become energy independent by the year 2000. But the plan presented yesterday by the President doesn't get us there. The President's plan is not an energy strategy, it's an energy tragedy. We can do better.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clauses 6 (f) and (i) of rule X, the Chair appoints as majority members of the Select Committee on Aging the following Members of the House:

Mr. ROYBAL of California, Chairman;
Mr. DOWNEY of New York;
Mr. FORD of Tennessee;
Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey;
Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee;
Ms. OAKAR of Ohio;
Mrs. BYRON of Maryland;
Mr. WAXMAN of California;
Mr. DERRICK of South Carolina;
Mr. VENTO of Minnesota;
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts;
Mr. LANTOS of California;
Mr. WYDEN of Oregon;
Mr. SKELTON of Missouri;
Mr. HERTEL of Michigan;
Mr. BORSKI of Pennsylvania;

Mr. ERDREICH of Alabama;
 Mr. SISISKY of Virginia;
 Mr. WISE of West Virginia;
 Mr. RICHARDSON of New Mexico;
 Mr. VOLKMER of Missouri;
 Mr. GORDON of Tennessee;
 Mr. MANTON of New York;
 Mr. STALLINGS of Idaho;
 Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts;
 Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York;
 Mr. BILBRAY of Nevada;
 Mr. JONTZ of Indiana;
 Mr. COSTELLO of Illinois;
 Mr. STAGGERS of West Virginia;
 Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey;
 Mrs. UNSOELD of Washington;
 Mr. DEFazio of Oregon;
 Mr. LEWIS of Georgia;
 Mr. OWENS of Utah;
 Mr. ROE of New Jersey;
 Mr. STUDDS of Massachusetts;
 Mr. ABERCROMBIE of Hawaii;
 Mr. SWETT of New Hampshire; and
 Ms. DELAULO of Connecticut.

And the Chair also appoints to that same committee the following minority Members of the House:

Mr. RINALDO of New Jersey;
 Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT of Arkansas;
 Mr. REGULA of Ohio;
 Ms. SNOWE of Maine;
 Mr. SMITH of New Jersey;
 Mr. BOEHLERT of New York;
 Mr. SAXTON of New Jersey;
 Mrs. BENTLEY of Maryland;
 Mr. LIGHTFOOT of Iowa;
 Mr. FAWELL of Illinois;
 Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas;
 Mr. BLAZ of Guam;
 Mr. HENRY of Michigan;
 Mr. SPENCE of South Carolina;
 Mrs. MORELLA of Maryland;
 Mr. PORTER of Illinois;
 Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee;
 Mr. STEARNS of Florida;
 Mr. JAMES of Florida;
 Mr. HOUGHTON of New York;
 Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut;
 Mr. HOBSON of Ohio;
 Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina;
 Mr. GILCHREST of Maryland;
 Mr. ZIMMER of New Jersey;
 Mr. NICHOLS of Kansas; and
 Mr. NUSSLE of Iowa.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 103 of House Resolution 51, 102d Congress, the Chair appoints as majority members of the Select Committee on Hunger the following Members of the House:

Mr. HALL of Ohio, Chairman;
 Mr. PANETTA of California;
 Mr. FAZIO of California;
 Mr. KOSTMAYER of Pennsylvania;
 Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota;
 Mr. CARR of Michigan;
 Mr. PENNY of Minnesota;
 Mr. ACKERMAN of New York;
 Mr. ESPY of Mississippi;
 Mr. FLAKE of New York;
 Mrs. PATTERSON of South Carolina;

Mr. FOGLIETTA of Pennsylvania;
 Mr. BUSTAMANTE of Texas;
 Mr. McNULTY of New York;
 Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA of American Samoa;

Mr. ENGEL of New York;
 Mr. AUCOIN of Oregon;
 Mr. WHEAT of Missouri;
 Ms. LONG of Indiana; and
 Mr. SYNAR of Oklahoma.

And the Chair also appoints to that same committee the following minority Members of the House:

Mr. EMERSON of Missouri;
 Mrs. ROUKEMA of New Jersey;
 Mr. MORRISON of Washington;
 Mr. GILMAN of New York;
 Mr. SMITH of Oregon;
 Mr. BEREUTER of Nebraska;
 Mr. UPTON of Michigan;
 Mr. HUNTER of California;
 Mr. WOLF of Virginia;
 Mr. SMITH of New Jersey;
 Mr. GILCHREST of Maryland; and
 Mr. RIGGS of California.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 203 of House Resolution 51, 102d Congress, the Chair appoints as majority members of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, the following Members of the House:

Mr. MILLER of California, Chairman;
 Mr. LEHMAN of Florida;
 Mrs. SCHROEDER of Colorado;
 Mr. MCHUGH of New York;
 Mr. WEISS of New York;
 Mr. ANTHONY of Arkansas;
 Mrs. BOXER of California;
 Mr. LEVIN of Michigan;
 Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia;
 Mr. SIKORSKI of Minnesota;
 Mr. WHEAT of Missouri;
 Mr. MARTINEZ of California;
 Mr. EVANS of Illinois;
 Mr. DURBIN of Illinois;
 Mr. SKAGGS of Colorado;
 Mr. SARPALIUS of Texas;
 Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota;
 Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan;
 Ms. HORN of Missouri;
 Mr. BACCHUS of Florida;
 Mr. PETERSON of Florida; and
 Mr. CRAMER of Alabama.

And the Chair also appoints to that same committee the following minority Members of the House:

Mr. WOLF of Virginia;
 Mr. HASTERT of Illinois;
 Mr. HOLLOWAY of Louisiana;
 Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania;
 Mr. SMITH of Texas;
 Mr. WALSH of New York;
 Mr. MACHTEY of Rhode Island;
 Mr. MCEWEN of Ohio;
 Mr. BILIRAKIS of Florida;
 Mr. KLUG of Wisconsin;
 Mr. SANTORUM of Pennsylvania;
 Mr. CAMP of Michigan;
 Mr. RIGGS of California; and

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

□ 1140

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of House Resolution 51, 102d Congress, the Chair appoints as majority members of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control the following Members of the House:

Mr. RANGEL of New York, Chairman;
 Mr. BROOKS of Texas;
 Mr. STARK of California;
 Mr. SCHEUER of New York;
 Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois;
 Mr. GUARINI of New Jersey;
 Mr. FASCELL of Florida;
 Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey;
 Mr. LEVINE of California;
 Mr. ORTIZ of Texas;
 Mr. SMITH of Florida;
 Mr. TOWNS of New York;
 Mr. TRAFICANT of Ohio;
 Mr. MFUME of Maryland;
 Mrs. LOWEY of New York;
 Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey;
 Mr. MAZZOLI of Kentucky;
 Mr. DELUGO of the Virgin Islands;
 Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER of New York;
 Mr. WASHINGTON of Texas; and
 Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

And the Chair also appoints to that same committee the following minority Members of the House:

Mr. COUGHLIN of Pennsylvania;
 Mr. GILMAN of New York;
 Mr. OXLEY of Ohio;
 Mr. SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin;
 Mr. DORNAN of California;
 Mr. LEWIS of Florida;
 Mr. INHOFE of Oklahoma;
 Mr. HERGER of California;
 Mr. SHAYS of Connecticut;
 Mr. PAXON of New York;
 Mr. CLINGER of Pennsylvania;
 Mr. COBLE of North Carolina;
 Mr. GILLMOR of Ohio; and
 Mr. RAMSTAD of Minnesota.

LET US MAKE SURE AMERICA WILL NOT BE VULNERABLE TO FUTURE SADDAM HUSSEINS

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

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the American people can be proud of the fact that we have supported a strong defense of our Nation. Our forces are performing well in the Persian Gulf. Before Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, we rejoiced that the Berlin Wall came down, the Eastern bloc nations renounced communism in favor of democracy, and President Gorbachev embraced glasnost and perestroika. Because of all this the administration, with acquiescence by Congress, an-

nounced a 25-percent reduction in defense for the next 5 years. Now, in view of Mr. Gorbachev's backsliding and the advent of Desert Storm, the administration and the Congress should reassess that 25-percent drawdown and make sure that America will not be vulnerable to the future Saddam Hussein of this world.

WE SHOULD BE SUPPORTIVE OF THE MISSION OF OUR NATIONAL LEADERS

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein told his people this morning that he is not leaving Kuwait. He has committed his nation to continued war and possible suicide.

All of those who told us a few weeks ago that sanctions alone would drive Saddam out of Kuwait now should know better. He is willing to fight to the last Iraqi standing provided he is the last one standing.

Yet those in this body who did not want to stand up to Saddam a few weeks ago are today suggesting that they know better how to run the war than President Bush, Secretary Cheney, or Chief of Staff Powell. Instead of giving our national leaders more problems to deal with, we should be more supportive of their mission.

The American people are a little tired of those who are not willing to go to war now telling us how to run it. The American people are a little tired of those who would not fight now fighting with the people who are trying to achieve a victory. The American people are a little tired of those who say they support the troops but spend most of their time trying to undermine the leadership those troops depend upon.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S ENERGY STRATEGY WOULD TAKE AMERICA "BACK TO THE FUTURE"

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

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the words of former Yankee manager, Yogi Berra, "It's like déjà vu all over again." Yesterday the administration had the chance to begin a new chapter in this country's energy history, but instead it copied the time-worn, hackneyed script of its predecessor. Instead of a vision of the future, the administration wants to take us back to the future. Indeed, the administration has put forth an energy strategy designed for another era, a time when American oil seemed unlimited and problems like global warming were confined to the pages of science fiction novels.

The policy unveiled yesterday does not indicate that the administration has learned the hard lessons of energy dependence or understood the environmental warning signs that surround us. Moreover, events in the Persian Gulf and their impact here at home demand a fundamental shift in American energy strategy, not a half-hearted reprise of old energy policies. The administration's policy relies on the dubious promise of increased oil and nuclear energy production while it gives short shrift to the significant potential of energy conservation and safe alternative energy sources.

We need an energy policy that capitalizes on American ingenuity and creativity in the fields of conservation and alternative energy. We need leadership not gimmicks. We need an energy strategy that does not sell the American people short.

PROGRESS IN GETTING THE S&L CROOKS

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, last year, this Congress passed a law to assist the administration in getting at the S&L crooks who have stolen the taxpayers' money in the savings and loan debacle.

I am pleased to report today, that a great deal of progress has been made in this area. Some of the kingpins of the S&L industry have finally been brought to justice. Don Dixon—Vernon S&L—has been convicted. No more fancy eating trips through Europe for him, and passing the bill off to the taxpayers. Ed McBirney—Sunbelt Savings—has pleaded guilty—no more shopping sprees at Neimen Marcus for him on the taxpayers tab. Charlie Keating—Lincoln—has criminal charges filed against him and is awaiting trial, and the regulators are trying to collect \$31 million from David Paul—Centrust.

All totaled, since October 1988, 566 defendants have been charged in savings and loan cases, and 403 have been convicted. Only 18 have been acquitted. Prison sentences total 768 years and \$231 million in restitutions have been ordered.

Election year or not, this body can be assured that this Member and the Bush administration remain committed to getting the S&L crooks.

AN ENERGY SCAM

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President unveiled his energy plan. Frankly, it was not an energy

plan. It was an energy scam. It went in precisely the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, nations all over the world are concerned about global warming. They are concerned about the greenhouse effect. They are concerned about acid rain, and they are trying to conserve and reduce global dependence on fossil fuel energy. That is the great challenge.

This pitiful excuse for an energy plan sends us right down the road to more fossil fuel production and more fossil fuel consumption, exactly what America does not need and what the world does not need.

Originally, the enlightened experts at the Department of Energy under the leadership of Adm. James Watkins, a terrific leader in the field of energy and environment, came up with a very useful and constructive plan that depended largely on renewed efforts to achieve energy efficiency, and investments in our national economy to make us more fuel-effective and more energy-effective. It depended upon conservation. It depended on production of alternative fuels. It was an excellent plan.

But the bean counters at the Office of Management and Budget apparently thought otherwise. Someone took a surgeon's scalpel to it and cut out all of those constructive and useful approaches. I do not know who the surgeon was, but I suspect his name was Sununu.

Mr. Speaker, we have asked a half million of our finest youth, men and women, to put their lives on the line in the Persian Gulf. Are we incapable of asking the American people to turn off the water, to engage in car pooling, to buy fuel-efficient cars, to turn out the lights when they leave the room? This is the approach that we need.

There are vast sources of new energy available just through conservation, just through energy efficiency. We ought to have the character and the strength and the commitment to those men and women out in the Persian Gulf to match their zeal in producing energy through conservation and energy efficiency.

COME UP WITH ENERGY POLICY DIRECTED AT NATIONAL INTERESTS

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this tragic war has made Americans realize their cherished independence is really being undercut by a heavy dependence on foreign oil. At the same time, President Bush's popularity is soaring, so it is a perfect time to couple his high popularity with American awareness and come up with an energy policy that is

really directed at national interests and not special interests.

Unfortunately, instead of giving special interests the boot, it appears they were shown the front door, and we now see an energy policy that does not reflect national interests at all but what special interests would like to see.

This Congress has now got to start from square one. We have got to tackle this thing, and we have got to make sure America gets an energy policy that truly makes her independent and ready for the 21st century.

EXCHANGE OF PRISONERS OF WAR MUST BE FIRST PRIORITY

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if a cease-fire should be borne out of this flurry of activities between Moscow and Baghdad, then we must make sure that any such cease-fire should contain elements of exchange of prisoners of war as a condition of the cessation of hostilities, not the other way around.

We have had sad experiences in both Korea and in Vietnam with our inability to track down and to secure the release of our prisoners of war. Whatever their numbers are, any cease-fire, any kind of accommodation that is reached by anyone in this present conflict, has to take into account now, before the cease-fire, if such a thing should exist, comes into being.

We do not want to repeat the tragedies that still go on from the remnants of the Korean conflict and from Vietnam.

□ 1150

FOCUS ENERGY POLICY ON CONSERVATION

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

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I was very distressed yesterday when President Bush came up with what he called a national energy strategy. I am disappointed because he ignores, in that program, the best, fastest, simplest, least expensive way to reduce dependence on foreign oil.

I speak, of course, of conservation. It is astonishing to me that the President would ignore conservation entirely in his program and, in fact, would recommend elimination of one existing conservation program.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, do not intend to vote for an energy program which would dig up our wildlife refuges and create more nuclear waste, which we do not know how to dispose of, until

energy conservation becomes not a part of but the centerpiece of our national energy strategy.

SHOW SADDAM THE REAL AMERICA

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

Mr. APPLGATE. Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein sends the United States pictures of brutalized, beaten, POW's confessing. We send him pictures of Americans protesting the war. He sends Americans pictures of dead civilians. We send him pictures of Americans burning the U.S. flag. Saddam sends the United States threats. We send him signals.

Is it not time that the news media let Saddam see some of the flag-waving supporters, shouting "U.S.A." singing "I'm proud to be an American," and "God bless the U.S.A."? Is anything wrong with that? Does that sound corny, or what?

I get upset when I see some of these things, and they are not being shown over there. I have tapes that I would like the networks or CNN to send over there at rallies I have attended, where the crowds are bigger than the sporting events. Let them see and hear what Americans are saying and how they feel. Let him know how Americans feel about America. Let him know how they feel about him.

LET'S GET SERIOUS ABOUT AN ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Bush released his long-awaited proposal for a national energy policy—a plan to address the Nation's energy needs. Unfortunately, what the administration has proposed is not a plan for achieving long-term energy independence, but a shortsighted strategy which would allow us to put off the real issues.

The President's strategy focuses almost entirely on increased domestic oil production. His primary answer to our long-term energy needs is drilling—even in ecologically sensitive areas.

This strategy could have a devastating effect on my home State of North Carolina. For the last several years, we have been battling Mobil Oil's plans to drill off our Outer Banks. Drilling is unprecedented there and could prove devastating to the fragile coastal environment.

But even where environmental damage is not an immediate danger, it is shortsighted simply to rely on tapping our energy reserves. More and more drilling ultimately will not solve our energy problems. We seemed to realize

this in the 1970's, but over the past decade we have abandoned, piece by piece, the incentives for energy conservation and fuel efficiency that were then in effect.

Incredibly, the President dropped measures to encourage conservation and development of renewable energy sources from his strategy. And the remaining framework is but a skeleton.

I believe any serious energy policy must have conservation, efficiency, and research at its core. If the crisis in the Persian Gulf has not impressed upon us the need for a truly serious national energy policy, I wonder if we have learned anything at all.

CORPORATIONS DONATING COMPUTERS FOR PERSIAN GULF MAIL

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

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, we are all frustrated by the fact that mail is being delayed that we are sending from here to the Persian Gulf. Last time I was there, General Pagonis, who is doing an outstanding job with logistics, is receiving about 400 tons of mail every day. That is the heart and soul of America, traveling from here to that foreign land. We all want them to get our loved ones' mail. However, it is delayed because 400 tons a day arrive.

Now, the people of Kentucky have combined the good services of IBM, General Electric, General Telephone, and the Red Cross, and they are using computers that have been donated, so that the loved ones from that area can come to the malls in Lexington and dictate their letters. They are being sent out by satellite and downlinked right straight to Saudi Arabia in real time. That is because of the efforts of these people.

If anyone wants to help out in their community, I would suggest that they check with the Red Cross and some of these corporations that are really there to help all Americans.

WHAT WILL FREEDOM COST?

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

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, today I will be supporting H.R. 586, because the American people deserve to know how much this war is costing, and they also deserve to know who else besides the United States will be paying. They deserve to know how much the war will be costing Americans now, and how much it will cost our children in the future, and how much of this burden we are prepared to bear.

Mr. Speaker, freedom is not free. Since World War II, our Nation has

spent about \$4.6 trillion defending ourselves and our allies, and we have produced some pretty smart weapons. However, Mr. Speaker, during that same period of time some of our allies, principally Japan and Germany, have had the luxury to produce smart students. We know, Mr. Speaker, that most of the people in our Nation are watching this war on TV sets that were made in Japan.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting H.R. 586, because we need to know the cost of war, and our allies need to know the price of freedom.

OPPOSE FURTHER JORDANIAN AID

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

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, the recent statements by King Hussein of Jordan in support of Iraq are nothing short of outrageous. He has accused the United States of waging war against "all Moslems" and has politically jumped in bed with Saddam Hussein.

If he is criticizing the deaths of civilians, where is his criticism for the rapes and murders of innocent Kuwaitis? Where is his criticism of Saddam's use of nerve gas to kill thousands of innocent Iraqi women and children? Where is his criticism of Iraq's use of Scud missiles to attack Israel, endangering the lives of Jews and Palestinians alike?

King Hussein has referred to Iraq as being "brotherly." I don't know that brothers go around raping neighbors like Iraq has pillaged and raped Kuwait.

The United States and the United Nations gave Saddam plenty of time to withdraw from Kuwait. We have also given Jordan plenty of foreign aid, over \$100 million in 1990 and another \$58 million for the current fiscal year. Mr. Speaker, it is Jordan's right to side with Saddam, and against much of the rest of the world. By the same token, it is our right—no, Mr. Speaker, it is our duty—to find the best use for our tax dollars. We know who our friends are now, and clearly Jordan is not among them. Accordingly, I urge the President to cut off all foreign aid to Jordan, and I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing any further aid to Jordan.

WHERE WILL PRESIDENT BUSH GET \$30 BILLION?

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the war in the Persian Gulf, it is imperative that we not lose focus on other issues of major consequence to this country. The savings and loan fiasco is the biggest single act of thievery in the history of humanity. It is es-

timated that it will cost the American taxpayer some \$500 billion.

Mr. Speaker, very shortly, perhaps within a week or two, this body is going to be asked to appropriate another \$30 billion for the savings and loan fiasco. It seems to me that given the fact that we have a \$300 billion deficit, that before we appropriate another penny, that the President come before the people of this country and tell Americans exactly who is going to be paying this \$30 billion. It seems to me that given the fact that during the last decade, that the richest people in this country have become wealthier, while the middle class and poor have become poorer, that the richest people have enjoyed huge tax breaks, while the middle class and the poor are paying more in taxes, that those are the people who should be asked to bail out the S&L crooks, and not the ordinary American people.

I believe we should say no, not another penny for the S&L fiasco, until the President tells Americans exactly who is going to pay for it. It should be his wealthy friends and the corporations who are not paying their fair share of taxes.

□ 1200

NATIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY

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

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President unveiled his much awaited national energy strategy. This proposal was intended to lead our Nation into a new era of energy security. Unfortunately, this proposal has fallen short of that goal.

While the administration's proposal contains some positive initiatives, it is lacking in several key areas. The most glaring omission is the lack of a serious conservation and efficiency strategy. The President's strategy is based primarily on increasing production of oil. By relying on continued dependency on oil, we are not breaking the oil addiction. The fact is that will not remedy the economic difficulties that are associated with oil dependence. This country will continue to be adversely affected by fluctuations in the oil world markets, even if the bulk of our oil is produced domestically.

The kind of energy strategy we need is one that will utilize American ingenuity and technology to tap our nonoil resources, such as coal, shale, and natural gas. By doing so, we can make the best use of our own indigenous national resources.

In addition, we must look to increase our use of alternative fuel and alternative energy sources. By focusing on these areas and making conservation

and efficiency programs equal partners in a national energy strategy, we will succeed in providing this Nation with a truly secure energy policy.

If history has taught us something in the last 12 years, it is that energy efficiency works. The Japanese have shown that, and relying on supply-side economics in oil is a bad idea.

IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 19, CALLING FOR CERTAIN INFORMATION REGARDING OPERATION DESERT SHIELD

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

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, later today the House will debate a bill to require detailed reporting by the administration on the costs of the Persian Gulf War and the contributions by our allies to defray those costs. I urge passage of this measure.

The legislative branch of our Government has the responsibility for determining any needed appropriations for the Gulf War, and it is imperative that we be provided information as to what those remaining costs might be after all allied contributions are received.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to pay for this war now, rather than putting it on the national credit card. Earlier this year, with our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 37 that expresses the sense of Congress that the cost of the Persian Gulf military operations be covered by our allies and any remaining expenditures be covered by reductions in other military programs and through a surtax on high income taxpayers.

Fairness to our children and future generations demands that we pay for this war now. Passage of today's resolution is a step in the right direction.

INTRODUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT OPTIONS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months our attention has been focused primarily on two concerns—the economy and the Middle East. Consumer confidence is at an all-time low in New England and decreasing throughout the Nation.

The administration stated the country is experiencing a recession and it is time to take positive steps to turn around the economy. We need to increase our national savings rate. This is the reason why I am introducing the Individual Retirement Options Improvement Act of 1991.

This bill takes the first step toward increasing savings. We have become a nation that pays with plastic and lives on credit. We need to give people the incentive to start or increase their personal savings. Prior to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, individual retirement accounts were an extremely popular form of savings. This legislation will amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage savings by increasing the amount of deductible contributions which may be made to an individual retirement account. IRA's are a proven way to help people plan for retirement, while providing a stimulus for improving our national savings rate.

In addition, this bill provides for distributions from individual retirement accounts to be used without penalty to purchase a first home, to pay for higher education expenses, or to pay for certain medical costs of a catastrophic illness. This legislation will encourage individuals to save and it will give them peace of mind to know that they will not be penalized for using their savings for purposes other than retirement. Buying a first home, higher education and medical costs of an unexpected catastrophic illness are three of the most costly expenditures of working class families and also three of the most important.

I urge my colleagues to take a hard look at this legislation and decide they want to play a role in increasing national savings.

CALLING FOR SUBMISSION TO THE CONGRESS OF CERTAIN INFORMATION REGARDING OPERATION DESERT SHIELD

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 586) to require regular reports to the Congress on the amount of expenditures made to carry out Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm and on the amount of contributions made to the United States by foreign countries to support Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 586

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

SECTION 1. REPORTS ON UNITED STATES COSTS IN THE PERSIAN GULF CONFLICT AND FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS TO OFFSET SUCH COSTS.

(a) **REPORTS REQUIRED.**—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall prepare periodic reports on the incremental defense-related costs to the United States of the Persian Gulf conflict and on the amount of contributions made to the United States by foreign countries to offset those costs. The Director shall prepare these reports in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and other appropriate Government officials.

(b) COSTS OF PERSIAN GULF CONFLICT.—

(1) **PERIOD COSTS AND CUMULATIVE COSTS.**—Each report prepared under subsection (a) shall specify—

(A) the incremental costs incurred by the United States in the Persian Gulf conflict during the period covered by the report; and
(B) the cumulative total of such costs, by fiscal year, from August 1, 1990, to the end of the period covered by the report.

(2) **NONRECURRING COSTS AND COSTS OFFSET.**—In specifying the costs incurred by the United States in the Persian Gulf conflict during the period covered by a report and the total of such costs, the Director shall identify those costs that—

(A) are one-time and nonrecurring;
(B) are offset by in-kind contributions; or
(C) are offset (or proposed to be offset) by the realignment, reprogramming, or transfer of funds appropriated for activities unrelated to the Persian Gulf conflict.

(3) **ONLY COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PERSIAN GULF CONFLICT.**—In determining costs incurred by the United States in the Persian Gulf conflict, the Director shall include only those incremental costs directly related to conducting defense-related activities in the Persian Gulf conflict and shall not include costs that would have been incurred as part of normal operations in the absence of the Persian Gulf conflict.

(c) **SPECIFIC COST AREAS.**—Each report prepared under subsection (a) on the costs incurred by the United States in the Persian Gulf conflict shall divide the total cost to show the allocation of costs by category, including the following categories:

(1) **AIRLIFT.**—Airlift costs related to the transportation by air of personnel, equipment, and supplies in connection with the Persian Gulf conflict.

(2) **SEALIFT.**—Sealift costs related to the transportation by sea of personnel, equipment, and supplies in connection with the Persian Gulf conflict.

(3) **PERSONNEL.**—Personnel costs, including pay and allowances of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces called or ordered to active duty and increased pay and allowances of members of the regular components of the Armed Forces incurred because of deployment in connection with the Persian Gulf conflict.

(4) **PERSONNEL SUPPORT.**—Personnel support costs, including subsistence, uniforms, medical costs.

(5) **OPERATING SUPPORT.**—Operating support costs, including equipment support, costs associated with an increased operational tempo, spare parts, stock fund purchases, communications, and equipment maintenance.

(6) **FUEL.**—Fuel costs.

(7) **PROCUREMENT.**—Procurement costs, including ammunition, weapon systems improvements and upgrades, and equipment purchases.

(8) **MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.**—Military construction costs.

(d) **CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED STATES.**—

(1) **AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTIONS.**—Each report prepared under subsection (a) shall specify the amount of contributions made to the United States by each foreign country that is making contributions to defray the cost to the United States of the Persian Gulf conflict. The amount of each country's contribution during the period covered by each report shall be indicated as follows:

(A) Cash payments pledged.
(B) Cash payments received.
(C) Description and value of in-kind contributions pledged.

(D) Description and value of in-kind contributions received.

(2) **PLEDGE PERIOD AND USE RESTRICTIONS.**—In specifying the amount of each contribution pledged, the Director shall indicate—

(A) the time period, if any, for which that contribution applies; and
(B) any restrictions on the use of that contribution.

(e) **SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.**—

(1) **FIRST REPORT.**—The first report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Congress not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall cover the period beginning on August 1, 1990, and ending on December 31, 1990.

(2) **SECOND REPORT.**—The next report shall be submitted to the Congress not later than the 15th day of the first month after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall cover—

(A) January 1991, in the case of information required under subsections (b) and (c); and

(B) January and February 1991, in the case of information required under subsection (d).

(3) **SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.**—Subsequent reports shall be submitted to the Congress not later than the 15th day of each month thereafter and shall cover—

(A) the month before the preceding month, in the case of information required under subsections (b) and (c); and

(B) the preceding month, in the case of information required under subsection (d).

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "Director" means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget; and

(2) the term "Persian Gulf conflict" means Operation Desert Shield, Operation Desert Storm, and succeeding and related operations conducted as a consequence of the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq on August 2, 1990.

SEC. 2. REPORTS ON FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS IN RESPONSE TO THE PERSIAN GULF CRISIS.

(a) **REPORTS REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare periodic reports on the contributions made by foreign countries as part of the international response to the Persian Gulf crisis. The Secretaries shall prepare these reports in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and other appropriate Government officials.

(b) **INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED.**—Each report required by this section shall include the following information for each foreign country making contributions as part of the international response to the Persian Gulf crisis:

(1) **PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY COALITION.**—In the case of each foreign country whose armed forces are participating in the international military coalition confronting Iraq, any information available regarding the aggregate amount of the incremental costs associated with such country's participation, including a description of the forces committed in terms of personnel, units, and equipment deployed.

(2) **CONTRIBUTIONS TO THOSE COUNTRIES SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTED BY THE PERSIAN GULF CRISIS.**—Any information available on—

(A) any additional special assistance (financial, in-kind, or host-country support) pledged as a contribution to each of those countries significantly affected by the Persian Gulf crisis, and

(B) the value and a description of the types of such assistance received by each such country.

The information provided pursuant to this paragraph shall include information on such assistance as reported to the Gulf Crisis Financial Coordination Group.

(3) CONTRIBUTIONS TO OTHER FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—Any information available on the types of any additional special assistance (financial, in-kind, or host-country support) pledged and received as a contribution to other foreign countries as a result of the Persian Gulf crisis.

(4) CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Any information available on the value and nature of contributions pledged—

(A) to any United Nations organization,
(B) to the International Committee of the Red Cross, and

(C) to the extent the Secretary of State considers appropriate, to other international or nongovernmental organizations,

for the purpose of dealing with consequences of the Persian Gulf crisis (such as contributions to be used for humanitarian assistance for displaced persons or for assistance for responding to oil spills), and the value and nature of such contributions received by each such organization.

(5) OTHER FORMS OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—A description of any prepositioning rights, base or other military facilities access rights, or air transit rights that have been granted to the United States as a result of the Persian Gulf crisis. Information provided pursuant to this paragraph may be submitted in classified form if necessary.

(6) AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—Any information available on the aggregate value of the contributions made by each contributing country.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.—

(1) TIME FOR SUBMISSION, PERIOD COVERED.—(A) A report prepared pursuant to subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Congress not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to the contributions pledged and the contributions paid or otherwise delivered during the period beginning on August 1, 1990, and ending on December 31, 1990.

(B) A report prepared pursuant to subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Congress not later than April 15, 1991, or 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act (whichever is later) with respect to the contributions pledged and the contributions paid or otherwise delivered during the period beginning on January 1, 1991, and ending on March 31, 1991.

(C) Subsequent reports prepared pursuant to subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Congress not later than the 15th day after the end of each calendar quarter with respect to the contributions pledged and the contributions paid or otherwise delivered during that calendar quarter.

(2) CUMULATIVE TOTALS.—In addition to the required information regarding the contributions pledged and the contributions paid or otherwise delivered during the specified calendar quarter, each report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) or (1)(C) shall include cumulative totals for the contributions that have been pledged, and for the contributions that have been paid or otherwise delivered, by each foreign country as of the end of the calendar quarter covered by that report.

(3) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The information required to be submitted to the Congress pursuant to this section shall be submitted in unclassified form to the extent possible, with a classified annex if necessary.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "countries significantly affected by the Persian Gulf crisis" means Egypt, Jordan, Turkey, and Israel, and any other country whose economy the President determines is significantly affected by the Persian Gulf crisis; and

(2) the term "Persian Gulf crisis" means the military conflict, the United Nations Security Council embargo against Iraq, and other consequences associated with Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait and its failure to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, as part of the arrangement here, I ask unanimous consent to yield 10 minutes of my 20 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, likewise, I ask unanimous consent to yield the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the distinguished minority leader of the Committee on Foreign Affairs 10 minutes and also allow the gentleman to designate such time as he may allot to other Members.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 586, the Schumer-Panetta bill.

The bill is designated to improve congressional oversight of the cost accounting and burdensharing aspects of the Persian Gulf crisis. Specifically, the bill would require the administration to report regularly to Congress on a number of critical issues related to the Persian Gulf crisis.

Since the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq on August 2, 1990, the administration has had no systematic procedure for providing information to Congress on Persian Gulf-related matters. Information has been released by the administration in a sporadic and haphazard way. It has been impossible to get a handle on both the defense-related cost to the United States of the Persian Gulf conflict and the related issue of allied support.

In the interest of improving congressional access to information pertaining to the Persian Gulf crisis, a task force was convened at the request of the Speaker of the House, under the auspices of the majority leader, to nego-

tiate compromise legislation that the administration would not oppose.

A series of meetings was held this month with representatives of the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, and Budget—including the bill's original cosponsors—and representatives of the Departments of Defense, State, the Office of Management and Budget, and the White House. Consensus was reached on an amendment in the nature of a substitute that was adopted yesterday morning by the Committee on Armed Services and yesterday afternoon by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I strongly believe that information on the cost and burden sharing aspects of the Persian Gulf conflict should be made available to Congress in a routine fashion, in the interest of effective oversight. In my judgment, it is critical for us to have a complete picture of the defense-related cost of our current involvement in the Persian Gulf. Furthermore, the American people need to understand the full extent of the support our allies have provided with respect to, first U.S. military efforts in the Persian Gulf, second, the multinational coalition, and third, third countries affected by the crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield time to the two cosponsors of the bill, first to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and then to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider H.R. 586, legislation which requires monthly reports from the administration on the costs of the war in the Persian Gulf and the extent to which these costs are offset by contributions from our allies.

This information is absolutely essential if Congress is to exercise its oversight responsibility in an informed and thorough manner. The reports will break expenses down into categories such as sealift, airlift, personnel expenses, and so forth, and will distinguish between one time and recurring costs. With these reports, Congress will have the information it needs to assess the administration's supplemental budget request for the war. More important, the concrete information contained in these reports will move discussion of the financial cost of the war from speculation to fact, from guesswork to analysis.

The bill also requires data on the burden sharing efforts of our allies. There are two problems with our allies' efforts so far. First, though many nations have made enormous promises to support our efforts in the gulf, too often we have seen those promises disappear when it is time to pay up. If the bill passes, our allies will no longer be able to hide their paltry contributions behind grandiose promises.

Second, many allied contributions come in forms which are of no real value to our forces in the desert. Part of Japan's contribution has consisted of fax machines, Jeeps, and other items, not cash. Needless to say, all of these so-called contributions are purchased in Japan, helping Japanese industry more than it helps our troops in the gulf. Germany has included over \$500 million of unusable East German military equipment as part of their contribution. Because this bill requires the administration to describe in detail the in-kind contributions our allies have pledged, we will be able, for the first time, to assess the real value of allied contributions.

The American people are tired of rhetoric, promises, and pledges; they want the truth, and this bill will give it to them. These reports will shed badly needed light on the confusion surrounding allied support for our troops in the desert. They will provide the facts, not what we hope to get, not what we have been promised, but the bottom line: How much money we have in our coffers.

Burden sharing is an issue of vital strategic concern to the United States. As our troops fight in the gulf, our attention is, of course, focused on the tactical situation in the Middle East. But Congress and the administration must focus on a larger issue as well, the long-term strategic position of the United States. Our Nation's security is not the product of military might alone; rather, it is a function of economic strength, our ability to create wealth and to function competitively in the world market.

It would be tragic if we won the shooting war in the gulf, but lost the economic war in the aftermath. This is exactly what will happen if our allies continue to pour all of their resources into bolstering their own economies, while we allocate our wealth to their defense as well as our own. We cannot allow our allies to use this war to improve their economic position at the expense of the United States. Arming ourselves with the facts about burden sharing will give us the leverage we need to prevent our allies from evading their responsibilities.

Tomorrow, this body expects to receive the President's supplemental budget request to fund Operation Desert Storm. Congress will not be able to give this request fair consideration unless we have detailed information on the kinds of costs we face, and the extent to which our Nation's taxpayers are unfairly carrying the financial weight of this operation.

Right now, we have no way to gauge whether the President's request is appropriate, or whether his assessment of allied contributions is accurate. It is our responsibility to bring greater knowledge to this debate. I believe passage of this bill will ensure that we and

the American people are properly informed.

□ 1210

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to applaud both committees for bringing here this bipartisan amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 586. I would like to particularly commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD]; the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN]; the ranking member, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON]. Especially as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] for the series of hearings and briefings that have been held for committee members and all Members of Congress throughout the months of December, into January, and February. As a matter of fact, I would like to submit for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a list of approximately 160 briefings and updates that have been provided by the administration to Members of Congress since Operation Desert Shield, and now Desert Storm, began on August 2. I think the information has been forthcoming, and I think we who have desired to have access to data have certainly been able to take advantage of that during the months from August until this point in time.

What this particular legislation does, however, is in a cooperative way with the administration establish a format and a procedure for getting regular updates to Congress about the costs incurred by this country and by the allied nations.

The amendment that is offered today in the form of a substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and myself in committee yesterday meets the requirements of H.R. 586 and actually goes beyond the initial concerns that are raised in H.R. 586. It allows the committee to play their proper oversight role and allows them to have the information that all of us have collectively felt is necessary and that all of us who have sat through these hearings over the last 6 months have asked continual questions to the administration about. It also clarifies the cost categories that are required from OMB, and, finally, it establishes a workable and realistic timeframe for the report to be issued to Congress.

Section 1 of the report goes to the specific United States costs that will be incurred including airlift, sealift, personnel, personnel support, operating support, fuel procurement, and military construction. There are established dates in the legislation that

these reports will be provided to us both now, covering the period since August 2, and in the future on a regular and monthly basis. Also it will require the contributions, both pledged and received, to be specifically delineated by the administration. In addition, description and value of in-kind, pledged and received, dollars and items is also included in the legislation. Section 2 deals with foreign contributions, burden sharing, and it requires reports and documentation from the administration that deal with the allied commitment and the costs incurred by the allied nations, both contributions by our allies to other allied nations, as well as contributions by our allies to international organizations such as the United Nations, the Red Cross, and other nonprofit and governmental groups around the world who are in fact contributing to Operation Desert Storm.

The legislation even goes so far, Mr. Speaker, as to include special contributions. These include such items as basing rights, prepositioning rights and air transit rights, so this legislation, I think, goes far beyond what was originally proposed. I think it gives Congress the kind of information that all of us want to have access to.

I applaud the administration for being forthright in the past. I applaud the administration for working with the two committees in bringing this piece of legislation to Congress and for the administration not opposing it, but working for an acceptable compromise, and, with that, I urge my colleagues' support.

DESERT SHIELD HEARINGS/BRIEFING COMPLETED HOUSE

8/4—DIA/CIA briefing for House Armed Services Committee staff.

8/8—Congressional leadership is notified about President's decision to commit troops. SECDEF and Chairman Powell brief Members in the afternoon.

8/9—SECDEF and Chairman Powell brief Members.

8/10—OSD/LA begins distributing Public Affairs memoranda upon request.

8/15—DOD Comptroller releases fact sheet on Desert Shield costs. This information is disseminated to the Hill.

8/23—Desert Shield information packet distributed to all Hill offices.

8/28—Briefing at the White House.

8/31—House CODEL departs for the Middle East.

9/5—White House meeting with the President for CODEL members.

9/10—HPSCI has a briefing from State, DIA, and CIA on intelligence support for Desert Shield.

9/12—House Postal Personnel and Modernization Subcommittee held a hearing on legislation to provide free mailing privileges for members of the Armed Forces serving in the Middle East.

9/19—SECDEF and Chairman Powell appeared before the HAC Defense Subcommittee on Desert Shield, primarily on supplemental funding issues.

9/26—House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee heard from Vice Admiral

Donovan of the Military Sealift Command about Desert Shield sealift requirements.

10/3—Two HFAC Subcommittees met and heard from Wolfowitz and Bartholomew on the issue of the Saudi Arms sale.

10/10—House Public Works Subcommittee held a hearing on Civil Reserve Air Fleet Program (CRAF) and heard from DOD witnesses.

10/17—HASC had a closed hearing on Desert Shield, and DIA represented the building.

10/24—Cheney and Baker appeared before a group of House members who wanted a briefing about Desert Shield before the Congress went out for the year.

10/30—White House briefing.

11/12—White House briefing.

11/13—SECDEF and Chairman Powell appeared before a group of House members who wanted an update on Desert Shield.

12/14—SECDEF and Chairman Powell appeared before HASC on Desert Shield.

1/3/91—SECDEF and SecState brief House in closed-door session.

1/4/91—SECDEF meets with House Freshmen at Pentagon.

1/10/91—SECDEF meets with House Republican Caucus.

SENATE

8/4—DIA and CIA brief 70 Members of the Senate.

8/8—OSD/LA notifies selected Senators on the President's decision to commit troops to the Middle East. SECDEF and Chairman Powell brief Senators about Operation Desert Shield.

8/9—SECDEF and Chairman Powell brief Senators.

8/10—OSD/LA begins distributing Public Affairs memoranda upon request.

8/15—DoD Comptroller issues Desert Shield cost fact sheet. OSD/LA distributes to the Hill.

8/23—Desert Shield information packets are distributed to all Hill offices.

8/28—White House briefing.

8/31—Senate CODEL departs for the Middle East.

9/5—White House meeting for CODEL members.

9/7—SAC Defense Subcommittee held a briefing on burden sharing in the Middle East.

9/11—SECDEF and Chairman Powell testified before SASC on Desert Shield.

9/12—Steve Duncan and Chris Jehn brief Veterans Affairs Committee.

9/12—Wolfowitz testified before SSCI on intelligence aspects of Desert Shield.

9/13—Wolfowitz testified in a closed SASC hearing about Desert Shield.

9/25—SECDEF and Chairman Powell met with SAC Defense Subcommittee—this was not a formal hearing.

10/4—Two SFRC Subcommittees heard from Wolfowitz and Bartholomew about the Saudi Arms sale.

10/24—Cheney and Baker briefed members of the Senate about Desert Shield prior to the adjournment of Congress.

10/30—White House briefing.

11/12—White House briefing.

Week of 11/12—SECDEF and Chairman Powell brief Senators Nunn and Warner.

Week of 11/12—Cheney and Baker brief members of the Senate.

11/27—DIA appeared before Senate Armed Services Committee about intelligence aspects of Desert Shield.

12/3—SECDEF and Chairman Powell appear before SASC on Desert Shield.

1/3/91—SECDEF and SecState brief Senate in closed-door session.

1/4/91—Senate Freshmen invited to Pentagon for briefing (none attended).

DESERT STORM [DS] HEARINGS/BRIEFING COMPLETED

[Status as of Feb. 5, 1991]

Subject	Requested by	DOD OPR	Date provided
DS Daily Ops briefing, Senate and House.	Senate and House leadership.	OSD/LA	January 19—DIA-JCS, Capitol (Fri).
Aspin, Dickinson	Aspin, Dickinson	JCS	January 19, General Powell, Pentagon (Sat).
Nunn, Warner	Nunn, Warner	JCS	January 20, Gen. Powell, Pentagon (Sun).
Daily Ops briefing, Senate and House.	Senate and House leadership.	OSD/LA	January 21, DIA-JCS, Capitol (Mon-MLK).
Daily Ops briefing, Senate and House.	Senate and House leadership.	OSD/LA	January 22, DIA-JCS, Capitol (Tues).
Daily Ops briefing, Senate and House.	Senate and House leadership.	OSD/LA	January 23, DIA-JCS, Capitol (Wed).
DS Intel briefing, SSCI, HPSCI.	Senate and House leadership.	OSD/LA	January 23, DIA-JCS, Capitol (Wed).
Daily Ops briefing, Senate and House.	Senate and House leadership.	OSD/LA	January 24, DIA-JCS, Capitol (Thurs).
"Big 8" Ops brief.	SECDEF	SECDEF, OSD/LA, JCS.	January 24, Sec Cheney, Gen Powell, Pentagon (Thurs).
DS Intel briefing HAC-D.	House Appr. leadership.	OSD/LA, DIA	January 24, DIA-CIA-NSA, Capitol (Thurs).
DS Ops briefing	OSD Reserve Fcs Policy Bd.	JCS Chairman	January 25, Gen. Burr, Pentagon (Fri).
Ops/Intel briefing.	Senator Mitchell	JCS/DIA	January 26, JCS-DIA, Capitol (Sat).
Ops/Intel briefing.	Mitchell/Dole, Cohen.	JCS/DIA	January 28, JCS-DIA, Capitol (Mon).
Daily Ops briefing, Senate and House.	Senate and House leadership.	OSD/LA	January 29, JCS-DIA, Capitol (Tues).
DS Ops briefing for Dutch MFA, Van den Broek.	DASD/Europe and NATO.	DIA/JCS	January 29, DIA-JCS, Pentagon (Tues).
DS Ops briefing, Dep Def Min, Robert Fowler.	Canadian Emb.	DIA Foreign Liaison.	January 30, DIA-JCS, Pentagon (Wed).
DS Equipment briefing.	HASC, Full committee.	Service DCS/Log and Dep DCS/Ops.	January 30, Services, Rayburn, (Wed).
DS Intel weekly briefing.	HPSCI	DIA, NSA, State	January 30, DIA, NSA, State, Capitol, (Wed).
DS Intel weekly briefing.	SSCI	DIA, NSA, State	January 30, DIA, NSA, State, Capitol, (Wed).
All Senate MLAs	Scott Harris	OSD/LA	January 30, OSD/LA, FM&P
DS Equip Performance and Operations.	SASC Full committee.	OSD/LA	January 31, Service DCS Ops, Capitol, (Wed).
Defense Cmtes, Prof staff & MLAs, SASC, SAC-D, HASC, HAC-D.	OSD/LA	OSD/LA, FM&P	February 1, OSD/LA, FM&P Capitol, (Fri).

IRAQ/KUWAIT BRIEFINGS

Date	Audience	Briefer
July 25	SSCI staff	DIO
July 27	Senator Murkowski—Joint CIA/DIA session.	NIO and DIO
Aug. 2	SSCI staff	DIO
Aug. 3	HAC DEF SCITE and staff	DIO
Aug. 4	67 Senators in S-407	DR and DIO
Aug. 4	HASC staffer, Clark Murdock	DR and DIO
Aug. 17	HASC staffer, Warren Nelson	DIO
Aug. 22	HASC staffer, Warren Nelson	DIO
Aug. 24	SASC staffer, Les Brownlee	A/DIO

IRAQ/KUWAIT BRIEFINGS—Continued

Date	Audience	Briefer
Sept. 7	Senator Inouye JCS Desert Shield brief.	JS
Sept. 11	HPSCI hearing on Persian Gulf	DIO
Sept. 12	SSCI hearing on Persian Gulf	DIO
Sept. 13	Senator Nunn IQ/KU update by JCS.	JS
Sept. 13	Senator Nunn IQ/KU update by OSD.	DIO
Sept. 14	Senator Kerrey IQ/KU update	DIO
Sept. 17	SSCI staff IQ/KU update	DIO
Sept. 27	SSCI staff IQ/KU update	DIO
Sept. 27	Representative Gingrich Saddam's terror options.	DB-5
Sept. 28	SSCI staff IC brief on IQ/KU update.	NIO and DIO
Oct. 1	HFAC minority staff support ISA	JSI briefer
Oct. 2	Representative Gingrich IQ/KU update.	DIO
Oct. 4	SSCI and staff IQ/KU update	DIO and Richey ¹
Oct. 4	HPSCI and staff IQ/KU update	DIO and Richey ¹
Oct. 4	Representative Gingrich IQ/KU update.	Richey ¹
Oct. 17	HASC hearing on Persian Gulf	NIO and DIO
Oct. 18	Representative Gingrich IQ ground forces caps.	DIO
Oct. 18	Representative Gingrich IQ economic limitations.	DB-5
Oct. 25	Senators Boren and Cohen Iraqi update.	DIO
Oct. 25	SASC staffer George background papers on Iraq.	ITF
Oct. 25	HASC members of OPS and INTEL JSC sponsored update.	JSI briefer
Oct. 26	Representative Gingrich SNIE (IQ) discussions.	NIO and ITF
Oct. 29	HASC staffer Clark Murdock Iraq update.	DIO
Oct. 30	HASC staffer Tom Garwin Iraq's NBC caps.	DT-2
Nov. 2	HPSCI staffers Sheehy and Fitch Mideast update.	DIO
Nov. 5	Senators Glenn and Sasser Persian Gulf update.	DIO and DB-5
Nov. 8	HPSCI and SSCI staffers DIA/CIA Persian Gulf update.	NIO and DB-8
Nov. 9	HASC staffer Garwin Iraqi CBW capabilities.	DT-5
Nov. 13	SSCI staff Persian Gulf update	DIO
Nov. 14	Representative Owens Iraqi CBW capabilities.	DT-5
Nov. 15	HPSCI and SSCI staffers Mideast update.	NIO and DIO
Nov. 15	SSCI staffer Thomas hostage situation.	DB-5
Nov. 19	HASC staffer Nelson Persian Gulf update.	DIO
Nov. 21	HPSCI and SSCI staffers Persian Gulf update.	OICC
Nov. 25	18 representatives IR disposition at AAB.	JSI-1
Nov. 27	SASC brief on Persian Gulf	NIO and DIO
Nov. 28	HPSCI and SSCI staff Persian Gulf update.	OICC
Nov. 29	HASC staffers Persian Gulf update.	DIO
Nov. 30	Mr. Tom Garwin, HASC staffer IQ nuclear caps.	DT-1
Nov. 30	Mr. S. Roth, SD A&P SCITE, HFAC sanctions.	DIO
Dec. 4	HFAC briefing on Persian Gulf	NIO and DIO
Dec. 4	SSCI briefing on Iraqi sanctions	OICC
Dec. 5	HPSCI hearing on Persian Gulf	DDC/DIO
Dec. 6	SSCI briefing on political intentions of P.G. allies.	DIO
Dec. 19	Support C3I HPSCI staffer prior Desert Shield brief.	C3I
Dec. 20	HPSCI staff Iraq update	OICC
Jan. 3, 1991	HPSCI staff Persian Gulf update	NIO and OICC
Jan. 4	Paper on chronology of Intel support to Desert Shield (Note: Paper prepared for C3I for SSCI.)	ITF
Jan. 9	SSCI brief on Persian Gulf by DDI mainly sanctions.	DDI/DIO
Jan. 10	HPSCI and staff Persian Gulf update.	NIO/DIO
Jan. 11	Senate brief on sanctions	DDI/DIO
Jan. 18	SSCI Desert Storm	NIO/DIO
Jan. 18	Senate Desert Storm	DIO
Jan. 18	House Desert Storm	DIO
Jan. 18	HPSCI Desert Storm	DIO
Jan. 19	Full House brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 19	Full Senate brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 21	Full House brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 21	Full Senate brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 22	Full House brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 22	Full Senate brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 23	Full House brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 23	Full Senate brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 23	HPSCI brief Desert Storm	NIO/DIO
Jan. 23	SSCI brief Desert Storm	NIO/DIO
Jan. 24	Full House brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 24	Full Senate brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 24	HAC defense SCITE Desert Storm	NIO/DIO
Jan. 25	Full House brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 25	Full Senate brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 28	Senators Mitchell and Dole brief Desert Storm.	DIO

IRAQ/KUWAIT BRIEFINGS—Continued

Date	Audience	Briefer
Jan. 29	Full House brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 29	Full Senate brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 30	HPSCI brief Desert Storm	NIO/JCS
Jan. 30	SSCI brief Desert Storm	NIO/JCS
Jan. 30	Senate military LAFS Desert Storm brief	JSI-1
Jan. 31	Senator Mitchell brief Desert Storm	DIO
Jan. 31	Full House brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 31	Full Senate brief Desert Storm	DIO/JCS
Jan. 31	SSCI brief Desert Storm	NIO/JCS
Feb. 1	HASC AND HAC staffs Desert Storm brief	DIO/JCS
Feb. 1	SASC and SAC staffs Desert Storm brief	DIO/JCS
Feb. 4	Senators Mitchell and Dole Desert Storm brief	DIO
Feb. 6	HPSCI brief Desert Storm	NIO/DIO
Feb. 6	CH and RM of HPSCI collection assets brief	CA/DC
Feb. 6	SSCI brief Desert Storm	NIO/DIO

¹ Colonel Richey was the former U.S. defense attaché in Baghdad.

Note: In addition, 8 oversight committees receive DIA's daily finished intelligence products. Since August 2, 1991, these products have included daily assessment updates of the Desert Shield/Storm crisis.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 586, requiring regular reports to the Congress on the costs of the United States of Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm, on the contributions made by foreign countries to offset such costs, and on other contributions made by foreign countries in response to the Persian Gulf crisis. At the outset, let me commend my colleagues Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. PANETTA, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for introducing the legislation and for working with the Committees on Foreign Affairs and on Armed Services to reach an agreement on compromise language which enjoys broad bipartisan support in the Congress and the support of the administration. I would also like to thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. ASPIN, to whom this legislation was also referred, for his cooperation and assistance in developing this legislation. In addition, I would like to thank the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. BROOMFIELD, for his support and assistance in developing the language before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation sets up a system for ensuring that the Congress is kept fully and currently informed on the cost accounting and burden sharing aspects of Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. I would like to emphasize that while there is considerable public support in the United States for Operation Desert Storm, the American public is intensely and legitimately interested in the extent to which our allies are sharing the burden of the cost of the war. The information required by this legislation is not all inclusive. But it goes a long way in keeping the Congress more fully informed on the issue of burdensharing. These reports will also provide a sound foundation for congressional oversight and for consideration of both U.S. military and foreign assistance requirements.

In closing, I would like to note that the committee worked closely with the White House, the National Security Council, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Departments of State, Defense, and the Treasury in developing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 586, as amended.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also am very pleased to be a cosponsor of the Schumer-Panetta bill as reported by the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

Yesterday the Committee on Foreign Affairs was given a choice between two pieces of legislation: One, a resolution of inquiry which could have done grave harm to our national security; the other, a bill which will ensure that Congress has access to substantive information on the gulf war, yet will also preserve the President's need for secrecy in matters that could jeopardize our conduct of the war.

The resolution of inquiry, sponsored by Mrs. BOXER, will be tabled at the conclusion of this debate. Had it been adopted, it could have forced the President to reveal a wide range of extremely sensitive information.

For example, I am told the resolution would have requested: Assessments of United States vulnerabilities to terrorist attack in connection with combat operations against Iraq, and the casualties that terrorists could cause by exploiting those vulnerabilities; casualty estimates that have been made regarding combat operations against Iraq; projections about the possibility that combat operations against Iraq may lead to wider regional conflict; assessments of Iraq's chemical and biological weapons capability and our options for neutralizing that capability; information about United States efforts to encourage other governments to support Operation Desert Shield, including memoranda summarizing specific meetings that the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense have held with foreign leaders; and analyses of postwar options for Iraq.

You may remember our vote authorizing the President to use force in the gulf. Speaker after speaker said they would commit themselves to support our troops, whatever the outcome of the vote. Congress would present Saddam Hussein with a united front.

The Boxer resolution would have driven a wedge into the united front. It would have set up a needless confrontation with the White House at the very moment that our troops in the gulf needed the undivided support of their Government. It would have sent a message to our troops that their Government was still infected with the Vietnam syndrome.

The Foreign Affairs Committee had quite a debate over this resolution yesterday. We had a choice between an irresponsible resolution of inquiry and a bill which asserts the prerogatives of Congress in a responsible manner.

In choosing the Schumer-Panetta bill, the committee chose wisely. Much of the credit should go the chairman, DANTE FASCELL, and the other Members and staff who worked tirelessly to shape a bill which is satisfactory to both Congress and the White House.

The Schumer-Panetta bill would accomplish the objective of informed congressional oversight, yet it would do it without putting our troops or our military strategies at risk.

It requires the President to provide reports in two important areas—how much the war is costing and how much our allies are doing to help us defray those costs.

The Schumer-Panetta bill has the support of both the Committees of Foreign Affairs and Armed Services. The administration has no objection to the bill. In fact, it is already supplying Congress with information on the contributions of our allies.

It is a reasonable bill, and it will help Congress play a role in formulating a sound and responsible foreign policy. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

□ 1220

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], with the understanding that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, also yields 1½ minutes to the gentleman so that he will get a total of 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me express my thanks to the chairmen of both committees and the ranking minority members of both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to the leadership for their cooperation in fashioning the final version of H.R. 586 as it comes to the floor.

This is an extremely important piece of legislation in that it provides the kind of comprehensive information that is absolutely necessary if we are to meet our responsibility to the American people to justify the costs and the role of our allies with regard to this war.

Let me say at the outset that there are two very important principles: First, we are unified in the Congress and in the country on getting Iraq out of Kuwait, and our troops need not fear that they will somehow not have the adequate resources necessary to do that job. The resources will be pro-

vided. But the important issue that is presented by this bill is the need to accurately and adequately determine what the costs of the war will be, and we need to ensure that our allies carry their fair share of the burden.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide that information and to require the Office of Management and Budget on a monthly basis to present to us the incremental costs. It is extremely important that we understand that what we are dealing with here are the incremental costs, the costs above the defense budget level agreed to last year. We need to know what those are, and it is not easy because it involves very careful decisions about airlift, sealift, personnel costs, personnel support costs, operating costs, fuel, procurement, and military construction. These are all areas that need to be carefully analyzed in terms of looking at incremental costs.

Second, we want to look at the contribution of our allies. That is another key element that is involved in determining these costs. At the present time our allies have pledged something in the range of \$50 to \$52 billion. We have only received something in the vicinity of \$10 billion. It is important that we keep the pressure on our allies to meet their responsibilities as well.

Tomorrow we will receive a supplemental request. That is probably the first installment involving the cost of this war that we will consider, and we look forward to the information we will be provided at that time from the administration. But I want to warn all of my colleagues that regardless of the length of this war, there is the huge job we will have over these next few months in itemizing the costs, in looking at the incremental nature of those costs, and in looking at the role of our allies. I need not remind my colleagues here as chairman of the Budget Committee that we face very difficult constraints as a result of the budget and as a result of record deficits at the present time. We have a duty not only to provide the resources necessary here but to justify those costs to the American people and to ensure that the role of our allies in this new world order is not just a role that confirms a slogan but is a reality in terms of meeting those costs. This bill will help us to fulfill that responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] has expired.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, if I might and if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will allow us to have a brief colloquy, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, we had testimony from Mr. Boucher, the Comptroller General, to the effect that the GAO has not yet been allowed access to any of the costs incurred in connection with Desert Shield or Desert Storm. Is it the gentleman's understanding as one of the authors of this bill that this bill would authorize the General Accounting Office, considering the intent of it as provided by existing law, to have access on request to costs incurred, their accuracy, and their allocation as incremental costs to these accounts?

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely correct, that this bill would in fact authorize us to go to the GAO and ask them to audit the presentation for the administration, and indeed we would try to seek that out because we think we need the assistance of the GAO in order to evaluate these presentations.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] has again expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional one-half minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the issue is whether or not, as far as Defense is concerned, GAO will have access to both classified and unclassified material. Is it the intent of this legislation that GAO on behalf of the Congress will have access to classified and unclassified material so it will not be necessary to negotiate a contract between GAO and any agency of Defense in order to get the information? Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding.

Mr. FASCELL. Is that the gentleman's understanding of the purpose of the legislation?

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding of the purpose of the legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has 6 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has 7 minutes remaining, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on which I had the privilege of serving for many, many years, for the substitute they are bringing to the floor, and which I intend to support wholeheartedly.

I really had serious reservations about the resolution of inquiry, which we will be voting on a little later. That resolution of inquiry, House Resolution 19 without casting any reflections on the sponsor, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] or the cosponsors, because certainly their integrity, their sincerity, and their patriotism cannot be questioned at all—could have really hurt our war effort in the Persian Gulf.

As I read that resolution, it would have required within 10 days after the adoption of the resolution that the President of the United States furnish the House of Representatives with all kinds of classified information, information such as any document prepared for his use that would have described or discussed the possibility of U.S. combat operations in the Persian Gulf. It would have required furnishing any document prepared by and for the President describing or discussing the effects of bombing or attacking Iraqi facilities that produce biological or chemical weapons or components of these weapons; I think that would certainly have telegraphed our intentions to this tyrant, Saddam Hussein.

□ 1230

Last, it would have required furnishing any document prepared by and for the President concerning possible targets of terrorist activities as a result of the participation of the United States in combat activities in the Persian Gulf. That would have exposed, in my opinion, our entire FBI operations in this country and our entire intelligence operations overseas. And it would have revealed those facilities or areas that we believe are vulnerable to terrorist activity.

I just say to both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that the resolution of inquiry certainly ought to be defeated. The committees are to be commended, because after we pass H.R. 586, which I hope will be by a unanimous vote—we should by all means defeat the Boxer resolution of inquiry by voting to table it.

If something were to go awry, and the resolution of inquiry were to pass, we would end up sending more extensive and useful intelligence information to Saddam Hussein than he is already getting from his best intelligence source, CNN.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify some questions I have about this bill. It appears to marry two thoroughly incompatible ideas.

On the one hand, the bill seeks to specify and delimit what is an incremental cost for Operation Desert Storm, with an eye to holding down what the Pentagon can ask for in its supplemental appropriations request for this conflict. On the other hand, the bill seeks detailed and timely information on what our allies are doing to help pay for the war. Congress needs both types of information. Putting them together in the same report will, I fear, cause mischief.

The incremental costs required to be reported are just a narrow set of the costs of this war. While the incremental costs may have run as high as \$200 million a day during the Desert Shield portion and as high as \$1 billion a day since January 16, these costs do not count all of what we are spending to prosecute this war. Indeed, we spend nearly \$1 billion a day on supporting our Defense Establishment, most of which has been devoted to running Desert Storm. The Government has incurred other costs in terms of work by other agencies, used up or destroyed equipment, backfilling positions in Government held by reservists, and higher energy costs. And, as we all know, the American people have paid a very high price for this war in terms of careers interrupted, families separated, city hospitals stripped of medical personnel, and American men and women killed in the Saudi desert.

On the other hand, our allies get credit under this legislation for every penny they contribute, whether in kind or in cash. Take the case of Japan: The report will list the new Japanese pledge of \$9 billion. And this figure will be compared with an incremental cost of, perhaps, \$70 billion, of which the United States out-of-pocket cost may be as little as \$19 billion. This will inaccurately suggest that Japan, which has no troops in the gulf, which has no citizens at risk, is paying more, as a percentage of GNP, to support the war than the United States is. This does not pass the test. Moreover, while the United States spends 5 percent of its GNP on defense, including a large portion to defend Japan and the sealanes it needs to sell its goods abroad, Japan spends only 1 percent of its GNP on defense. Worse, a substantial portion of the \$9 billion contribution will be paid out of this tiny defense budget.

The fact is that the report required under this bill does not compare apples to apples. It compares a tiny fraction of all U.S. costs to every cost of our allies. The result will be that our allies will say they have already paid too

much. It happened last week. Congressman DAVE MARTIN and I were in Seoul and Tokyo trying to get increased contributions from Korea and Japan. While we were there, President Bush announced that the allies had paid 80 percent of the cost of the war in 1990. Japanese officials we met with asked us how we could possibly ask for a greater contribution.

So, the first point to be made is that the incremental U.S. costs reported under this bill cannot and should not be compared to the allied contributions reported under the bill. I would like to ask the sponsors of this bill whether they agree.

Mr. PANETTA. If the gentlewoman will yield, she makes a relevant point. The purpose of the bill is to ensure that Congress receives information from the administration concerning the incremental costs of Operation Desert Shield/Storm and the contributions made by our allies to offset those costs. It will not be possible to use the reports required by the bill to answer the question of whether Germany or Japan or any ally is bearing its fair share in the broader context of burdensharing, including our operations in the Persian Gulf.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. My second question has to do with in-kind contributions. We know that various countries have loaned us vehicles, permitted us to overfly their territory, released war materiel, supplied commercial flights for refugees, and done numerous other things to help the effort. These countries ought to be congratulated for this. Still, I do not want Dick Darman deciding that these sorts of actions are worth a great deal of money and, thereby, make it look like our allies are doing more than they are in fact doing. In fact, while Korea promptly sent commercial aircraft and ships to help with the deployment, they presented us with a bill for the insurance. I wonder what the sponsors of the legislation would say about the valuation of in-kind contributions.

Mr. PANETTA. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct. We don't want the administration to unilaterally set a value on in-kind contributions. That is why in addition to requiring the administration to estimate the value of in-kind contributions, the bill requires a description of such contributions so that Congress can review those estimates. The bill should not be interpreted to mean that Congress will necessarily accept the administration's determination of the value of in-kind contributions.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Next, the bill is completely silent on what commitments the United States has made to other countries to get their help. We know about the fact that we forgave Egypt's debt of \$6 billion to get their support. I certainly heard people in Korea say that we should stop pressing

them to open up their markets to United States firms in exchange for a larger payment. I wonder why the bill does not require a disclosure of these side deals.

Mr. PANETTA. The gentlewoman is correct. The bill does not ask the administration for information concerning the broader commitments made during the gulf crisis. However, this issue is far broader than the narrow focus of the Schumer-Panetta bill. The Schumer-Panetta bill addresses the incremental defense costs of the war and the allies' contributions pledged and received to offset those costs of the war. We are requesting information only on the incremental defense costs—a much narrower issue than you suggest.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. In terms of offsetting allied contributions against American expenditures, I think we should make it clear that in-kind contributions should be counted on both sides of the ledger. In other words, if the Saudis are to get credit for the huge amount of fuel and water they have provided, the incremental cost side must show this fuel and water as a cost and the contribution side should show the same amount as a contribution. Is this correct?

Mr. PANETTA. The gentlewoman is correct. In-kind support is counted in H.R. 586 on both sides of the ledger—as costs and contributions.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. My final point is this. I have studied what our allies have done to support the war in the gulf. Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Japan are all contributing substantial amounts of money to the effort. Yet, in terms of their ability to contribute and in terms of the total cost of the effort, these contributions are inadequate. Do you agree that no one should use these reports as a basis for saying that the allies are paying their fair share?

Mr. PANETTA. The gentlewoman is correct. The purpose of the bill is to enable Congress to get timely and accurate information on the incremental costs of Operation Desert Shield/Storm. The reports required by the bill cannot be, by themselves, used to answer the question of whether any ally is paying its fair share in the broader context of burdensharing.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank my colleague for his assurances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the managers of this bill, and especially want to thank the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] and the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, Mr. PANETTA, for that very important colloquy on the technical aspects of this bill. It is extremely important that we all understand this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. As Congress works to support the President and our troops in Operation Desert Storm, it is only right that such support be returned. But we also have the right and the obligation to know what this war will cost us, and what assistance we are receiving from abroad. H.R. 586 compels the administration to produce the economic facts—the costs of Desert Storm—equipment, personnel, transportation, and supplies.

Perhaps more important, however, are the provisions concerning foreign nations involvement in this conflict. I will say that, on the surface, the expressions of our allies have been expressions of good intentions for the most part.

Yet, as I have long maintained, we cannot finance this war on promises. We must have cold, hard cash. That is true burdensharing.

For that reason, I am particularly supportive of the provisions in this bill that would require the administration to inform Congress exactly what our allies have done—and given—to this united effort. Month by month, Congress must know what our allies have pledged us and, more important, what they have given.

This is not an American war. And we cannot and will not allow our allies—and the rest of the world for that matter—to forget that fact.

This bill is a first step toward ensuring that Congress gets the information it needs—to which it is entitled. Only then can we hope to turn promises and commitments into dollars and cents.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and assure Congress the role to which it is entitled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has 7 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has 2 minutes remaining, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the legislation, and certainly hope that the legislation will pass. But I am disturbed by where this whole process began. This whole process began with a resolution of inquiry.

Now, that may sound like it is a fairly normal thing, but a resolution of inquiry is a very abnormal thing. For one thing, it is one of those privileged measures that has to come to the floor, unless it is acted on in some other manner, which means that Congress is forced to take action on such a resolution.

Therefore, we began this process with a resolution of inquiry. Understand something else about a resolution of inquiry; a resolution of inquiry is typically a resolution designed against an administration which we do not trust. So a resolution of inquiry is borne in distrust of the leadership in the White House.

It is also, because of the nature of the resolution of inquiry we have before us, a resolution which was willing to risk making very important classified information public. So it was absolutely necessary for the leadership of the Congress to figure out some means to deal with something that was undermining of leadership, and also possibly dangerous to our own troops.

In other words, what we had here at the beginning was an activity designed to find ways to criticize, rather than to compliment, what was happening in the Persian Gulf. The "blame America first" crowd has not had much to work with in the last several weeks.

□ 1240

America is actually winning the war. We are doing it with weapons that many of the blame-America-first crowd did not even want to build, and we are doing that job. We are obtaining the victory as a part of an alliance that is actually holding together in very remarkable ways.

What do the critics of the administration seek to achieve in what they are doing? One has to believe that if possible they would like to find defeat in the face of victory. The perceived defeat of this Nation in Vietnam has served their cause very well for many years. They would like to cast doubt on the ability of our military to do its job and do it well, and they would like to raise suspicions about the very nature of our alliance. Some of those suspicions have been dealt with on the floor even in the course of this debate.

What they seem to want then is a flow of information that will give them the basis on which to raise those kinds of criticisms. I find that a little bit disturbing. The fact is that our regular process for determining authorizations and appropriations probably would get us the information that is going to be gotten by this resolution anyway. The Appropriations Committee is certainly able to ask any questions of the Defense Department or of the Department of State. They can bring the folks up here that are going to answer these questions and ask them those questions within the committee anyhow, so this resolution probably does not get us any new information.

But it does not do much harm either, and so we are all going to vote for it because there is nothing in particular wrong with asking for the kinds of things that are in this resolution.

But the original intent of the resolution of inquiry I think is very trouble-

some and something that we should not lose track of as we move forward here. Instead of trust in the Presidential leadership, the process began with distrust. Instead of doing what is best for our troops, this process began with a resolution of inquiry which literally could have put their lives at risk.

I am happy that we ended up with a resolution that all of us can support and that the administration feels comfortable with. But I do not think that as a Congress we should ever allow people to put us at the kind of risk that we were originally facing.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and first appreciate his support of the legislation. As he stated, this legislation is not intended to be partisan. I think just about everyone who supports the legislation is fully in support of the war effort, but it is our responsibility to know both the costs of that effort and who is paying for it. We all want to see our allies pay a fair share.

Mr. WALKER. I was going to say to the gentleman that I think we could have found out that information probably without the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. That is the very point I wish to make to the gentleman. I have made several inquiries of the relevant authorities, and I know the chairman of the Budget Committee has asked them to come and testify on these particular issues, and we could not really get answers.

Mr. WALKER. The fact is that next week we will have a supplemental appropriation bill coming to the Hill. In the course of determining the nature of that supplemental appropriation, the administration witnesses are obviously going to have to answer questions related to the amounts of money they have in it. That is the way the normal process works. One would have to believe that that is exactly what would happen in this particular case.

Mr. SCHUMER. If the gentleman will yield further, until the legislation—until this legislation was drafted and had its genesis in the points I have mentioned, and the gentleman from California and I had talked about, we just were not getting those answers when we asked questions. We were getting very good information, for instance, on how much the allies had pledged. We were not getting very good information at all about how much they had actually paid. I am sure the gentleman will agree that a pledge is not worth very much; actual money in the bank is.

So the purpose of this, I would say to the gentleman, is not nefarious, it is not partisan, it is not intended to undercut anybody, as I do not think the

resolution of inquiry was, and as I am sure the gentlewoman from California will talk about.

Mr. WALKER. I would simply say to the gentleman that the resolution of inquiry, though, had many troublesome aspects to it.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I thank both gentlemen for yielding me the time.

I rise in support of the Schumer-Panetta proposal, and I support the tabling of House Resolution 19, the resolution of inquiry that has been discussed here today.

The resolution of inquiry was introduced in the spirit of this Congress needing information to make a very difficult choice. It was written before the war broke out, and clearly the kind of information we were asking for was information that we needed in order to make an intelligent decision.

I for one can say that I did not come here to Congress to make decisions based on hopes and dreams, but on solid information. I am very pleased to say that because of the development that came out of the resolution of inquiry and other independent issues surrounding it, we are going to get the information that we need. We are going to get the information through the Schumer-Panetta bill, information regarding burdensharing, very important information regarding what our allies will actually pay over to the taxpayers of this country.

Our men and women are taking the gamble on their own lives here, and we need to know that our allies are doing their fair share. Everyone has stated that.

Since the resolution was introduced, not only did the Schumer-Panetta bill come forward, but the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] and the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], have written some very important letters to the President asking for some very important information that goes back to the history of this situation and that talks to the future of the Middle East. So I think No. 1, certainly the war broke out and that changed the need for the resolution of inquiry that was written before the war broke out, and our colleagues, Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. PANETTA, have moved very aggressively on the budgetary issues surrounding the war. The fact that the two chairmen have pledged to do all they can to get the information they need means that today we have a

wonderful compromise here. We can pass Schumer-Panetta and we can table House Resolution 19, and all of us, the 17 Members who are on that bill, can feel very comfortable that we are going to get the information we need.

I want to point out to this body something that is critical here. Of course this body does receive classified information. It does so all the time, and the rules of the House state how that can be handled, and everything going along with this resolution or going along with the Schumer-Panetta bill will be dealt with in that fashion.

I thank the gentlemen very much for yielding the time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I just rise with a question for the gentlewoman from California. She states that her resolution of inquiry was drafted before the war began. The war began on August 2. Was the resolution of inquiry drafted before August 2?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about before the Congress voted, I would have to say, on the war, because to me, under our Constitution, Congress has to vote.

Mr. WALKER. Reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentlewoman that we began to deploy troops to the Middle East and put them in harm's way as of August 2. So the fact is that that is when the war broke out, and that is when troops began to get in harm's way. So the gentlewoman is saying to us that her resolution of inquiry was drafted in fact after our troops were placed in harm's way.

Mrs. BOXER. As the gentleman knows, the President of the United States came to this Congress in January, and this Congress did not vote on that war resolution until January, and this resolution was drafted before.

Mr. WALKER. The Congress did not vote until the lives of our troops were at stake, and the gentlewoman has admitted that her resolution of inquiry came after that time.

The SPEAKER, pro tempore. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has 1 minute remaining; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has 1 minute remaining; the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has 30 seconds remaining; and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, chairman of the committee, for having made available this

time to me. I commend him and the two committees for the fine leadership which they have displayed in terms of bringing this legislation to the floor.

□ 1250

I do feel very strongly that stronger provisions, however, are needed, and it is my feeling that as events go forward we are going to have to encourage our so-called friends and allies around the world that they should participate to a greater degree both in terms of real efforts and also financial efforts to resolve the problem in the gulf.

Just 2 weeks ago, the administration reported that the allies had pledged \$51 billion to the war effort. That is good news. The bad news, however, is that only \$7 billion of these pledges have been paid. Japan, for instance, has pledged a total of \$13 billion, but still owes \$9 billion. As the Japanese Government continues to debate with itself, the United States cannot be certain whether the pledge will ever be paid or whether, indeed, any meaningful contribution will flow from that country.

A similar problem exists with regard to Germany, where Germany has made healthy payments to the Soviet Union for the housing and other benefits to be conferred upon the soldiers that the Soviets have withdrawn from Eastern Germany, but where very little in terms of real assistance comes to the United States.

This is not a war that is being fought by the United States for American interests. The United States and our friends and allies and members of the coalition are engaged in a major effort to see to it that the U.N. resolutions are carried forward.

It is outrageous that some nations will continue to sit on the fence while the United States spends its treasure and blood to restore balance to one of the most dangerous and troublesome areas of the world and to prevent not only economic dominance of that area real political, economic, financial, and other dominance of the world by Saddam Hussein.

It is time others participated in this effort with cash and not promises.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 586, which requires the administration to submit reports to the Congress on the cost of the Persian Gulf war as well as the contributions made by our allies. I only wish that some of the stronger provisions which I authored in H.R. 317 could have given this bill more teeth. My bill allowed the President to use additional import duties to ensure that laggard allies pay their fair share when the bill comes due. While H.R. 586 does not go this far, I am hopeful that it will ensure that the costs of this war will be shared fairly.

Just 2 weeks ago the administration reported that the allies have pledged \$51 billion to the war effort. However, only \$7 billion of those pledges have been paid. Japan, for instance, has pledged a total of \$13 billion, but

still owes \$9 billion. As the Japanese Government continues to debate amongst itself, the United States can not be certain that its pledge will ever be paid.

It is outrageous that some nations continue to sit on the fence while the lives of our men and women are being lost. The burden must be shared with cash, not promises. And it must be shared now.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just like to say I think this is a good piece of legislation. I would hope that no one would misconstrue the fact that the administration has not over the last 6 months provided this Congress and its Members with the information and access to documents relevant to the operation of Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

For the record, I have submitted the detailed descriptions of over 170 briefings, both classified and unclassified, and access to information by Members of this body and the other body on the operation of Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

At this time I am submitting for the RECORD a letter dated February 20 from Brent Scowcroft to the honorable chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs outlining additional information and documents that have been provided, and I would also state for the record that the information as to dollars placed and received as of this point in time is available and has been available for at least a week in classified form to any Member of this institution who wished to get access to that information.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 586.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, February 20, 1991.

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am responding on behalf of the President to your letter of February 7, 1991, concerning H. Res. 19, a resolution of inquiry on Operation Desert Shield. I hope you will agree that since the onset of Operation Desert Shield the Administration has made every effort to provide accurate and timely information to the Congress. As part of the Administration's commitment to close consultation with Congress, the President has had over 25 meetings with the congressional leadership and Members. Secretary of State Baker, Secretary of Defense Cheney, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Powell have appeared numerous times before your Committee and at meetings to which the full membership of the House and Senate were invited. In addition, their departments have provided regular briefings to the full congressional membership. We fully intend to maintain this level of consultation and dialogue.

In response to your request for specific documentation, I am enclosing documents from the White House and the Departments of State and Defense. Included among the White House documents are (1) a list of congressional hearings, briefings, and meetings involving Administration officials, and (2) a

fact sheet and table on burdensharing. The State Department documents consist of (1) a list of congressional hearings and briefings involving Secretary Baker, and (2) tables concerning burdensharing. The Defense Department documents include (1) a list of military briefings and testimony that have been provided to Congress, (2) a list of intelligence briefings that have been provided, (3) casualty reports through February 11, (4) a January 14 report by the Comptroller of the Defense Department on contributions to the Defense Cooperation Account, and (5) Desert Storm Advisory Reports that have been provided to members of Congress. The Central Intelligence Agency also will be providing you with a list of finished intelligence products and briefings on Persian Gulf topics raised by H. Res. 19 that have been provided to the House Armed Services or Foreign Affairs Committees since August 2, 1990. The CIA information will be provided to you in classified form under separate cover.

I emphasize that all of this information is current and therefore relates to both the Desert Storm and Desert Shield phases of the Persian Gulf deployment. The information therefore is broader than that requested by H. Res. 19, which was restricted to the Desert Shield phase. While this information is not presented in the detailed format requested by your letter, it is the best that we have been able to do in the limited time afforded by your request. In an effort to be as responsive as possible, I provide below additional observations about the specific categories of information requested by H. Res. 19.

1. Casualty Estimates.—We have promptly advised the two Armed Services Committees of every casualty sustained in Operation Desert Shield/Storm. This information is recapitulated in the casualty reports through February 11, included among the materials enclosed from the Defense Department. This information relates to actual casualties, not estimates, and therefore should be of greater interest than the casualty information requested by H. Res. 119.

2. Catalyst for Wider Regional Conflict.—All Members of the House and Senate have been invited to briefings by Secretaries Baker and Cheney on numerous occasions to discuss Operation Desert Shield/Storm. On each occasion, the Secretaries have frankly discussed the international relations ramifications of the Operation, and Members have had the opportunity to ask questions. In addition, the Intelligence Community provides daily finished intelligence products to eight congressional committees, including your Committee. This material routinely analyzes relationships among countries of the region.

3. Biological and Chemical Weapons.—The Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Intelligence, and Appropriations Committees of both houses have been briefed in detail about Iraq's biological and chemical weapons capability. The periodic update briefings for all Members of the House and Senate have included detailed discussions of the damage inflicted by Coalition air strikes on Iraqi biological and chemical weapons facilities. Again, the information provided in these briefings relates to damage actually inflicted rather than projections of the damage that could be inflicted.

4. Disruption of Oil Supplies from the Persian Gulf.—Secretary Watkins' congressional testimony has discussed this issue. In addition, congressional meetings with Secretaries Baker and Cheney and General Powell have addressed this subject, as have the periodic update briefings for all Members.

5. Terrorism.—The two Intelligence Committees and the House Foreign Affairs Committee have been briefed in detail on the terrorist threat by representatives of the CIA, the State Department, and the FBI. In addition, intelligence analysts have provided numerous updates on the terrorist threat during periodic briefings for Members.

6. Burdensharing.—Detailed information on this subject is enclosed. The congressional meetings with Secretaries Baker and Cheney, in particular, have included lengthy discussions of their meetings with representatives of Coalition governments.

7. Budgetary Options for Paying for Operation Desert Shield.—Administration officials have stated on numerous occasions that Desert Shield/Storm will be funded separately through a supplemental appropriation. Congress agreed to this approach as part of the budget agreement reached in October 1990, and we anticipate submitting the proposed supplemental in the very near future.

8. Post-Conflict Options for Iraq.—Secretary Baker has commented extensively on this subject in congressional testimony.

I hope that this information is useful to your Committee. Please contact me if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

BRENT SCOWCROFT.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

But we are here because our allies have pledged \$50 billion and have only delivered \$10 billion. We are here because we do not think that enough pressure is being brought on our allies to do their share.

We are also anticipating that our allies will not pay their share, and that we will be forced, with another supplemental, to pay for that share.

And, last, we are here because if our allies do not pay their share, that means money from health care, education programs, that our people want and need.

Mr. Speaker, if there has been one Persian Gulf war issue on which there is unequivocal unanimity among Americans, it is that it not be fought, or paid for, by the United States alone.

Determining equitable burdensharing among nations at the best of times is not simple. In wartime the problem is even more complex. What assumptions do you make for military and civilian planning purposes? How do you compare contributions in areas as different as manpower, logistical support, aid in kind, and aid to front-line states? How do you compare dependence on Middle Eastern oil among countries of wildly differing sizes, resources, and needs? There can be no precision in estimating costs when we do not know how long the war will be fought and the type of warfare which will be conducted. But comparisons and assumptions have been made by the executive branch. I support this resolution's requirement that periodic reports on allied contributions be made to the Congress, and to the American people. We, too, must make plans for the future of this country.

Comparisons I have made to date based on available public information prove there are still blatant discrepancies in who is funding and fighting this war. Another way of putting it, is the burdensharing glass half empty or half full? For the President, the glass is half full, and destined to be filled. For my part, the glass is still half empty, and the prospects for filling it are dim.

From an analysis of the President's proposed fiscal year 1992 budget, it is clear the administration is assuming that the fighting will be over by summer and that, as a result, the United States share of the war will only cost \$15 billion. To implement these assumptions, the administration is now preparing a two-part supplemental request to Congress for money to pay for military costs in the Persian Gulf for the first 3 months, or 1 fiscal year quarter, of 1991. First, President Bush will ask for congressional approval to spend about \$40 billion in new contributions from U.S. allies. Second, the administration will seek congressional authority to spend about \$15 billion in American funds if the allied contributions prove to be inadequate.

Even while Congress is being asked to approve additional spending, the Pentagon cannot document precisely how the funds will be spent, nor can the administration promise the allies will, in fact, pick up 80 percent of the war's costs as the United States plans. But the costs keep mounting. We have been at war now for 36 days, and there is no sign that we will not be at war 36 days from now. Will allied contributions increase proportionately, or have their contributions peaked?

The lowest figure being used to assess daily warfighting costs is \$500 million a day since January 17, 1991; more often one hears of estimates of \$1 billion per day. Between August 2 and December 31, 1990, the allies have contributed 88 percent, or \$9.7 billion of the \$11.1 billion total spent on the war. They are to be commended for their commitments and contributions.

However, of the six countries that offered the largest contributions to Operation Desert Shield at its outset in August, only Kuwait has given all the money it originally promised—yet its armed forces stand now at only 7,000, less than half of its preinvasion 16,000-man army. The Japanese Government, after a tardy and stingy first offer of \$1.74 billion, is in danger of falling prey to a vote of no confidence over their request to the Diet for a further \$9 billion appropriation for warfighting costs. Chancellor Kohl of Germany churlishly denied Pentagon complaints about the tardiness of its promised contributions, and is coy about future levels of financial commitment. Estimates of Arab windfall profits from increased oil revenues have not readily translated into increased economic support for the frontline troops.

Can we really plan on more money being made available if the war drags on? Or is a half full glass all we will get to slake the desert-induced thirst?

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are 6 months into Desert Shield-Desert Storm, and it is past due that we have an accounting of

what costs have been incurred and what contributions have been received since this bill is long overdue, and I urge everyone to support its passage.

By the same token, we have accountants at the General Accounting Office who have an equal entitlement. In fact, they have a statutory authorization in title 31, section 716, of the United States Code, access to the supporting documentation, and I hope we pass this bill with confirmation of that authority and the right to audit the accuracy and the allocation of the information we seek to have reported in this bill.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 586, legislation that would require the administration to provide the Congress with reports on the incremental costs to the United States of the Persian Gulf war, and on the contributions of allied nations.

Allied pledges have poured in during the last few weeks to help offset the mounting costs of the Persian Gulf war. These gestures are welcome, but we must not be lulled into complacency by allied promises of cost sharing.

Nor should we forget the enormous financial costs of Operation Desert Storm. Before the war broke out, the congressional budget office estimated that war could add from \$17 billion to \$35 billion to the Pentagon's fiscal 1991 budget. The high-technology gulf war is estimated to cost \$600 million a day, and this figure could climb to as high as \$2 billion a day once a ground war starts.

H.R. 586 would put in place an important mechanism to chart both the financial costs of the war in the gulf and the amount of the contributions made to the United States by foreign countries to offset those costs.

With persistent budget and trade deficits, a growing recession, and many urgent domestic needs, we must be diligent in our assessment of the incremental costs of the war effort. Moreover, it's time that we demand that our allies pay their fair share for our common defenses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support of H.R. 586.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the measure before us.

Many of this bill's provisions mirror those of legislation I introduced earlier this year. Both require that the President submit to Congress reports detailing the cost of the war to the American taxpayer, as well as the contribution of our allies.

The American people, and Congress, need to know how many of our tax dollars are being spent on Operation Desert Storm. This knowledge will enable us to plan and perform to the best of our abilities.

By knowing the extent of our obligation in this area, we will be better able to estimate what resources are available for dealing with other concerns. This is true not only for the upcoming fiscal year, but also for years to come.

Furthermore, the American people deserve to know what the contributions of our allies are in this war. This will enable us to determine who really put their money where their mouth is. This could offer us a valuable lesson for the future.

A new world order has often been discussed. By knowing whether multiple countries are truly willing to work together and contribute to this struggle to force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait, we will be able to determine the likelihood of future global police force actions.

I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, well we are at it again—debating how we can properly do our job without doing the President's job for him. We have had this debate before and we will surely have it again * * * and it is a good debate to have. However, put in the context of war, the merits of the decisions made in this Chamber could very well be measured in the life and death of our troops in the Middle East. Now, more than ever, we must be aware of the fine line between legislative duty and legislative meddling.

The measure before us today allows us to do what we were sent here to do. The principle function of Congress is oversight, and in having the President report to us on the fundamental costs of Operation Desert Storm, we are fulfilling our obligation to our constituents and our country. I support H.R. 586 for this reason, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

What troubles me Mr. Speaker, have been the attempts of some of my colleagues to micromanage every aspect of this war. There has even been an initiative to force the administration to release some very sensitive information—information that, if leaked during wartime, could have devastating consequences to our troops in the field. During my time in the CIA, I saw firsthand that leaked secrets cost lives—plain and simple. They undercut our policy objectives and undermine our credibility throughout the world.

This war cannot and should not be fought with 435 commanders in chief. I believe the administration has done an excellent job in providing this Congress with timely and accurate information—and I am confident that this cooperation will continue.

We will not be left out in this process, the Constitution guarantees that. In these extraordinary times of war, we owe it to our troops in the field to give them every opportunity to come back to us safely. Let the President do his job and let us do ours. That is the way the Constitution intended, and that is the way Government works best.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the President has done a masterful job in assembling a political coalition against Saddam Hussein. He has marshaled the forces of democracy and justice, calling upon some of our wealthiest allies to join in this cause.

The Congress, and the administration, has reminded our allies that with prosperity comes responsibility. Although the United States is now the dominant country capable of assembling the might to eject Saddam from Kuwait, there are many nations around the world who must also share the burden, particularly the economic burden, of fighting this war.

We have now amassed \$53 billion of IOUs from our allies, but they have only written checks for \$13 billion in direct payments and in-kind contributions. We know this is an expensive endeavor, but we still do not know how expensive it has been, or will be. Our citi-

zens are deeply concerned that the allies are engaging in burden-shirking rather than burden-sharing, that America will have to borrow billions upon billions of dollars to finance the war, and that we will bear too heavy a burden and pay too high a price for sacrifices that must be equally shared.

This legislation requires the administration to provide Congress with the information about the costs of Desert Shield and Desert Storm from the day our deployment began and every month thereafter. This legislation will give us information about the actual size of the contributions from our allies to help offset the costs of this operation. And finally it requires periodic reports of contributions made by our allies to other members of the coalition allied against Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation now feels the special unity that comes during wartime. We have seen an outpouring of pride in our country, our soldiers, the performance of our technology, and, most of all, in a cause that is just.

Resting below these deep feelings of pride, I think it is fair to say, are also feelings of anxiety—concern about what this new world order will bring, what the war will mean for our economy, and what the war will mean for our future.

The legislation before us today is about all of these things, even as it addresses directly an accounting issue and, indirectly, a matter of principle. That principle is simply this: When you mobilize the world on behalf of a cause that is just, the world has a responsibility to stand with us on all fronts: moral, military, diplomatic and financial. The bill before us will help us ensure that responsibility is fulfilled.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the legislation sponsored by my friend from New York to insure that Congress gets adequate information about the costs of the gulf war and the contributions made by our allies to the war effort.

On the first day of this session, I introduced House Joint Resolution 50, which included a similar requirement for monthly reports to Congress on allied burdensharing pledges and actual contributions.

The administration claims our allies have been very forthcoming with contributions to offset U.S. costs in the Middle East, but many of us, Mr. Speaker, are not impressed.

Aid has been offered only grudgingly, and very little of what has been promised has actually materialized.

The Saudis and the United Arab Emirates are raking in billions in additional profits from their increased oil production as a result of the war, while they benefit from the protection of U.S. forces and U.S. military expenditures.

The Germans are excusing themselves from extensive aid, citing the cost of reunification and other economic woes.

The Japanese have tried to hide behind their constitution to avoid their fair share of the burden.

Meanwhile, the costs to the United States are mounting at the rate of nearly \$500 million a day. Unfulfilled allied promises will not pay those bills. And we all know the U.S. taxpayer has no one else to pass the buck to.

While our allies shuffle their feet and make excuses, American blood is being shed in defense of Saudi Arabia and other Arab targets

of Saddam's aggression, and to preserve the oil lifeline that is much more vital to most of our allies than it is even to us.

If our allies are indeed going to pick up the overwhelming share of Desert Shield and Desert Storm costs, then let's have the figures to prove it.

There's still considerable uncertainty over the extent to which allied contributions are to be applied to offset U.S. costs directly, or whether they are intended for aid in kind or aid to frontline states. While all assistance is appreciated, the distinction is still crucial to the U.S. bottom line.

The information required by this bill will give us the ability to make a fair assessment of U.S. costs and allied contributions. It will put our allies on notice that their responsibility to pay a fair share of the economic burden is taken seriously by the Congress, and will be monitored closely.

I urge my colleagues to lend their full support to the bill.

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, it is time that our allies help us in bearing the burden of Operation Desert Shield. And H.R. 586 a bill to require reports on the Cost of Persian Gulf Operations is the first step in the right direction.

This measure requires the administration to submit periodic reports on the cost of military operations in the Persian Gulf region and on the contributions of allied countries. At this time, our allies have pledged \$50 billion and so far they've only given us \$10 billion. This bill is long over-due in order to see that our allies cover their share of the costs.

Clearly the United States is the only world power to lead such awesome international coalition against Saddam Hussein. We can do it because of our outstanding military and because of our political stability. We are also sacrificing much more than any other country in terms of human costs. However, we should not be the ones to bear the financial responsibility as well. After all, this is a global crisis.

The provisions of H.R. 586 will provide Congress and the American people with hard data to determine what the next step should be in getting our allies to comply with their fair share of the burden.

The administration will have to report costs of any defense-related expenditures above those that normally would have been incurred during peace-time. At the same time, the administration will also have to report the actual financial contributions made by foreign nations to defray the costs to the United States of the Persian Gulf war.

Once we have rock-solid figures through the provisions of H.R. 586, the administration and Congress can shape an allied burden-sharing policy with teeth. I am a cosponsor of H.R. 317 which represents the type of burden sharing agenda we should pursue. It poses economic penalties in the form a twenty-percent duty on all goods of any nation that is not paying its share. Moreover, all funds earmarked by H.R. 317 will go to pay for American contributions to Operation Desert Storm.

Japan, Germany, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and others need to know that if they do not contribute their fair share in this urgent world crisis that there will be a high economic penalty. If they do not physically give us the money, the American Congress and administration will

take steps to extract it from noncompliant Allies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 586, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—393

Abercrombie	Dannemeyer	Hayes (IL)
Alexander	Darden	Hefley
Allard	Davis	Hefner
Anderson	DeFazio	Henry
Andrews (ME)	DeLauro	Herger
Andrews (NJ)	DeLay	Hertel
Andrews (TX)	Dellums	Hoagland
Annunzio	Derrick	Hobson
Anthony	Dickinson	Hochbrueckner
Applegate	Dicks	Holloway
Archer	Dingell	Hopkins
Armey	Dixon	Horn
Aspin	Donnelly	Horton
Atkins	Dooley	Houghton
AuCoin	Doolittle	Hoyer
Bacchus	Dorgan (ND)	Hubbard
Baker	Downey	Hughes
Ballenger	Durbin	Hutto
Barrett	Dwyer	Hyde
Bateman	Early	Inhofe
Bellenson	Eckart	Ireland
Bennett	Edwards (CA)	Jacobs
Bentley	Edwards (OK)	James
Bereuter	Edwards (TX)	Jenkins
Berman	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Bevill	Engel	Johnson (SD)
Bilbray	English	Johnston
Bilirakis	Erdreich	Jones (GA)
Bliley	Espy	Jones (NC)
Boehert	Evans	Jontz
Boehner	Fascell	Kanjorski
Bonior	Fawell	Kaptur
Borski	Fazio	Kasich
Boucher	Feighan	Kennedy
Boxer	Fish	Kennelly
Brewster	Flake	Kildee
Brooks	Foglietta	Kiecicka
Broomfield	Ford (MI)	Klug
Browder	Frank (MA)	Kolbe
Bruce	Franks (CT)	Kolter
Bryant	Frost	Kopetski
Bunning	Gallegly	Kostmayer
Burton	Gallo	Kyl
Byron	Gaydos	LaFalce
Callahan	Gejdenson	Lagomarsino
Camp	Gekas	Lancaster
Campbell (CA)	Gephardt	Lantos
Campbell (CO)	Geren	LaRocco
Cardin	Gibbons	Laughlin
Carper	Gilchrest	Leach
Carr	Gillmor	Lehman (FL)
Chandler	Gillman	Levin (MI)
Chapman	Gingrich	Levine (CA)
Clay	Glickman	Lewis (CA)
Clement	Gonzalez	Lewis (FL)
Clinger	Goodling	Lewis (GA)
Coble	Gordon	Lightfoot
Coleman (MO)	Goss	Lipinski
Coleman (TX)	Gradison	Livingston
Collins (IL)	Grandy	Lloyd
Collins (MI)	Gray	Long
Combest	Green	Lowery (CA)
Condit	Guarini	Lowey (NY)
Conyers	Gunderson	Luken
Cooper	Hall (OH)	Machtley
Costello	Hall (TX)	Madigan
Coughlin	Hamilton	Manton
Cox (CA)	Hammerschmidt	Markey
Cox (IL)	Hancock	Martin
Coyne	Hansen	Martinez
Cramer	Harris	Matsui
Crane	Hastert	Mazzoli
Cunningham	Hatcher	McCandless

McCloskey	Perkins	Slattery
McCollum	Peterson (FL)	Slaughter (NY)
McCrery	Peterson (MN)	Slaughter (VA)
McCurdy	Petri	Smith (FL)
McDade	Pickett	Smith (IA)
McDermott	Pickle	Smith (NJ)
McEwen	Porter	Smith (OR)
McGrath	Poshard	Smith (TX)
McHugh	Price	Snowe
McMillan (NC)	Pursell	Solomon
McMillen (MD)	Quillen	Spence
McNulty	Rahall	Spratt
Meyers	Ramstad	Staggers
Mfume	Rangel	Stallings
Michel	Ravenel	Stark
Miller (CA)	Ray	Stearns
Miller (WA)	Reed	Stenholm
Mineta	Regula	Stokes
Mink	Rhodes	Studds
Moakley	Richardson	Swett
Molinar	Riggs	Swift
Mollohan	Rinaldo	Synar
Montgomery	Ritter	Tallon
Moody	Roe	Tanner
Moorhead	Roemer	Tauzin
Moran	Rogers	Taylor (MS)
Morella	Rohrabacher	Taylor (NC)
Morrison	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas (GA)
Mrazek	Rose	Thomas (WY)
Murphy	Roth	Thornton
Murtha	Roukema	Torricelli
Myers	Rowland	Towns
Nagle	Roybal	Trafficant
Natcher	Russo	Unsoeld
Neal (MA)	Sabo	Upton
Neal (NC)	Sanders	Valentine
Nichols	Sangmeister	Vander Jagt
Nowak	Santorum	Vento
Nussle	Sarpalius	Visclosky
Oakar	Savage	Volkmer
Oberstar	Sawyer	Vucanovich
Obey	Saxton	Walker
Olin	Schaefer	Walsh
Orton	Scheuer	Waxman
Owens (NY)	Schiff	Weber
Owens (UT)	Schroeder	Weldon
Oxley	Schumer	Wheat
Packard	Sensenbrenner	Williams
Pallone	Serrano	Wise
Panetta	Sharp	Wolf
Parker	Shaw	Wolpe
Patterson	Shays	Wyden
Paxon	Shuster	Wyllie
Payne (NJ)	Sikorski	Yates
Payne (VA)	Sisisky	Yatron
Pease	Skaggs	Young (AK)
Pelosi	Skeen	Young (FL)
Penny	Skelton	Zeliff

NAYS—1

Stump

NOT VOTING—39

Ackerman	Hayes (LA)	Schulze
Barnard	Huckaby	Solarz
Bartlett	Hunter	Sundquist
Barton	Jefferson	Thomas (CA)
Brown	Lehman (CA)	Torres
Bustamante	Lent	Traxler
de la Garza	Marlenee	Udall
Dornan (CA)	Mavroules	Washington
Dreier	Miller (OH)	Waters
Duncan	Ortiz	Weiss
Dymally	Ridge	Whitten
Fields	Roberts	Wilson
Ford (TN)	Rostenkowski	Zimmer

□ 1315

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An Act to require regular reports to the Congress on the costs to the United States of Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm, on the contributions made by foreign countries to offset such costs, and on other contributions made by foreign countries in response to the Persian Gulf crisis."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONNEL EXPLANATION

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on H.R. 586 because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been able to vote on the measure, I would have voted in the affirmative.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time so that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for the balance of this week and next week, and I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

There will be one additional vote this afternoon on a motion to table. That motion will be made imminently and the vote will come right away, without debate.

There will be no session or no votes tomorrow.

On Monday, February 25, the House will meet at noon, but there will be no legislative business.

On Tuesday, February 26, the House will meet at noon to take up suspensions, but suspension votes will be postponed until Wednesday, February 27. We will consider House Joint Resolution 100, recognizing the 200th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and Portugal.

On Wednesday, February 27, the House will meet at 2 p.m. to consider H.R. 111 to provide for VA grants to assist medical schools in establishing new research centers. Of course, the vote, if there is one, on Tuesday, will be held on Wednesday.

On Thursday, February 28, the House will meet at 11 a.m. to take up a House resolution concerning the Resolution Trust Corporation funding. That is subject to a rule.

On Friday, March 1, the House will not be in session.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
FEBRUARY 25, 1991

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY,
FEBRUARY 27, 1991, MOTION
TO CONSIDER BILL UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday, February 27, to consider a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 111, to provide for VA grants to assist medical schools in establishing new research centers.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF
HOUSE RESOLUTION 19 CALLING FOR
SUBMISSION TO HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES OF CERTAIN
INFORMATION REGARDING OPER-
ATION DESERT SHIELD

Mr. FASCELL, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-5, part II) on the resolution (H. Res. 19) calling for the submission to the House of Representatives of certain information regarding Operation Desert Shield, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1320

REGARDING INFORMATION ON
OPERATION DESERT SHIELD

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of February 20, 1991, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 19) calling for the submission to the House of Representatives of certain information regarding Operation Desert Shield, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The text of House Resolution 19 is as follows:

H. RES. 19

Resolved,

SECTION 1. INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED.

Within 10 days after the adoption of this resolution, the President shall furnish to the

House of Representatives the following information with respect to Operation Desert Shield:

(1) **CASUALTY ESTIMATES.**—(A) Any document prepared for or by the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the chief of staff of any military service, or the United States Central Command in Saudi Arabia that describes or discusses—

(i) the estimated casualties that would be suffered by United States military personnel in the event that combat operations commence under Operation Desert Shield; or

(ii) the estimated casualties that would be suffered by military and civilian personnel of other countries in the event that combat operations commence under Operation Desert Shield.

(B) The documents submitted pursuant to this paragraph shall include any document describing or discussing casualty estimates under any or all types of scenarios considered plausible, including defensive and offensive operations.

(2) **OPERATION DESERT SHIELD AS CATALYST FOR A WIDER, REGIONAL CONFLICT.**—Any document prepared for or by the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or the chief of staff of any military service that describes or discusses the possibility that a United States combat operation, defensive or offensive, would be the catalyst for a wider, regional conflict.

(3) **BIOLOGICAL AND CHEMICAL WEAPONS.**—Any document prepared for or by the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or the chief of staff of any military service that describes or discusses—

(A) the long-term effects of exposure to the biological and chemical weapons now available to the Iraqi Government; or

(B) the effects of bombing or attacking Iraqi facilities that produce biological or chemical weapons or components of these weapons.

(4) **DISRUPTION OF OIL SUPPLIES FROM THE PERSIAN GULF.**—Any document prepared for or by the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, or the Secretary of any other executive department that describes or discusses the effect of an armed conflict on the flow of oil from the Persian Gulf region to the United States, our Western allies, or Japan.

(5) **TERRORISM.**—Any document prepared for or by the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or the chief of staff of any military service that describes or discusses—

(A) possible targets of terrorist activity as a result of the participation of the United States in combat activities in the Persian Gulf; or

(B) estimated casualties of possible terrorist activities within the United States as a result of such activities.

(6) **BURDENSHARING.**—(A) Any document prepared for or by the President, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Defense that describes or discusses efforts on behalf of the United States Government—

(i) to obtain the participation of other countries in Operation Desert Shield, or

(ii) to increase the participation of those countries already participating in Operation Desert Shield, including the commitment of additional military forces.

(B) Any document prepared for or by the President, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Defense that describes the commitments made by any foreign country to pro-

vide military personnel for Operation Desert Shield, including—

(i) any document describing the number of, the military service of, or the functions to be performed by, the military personnel that such foreign country committed itself to provide, and

(ii) any document describing the number of military personnel actually deployed by that foreign country, the military service to which they belong, or the functions they perform.

(C) Any document prepared for or by the President, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Defense that describes or discusses efforts on behalf of the United States Government to achieve agreement, by other countries participating in Operation Desert Shield, that military force should be considered an option in resolving the conflict with Iraq.

(D) Any document prepared for or by the President, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Defense that describes or discusses efforts on behalf of the United States Government to gain commitments by other countries to provide financial support for Operation Desert Shield, to provide humanitarian assistance for those affected by Iraq's aggression, or to provide assistance to other foreign governments to offset the effects of the economic embargo against Iraq.

(E) Any document prepared for or by the President, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Defense that describes the commitments made by any foreign country to contribute funds to the United States to help defray the costs of Operation Desert Shield, to provide humanitarian assistance for those affected by Iraq's aggression, or to provide assistance to other foreign governments to offset the effects of the economic embargo against Iraq, including—

(i) any document describing the amount of the contribution that such foreign country committed itself to provide, and

(ii) any document describing the amount that country has actually contributed.

(F) In the case of any foreign country with respect to which a document is required to be submitted pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (D), any document prepared for or by the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of Energy that describes the percentage of that country's oil needs that are currently derived from the Persian Gulf region.

(G) The documents submitted pursuant to this paragraph shall include any document describing or discussing any "tradeoff" or other agreement or understanding between the United States and any foreign government resulting from United States efforts to obtain support by that foreign government for Operation Desert Shield.

(H) The documents submitted pursuant to this paragraph shall include any document describing or discussing any meeting by the President, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Defense with any foreign government official to discuss Operation Desert Shield, including the meetings held on or about the following dates in the following locations:

(i) August 11, 1990: meeting in Brussels with representatives of member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(ii) September 6, 1990: Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.

(iii) September 8, 1990: Israel and Egypt.

(iv) September 9, 1990: Helsinki, Finland.

(v) September 10, 1990: meeting in Brussels with representatives of member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(vi) September 11, 1990: Moscow.

(vii) September 13/14, 1990: Syria.

(viii) September 16, 1990, Bonn and London.

(ix) September 28, 1990: United Nations, New York.

(x) October 18, 1990: Washington.

(xi) November 3-11, 1990: Moscow, Turkey, Syria, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Kuwait, Paris, and London.

(xii) November 13, 1990: Bermuda.

(xiii) November 16, 1990: Brussels.

(xiv) Week of November 19, 1990: Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Paris, and Yemen.

(xv) Week of November 26, 1990: New York.

(7) **BUDGETARY OPTIONS FOR PAYING FOR OPERATION DESERT SHIELD.**—Any document prepared for or by the President that describes or discusses budgetary options with regard to the additional expenses incurred by the United States as a result of Operation Desert Shield, such as increases in taxes or reductions in spending for other United States Government programs or activities, including any document indicating any decision made by the President with respect to any such option.

(8) **POST-CONFLICT OPTIONS FOR IRAQ.**—Any document prepared for or by the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or the chief of staff of any military service that describes or discusses options regarding a post-conflict Iraq should a military conflict occur, specifically including any such documents concerning the possibility of a permanent United States or United Nations presence in Iraq.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this resolution—

(1) the term "document" includes any plan, report, memo, or briefing paper, whether classified or unclassified; and

(2) the term "Operation Desert Shield" means those military operations undertaken by the United States and other countries in response to Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced on January 3, 1991 by the gentleman from California, Mrs. BOXER, and joined by 19 cosponsors. This resolution was referred jointly to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services and directs the President to provide to the House of Representatives any documents detailing information with respect to Operation Desert Shield.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XXII of the House of Representatives, the Congress has exercised its right to request information from the executive branch through the use of resolutions of inquiry since its earliest days, with the first rule on this subject adopted by the House in 1820. This procedure for obtaining information from the executive branch is available to all Members of the House and recognizes the right of the legislative branch to request such information as part of its constitutional responsibilities. As such, resolutions of inquiry are given highest privilege both in committees and in the House as a whole. Historically, this parliamentary procedure for seeking information from the executive branch has been utilized by Members of both parties regardless of the party in power in the executive branch.

House Resolution 19 relates to Operation Desert Shield and was introduced prior to the authorization of the use of force in the Persian Gulf by the Congress. It should be noted that

the invasion of Kuwait occurred on August 2, 1990. On August 9, 1990, the President of the United States notified the Congress pursuant to the provisions of the War Powers Resolution that U.S. Armed Forces were being deployed to the Persian Gulf. The President stated in his notification that he "did not believe that involvement in hostilities was imminent." Indeed, it was the President's belief as stated in his notification that the deployment was defensive in nature and "would facilitate a peaceful resolution of the crisis."

On November 16, 1990, the President notified the Congress that the further deployment of U.S. forces "would ensure that the coalition has an adequate offensive military option should that be necessary to achieve our common goals." The November 16 letter, however, reaffirms "that involvement in hostilities was not imminent." On November 29, 1990, the U.N. Security Council voted to authorize the use of force, at the request of the administration, to secure the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait and secure Iraq's compliance with appropriate U.N. Security Council resolutions. After the adoption of this resolution, it became clear that the President had determined that it was necessary to move from a defensive to an offensive posture in order to implement the resolutions of the Security Council. On January 3, the Honorable BARBARA BOXER, along with 19 other cosponsors, introduced House Resolution 19, a resolution of inquiry requesting information concerning options for and the implications of going to war in the Persian Gulf. Shortly thereafter, on January 8, 1991, the President formally requested that the Congress authorize the use of force to implement U.N. Security Council Resolution 678.

There has been a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding with regard to the intent of House Resolution 19. The sponsors of the resolution, inasmuch as it was introduced prior to the outbreak of hostilities in the Persian Gulf involving U.S. forces, never intended in the request for information to put into harm's way U.S. forces stationed in the Persian Gulf. Furthermore, the resolution would in no way compromise the provision of classified material provided to the House. I would like to remind my colleagues that classified material submitted to the House is treated pursuant to the rules and procedures of the House of Representatives whether it is provided pursuant to a resolution of inquiry, through the normal disposition of congressional oversight, or through executive branch communications.

House Resolution 19 has proven to be a catalyst for the executive branch to be more forthcoming with the Congress in providing necessary and appropriate information in order to satisfy the oversight responsibilities of the Congress. In fact, the executive branch on February 20 submitted a more detailed and substantive response to the resolution than the initial executive branch response. I would like to commend the administration for the cooperation in providing information and documentation to the Congress in response to this resolution. All of the correspondence between the Congress and the executive branch on this resolution, as well as the additional documents submitted by the executive branch, have been included in the Committee's report on House

Resolution 19. I would also like to insert at this point in the RECORD the letters I have referred to in my statement.

Because this resolution has been overtaken by events and because major portions of this resolution were incorporated in H.R. 586, the sponsors of the resolution have requested that House Resolution 19 be tabled. I would assure the sponsors of this resolution that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will continue its oversight of the issues relating to Operation Desert Storm which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee and will continue to work with them in this regard.

I urge my colleagues to support the motion to table House Resolution 19.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, August 9, 1990.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker,

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On August 2, 1990, Iraq invaded and occupied the sovereign state of Kuwait in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. In the period since August 2, Iraq has massed an enormous and sophisticated war machine on the Kuwaiti-Saudi Arabian border and in southern Iraq, capable of initiating further hostilities with little or no additional preparation. Iraq's actions pose a direct threat to neighboring countries and to vital U.S. interests in the Persian Gulf region.

In response to this threat and after receiving the request of the Government of Saudi Arabia, I ordered the forward deployment of substantial elements of the United States Armed Forces into the region. I am providing this report on the deployment and mission of our Armed Forces in accordance with my desire that Congress be fully informed and consistent with the War Powers Resolution.

Two squadrons of F-15 aircraft, one brigade of the 82nd Airborne Division, and other elements of the Armed Forces began arriving in Saudi Arabia at approximately 9:00 a.m. (EDT) on August 8, 1990. Additional U.S. air, naval, and ground Forces also will be deployed. The Forces are equipped for combat, and their mission is defensive. They are prepared to take action in concert with Saudi forces, friendly regional forces, and others to deter Iraq aggression and to preserve the integrity of Saudi Arabia.

I do not believe involvement in hostilities is imminent; to the contrary, it is my belief that this deployment will facilitate a peaceful resolution of the crisis. If necessary, however, the Forces are fully prepared to defend themselves. Although it is not possible to predict the precise scope and duration of this deployment, our Armed Forces will remain so long as their presence is required to contribute to the security of the region and desired by the Saudi government to enhance the capability of Saudi armed forces to defend the Kingdom.

I have taken these actions pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct our foreign relations and as Commander in Chief. These actions are in exercise of our inherent right of individual and collective self-defense. I look forward to cooperation with the Congress in helping to restore peace and stability to the Persian Gulf region.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, November 16, 1990.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There have been a number of important developments in the Persian Gulf region since my letter of August 9, 1990, informing you of the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. In the spirit of consultation and cooperation between our two branches of Government and in the firm belief that working together as we have we can best protect and advance the Nation's interests, I wanted to update you on these developments.

As you are aware, the United States and Allied and other friendly governments have introduced elements of their Armed Forces into the region in response to Iraq's unprovoked and unlawful aggression and at the request of regional governments. In view of Iraq's continued occupation of Kuwait, defiance of 10 U.N. Security Council resolutions demanding unconditional withdrawal, and sustained threat to other friendly countries in the region, I determined that the U.S. deployments begun in August should continue. Accordingly, on November 8, after consultations with our Allies and coalition partners, I announced the continued deployment of U.S. Armed Forces to the Persian Gulf region. These Forces include a heavy U.S. Army Corps and a Marine expeditionary force with an additional brigade. In addition, three aircraft carriers, a battleship, appropriate escort ships, a naval amphibious landing group, and a squadron of maritime prepositioning ships will join other naval units in the area.

I want to emphasize that this deployment is in line with the steady buildup of U.S. Armed Forces in the region over the last 3 months and is a continuation of the deployment described in my letter of August 9. I also want to emphasize that the mission of our Armed Forces has not changed. Our Forces are in the Gulf region in the exercise of our inherent right of individual and collective self-defense against Iraq's aggression and consistent with U.N. Security Council resolutions related to Iraq's ongoing occupation of Kuwait. The United States and other nations continue to seek a peaceful resolution of the crisis. We and our coalition partners share the common goals of achieving the immediate, complete, and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait, the restoration of Kuwait's legitimate government, the protection of the lives of citizens held hostage by Iraq both in Kuwait and Iraq, and the restoration of security and stability in the region. The deployment will ensure that the coalition has an adequate offense military option should that be necessary to achieve our common goals.

In my August 9 letter, I indicated that I did not believe that involvement in hostilities was imminent. Indeed, it was my belief that the deployment would facilitate a peaceful resolution of the crisis. I also stated that our Armed Forces would remain in the Persian Gulf region so long as required to contribute to the security of the region and desired by host governments. My view on these matters has not changed.

I appreciate the views you and other members of the congressional leadership have expressed throughout the past 3 months during our consultations. I look forward to continued consultation and cooperation with the

Congress in pursuit of peace, stability, and security in the Gulf region.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, January 8, 1991.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The current situation in the Persian Gulf, brought about by Iraq's unprovoked invasion and subsequent brutal occupation of Kuwait, threatens vital U.S. interests. The situation also threatens the peace. It would, however, greatly enhance the chances for peace if Congress were now to go on record supporting the position adopted by the UN Security Council on twelve separate occasions. Such an action would underline that the United States stands with the international community and on the side of law and decency; it also would help dispel any belief that may exist in the minds of Iraq's leaders that the United States lacks the necessary unity to act decisively in response to Iraq's continued aggression against Kuwait.

Secretary of State Baker is meeting with Iraq's Foreign Minister on January 9. It would have been most constructive if he could have presented the Iraqi government a Resolution passed by both houses of Congress supporting the UN position and in particular Security Council Resolution 678. As you know, I have frequently stated my desire for such a Resolution. Nevertheless, there is still opportunity for Congress to act to strengthen the prospects for peace and safeguard this country's vital interests.

I therefore request that the House of Representatives and the Senate adopt a Resolution stating that Congress supports the use of all necessary means to implement UN Security Council Resolution 678. Such action would send the clearest possible message to Saddam Hussein that he must withdraw without condition or delay from Kuwait. Anything less would only encourage Iraqi intransigence; anything else would risk detracting from the international coalition arrayed against Iraq's aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I am determined to do whatever is necessary to protect America's security. I ask Congress to join with me in this task. I can think of no better way than for Congress to express its support for the President at this critical time. This truly is the last best chance for peace.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 19, the resolution of inquiry requiring a very broad range of detailed classified and unclassified information regarding Operation Desert Storm. Yesterday, when this resolution was before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I voted for an unfavorable recommendation. My position has not changed.

Congress already receives a sufficient amount of information through frequent Defense Department briefings. I have attended many of these closed meetings. They are informative and most questions asked by Members are answered. I am concerned that some, including proponents of this resolution, claim their concerns are not being addressed by the Pentagon. However, I have listened to some of those questions, and I know they cannot be answered at the time, usually be-

cause there isn't an answer. The Pentagon, unlike the media and some Members, doesn't try to speculate, guess, and spread around information that is unconfirmed or unverified. Of course, if the Pentagon did speculate, these same critics would attack the Pentagon for doing just that.

Some questions are left unanswered because of their very sensitive nature. For example, we do not need to know the exact location of every military unit in the theater. If such information were leaked, even by accident, it could result in greater losses of American and allied lives. As we used to say in World War II, loose lips sink ships. American men and women shouldn't lose their lives to satisfy the curiosity of some Member of Congress. Besides, the House and Senate Intelligence Committees are privy to all information, including the most sensitive. Congress, not the Pentagon, established this system of using the Intelligence Committees. The system works and now, in the middle of a war, is not the time to change it.

Frankly, I know why this resolution is really before us. It is pure and simple politics. While the vast majority of the American public and Congress strongly support Operation Desert Storm and our brave troops fighting in the Persian Gulf, there is a minority that does not. While most Americans understand why we are in the Persian Gulf and the very real dangers Saddam Hussein poses to our own national security interests, this vocal minority continues to try to misconstrue the reasons and, in some cases, the actual events that have occurred. Thus far, they have failed.

Now, this minority wants the Defense Department to help its efforts. Many items on the long list of this inquiry would require the Defense Department to speculate—guess at what possible answers could be. Of course, because many of these questions focus on possible future events and future outcomes, the Pentagon's guessing could be wrong. President Bush, Secretary Cheney and the Defense Department will, I believe, be attacked every time a guess is not 100 percent correct. Some questions involve very sensitive issues that could adversely affect our relations with important coalition partners. I'm certain that war critics will exploit this situation, again to the detriment of our forces on the front lines.

For example, this resolution asks for speculation on post-conflict options for Iraq and the gulf. I know that we're already focusing on this important issue. This resolution lets Saddam Hussein and others who do not need to know exactly what we're thinking. Believe me, his propaganda machine will use and abuse this information to benefit Iraq. That could cost more American lives and undercut our strategy and alliance unnecessarily.

As I said, all of the issues raised by this resolution are being addressed through the appropriate fora, whether it be through Member briefings or the work of the Intelligence Committee. Congress is getting the information to which it is entitled and it is happening in a timely way. Clearly, the recent lengthy hearings including Secretary of State Baker, Secretary of Defense Cheney and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General Powell exemplify that. This resolution only really helps the Iraq intel-

ligence services by providing a very easy answer to many questions Saddam Hussein would like answered.

Further, there are some issues that require detailed, indepth analysis. Yet, as far as Congress is concerned, if that is done immediately or after the war, it really doesn't matter. Let's fight to win first instead of diverting valuable resources away from our forces in the desert. Frankly, with a war going on, the Secretary of Defense and others have a lot to do on very time-sensitive issues. Why unnecessarily increase their work and force them to, therefore, spend less time on critical issues affecting our troops and the war they are fighting?

The bottom line is Congress is getting what it needs in a timely manner. This resolution only forces the Defense Department to take extra time to provide critics of the gulf war with speculative ammunition to use against U.S. involvement. That only benefits Iraq and could increase American casualties.

I strongly urge my colleagues to table this faulty resolution.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay House Resolution 19 on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—390

Abercrombie	Bryant	Derrick
Alexander	Bunning	Dickinson
Allard	Burton	Dicks
Anderson	Byron	Dingell
Andrews (ME)	Callahan	Dixon
Andrews (NJ)	Camp	Donnelly
Andrews (TX)	Campbell (CA)	Dooley
Annunzio	Campbell (CO)	Doolittle
Anthony	Cardin	Dorgan (ND)
Applegate	Carper	Downey
Archer	Carr	Durbin
Armedy	Chandler	Dwyer
Aspin	Chapman	Early
Atkins	Clay	Eckart
AuCoin	Clement	Edwards (CA)
Bacchus	Clinger	Edwards (OK)
Baker	Coble	Edwards (TX)
Ballenger	Coleman (MO)	Emerson
Barrett	Coleman (TX)	Engel
Bateman	Collins (IL)	English
Bellenson	Collins (MI)	Erdreich
Bennett	Combest	Espy
Bentley	Condit	Evans
Bereuter	Conyers	Fascell
Berman	Cooper	Fawell
Bilbray	Costello	Fazio
Bilirakis	Coughlin	Feighan
Billiey	Cox (CA)	Fish
Boehert	Cox (IL)	Flake
Boehner	Coyne	Foglietta
Bonior	Cramer	Ford (MI)
Borski	Crane	Frank (MA)
Boucher	Cunningham	Franks (CT)
Boxer	Dannemeyer	Frost
Brewster	Darden	Gallo
Brooks	Davis	Gaydos
Broomfield	DeFazio	Geldenson
Browder	DeLauro	Gekas
Bruce	DeLay	Gephardt

Geren	Manton	Rohrbacher
Gibbons	Markey	Ros-Lehtinen
Gilchrist	Martin	Rose
Gillmor	Martinez	Roth
Gilman	Matsui	Roukema
Glickman	Mazzoli	Rowland
Gonzalez	McCandless	Roybal
Goodling	McCloskey	Russo
Gordon	McCollum	Sabo
Goss	McCrery	Sanders
Gradison	McCurdy	Sangmeister
Grandy	McDade	Santorium
Gray	McDermott	Sarpallus
Green	McEwen	Savage
Guarini	McGrath	Sawyer
Gunderson	McHugh	Saxton
Hall (OH)	McMillan (NC)	Schaefer
Hall (TX)	McMillen (MD)	Scheuer
Hamilton	McNulty	Schiff
Hammerschmidt	Meyers	Schroeder
Hancock	Mfume	Schumer
Hansen	Michel	Sensenbrenner
Harris	Miller (CA)	Serrano
Hastert	Miller (WA)	Sharp
Hatcher	Mineta	Shaw
Hayes (IL)	Mink	Shays
Hefley	Moakley	Shuster
Hefner	Molinari	Sikorski
Henry	Mollohan	Sisisky
Herger	Montgomery	Skeen
Hertel	Moody	Skelton
Hoagland	Moorhead	Slattery
Hobson	Moran	Slaughter (NY)
Hochbrueckner	Morella	Slaughter (VA)
Holloway	Morrison	Smith (FL)
Hopkins	Mrazek	Smith (IA)
Horn	Murphy	Smith (NJ)
Horton	Murtha	Smith (OR)
Houghton	Myers	Smith (TX)
Hoyer	Nagle	Snowe
Hubbard	Natcher	Solomon
Hughes	Neal (MA)	Spence
Hunter	Neal (NC)	Spratt
Hutto	Nichols	Staggers
Hyde	Nowak	Stallings
Inhofe	Nussle	Stark
Ireland	Oakar	Stearns
Jacobs	Oberstar	Stenholm
James	Obey	Stokes
Jenkins	Olin	Stump
Johnson (CT)	Orton	Swett
Johnson (SD)	Owens (NY)	Swift
Johnston	Owens (UT)	Synar
Jones (GA)	Oxley	Tallon
Jones (NC)	Packard	Tanner
Jontz	Pallone	Tauzin
Kanjorski	Panetta	Taylor (MS)
Kaptur	Parker	Taylor (NC)
Kasich	Patterson	Thomas (GA)
Kennedy	Paxon	Thomas (WY)
Kennelly	Payne (NJ)	Thornton
Kildee	Payne (VA)	Torricelli
Klecza	Pease	Towns
Klug	Pelosi	Trafiacant
Kolbe	Penny	Unsoeld
Kolter	Perkins	Upton
Kopetski	Peterson (FL)	Valentine
Kyl	Peterson (MN)	Vander Jagt
LaFalce	Petri	Vento
Lagomarsino	Pickett	Visclosky
Lancaster	Pickle	Volkmer
Lantos	Porter	Walker
LaRocco	Poshard	Walsh
Laughlin	Price	Waxman
Leach	Pursell	Weber
Lehman (FL)	Quillen	Weldon
Levin (MI)	Rahall	Wheat
Levine (CA)	Ramstad	Williams
Lewis (CA)	Rangel	Wilson
Lewis (FL)	Ravenel	Wise
Lewis (GA)	Ray	Wolf
Lightfoot	Reed	Wolpe
Lipinski	Regula	Wyden
Livingston	Rhodes	Wyllie
Lloyd	Richardson	Yates
Long	Riggs	Yatron
Lowery (CA)	Rinaldo	Young (AK)
Lowey (NY)	Ritter	Young (FL)
Luken	Roe	Zeliff
Machtley	Roemer	Zimmer
Madigan	Rogers	

NAYS—0 NOT VOTING—43

Ackerman	Gallely	Schulze
Barnard	Gingrich	Skaggs
Bartlett	Hayes (LA)	Solarz
Barton	Huckaby	Studds
Bevill	Jefferson	Sundquist
Brown	Kostmayer	Thomas (CA)
Bustamante	Lehman (CA)	Torres
de la Garza	Lent	Traxler
Dellums	Marlenee	Udall
Dornan (CA)	Mavroules	Washington
Dreier	Miller (OH)	Waters
Duncan	Ortiz	Weiss
Dymally	Ridge	Whitten
Fields	Roberts	
Ford (TN)	Rostenkowski	

□ 1337

So the motion to table was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on official business during rollcall votes. Had I been present on the House floor I would have cast my vote as follows:

Roll No. 23, yea on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 586, calling for submission of certain information regarding Operation Desert Shield.

Roll No. 24, yea on laying House Resolution 19 on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 759

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 759.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 84) electing members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] for an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution incorporates the recommendations of both the majority and the minority, and is in the customary form used in previous Congresses. With the adoption of the resolution, these joint committees can organize and get on with their respective businesses.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] has explained the resolution. The leadership on this side of the aisle is in concurrence.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 84

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following joint committees of Congress to serve with the chairman of the Committee on House Administration:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING: Mr. Gejdenson, Connecticut; Mr. Kleczka, Wisconsin; Mr. Roberts, Kansas; and Mr. Gingrich, Georgia.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY: Mr. Kolter, Pennsylvania; Mr. Mantton, New York; Mr. Barrett, Nebraska; and Mr. Roberts, Kansas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on H.R. 586, which passed the House today.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1340

DECLARATION OF ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation—or I should say reintroducing legislation—that when approved and implemented will improve the lifestyle of Americans for years to come.

This legislation will declare our independence from a growing reliance on foreign oil. Our country needs an alternative energy and conservation program. My legislation will authorize a number of alternative fuel and energy conservation programs to address an energy crisis that has resulted because this country is too dependent on foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the administration submitted to Congress a "national energy strategy" that will do nothing to curtail this country's escalating dependence on foreign oil. Because of the administration's failure to deal with this situation, the once used phrase "oil shock" and its consequences will again be a part of our everyday life. My legislation is needed to correct the administration's shortcomings.

When this legislation is passed, the Congress will declare this country's independence from foreign oil. I want to urge my colleagues to join me and support this legislation to free America from foreign oil.

MONEY-SAVING PLAN ON EEOC ENFORCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to propose an idea which I believe will save the taxpayers of the United States \$31 million in the 1992 fiscal year budget.

Americans are overtaxed and our Government is overextended, and I think that each of us has a responsibility to try to do something about that. I would invite my colleagues' critical review and suggestions for improvements to one idea that I believe can work to save us money.

My idea pertains to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the EEOC. Let me begin by saying that I believe it is and should be a matter of national policy in our country that there is a strong, tough, well-enforced law against discrimination. No one should be denied a job or a promotion or a business opportunity because of color or gender or race or national origin. The issue before us is how best to enforce that law, and the orthodox thinking that we hear seems to say that there are two choices. Our choice is that we spend less money and do less enforcement, and the other choice is that we spend more money, that we put more Government revenues into enforcement.

I would suggest to the Members that if we view those suggestions as our only choices, we are locked in the prison of the status quo, that there is a better way to achieve more vigorous

enforcement at a lower cost to the taxpayers.

My proposal, Mr. Speaker, which I will be submitting to our colleagues for their careful consideration is that the EEOC enabling legislation be amended so that when the EEOC successfully settles or wins a claim for employment discrimination, it is empowered to collect attorneys' fees from the defeated losing party. It is a practice that is common in other areas of our law, and it comes down to the basic, simple, common sense proposal that those who violate the law should pay for the cost of its enforcement.

In fiscal year 1990, the last year for which statistics are available, the data show that the EEOC collected \$93 million on behalf of persons victimized by discrimination. About \$77 million was collected as a result of settled cases, and about \$16 million was collected as a result of lawsuits brought by the EEOC and won by the EEOC. If we use as a rule of thumb the practice that is common in the plaintiffs' personal injury field, which is that the attorney collects one-third of the recovery from the client, and if we add that one-third to the moneys collected, we would achieve new revenues in the neighborhood of \$31 million.

This proposal, I believe, would achieve three things: First of all, it would act as a greater disincentive and deterrent for people who break the law. If you discriminate against someone because of their color or their religion or their national origin, not only will you pay damages, you will pay attorney fees and you will reimburse the public for the cost of the enforcement action. I believe also it would help to unclog our court system and encourage more settlements because the longer the litigation goes, the more it costs in counsel fees and the greater the risk to the defendant.

Most importantly, at a time when our national debt is one-half of our gross national product, at a time when Americans all across this country are stifled with burdensome taxation at the local, State, and Federal levels, it will save the taxpayers of the country \$31 million. This is better service at a lower cost. That is the new option and the new way of looking at this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to review this legislation once it is introduced, contact us with suggestions for improvements, and work together with us so that we can improve enforcement and save the taxpayers money.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM IN THE PERSIAN GULF CRISIS

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of this body a salient feature of the Persian Gulf conflict that has not, perhaps, received the notice or acclaim that is its due. Nations, like individuals, are wont from time to time to take their closest friends for granted. We do so, I expect, because of an instinctual belief, bred by intimate association over many years, that in times of trial and crisis our friends will always be there.

Of the friends who have stood shoulder to shoulder with the United States in out-facing Saddam's threat to the world community, none has stood taller than the United Kingdom.

Since the earliest days of this crisis, Great Britain has rendered invaluable assistance to the U.N.-led effort to evict Saddam and his band of larcenous brigands from Kuwait. The Thatcher and Major governments have steadfastly demonstrated unequivocal resolve in resisting Iraqi aggression and upholding the rule of law. Importantly, Whitehall's principled policy has been given the overwhelming support of Parliament and the British nation. By economic sacrifice, by diplomatic exertion, and by the supreme act of placing its finest young men and women in harms way, Great Britain has made it emphatically clear that Saddam's outrageous aggression will not be allowed to stand.

Particularly impressive has been Great Britain's military deployment in the gulf. Aside from the United States, no other nation has made a greater military commitment to this U.N. authorized endeavor than that currently being made by the United Kingdom. In the earliest days of August, London responded with determination and dispatch to requests for assistance from the GCC states to help deter further Iraqi aggression. At the start of military operations on January 16, the United Kingdom had committed some 35,000 men and women to the gulf. Reinforcements announced since then—including the additional half squadron of Buccaneer aircraft sent to reinforce the courageous and skillful pilots of the RAF—will put total United Kingdom personnel in the gulf at approximately 42,000.

Given our common outlook, common cultural heritage, common historical bond, and common interest in a new world order, one can only conclude that the special relationship between Washington and London is as close and vital as ever. I know I express the views of all Members in extending gratitude and appreciation to Prime Minister Major and his government, as well as to the people and armed forces of the United Kingdom, for their unwavering support of the United Nations and all the countries united in a commitment to ensure that unbridled ag-

gression will be deterred rather than rewarded.

□ 1350

CHANGES TO REGULATORY STRUCTURE OF BANKING INDUSTRY

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

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Department of Treasury's proposed changes to the regulatory structure of America's banking industry. With some exceptions, it appears to provide the necessary mix of broadened powers, streamlined regulation—not deregulation—and enhanced safety to ensure that our banking industry can once again resume its leading position in the competitive world marketplace of financial services. Easier banking, enhanced product and service powers, and a simpler regulatory structure will serve to correct many of the industry's problems, which have been caused, in part, by the need to deal with a 1930's regulatory structure in the world of the 1990's.

Mr. Speaker, my support is not without reservation. I am concerned that the Treasury Department's proposals limiting the number of accounts per individual that can be insured are unworkable and attack a problem which does not exist. Far more useful would be a reevaluation of the too-big-to-fail policy as it is currently being implemented.

Additionally, I think it would be irresponsible on our part to carry out such sweeping reforms without also dealing with the recapitalization of the bank insurance fund in a way which restores it to a safe level without fatally wounding the very industry it is intended to protect.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to move expeditiously to consider the Department of Treasury's proposals, and to act quickly to reform our 50-year-old banking laws.

THE GROWING NEED FOR A CARBON TAX

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, as a nation we are facing a variety of seemingly unrelated crises. Our budget deficits and unimaginable debt hinder us at every turn. We lack a national energy strategy that makes any sense, and partly as a result of this have ended up in a war in the Middle East. We face mounting environmental problems, with this administration ignoring arguably the most important one, global warming from increased carbon dioxide emissions.

Elegantly, a carbon tax squarely addresses each of these problems. A carbon tax, quite simply, places a tax on fossil fuels based on their carbon content. The affected fuels are coal, oil, and natural gas. The emission of carbon into the atmosphere is one of the main causes of global warming.

Global warming is one of the most serious environmental problems facing not just the United States but the entire globe. More than 100 scientists were brought together by the United Nations under the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Their conclusion was global warming is a certainty. A few in industry would say that global warming is not happening or is insignificant, they sound more and more like the tobacco companies claiming cigarettes are healthy and don't cause cancer. The scientific level of certainty on global warming is 100 percent with the vast majority of scientists believing that the greenhouse effect will cause climate change posing great risks to society and to the natural world. The levels of carbon tax in the legislation are estimated to significantly slow the growth in U.S. carbon emissions.

That the United States lacks an energy policy is obvious. The Bush administration's proposed energy policy is filled with ways to drain America first and little else. Only one thing really affects the way we use energy in this country—price. The carbon tax by affecting price, implements a sound, market-oriented, energy policy. By including environmental damage in the price, energy conservation and efficiency decisions become built in. Each individual's decision whether to buy the most efficient toaster for home or the most efficient blast-furnace for the company is influenced by the carbon tax. Costly, complicated, command and control regulations are unnecessary.

The carbon tax puts industry on the road to international competitiveness. Energy prices are significantly higher in both Western Europe and Japan. Japanese industry uses energy 20 to 40 percent more efficiently than we do. U.S. businesses need to make sound energy investment decisions. The carbon tax will help. Energy conservation and efficiency will help American business position themselves for the next century, the greenhouse century. It will have them develop and market new ranges of products and services. A carbon tax, unlike regulations, will continue to foster innovations as increased efficiency is strived for. We must be ready to deal with the certainty of higher energy prices and energy efficient foreign competition.

One of the lessons of the war in the Persian Gulf must be that we deal with energy more responsibly. A carbon tax imposes that responsibility. A carbon tax can position the U.S. economy so that access to energy does not become part of a reason to launch a war. Indeed, the Japanese are imposing an additional tax on petroleum to pay for their part of the war effort.

We face huge budget deficits, with additional items still to be added to the burden. The cost of the savings and loans debacle spirals by tens of billions. The Persian Gulf war bill is well over \$50 billion and that is not the total cost. The recession is forcing revenues down. The carbon tax is estimated to bring in \$7 billion in the first year growing by \$7 billion

per year. When phased in over 5 years, the carbon tax will bring in \$35 billion per year with a 5-year revenue total of \$105 billion. This will go a long way toward dealing with Federal red ink.

The carbon tax will have many positive effects on the economy. There will be new investment in energy saving devices by both individuals and corporations. The tax will encourage increased use of alternative energy sources. Research and development in energy efficiency will be spurred. Money saved on energy will be spent for other goods. The economic advantages of a reduced budget deficit will ripple through the economy and help international competitiveness.

A carbon tax will not affect all sectors of the national economy equally. I believe that some of the money raised by the carbon tax should be used to mitigate problems caused by the carbon tax whether the problems are regional or those felt by low-income individuals.

It is important to note that the levels of the carbon tax introduced this year are higher than in last year's bill. The effects of carbon emissions are cumulative. By delaying action, we will confront a compounded problem, and the solution will have to be more drastic and painful. The legislation reflects the fact that we have delayed a year by increasing the charge per ton of carbon from \$25 per ton to \$30 per ton. Procrastination on this issue has its price.

The United States is almost unique in the industrialized world in that it is not addressing the carbon emissions problem seriously. The European Economic Community is setting targets to reduce carbon emissions. Japan is acting in a similar fashion. Both are seriously discussing using carbon and energy taxes to achieve their goals. With their energy prices already significantly higher, failure to act on our part will only put the United States farther behind and require more drastic measures to catch up.

The carbon tax fits into the comprehensive approach that the Bush administration is taking to controlling greenhouse gases. The carbon tax also meets U.S. global obligations to reduce carbon emissions, obligations that fall on us as the largest emitters of carbon.

Mr. Speaker, economists have joined scientists in the call for a carbon tax. Robert Samuelson writing in the Washington Post on more than one occasion has endorsed the need for energy taxes and specifically a carbon tax. Economist Roger Dower with the World Resources Institute, testifying last spring before the Ways and Means Committee, strongly touted the economic benefits of a carbon tax. It is an efficient regulator, consistent with market capitalism.

The broad spectrum of ills addressed by the carbon tax makes it an almost unbelievable solution. All evidence points to the fact that we must enact a carbon tax as soon as possible. We must address the environmental damage, foreign policy problems, domestic ills, and economic disadvantages that the carbon tax can help us solve.

If one doubts the hardship and economic distress that results from climate change, I invite them to visit my home State of California which is facing a fifth straight year of drought.

Following is the text of the legislation:

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. IMPOSITION OF CARBON TAX ON PRIMARY FOSSIL FUELS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Chapter 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to environmental taxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subchapter:

"Subchapter E—Carbon Tax on Primary Fossil Fuels

"Sec. 4691. Tax on coal.

"Sec. 4692. Tax on petroleum.

"Sec. 4693. Tax on natural gas.

"Sec. 4694. Inflation adjustments.

"SEC. 4691. TAX ON COAL.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There is hereby imposed a tax at the rate specified in subsection (b) on coal sold by the producer or importer thereof.

"(b) RATE OF TAX.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the rate of the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be \$18 per ton.

"(2) PHASE-IN.—

Effective during calendar year: The rate of the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be the following amount per ton:

1992	\$3.60
1993	7.20
1994	10.80
1995	14.40

"(c) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) COAL TO INCLUDE LIGNITE.—The term 'coal' includes lignite.

"(2) TON.—The term 'ton' means 2,000 pounds.

"(3) USE TREATED AS SALE.—If the producer or importer of any coal uses such coal, such producer or importer shall be liable for tax under this section in the same manner as if such coal were sold by such producer or importer.

SEC. 4692. TAX ON PETROLEUM.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There is hereby imposed a tax at the rate specified in subsection (c) on any petroleum with respect to which there is a taxable event.

"(b) TAXABLE EVENT.—For purposes of this section, the term 'taxable event' means any event which would result in tax being imposed under section 4611 if—

"(1) such section were applied without regard to subsections (b)(2), (e), and (f) thereof, and

"(2) section 4612(b) were applied by substituting 'section 4692' for 'section 4611'.

"(c) AMOUNT OF TAX.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the rate of the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be \$3.90 per barrel.

"(2) PHASE-IN.—

Effective during calendar year: The rate of the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be the following amount per barrel:

1992	\$7.78
1993	1.56
1994	2.34
1995	3.12

"(d) PERSON LIABLE FOR TAX.—The person required to pay the tax imposed by this section on any petroleum shall be determined under the principles of section 4611(d).

"(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) PETROLEUM.—The term 'petroleum' means any petroleum product including crude oil.

"(2) BARREL.—The term 'barrel' means 42 United States gallons.

"(3) FRACTION OF BARREL.—In the case of a fraction of a barrel, the tax imposed by this section shall be the same fraction of the amount of such tax imposed on a whole barrel.

"(4) CERTAIN RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (c) and (e) of section 4612 shall apply to the tax imposed by this section.

"SEC. 4693. TAX ON NATURAL GAS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There is hereby imposed a tax at the rate specified in subsection (c) on—

"(1) natural gas received at a United States pipeline facility, and

"(2) natural gas entered into the United States for consumption, use, or warehousing.

"(b) TAX ON CERTAIN USES, ETC.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

"(A) any domestic natural gas is used in or exported from the United States, and

"(B) before such use or exportation, no tax was imposed on such natural gas under subsection (a),

then a tax at the rate specified in subsection (c) is hereby imposed on such natural gas.

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN USES ON PREMISES WHERE PRODUCED.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any use of natural gas for extracting oil or natural gas on the premises where such natural gas was produced. The preceding sentence shall not apply to any use involving the combustion of the natural gas.

"(c) RATE OF TAX.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the rate of the taxes imposed by this section shall be 48 cents per MCF.

"(2) PHASE-IN.—

Effective during calendar year: The rate of the taxes imposed by this subsection shall be the following amount per MCF

1992	\$0.96
1993192
1994288
1995384

"(d) PERSONS LIABLE FOR TAX.—

"(1) RECEIPT AT PIPELINE.—The tax imposed by subsection (a)(1) shall be paid by the operator of the United States pipeline facility.

"(2) IMPORTATION.—The tax imposed by subsection (a)(2) shall be paid by the person entering the natural gas for consumption, use, or warehousing.

"(3) TAX ON USE OR EXPORTS.—The tax imposed by subsection (b) shall be paid by the person using or exporting the natural gas, as the case may be.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) NATURAL GAS.—The term 'natural gas' includes any natural gas liquid which is not treated as petroleum for purposes of the tax imposed by section 4692.

"(2) DOMESTIC NATURAL GAS.—The term 'domestic natural gas' means any natural gas produced from a well located in the United States.

"(3) UNITED STATES PIPELINE FACILITY.—The term United States pipeline facility means any pipeline in the United States for purposes of transporting natural gas (other than a pipeline which is part of a gathering system).

"(4) MCF.—The term 'MCF' means 1,000 cubic feet.

"(5) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—The terms 'United States' and 'premises' have the respective meanings given such terms by section 4612(a).

"(6) FRACTIONAL PART OF MCF.—In the case of a fraction of an MCF, the tax imposed by this section shall be the same fraction of the amount of such tax imposed on a whole MCF.

"(7) CERTAIN RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (b), (c), and (e) of section 4612 shall apply to the tax imposed by this section.

"SEC. 4694. INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Each rate of tax which would otherwise be in effect under this subchapter during any calendar year after 1992 shall be increased by the percentage (if any) by which—

"(1) the CPI for the preceding calendar year (as defined in section 1(f)(4)), exceeds

"(2) the CPI for calendar year 1991 (as so defined).

"(b) ROUNDING.—Any increase under subsection (a) shall be rounded—

"(1) to the nearest multiple of 10 cents in the case of a rate in effect under section 4691,

"(2) to the nearest multiple of 1 cent in the case of a rate in effect under section 4692, and

"(3) to the nearest multiple of 1/10 cent in the case of a rate in effect under section 4693."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapters for chapter 38 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Subchapter E. Carbon Tax on Primary Fossil Fuels

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 1992.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS' INVESTIGATION OF BANCA NAZIONALE DEL LAVORO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this is the second in a series of special orders that I have planned concerning the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives' investigation of the Banco Nazionale del Lavoro, otherwise known as the BNL, scandal.

As explained in the first special order on February 4, the BNL scandal is a sensational bank fraud and regulatory blunder in which former employees of the Atlanta agency of the BNL, which is really an Italian Government-owned bank, were able to loan Iraq \$3 billion without presumably reporting those loans to its headquarters in Rome or to the Federal Reserve and State banking officials.

I brought out also in the first special order that in effect the alarming thing about this, as we first began to look into it more than a year and a half ago, was that it revealed an absence of suitable regulatory oversight on the part of our American regulatory system, which means that the United States is the only nation in the industrialized world, West or East, that permits such a tremendous volume of foreign money, in effect better than \$635 billion right

now, with little or no accountability or regulatory power exerted from the national interest standpoint of the United States.

The bank regulatory failure in this case is and continues to be the main focus of attention of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. The committee will pursue legislative remedies to ensure that entities like BNL are properly supervised.

As a matter of fact, this morning in the Washington Post there was a considerable story in which it was reported that the Federal Reserve Board was looking into a Washington-based bank's control or ownership influence by Iraq or Iraqi elements.

Well, let me say that if that is coming to light, it is coming too late, as in the case of BNL.

What continues to be disturbing to me is that nobody knows what the type of activity involving this huge amount of money in the United States, in which foreign entities owned by foreign governments can, in the exercise of their business, be acting contrary to the basic national policy as set forth by our own Government.

The second main facet of the investigation deals with BNL's relationship with Iraq. The committee is investigating the role BNL played in upgrading the military capability of Iraq, which is quite considerable.

If our boys, as it looks now, unfortunately and tragically will be the case, will go into the ground fighting, they will be facing death or serious bodily harm by missiles or chemical weapons actually funded and paid for by U.S. businesses and guaranteed by the American taxpayer.

As astounding as this is, it is and has happened, and continues to, incidentally.

BNL was one, not the only one, but probably one of the more significant, sources of funding for a complicated Iraqi scheme to obtain sophisticated Western technology and know-how.

BNL financed the sale of chemicals, specialty steel products, sophisticated computer controlled industrial machinery, electronic components, computers, and engineering and construction services. Much of this technology had civilian as well as military uses.

Evidently the United States and other Western nations ignored the true intentions of Iraq, though personally I think that those intentions were well-known, except that at that time, and I think in view of what is happening today, and being that we seem to have very short memories nowadays, we find it difficult to evoke the environment that existed during the Iraq-Iran War for 8 years, and the years immediately following the truce, in which we actually had, as a matter of Government policy, been aiding and abetting the Iraqis against the Iranians.

□ 1400

That sounds unbelievable today, but it is true. Truth is stranger than fiction.

It is equally true that 47.6 billion dollars—worth in an 8-year period of sophisticated weaponry was provided Iraq by not only the United States but almost every other country, including the so-called People's Republic or People's Country of China which used the technology that our licensing agreements enabled the Chinese to produce, such as the Silkworm missile which, incidentally, was the missile that sank or damaged and killed 37 of our sailors just a few years ago fired by an Iraqi source when our Navy was flying the flag for Kuwaiti oil tankers and patrolling the gulf.

Incidentally, the reason that all this financing could be done by the Iraqi Government through its central bank and through these foreign government-owned banks with either branches or agencies, as they call them, in the United States, and the one particularly in Atlanta, is that President Reagan in 1983 saw fit to remove Iraq from the list of nations that he himself listed as terrorist nations. And when he removed Iraq from that designation it opened the sluice gates for considerable commerce and weapons trading.

The BNL was also a major source of agricultural financing for Iraq. BNL financed the sale of over \$850 billion in United States agricultural products to Iraq; \$720 million of that amount was guaranteed and ultimately is being paid for by the United States Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation, or the taxpayer.

Between 1983 and 1990, the CCC granted credit guarantees which enabled Iraq to purchase a total of \$5.5 billion in United States farm products. In addition, the Export-Import Bank granted Iraq a \$200 million insurance policy to protect United States companies against the potential risk of loss related to exporting goods to Iraq, and of course they did suffer that loss and, of course, the taxpayers pay that guarantee or insurance.

These United States Government guarantees were very important to Iraq. It not only permitted Iraq to purchase high-quality food for its people and its army, it freed up a like amount in foreign exchange, more importantly, which was used to purchase the technology and military goods from various countries around the globe.

The BNL scandal which burst onto the scene publicly in August 1989 played a key role in the disintegration of United States-Iraq relations. As we are now tragically aware, the break in United States-Iraq relations ultimately ended in war.

Revelation of the BNL scandal was important to United States-Iraq relations because of several reasons. BNL was a major bank participant in the

Commodity Credit program with Iraq. Alleged violation of CCC regulations by BNL in Iraq, still being investigated by our United States attorney in Atlanta and by the Department of Agriculture, made and compelled the administration, this administration, to rethink the billions of dollars in agriculture credit guarantees provided to Iraq. Iraq received \$1 billion in agriculture credit from 1989.

Mind you, it was in August 1989 that we had the first exposure of the deal, but at that time the climate was very favorable in our country and in our Government as a matter of policy toward Iraq, as contradistinguished from Iran. The Department of Agriculture was in the midst of granting Iraq another \$1 billion program for 1990 when the BNL scandal surfaced.

Facing pressure from possible irregularities in the Iraq program, the Agriculture Department was reluctantly forced to limit the program with Iraq in 1990 to \$500 million. The Iraqis were incensed, because Iraq was effectively bankrupt and had little money to purchase food with. It was counting on an increase in the CCC program, and not a huge cut in the program. This was a blow at the time for Iraq. Iraq took the lowering of the \$500 million level as an insult. They claimed this action was indefensible because they were not violating American law at that time, as indeed they were not since Mr. Reagan removed them from the list in 1983, and that no formal charges had been filed against them because of the BNL scandal.

Lowering the level of the CCC credit to \$500 million also placed increased pressure on Iraq's already scant resources.

The implication of the BNL scandal did not end there. As I have mentioned earlier, BNL was a major source of financing for a complicated Iraqi technology procurement network. During the 1980's, Iraq established ownership or control of a sophisticated network of United States and European front companies whose primary mission was to obtain Western military technology and know-how and export it back to Iraq.

Of course, the Iraqis were very secretive in their dealings and were careful to conceal their true affiliation. During the latter half of the 1980's they relied heavily on these BNL loans to finance the procurement of much of the Western technology they were seeking, including the so-called big gun, the chemical weapons component and other missile and munition facilities, one of which plants was established in Baghdad.

But BNL loans were not ordinary financing. BNL contracted to loan Iraq \$2.155 billion at interest rates that were not economically feasible. In addition, a good portion of those loans did not have to be paid back for many

years; they were long term, which is incredible. The Small Business Administration has not in many years been able to do anything one-tenth as much for any U.S. businessman.

The former employees of BNL were operating like a charity, not a bank. The BNL raid in August 1989 put an end to this practice at that point and certainly put a damper on the Iraqi procurement of a long list of United States and Western technology. About \$1 billion at that point had not yet been disbursed under the charity loan schemes when BNL was raided in August 1989.

The BNL scandal also made the Baghdad diplomatic community worry that Iraq was so desperate for credit it was willing to engage in illegal activity. Iraq feared its already tarnished financial reputation because of their defaults would be further damaged by BNL's scandal, and they were worried that the scandal would possibly jeopardize high-profit Iraqi projects being constructed by foreign companies.

While BNL money and United States credit guarantees would not have been significant to a financially strong nation, it was critically important to a country like Iraq because it was in such a poor financial shape after the terribly inhuman 8-year war with Iran.

□ 1410

By the end of 1989, Iraq had already defaulted on most of its debts with the governments and private companies of most Western countries as well as with Japan and Korea. Until the BNL scandal, the United States had almost been the only exception in this rule. Iraq had remained relatively current on its United States obligations.

But limiting United States Government credit programs because of BNL and stopping the flow of BNL lending to Iraq was eventually the proverbial last straw that broke the camel's back in that effectively rendering Iraq bankrupt.

The impact of the BNL scandal and its effect on Iraq is echoed in the words of the Iraqi Foreign Minister during his meeting with Secretary of State James Baker just prior to the allied offensive against Iraq. Iraq had offered many excuses for its brutal invasion of Kuwait. Among others, it accused the United States, other Western nations, Israel, and Kuwait of conspiring to destroy it economically. Related to the United States role in this supposed scheme, Tariq Aziz, the diplomat and Foreign Minister, stated in his Geneva meeting with Secretary Baker, and I am going to quote:

The United States actually implemented an embargo on Iraq before August 2, 1990. We had dealings with the United States in the field of foodstuffs. We used to buy more than \$1 billion of American products. Early in 1990, the American administration suspended that deal which was profitable for both sides. Then the United States Government decided

to deny Iraq the purchase of a very large list of items.

Evidently, to the Iraqis, the impact of the BNL scandal was a key factor in the decline of United States-Iraqi relations.

As we know, Saddam Hussein reacted to his dire financial straits by invading Kuwait which ironically, along with several other Arab nations, had loaned Iraq tens of billions of dollars during the conflict with Iran.

To summarize, the failure of our bank regulatory system to detect the \$3 billion in shady loans to Iraq, coupled with billions in questionable credits to Iraq, along with our inability to stop Saddam from importing BNL-financed technology which was used for military purposes, is being used now in which our soldiers will confront, all worked together to cause our war with Iraq.

Hopefully the committee's investigation of BNL will shed light on how these failures occurred. I would hope an understanding of these failures would work to reduce the risk of more Iraqis on our horizon, even now especially before we are forced to risk many more lives of our soldiers.

I would like to take this opportunity to demonstrate another important reason for proceeding with the Banking Committee's investigation. I have obtained from a source I must protect a memorandum that indicates a top-ranking administration official from a Cabinet-level Department had knowledge that BNL was used for purchasing military goods. This administration official was concerned that the revelation of BNL financing of military articles would be bad for his particular program, because it would cause considerable adverse congressional reaction and press coverage.

He stated in this memorandum:

In the worst-case scenario, congressional and other investigators would find a direct link to financing Iraqi military expenditures, particularly the Condor missile.

The astounding contents of this memorandum shed significant light on the administration's and the Federal Reserve Board's efforts to thwart our Banking Committee and its investigation of BNL. To date, they remain silent on the topic of BNL financing of military articles.

With all the lessons we could learn from the BNL scandal, let me say by way of parentheses, I am submitting in furtherance of what this comment from this official implies; in this RECORD, Mr. Speaker, at this point, an article in the Financial Times of London, an article of February 21, 1991, entitled "Warning Forced Bechtel Out of Iraq Chemical Project," and believe it or not, this involves a former Secretary of State, George Shultz, who after he left the secretaryship went back to his employer, the Bechtel Corp., which is where he had come from, and this arti-

cle by Alan Friedman, reporting out of New York for the London Financial Times, says, "I said something is going to go very wrong in Iraq, and if Bechtel was there, it would get blown up."

[From the Financial Times, Feb. 21, 1991]

WARNING FORCED BECHTEL OUT OF IRAQ CHEMICAL PROJECT

(By Alan Friedman)

Bechtel, the California construction group, withdrew from an Iraqi petrochemicals project on the advice of Mr. George Shultz, the former US secretary of state, who joined the company's board of directors after leaving the Reagan administration in 1989. Mr. Shultz disclosed his role in an interview with the Financial Times.

Bechtel has also revealed, separately, that it was instructed by the government of Iraq to obtain payment for work it did on the petrochemicals project from the Atlanta, Georgia, branch of Banca Nazionale del Lavoro (BNL).

BNL is the Italian bank caught up in the scandal over \$3bn (£1.5bn) of Iraqi loans made in 1988-89 by its Atlanta branch. Indictments of US bank employees and Iraqi officials implicated in the scandal were due to have been announced last week, but they have been delayed after a fresh round of consultations in Washington.

The disclosures by Bechtel come amid allegations by US chemical weapons experts that Baghdad planned to use intermediate products from the apparently civilian Iraqi project known as PC2—for the manufacture of mustard gas.

Mr. Shultz, who had served as president of Bechtel before joining the Reagan administration in 1982, said he first learned of Bechtel's work as project manager of the Iraqi petrochemicals complex in 1989 when he "spent a little time at Bechtel's London office and found there was work going on in Iraq".

Mr. Shultz said he checked into the PC2 project in 1989 and was given assurances that it had nothing to do with chemical weapons. "But I thought about it a little more and I gave my advice they should get out," said the former secretary of state.

He recalled that at a Bechtel meeting in the Spring of 1990, as work was continuing, "I really hit it very hard and I said something is going to go very wrong in Iraq and blow up and if Bechtel were there it would get blown up too. So I told them to get out."

The revelations by Bechtel, which says it had no knowledge of any plans by Iraq to apply the petrochemical plant's products for military use, mark the first time a U.S. company has provided details of the direct involvement of Iraqi officials in the BNL Atlanta affair.

Western intelligence officials say that a substantial portion of the \$3bn of BNL money was used by Iraq to finance its development of unconventional weapons systems, including the Condor-II ballistic missile project and nuclear and chemical weapons projects.

The Iraqi project was handled by Bechtel Overseas of Hammersmith Road in London, the company's U.K. affiliate. The Financial Times has obtained a copy of a 1988 telex instruction from the central bank of Iraq to BNL's Atlanta branch, asking that Bechtel's U.K. subsidiary be paid \$10m.

Mr. Tom Flynn, a senior vice-president at Bechtel, said the company never knew there was anything suspect about the \$10m of BNL funds, provided in the form of two letters of

credits that were issued in September 1988 and amended three months later.

"We were hired by the government of Iraq to be the project manager for an ethylene plant. Our client, the government of Iraq, told us we would be paid through letters of credit from the BNL Atlanta branch."

The Bechtel official also said that the company received "direct encouragement" for the PC2 project from the U.S. Department of Commerce. A spokeswoman for the Commerce Department said "we were aware of Bechtel's work in Iraq through the U.S. embassy in Baghdad, but our role was a passive one".

Bechtel said there was no suggestion at the time about the final use that Iraq might make of ethylene oxide, a product that has multiple civilian applications, but also has military uses.

Mr. Seth Carus, an expert on Iraq's chemical weapons programs who is a fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, said the PC2 Iraqi project was intended for several purposes, both military and civilian.

"I think it is very clear, however, that the Iraqis understood what they were doing. It is evident that they wanted to limit their import dependence on chemicals that are used for weapons."

A key feature of the PC2 project was the plan to manufacture ethylene oxide, a precursor chemical that Mr. Carus said "is easily converted to thiodiglycol, which is used in one step to make mustard gas".

Mr. Shultz, asked about the possible production of mustard gas, said he was not "a technically proficient person" but that "I kept going back and saying these things could be converted pretty easily". Bechtel subsequently followed the advice of Mr. Shultz, just months before the invasion of Kuwait.

Bechtel is currently one of several U.S. and U.K. firms seeking contracts for the eventual reconstruction of Kuwait.

Well, of course, Bechtel was there and, of course, after the Secretary left being Secretary, he was bound to know that ultimately Iraq was going to be a problem. But this is just one example of the nature and type of the largest corporations in our country that did extensive business. And what in? Chemical projects.

With all the lessons we could learn from the BNL scandal, I am saddened, of course, as I always am, and have been, and perplexed to report that the Banking Committee's investigation of BNL is being obstructed and frustrated by the Federal Reserve, the Justice Department, the State Department, the State of Illinois, and the Treasury Department.

Another serious example of the obstruction faced by the Banking Committee is the unwillingness of the Federal Reserve to supply over 70 BNL-related documents subpoenaed by the committee. Our committee subpoenaed, on my request, better than 40 documents.

The Federal Reserve states that it has reacted or withheld these State documents at the request of the Justice Department, and in the February 4 first report that I made, I incorporated the exchange of letters I had with the Attorney General, Thornburgh, who ap-

parently was, and maybe continues to be, ignorant of the constitutional prerogatives involved here in the U.S. Congress' basic right to know, which is one of the last three basic powers that the Congress, I think, still preserves inviolate.

Supreme Court decision after Supreme Court decision has said nothing, not even a pending investigation, not even a pending contemporaneous judicial procedure shall prevent the Congress from having knowledge, and the Congress knowing what the facts are.

But we are obstructed blatantly, premeditatedly and coldly, and in defiance of the plain constitutional prerogative of the Congress to know. The Justice Department, at first, said, well, they were involved in a criminal prosecution in Atlanta, and they did not want to have anything to frustrate it. Well, of course not. We are sensitive to that. We are not an executive branch investigating body. We are not a judicial body. We are not a prosecutorial body. We are a legislative body, and under the rules of the House and pursuant to the Constitution, we have investigative powers in pursuance of legislative objectives which is what we are.

There is no doubt the committee has the right and needs to have and obtain this information. If we have reached the point in our country, and we have in other respects, where in effect there is no Constitution, who else but the Congress then remains?

□ 1420

If the Congress abdicates, then, in effect, ironically, at this 200-year point, or a little bit better, of the celebration over this system of constitutional government, we in effect have repudiated it through our abdication of our plain constitutional responsibilities. The committee must not be needlessly thwarted in fulfilling its legislative and oversight responsibilities.

Accordingly, the Justice Department has the responsibility to show the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, not the other way around, access to the subpoenaed documents, and how, if they were to comply with the subpoena, that would hinder their criminal prosecution. They cannot, and they have not, up to this date, given any reason that that would happen. The Justice Department failed to reveal to the committee and failed to give the committee access to these documents, and after repeated requests, to show how the delivery of those documents would diminish their ability to successfully prosecute the case against the former employees of BNL in Atlanta.

The documents being withheld, the carelessness in which some documents were redacted, and the number of people with access to redacted documents, all lead me to question absolutely the Justice Department and the Federal

Reserve employees for trying to live up to their responsibility. They are needlessly, I charge again, impeding the committee investigation. I doubt that they have, even now, recognized their true understanding of the investigative and legislative functions of the Congress. But I will not yield, and I will continue to insist, and the committee will pursue this matter, because time has long gone by that our regulatory system needs to be overhauled, where the American people will be insured that they will not continue to be paties of foreign governments and banking interests operating in our country, as they are now.

There is nobody, the Federal Reserve Board of the banking commissions in the individual States that charter these banks, this is how they get around it. The Federal Reserve Board says, "Well, these are chartered by the State of Georgia, so what?" The Federal Reserve Board is the prime responsible regulatory body for foreign entities doing business, banking business, in the United States. Yet they cannot, and no banking commission can, tell any person in America today, including the Congress, how those 635 plus billions of dollars are operating, even along the same channels as a BNL bank in Atlanta. I think this is grievous. I think this is unpardonable. I think this is a serious attack on our basic tenets, upon which our Government is predicated. I am concerned, as chairman of this committee, that the regulation and examination of the U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks is inadequate. As I stated, these entities command over \$500 billion in assets, in the United States, and a significant portion of their liabilities are now being guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. That is the bank insurance fund. It is broke right now. Those foreign entities, this massive, and I said \$500 billion, someone else said \$600 billion, most of these are in such form that they are insured deposits. It is incredible.

For years, I had unsuccessfully, before I was chairman of this committee, attempted to convince two prior chairmen of the committee to have some kind of hearings with respect to this international financing. I was chairman of the Subcommittee on International Development, Finance, Trade, and Monetary Policy, so I think I have some reason to be charged with knowledge. The magnitude of the BNL fiasco certainly raises a question of the adequacy of State and Federal regulations and oversight of these entities. The Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs has a responsibility to ensure that U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks are properly and accountably regulated and supervised. The BNL case provides a clear case of regulatory breakdown that first must be understood and analyzed, and then

immediately addressed and remedied. Those documents that provide clues to help the committee understand and correct these breakdowns. This is a reason we had them subpoenaed. However, the Justice Department and the Federal Reserve apparently feel the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs could not have the right to know the committee story surrounding the BNL scandal. I can understand. It is embarrassing now, in view of the fact that our boys, will be facing death or serious bodily harm with the very procurement that those banking credits made it possible for Saddam Hussein to obtain, this weaponry. It is embarrassing.

However, it ought to be worse than that. It ought to be defined as criminal negligence by denying the committee information related to the BNL affair. The Justice Department and the Federal Reserve could very well be impeding the committee's ability to legislate, a responsibility given to the people's representative and surely one of the cornerstones of our democratic form of government. The State Department has also asked the Federal Reserve to withhold subpoenaed documents related to its involvement in the BNL scandal. Well, I guess so. If we have now former secretary of states saying, "Hey, I told this corporation once. I came back and said, hey, you better get out," well, I think in retrospect, a lot of these documents will point a sort of a culpatory finger to that State Department. One can only speculate what these documents contained. Obviously, the State Department played the key role in the United States-Iraqi relations. When did the State Department learn about the BNL scandal? Did the State Department know that BNL was financing companies that were exporting technology to Iraq, that was employed in its Iraqi military machine? Certainly former Secretary Shultz' statement indicates they must have. The State Department documents withheld by the Federal Reserve may or may not provide answers to these documents. At this time, the committee can only guess about the content of these important documents.

The Federal Reserve is, of course, better known as the Nation's equivalent to a central bank. But over the years, Congress has entrusted the Federal Reserve with substantial banking regulatory responsibilities. The Congress relies on the Federal Reserve to carry out many of the banking laws it has enacted. It regulates thousands of our Nation's domestic banks, large and small, and has prime supervisory authority over foreign banks operating in the United States. In that capacity, Congress relies on the Federal Reserve, as well as the other banking regulatory bodies, to ensure our Nation's financial system is operating in a safe, sound, and efficient manner.

I always ask this question when bankers and everybody else who have become inured to being the biggest relievers on the Government dole ever. Why is it that we have had thousands, tens of thousands of bank failures in 100 years, and especially here in this last decade, when Great Britain, England, has not had any major banks fail? Why? During the Depression when we had a moratorium and the banks were closed, Canada never did. Why?

□ 1430

There is a good reason, and this is what I have been trying for 29 years to broach to the committee that I have belonged to for 30 years, the U.S. House of Representatives Banking Committee.

First, the Federal Reserve has been derelict in its responsibilities because it never notified the Congress about the 43 billion BNL scandal. Obviously, it is not possible for the Congress to monitor each of the roughly 30,000 Federal financial institutions operating in the United States. This is why we have the constitutional responsibility of being the policymaking body and the executive branch being the faithful executor of that policy, faithfully executing the laws.

The Congress created the Bank Regulatory Agency, like the Federal Reserve, to perform this function. The Federal Reserve and other Federal bank regulatory agencies have a responsibility to keep the Congress informed of significant developments affecting our financial system.

I will say this in all fairness, and I have said this for 30 years. No matter how much I may point my finger at the Federal Reserve, if the Congress had not abdicated its responsibility all through these years, the Federal Reserve Board would not have gotten away with any of this. It always has to be traced back to somewhere in our system, this marvelous apparatus that has given us all your opportunities and our freedom. Whenever we have had a shortchanging of that constitutional system, we have always had a great deal of mischief to the national interest.

I feel that no longer do we have the luxury of time as we have had in the past and that hanging perilously dangling by a thin thread is a very great threat to our basic freedoms.

The Federal Reserve also attempted to frustrate the request of the committee for information involving a Bank of Italy examination report of the BNL.

Now, mind you, meanwhile I have had delegations of the Italian Parliament, the Italian Senate, who are investigating their Government because the BNL is primarily owned by the Government of Italy, and they are distressed because all of the deals, the settling of the letters of credit and the like, have been done by Iraq in the

banking room in secret. So now is not only the United States, but the Italian Government, is out a couple billion dollars because of Iraqi defaults; so the Italian Parliament, the Senate did the investigating, and while the Federal Reserve Board says, "Oh, we can't give you this because we don't want to impair our relationship with the Italian bank."

Can you believe that? The Italian Government officials are giving us what is otherwise denied by our own agencies.

We are not interested in knowing every leaf falling from the Banking and Federal Reserve Board system. We do not want to know when a bank executive stubs his toe, but it surely is reasonable to expect that a \$3 billion bank fraud falls into a category that would be worthy of congressional notification.

Sadly, this Banking Committee chairman had to learn about the BNL scandal from other independent sources, mostly foreign journalists, which to this day continues to be a great source of information to me, as they have throughout the years.

Another example of the efforts of the Federal Reserve to frustrate the committee was the request or the information involving the Bank of Italy, and its examination of the BNL. The Bank of Italy is the official bank. The Bank of Italy acts as Italy's central bank, as well as having supervisory authority over all Italian banks. Being an Italian government-owned bank, BNL's worldwide banking operations are subject to regulation by the Bank of Italy. Upon being notified of the BNL scandal in August 1989, the Bank of Italy decided to do an examination of the Atlanta agency of BNL, which was completed shortly thereafter.

The Central Bank of Italy shared the result of its examination with the Federal Reserve and provided the Federal Reserve with a copy of its examination.

The Federal Reserve has acted irresponsibly by refusing to provide to the Banking Committee a copy of this examination report. To this date, they are refusing.

The Bank of Italy examination report would be valuable to the committee's investigation, for several reasons. First, it would offer the committee a chance to compare and contrast the Bank of Italy's examination with those of the Federal Reserve, or the Commission of Georgia.

In effect, this would provide the committee with insight into the competency of the Federal Reserve, and this is why the Federal Reserve does not want us to see it.

By comparing examination results, the committee might find the Federal Reserve did do an exact and exemplary job and that its findings are far more comprehensive than that of the Bank of Italy. Such a comparison might also

reveal the Federal Reserve was asleep at the switch and that the examination of BNL was totally inadequate.

By refusing to allow the committee to see the Bank of Italy's examination of BNL, are we not then to feel suspicious of the motives of the Fed?

The Bank of Italy examination may turn out to be the key document in the committee's investigation of BNL.

Did BNL finance the sale of military articles to Iraq? Did top officials of BNL in Rome know about the activities of the Atlanta Branch? Were the former employees of BNL that perpetrated the fraud Iraqi agents? Was the CIA involved with BNL? Did the Bank of Italy examination of BNL find answers to any of these critically important questions? Only the Bank of Italy and the dozens of employees of the Federal Reserve know.

By refusing to provide the Bank of Italy examination, the Federal Reserve takes the position that the Congress of the United States does not have the right to know if the Bank of Italy report even addresses these issues.

Of course, the Federal Reserve knows what the report says. It is the Congress that does not have the right to know.

I find the Federal Reserve position preposterous and absolutely outlandish. It is a prime example of a regulatory agency that is no longer accountable, either to the Congress or to the President, but particularly to the Congress that created it.

BNL has branches in New York, Los Angeles, Miami, and Chicago. The State examination reports of the BNL offices were among the subpoenaed documents that we requested. The Federal Reserve notified each State that the documents had been subpoenaed. After initial delays, the reports of examination by the States of California, Florida, Georgia, and New York, were provided to this committee. Illinois, however, objected to the production of documents by the Federal Reserve and filed a lawsuit to prohibit the Federal Reserve from providing the committee with Illinois' examination report of the BNL's Chicago office.

To date, the courts have sided, that is, the State courts have sided with the State of Illinois, but we are appealing this decision in the Congress. Hopefully we will prevail, because without the Illinois examination report the committee does not have a complete picture of how BNL was examined by bank regulators, State bank regulators who charged the bank to begin with.

The Federal Reserve used the Illinois decision as the basis for withholding information taken from examination reports of BNL prepared by other State regulators. In addition, the superintendent of banks for the State of New York wrote the committee requesting that the committee reach an accommodation with each State bank regulatory agency related to the confiden-

tiality of their bank examination process.

The committee understands that request, as well as other State communications related to this issue, to mean that every State and perhaps every company and bank will want individual treatment if such treatment is granted to the State of Illinois.

The actions of New York and the Federal Reserve confirm the committee's suspicion that forcing the committee to subpoena documents from each State would result in an endless round of negotiations, then rumors, then disputes and coordination problems related to such negotiations, causing the investigation to grind to a halt.

□ 1440

The State of Illinois lawsuit has delayed the committee's investigation, and in the process is damaging the national interest. First, it prevents the Congress from finding out how BNL's offices in the United States facilitated the arming of our enemy. It is intolerable that the Congress should be enjoined, by court order, from obtaining records related to how this bank helped arm Iraq, and whether or not the Federal Reserve and State bank supervisory officials were, as they claim, blameless for not discovering this travesty.

Second, entities similar to BNL hold over \$7.5 billion in deposits that are guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation [FDIC]. As the world knows, the FDIC is already in a very unwholesome position. If there is, in fact, a structural flaw in the system of regulating and supervising entities like BNL, the FDIC, and sadly, as we have learned from the savings and loan crisis, the American taxpayer, face a substantial financial risk.

To date, the Illinois lawsuit has delayed the committee's inquiry into this matter. It has prevented the Congress from fully identifying structural weaknesses in bank supervision that were exploited by BNL and its lending officers. As a result, unevenness and flaws in the system of bank supervision, which could be revealed by the committee's investigation, remain hidden and unresolved. The FDIC and the American taxpayer remain at risk, because in the subterranean there flourish these scandals and frauds which are flourishing and finding nature only in secrecy. We want to bring the sunlight in. What is wrong with that?

Third, the Illinois lawsuit prevents the Congress from having all the information necessary as to what exact legislative reforms involving not only foreign banks but our dual system of bank regulation are warranted.

Finally, the Illinois lawsuit creates a dangerous precedent that could seriously hinder future congressional over-

sight and investigations, our investigative efforts.

The Secretary of the Treasury Department acts as the Chairman of the National Advisory Council [NAC], an interagency coordination body which was responsible for approving the \$5.5 billion in agriculture credits to Iraq as well as a \$200 million insurance policy, as I explained, offered by the Export-Import Bank to cover exports to Iraq. One component of the committee's investigation deals with the role of the NAC in granting such a large credit line to Iraq and the effect the BNL scandal had on Iraq participation in agriculture and export credit programs.

On October 6, 1990, I wrote Secretary Brady requesting that Banking Committee investigators be permitted to review the minutes of NAC meetings dealing with BNL involvement with Iraq in the above programs. The Treasury Department could not find the time to permit this to occur for over a period of 4 months. Finally, after repeated insistence on our part on February 14, 1991, Treasury allowed a committee investigator an opportunity to review the pertinent NAC minutes. There were roughly 40 pages of minutes, of which only a portion were related to the decision of the NAC to approve the Iraqi credits. But Treasury withheld minutes from the two most important NAC meetings in 1989 and 1990.

Why would they withhold? If they were so right then, even though it may not look so good now, why would they be hesitant? When you are right, you want to proclaim it from the rooftops, you do not want to hide it. It is only when you fear something, as Treasury does, that you have fear.

To the committee's surprise, the Treasury had classified the minutes of the meetings and would not permit the committee to look at them because of a lack of security clearance. Of course the Treasury Department had failed to mention that the minutes of the two important meetings had been classified. When asked how often the Treasury Department classified minutes of meetings of the NAC, the counsel, the lawyer, for the Treasury Department stated, "To the best of my recollection, and I may be wrong, I cannot remember the minutes of the meetings being classified over the roughly 10 years I have had contact with them."

The Treasury's unusual action raises several interesting questions. What is the Treasury Department and the other NAC participants hiding? I wonder if they are embarrassed by their decision to grant billions in credit to Iraq even though Iraq was not credit-worthy? It had already defaulted. I bet the United States taxpayer, who is out over \$2 billion because of Iraqi defaults on these programs, would sure like to know if this was the case. It couldn't be that NAC participants, the State

Department, the Federal Reserve, the United States Trade Representative, the Commerce Department, the Agency for International Development and the Export-Import Bank are embarrassed by their decision to grant billions in credit to Iraq even though Iraq was:

- Using poison gas on its own people;
- Using poison gas in its war with Iran;
- Supporting international terrorism;
- Repeatedly violating the human rights of its people including placing severe limits on free speech, and freedom of assembly;

- Detaining political prisoners without charge or trial;

- Torturing and executing political prisoners;

- Destroying cities housing over 100,000 Kurds and making refugees out of these people;

- Developing nuclear weapons;
- Cheating on Agriculture Department programs; and

- Executing a foreign journalist, just to mention a few of the known faults of the Iraq regime.

Can it be that this august body, known as the National Advisory Council, knowing full well and charged with knowledge of this, would still grant these huge billions of dollars of credit to Iraq? I guess it would be embarrassed.

Rest assured, the Banking Committee, as long as I am chairman, plans to investigate the factors pertinent to the administration's decision to grant billions in credit to the oppressive regime of Saddam Hussein and also to act forthwith and as soon as possible to prevent ongoing transactions that are now going underway in the case of other foreign banking institutions that could be contrary to the national interest. In fact, after the President announced and issued the two Executive orders on August 2, the decision to freeze assets—and by that time, of course, the country of Iraq did not have any assets, it had its liabilities over here on which it had defaulted—but we also announced the embargo.

In November, Germany alone—and there are a lot of German banking interests' activities in our country—were given a list of 50 companies in Germany by the National Security Agency that were violating the embargo in November. Was anything done? No.

How much of that is still going on?

Rest assured, the Banking Committee will not let go of this.

While the committee continues to encounter efforts to thwart its BNL investigation, the BNL investigation is going to go through. I plan to go ahead full steam with the investigation to learn the entire truth about the scandal in order to understand fully its effect on United States-Iraqi relations, plus the other and most important, which is the necessary legislative reforms to plug up these leaks and patch

up and, if possible, develop an efficient regulatory system in our country.

We must learn from our mistakes in order to stop avoidable wars. The public demands and deserves no less from us, their Representatives.

□ 1450

LESSON NO. 4: WAR AND OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, those of us who speak during these special order times are often asked by our constituents back home why the Chamber is empty because the regular legislative business is over, and the major reason that we use these special order times is that it is a quiet time of the day where we are uninterrupted, where we can talk more than 5 minutes on issues that are rather complex, and so today I rise during this special time to present lesson No. 4 of a series that I have been doing the war in the Persian Gulf and its relationship to oil.

Mr. Speaker, as this war continues, we are simultaneously working with other nations to implement a framework for a lasting, equitable peace in the Middle East. If we can do that, we can certainly implement a national energy independence policy here at home.

The President's national energy plan, as proposed yesterday, was truly a disappointment.

To win a war, a durable peace must be achieved. The ability for people to be free and not to fear, nor hunger, nor want, are just reasons to go to war. We Americans understand this and even while at war do our utmost to foster peace as our ultimate objective in the Middle East, and we further understand that we also need to take the steps here at home that minimize the chances of future conflicts. Those Americans who are serving in the Persian Gulf deserve no less from us, nor do those we especially remember here, the 19 Americans already killed in action, the 135 Americans that have been killed in noncombat deaths already related to the war, the 30 Americans missing in action, and finally the eight Americans that are prisoners of war. All who have died or suffered are worth our questioning how to avoid war again.

During the course of this conflict I have analyzed the events and circumstances, and I have put them on the record, that have led to this war. Through careful analysis and candor with one another the lessons learned will carry America and the world to a new day.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Ohio, Senator JOHN GLENN, in an interview that appeared in my hometown

newspaper, the Toledo Blade, while he supported President Bush's handling of the war so far, faulted the President for telling the public that the war was being fought solely over the takeover of Kuwait and not the world's oil reserves. Senator GLENN said, and I quote.

Why else are we down in that sand pile? There's aggressiveness all over the world, but we're not sending our troops to those places. This is one major area where I feel the President has not communicated to the American people. The fact is that a ten-square-mile area of shipping lanes in the Persian Gulf provides access to 71 percent of the world's oil reserves. Whoever controls that area has mastery of the industrial world.

Senator GLENN said that somehow, equating the war effort with open access to oil reserves has been viewed negatively by the public. But he went on to say,

But it shouldn't be because we're talking about 71 percent of the world's oil reserves and what that can do to other countries' economies.

It is a fact that Iraq and Kuwait, when taken together, account for 20 percent of the world's oil reserves, 13 percent of world petroleum export trade and billions upon billions of dollars of wealth. This economic power translates directly into political power. One has to only imagine how many arms have been bought and would have continued to be bought with that oil money.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot blindly ignore the fact that the West's involvement was driven because of our dependency on foreign imported oil. For the most legitimate of national security reasons, the security of our entire industrialized world, the West was drawn into that region to ensure the West's supply of energy. Can my colleagues imagine our national security, our energy supply, being held hostage to the whims of a man like Saddam Hussein? That was simply unacceptable.

Saddam Hussein will be effectively dealt with. He has undertaken to mistreat captured airmen, bombed solely for purposes of terror, threatened to unleash an international terrorist campaign, and used chemical weapons. Any decent human being abhors these actions. This kind of brutality runs counter to our most basic conception of how human beings should treat one another.

For a long while though, the world had quite an idea of Saddam Hussein's character. It would have been difficult to predict exactly what treachery this one man was capable of, but a pretty good inkling of it was described in a New York Times article that I submit for the RECORD. Briefly the article pointed out how the United States supplied the Iraqis before August with trade credits, Federal subsidies and agriculture, as well as intelligence and arms. The Congress tried to stop the

executive branch from doing this and at the same time condemned Iraqi use of chemical weapons against its own Kurdish people. Last summer the Bush administration opposed Congress in these attempts. I am fully convinced, nonetheless, that after this war is over Saddam Hussein will not be able to pose the threat that he once did, which leaves us with the question of why we initially entered this conflict.

The United States and the West in general have a problem and it is not only with us. The Gulf States have the flip side of the same problem. We are both mutually dependent on oil. On the one hand, we have the Gulf States that are totally dependent on exporting oil for the sake of their own economic and political well-being. Oil is virtually the only commodity they have to export. On the other hand, we have the West, including the United States, dependent on oil to fuel its economy. This mutual dependency on oil is literally the starting fluid from which the present fire burns.

No person, nor any nation, likes to admit that they are dependent on a substance, oil in this case, that we do not have complete control over. This is probably why we, as a nation, are having such a hard time in coming to terms with the fact that the Gulf States are dependent on exporting oil, and we are in turn dependent on importing it. If we are to learn from this war, then denial of our mutual dependency has no place.

When contemplating the present economies of the Gulf States, a certain analogy comes to mind from history. The Gulf State economies can be likened in many ways to those of Central American countries in the late 1800's and early into this century.

In the case of the Central American countries, there was a systematic attempt to gear their economies to one commodity: bananas. There were very few countries in the world that could grow bananas, and because they were in high demand, foreign companies intervened to reap huge profits. In the process, governments were corrupted, boundaries were redrawn. There were even cases of foreign armed intervention to reassert the companies' control over those banana plantations. Needless to say, this all happened at the expense of the people, the indigenous people, who lived in those areas. Bananas played such an important role in these nations' economies that, as hard as it seems to us today to understand, that everything became geared toward them. Even when national governments tried to take back control of their production and diversify their economies, they met with little success. Their economies had become too dependent on the revenues that the bananas brought in. These same Central American countries, rich with natural resources, are still today in a weak

economic position. Most have extremely corrupt and brutal regimes because of their initial total dependency on the export of one commodity.

□ 1500

Is this analogy a fair one to make of the Gulf State economies in the world that we know today? Are they totally dependent on one commodity? Let us look at the facts.

I will systematically analyze each major Gulf country. The numbers I use are those supplied through OPEC, the Organization for Petroleum Exporting Countries in the Middle East and elsewhere, probably the most reliable source of information for that region. The figures are from 1989, so that we may get a true picture without the distortions brought about by the war.

The United Arab Emirates, which is just next door to Saudi Arabia and is a very wealthy nation, had a gross national product, or the measure of all goods and services for that country, of \$27.4 billion in 1989. Of that figure, oil accounted for nearly half of everything that country produced, or more than \$11.5 billion earned from its sale. More importantly—and this is the key number—oil accounted in the Arab Emirates for 74 percent of all exports from that country. That is the country's ability to make money from its exports and create new wealth. All of it was largely tied to oil.

Iran had a gross national product of \$195 billion. It is a more self-sufficient economy than the United Arab Emirates, being a larger country, but oil accounted for about 6 percent of everything Iran produced, equaling over \$12.5 billion for that country. But oil still for Iran accounted for 93 percent of its total exports.

Now, let us move on to Kuwait, which had a gross national product of over \$31 billion, and of that oil accounted for 35 percent of everything Kuwait produced, equaling over \$10 billion from its sale. But more importantly, oil accounted for nearly 96 percent of Kuwait's total exports.

These countries are not exporting wheat, they are not exporting machinery goods, and they are not even exporting bottled sand; they are exporting oil in order to make money worldwide.

Now, let us take a look at Saudi Arabia. It had a gross national product at the end of the 1980's of \$79 billion, and of that oil accounted for about 30 percent of everything that Saudi Arabia produced, equaling over \$24 billion, but oil accounted for nearly 90 percent of its total exports.

Finally—and this is really interesting—for Iraq, which had a gross national product of \$66 billion, oil accounted for about a quarter, 25 percent of everything that Iraq produced, equaling \$14.5 billion, but oil accounted for an incredible 99.3 percent, nearly

100 percent, of total exports. Iraq was totally dependent and is totally dependent on oil for wealth generation for that nation.

The role oil plays as a percentage of total exports is an extremely important indication of a country's dependency on that one commodity. Exports are a country's main source of foreign currency revenue, the money that a country needs to buy goods from the outside. Without a good source of foreign currency like the dollar, that country will have a stagnated economy and little prospect for growth.

Foreign currency from exports is also used by countries, especially those here in the Middle East, where the amount of arms equals security and power. The vast amount of their oil dollars earned were spent to buy arms. With this region being traditionally volatile, more and more dollars gotten from exports were being used to buy weapons of war. For example, between 1983 and 1987 Iraq bought close to 30 billion dollars' worth of arms, mostly from the Soviet Union but from many other places, including Italy and the West; 99.3 percent of Iraq's foreign currency earnings came from oil. Thus, for Iraq specifically and the region in general, oil money is the basis for economic, political, and military power.

These countries' economic power consists of oil reserves, their production capability, how much they can produce and how fast, and how much is left underground, as well as their market share worldwide. We knew when the war started that Saudi Arabia and Kuwait alone controlled about 70 percent of the oil generated and the wealth that moved from that region, and Algeria, Libya, and Iraq controlled only about 30 percent. So there was a real effort on the part of the nationalist states like Iraq, like Libya, and like Algeria to gain a greater share of the wealth and power that were held by Kuwait and by Saudi Arabia.

The major Gulf countries were willing to use oil as a weapon of war—and we know that all too well now—as they did in 1966 by closing the Suez Canal, in 1967 when the war with Israel occurred, and again in 1973, when these countries used the oil embargo as the equivalent of a declaration of war against the West. And we have never been the same in this country since that first oil embargo of 1973. We have been in a steady state of recession and erosion of the inroads of this economy because we are paying so much more money for the oil that we buy from that region and other places.

Oil has now even been used physically in itself as a weapon of war, as we have seen with Saddam Hussein's dumping of oil directly into the Persian Gulf as a military tactic to make beach landings more difficult in the Kuwait area.

We must also remember that it was Iraq's claims against Kuwait, saying that it was producing more than its quota to drive the prices down and slant-drilling into the Rumalia oil field, which spans both Iraq and Kuwait, that helped to motivate Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August.

It is fair to make the analogy that the economies of the major Gulf States are like those of Central America. In fact, we may ask, have we moved from banana republics to oil republics. The facts speak for themselves. 74 percent, 88 percent, 93 percent, 95 percent, and 99 percent are the percentages that indicate how much these countries rely on oil. They are totally captive to it.

As the countries of the gulf are dependent on exporting oil, we in the West are equally dependent on importing cheap foreign oil. Modern economies depend on it for economic growth. Without oil, countries in the West could come to an absolute standstill.

Nearly 20 years ago, while he was President, Richard Nixon once said, and I quote:

We use 30 percent of all the energy here in America that the world produces. That isn't bad. That is good. That means that we are the richest, strongest people in the world, and that we have the highest standard of living in the world. That is why we need so much energy, and may it always be that way.

Mr. Nixon said this before the 1973-1974 oil embargo, which cost the United States 7 percent of our gross national product for that year and threw us and the rest of the world into a major recession, one of the worst we have experienced since World War II. Even after this rude awakening, the West continues to become even more dependent on imported oil. Have we learned nothing?

France is dependent on imported oil for nearly 90 percent of its total consumption, Germany is dependent on imported oil for 82 percent of its consumption, Italy for 84 percent, and Belgium for 85 percent. Japan, which used to be 99 percent dependent on foreign oil, has reduced that dependency largely through conservation, to 90 percent. But all of these major industrial powers are extremely dependent on oil.

□ 1510

Traditionally, because of its original wealth of natural resources, the United States was self-sufficient for its oil needs. In fact, we were a net exporter of oil at one time. But then we used up all of our reserves. There are some left, but really, except for Alaska and a few other places in the country, our situation has radically changed in the last 25 years.

The United States, during most recent history, became totally dependent on imported oil for over half of what we use in this country.

In 1967, when the Gulf States were first contemplating an oil embargo, the United States was in good shape. We

were dependent on imported oil for only about one-fifth, or 20 percent, of total oil, and we were exporting oil at that point to other countries, including Europe, to cover their needs.

When the Gulf States did successfully impose an oil embargo in 1973, we were up at that point to a 37-percent dependency on oil, just over one-third.

This was exacerbated, however, by the end of the decade, in 1977, by speculation on the oil market, driving dependence up at that time, this was in the late 1970's, to nearly half, 47.7 percent.

Because of Presidential leadership by Jimmy Carter and a new national awareness of the problem in the late 1970's, and because of the embargoes in 1973 and 1974, and then price hikes in 1977 and 1978, our dependency began to drop, after great Presidential leadership, reaching a level back to 32 percent in 1983.

However, unfortunately, this did not last. The Reagan administration lost sight of the big picture on energy and on America's defense security needs in terms of energy.

Mr. Speaker, we are now even more dependent on foreign oil. This is America's highest rate of dependency in our history, now at 55 percent, and it is growing.

The Congressional Competitive Caucus, of which I am a cochair, works extremely hard to keep America strong. Among other things, this means strengthening our industrial base, safeguarding people's jobs, and making sure our farmers and businesses get a good price for their goods in the international market. I am, of course, concerned about our continuing trade deficit, a sure sign of an economy's health or sickness.

At present we have been annually in the red to the tune of approximately \$100 billion. Of that \$100 billion in the red every year, 55 percent is related to the continuing import of foreign oil.

That is how dependent we have become, a nation that began its history with a declaration of independence.

As I alluded to before, this dependency has every indication of getting worse.

The United States not only has the possibility of being more dependent on imported oil, but also more dependent on oil from the gulf region. The same region to which we have committed half a million American lives.

An article that recently appeared in *Amphibious Warfare Review*, a prestigious publication on military matters, states:

With the world's proven oil reserves of some 1.011 trillion barrels steadily declining, market supplies will come increasingly from the 640.5 billion oil reserves presently found in the Middle East. According to a 1987 report by the National Petroleum Council on the "U.S. Oil and Gas Outlook," approximately 35 to 46 percent of the world's oil will originate from the Middle East by the year

2000 if present trends continue. The vast oil reserves in the Middle East are likely to provide the majority of the world's oil well into the next century if world production peaks by the year 2000 as some futurists predict.

Given the predictions for the future, the mutual dependency on oil of the Gulf States and the West is going to become even more intertwined. Both sides, each in their own way, are becoming more prone to violence, as their dependence on oil increases. The war in the gulf is the latest, and most dramatic, example of this desperate dependency. Many people are dying because of it. And I say now: any further delay in dealing with this mutual dependency on oil, and the hard political questions that accompany it, would have grave consequences.

However, I know that breaking this cycle of dependency is going to be extremely difficult. There is going to be a great temptation to do nothing. The President's new energy policy leads exactly where?—nowhere. Business as usual. Every indication points to the fact that there will be a world oil glut after the war. The price of a barrel of oil is already near the prewar level, and falling. When this conflict is over, Kuwait and Iraq will begin producing oil again, and producing as much as they can to pay for the costs of the reconstruction. Other Gulf States, such as Saudi Arabia, which has already upped daily oil production by 3 million barrels since the beginning of the conflict, will face heavy political pressure to also continue producing as much as they can, because economic power translates into political power in this region. All of this oil production will have the cumulative effect of driving prices down even further, possibly to \$10 a barrel.

This would seem to be good news, would it not, for a struggling U.S. economy. However, let there be no mistake: If the price of oil goes down to \$10 a barrel, the long-term effects would be disastrous. America's addiction to foreign oil would even skyrocket at that price. Our domestic oil production and alternative energy sources could not be induced to compete. We would be held hostage to foreign sources. There would be no incentive here in America to develop new sources of energy, and, with oil itself, no incentive to explore for new supplies.

Southern States, like Texas and Louisiana, that rely on producing oil, would be thrown into a deep recession. When the price of oil collapsed in 1986, that is exactly what happened to those States, and it proved to be one of the primary reasons that the savings and loan crisis centered in that part of our country.

If the price of oil drops too much, the United States could find itself 60, 70, even 80 percent dependent on imported oil. With competition being pushed out of the domestic market, prices will

boomerang back at some point, possibly well beyond what we are paying now. All our decisions would then be held hostage to our dependency on imported oil. To me, this is not in America's national security interest.

That is not all. The international ramifications could even be graver. The limited competition that exists in the international oil market now would be driven out. Multinational oil corporations, big oil, would literally continue to rule our lives. And in the gulf region, where we would increasingly depend for our oil, a vicious production war to gain market share could spawn even more vicious wars than what we are experiencing now. We would have to intervene again, and again, because we would be more dependent on their oil.

Believe me, this scenario is not a pleasant one to draw. It is scary to contemplate. But it could happen, and it is already beginning to happen.

We must break this cycle of mutual dependency on oil while we still can. To do so, the United States must formulate a comprehensive energy plan. It is not enough to only touch on the surface of this problem, as efforts in the past have done. Legislation proposed in Washington is all too often a peacemeal approach. Special interests must not be allowed to block the national interest in our collective pursuit of shaking our oil dependency. Quite frankly, it has gone way beyond fears of Government intervention; increased regulation of oil is our only means of survival, and taxing those who make profits out of taking America down the wrong path.

It is in our Nation's best interests to develop alternative energy sources. We are not a poor nation in natural resources. Why should we act like one?

□ 1520

Let us take just one small section of our country and look at it under a microscope. In States like Ohio where I come from, or Pennsylvania, or West Virginia and others in the Midwest, in fact the belt that runs all the way from Lorain, OH, to Denver, CO, cleaning coal would amply fill most of our Nation's energy needs, both industrial and residential for hundreds of years. Cleaning coal in closed systems with no emissions to the atmosphere could produce methanol and other fuels that would be cleaner than burning oil. Oil is dirty with the hydrocarbons and the emittants that it produces, unfortunately.

President Bush's budget eliminates all clean coal research funds, and we know under the ground in America today we have more recoverable coal reserves than the Middle East has oil. Why have we allowed ourselves to become so dependent on dirty oil when we have the ability to mine and refine our own coal here in the United States?

Even the highest sulfur coal can be cleaned.

We know that recoverable coal reserves worldwide are three times as great as oil. In these same States, farmers grow enough corn and related crops on their fields to engineer an incredible supply of ethanol-based fuels. And there is always enough Sun for solar energy which makes sense in some parts of America and the world, and this is to say nothing of hydrogen power and even the nuclear reprocessing of spent fuels, which is a process that the world demands an answer to.

The emphasis of President Bush's new energy policy was on increased oil production for the most part, and as the Toledo Blade from my district calls it, this energy policy is a "half-baked energy plan."

Actually, it is a nonpolicy because not only does it offer nothing new, it increases our dependence on oil, which is not in this Nation's national security interest.

As I have pointed out in these remarks, this is the kind of plan that will lead to our ruin, not tomorrow but in the next century. We owe our children and grandchildren so much more.

No, we need something greater. Each and every one of us must be challenged to conserve energy. Just using a new type of building and automotive glass, perfected by Libby Owens Ford Co., a major producer in my district, can on an annual basis, because of the way that it filters the Sun's rays, save the equivalent of what we bring through the Alaska pipeline every year. There are hundreds of other companies and talented individuals in this country that can help us find energy alternatives, both on the conservation and production side, and I like those who suggest that what America needs in terms of energy is what we had in terms of producing atomic power with the Manhattan project. If we can do that in this Nation, we can produce alternative fuels.

America lowered our dependence on foreign oil in the early 1980's after President Carter's leadership lead us in that direction, and on a wider scale we as a nation must begin to wean ourselves from oil by replacing private interests with the national interest, seriously developing new sources of energy and cutting our consumption. Internationally the oil market must be stabilized.

It may seem strange, but it is imperative that we assist organizations like OPEC to reestablish product quotas. The world simply cannot withstand a volatile oil market with prices careening from highs to lows. This situation is what leads to war and unsettled regional conflicts.

Congressman LEON PANETTA's bill is a good start in stabilization, but frankly, the world oil market needs something even more comprehensive. A

price range must exist that allows for an equitable return for the oil exporting countries and a measure of security for oil importing countries. Specifically, for the Middle East, this stabilization must take place in connection with a general political framework for peace. Pouring billions of dollars into a chaotic region is morally wrong. We can no longer allow the money we spend on imported oil which has most often been used to buy more arms, arms that in turn are used to repress the people of that region, and now used against American and allied soldiers and forces.

Saddam Hussein would not pose the threat that he does today without the weapons that he bought with that oil money. And after this war is over, after Saddam is defeated, we must press for a political conciliation between the warring factions and provide them with the means to end their own dependency and our dependency on them.

In conclusion, I appeal to the good sense of the American people and to the world at large: Break this vicious mutual dependency on oil where we have been lead by the major oil companies of the world who have been largely silent as this conflict proceeds. We owe it to every young person that is fighting in this war to learn from it. Our hopes for the future and prosperity are riding on our ability to understand and accept the need for change and then to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I will place in the RECORD the news article that I referenced in my remarks as well as three charts, one that documents in detail the estimated recoverable coal reserves around the world, the number of Btu's that are available worldwide, showing the United States as the world's leader in coal reserves, and then a chart documenting the oil reserves which are about only one-fourth as great worldwide as the coal reserves, and finally natural gas reserves which are the least of the three, but nonetheless significant in terms of worldwide reserves.

The documents referred to follows:

U.S. SAT AS IRAQ GOT POWER, CRITICS SAY

WASHINGTON.—For 10 years as Iraq developed a vast army, chemical weapons, nuclear ambitions and a long record of brutality, the Reagan and Bush administrations quietly courted Iraq President Saddam Hussein as a counterweight to Iran's revolutionary fervor. Now, critics say, Washington is paying the price for that policy.

Iraq is a power with a 100,000-man army entrenched in Kuwait and designs on the world's petroleum stocks while the United States has hastily mounted its largest military mobilization since Vietnam to keep Saudi Arabia from sharing Kuwait's fate.

Iraq reached these heights with American acquiescence and sometimes its help.

It benefited from a thriving grain trade with American farmers, cooperation with U.S. intelligence agencies, oil sales to American refiners that helped finance its military, and muted White House criticism of its human rights and war atrocities.

The United States removed Iraq from its list of nations supporting terrorism in 1983. The action was significant for it opened the door to federal subsidies and loan guarantees.

Since 1982, Baghdad has become one of the biggest buyers of U.S. rice and wheat, purchasing some \$5.5 billion in crops and livestock with federally guaranteed loans and agricultural subsidies and its own hard cash.

It also has been extended some \$270 million in government-guaranteed credit from the Export-Import Bank to buy other American goods, despite repeated failures to make loan repayments on time.

Current and former government officials also say the CIA provided the Iraqis with valuable information on the military operations of their Iranian foes.

In return, the United States received what the officials called largely disappointing data on terrorism, the Soviet Union and Iran.

Many critics, and some former administration officials, say the potential costs of the Reagan and Bush administrations dance with Hussein threaten to be especially steep.

The muted American reaction to the use of mustard and nerve gases by Iraq against Iran, first reported in March 1984, and its rocketing of Iranian cities with intermediate-range ballistic missiles may have encouraged the spread of such weapons.

Speaking Sunday on the ABC News program "This Week With David Brinkley," Secretary of State James Baker said as much.

"I do think it's worth looking at, in the future, arms sales practices and policies," Baker said. "We're very concerned about chemical weapons proliferation. These things, though, have all come about in the last three or four years. We would have been more concerned about all of this, perhaps going further back."

In an interview last week, a senior Pentagon official in the Reagan administration, Richard Armitage, said that "in retrospect, it would have been much better at the time of their use of gas and IRBMs if we'd put our foot down."

"The mistake we made was not pushing very hard and loud for international action," he said.

Armitage and other officials said they did not press for further punishment of Iraq at the time because they hoped to expand American influence with Hussein and shore up Iraq's ability to pursue the war with Iran.

After the war the argument was that economic and political ties were the only hope of influencing Hussein.

In the weeks before the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, the White House abandoned even that tack, fighting trade sanctions against an increasingly belligerent Iraq by contending they would hurt American farmers and businesses without swaying Baghdad in the least.

Some Members of Congress, especially from agricultural states, also lobbied strongly against sanctions and for increased trade.

Now, administration officials concede the policy did not work. But they insist, in the words of senior State Department official Edward Gnehm, that "it was incumbent on us to try."

"There were lots of things in the equation that didn't work," Gnehm said, "but we hoped to be able to weave him into the fabric of Western nations. And we never tried to build that relationship with an extended hand without pointing out these problems with the other hand. I can only say it failed."

World crude oil reserves—Jan. 1, 1989

(Quadrillion Btu)

North America	515.88
Mexico	318.24
United States	157.65
Central and South America	400.00
Venezuela	341.76
Western Europe	108.82
Norway	61.18
Eastern Europe and U.S.S.R.	354.71
U.S.S.R.	344.12
Middle East	3,847.06
Saudi Arabia	1,500.00
Iraq	588.24
United Arab Emirates	577.06
Kuwait	555.88
Iran	546.47
Africa	334.71
Libya	129.41
Nigeria	94.12
Algeria	49.41
Far East and Oceania	265.29
China	138.82
Total	5,827.06

Source: Oil & Gas Journal, Dec. 26, 1988.

World estimated recoverable reserves of coal—1987

(Quadrillion Btu¹)

North America	6,677.78
United States	6,463.11
Central and South America	126.22
Western Europe	2,726.22
Germany	1,513.78
Eastern Europe and U.S.S.R.	7,376.44
U.S.S.R.	5,994.67
Poland	1,046.22
Middle East	4.44
Africa	1,584.22
Far East and Oceania	4,139.78
China	2,420.00
Total	22,635.11

¹ 1 Quadrillion Btus of coal energy is equivalent to 170 million barrels of crude oil or 28 days of U.S. petroleum imports.

Source: The World Energy Conference.

World natural gas reserves—Jan. 1, 1989

(Quadrillion Btu)

North America	337.9
United States	168.0
Canada	95.1
Mexico	74.8
Central and South America	161.2
Venezuela	102.2
Argentina	26.7
Western Europe	199.9
Norway	85.5
Netherlands	62.5
Eastern Europe and U.S.S.R.	1,529.0
U.S.S.R.	1,500.0
Middle East	1,182.1
Iran	494.4
United Arab Emirates	201.5
Oman	156.7
Qatar	152.0
Africa	253.3
Algeria	104.2
Nigeria	85.0
Far East and Oceania	272.4
Indonesia	83.6
Malaysia	51.7
China	31.7
Total	3,935.9

Source: Oil & Gas Journal, Dec. 26, 1988.

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New

York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced a resolution to establish a House Commission on Legislative Process Reform. The Commission would be composed of 12 members, including 8 current and 4 former House Members, equally drawn from the two major political parties.

The Commission would be charged with conducting a thorough investigation of the structure and operation of the legislative process in the House and reporting its findings and recommendations by the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Rules Committee which has jurisdiction over House rules and procedures, it is with some reluctance that I am urging the creation of a special commission to initially look into what is at least partially under our jurisdiction. But I think the erosion of the legislative process is serious and urgent enough to warrant such a special and comprehensive review by such a unique, new panel.

Moreover, the Rules Committee will soon be preoccupied with processing legislation from other committees to the House floor, and will not have time to do such a reform effort justice. And finally, I think this reform effort, like many of its predecessors, deserves broader representation both from current House Members as well as former Members, and that it should be completely bipartisan if it is to succeed.

I think it is important to emphasize that whatever the Commission does report will be referred to the committees of jurisdiction so that any legislative measure or rules changes which are recommended will have to be reported from those committees before coming to the House floor. So this in no way constitutes a complete bypass of the committee system. Indeed, I am confident that any final product that is reported to the House will bear the distinct imprint of the committees reporting it.

Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill once said that "democracy is the worst form of Government except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time." Indeed, our own unique democratic system of divided powers and checks and balances was intentionally designed to produce inefficiency, delay, and conflict. Jefferson is often quoted as saying that "Democracy is cumbersome, slow and inefficient." "But," he went on to add, "in due time the voice of the people will be heard and their latent wisdom will prevail."

Mr. Speaker, I think we all recognize that democracy is inherently messy, slow, and inefficient. But that is no excuse for us to deliberately make things worse by our actions or inaction. It should be our aim to make our system of Government work for the people to the best of our ability and its potential. Instead, we seem to be more intent on building our little warring fiefdoms than in restoring a working and workable committee system.

Mr. Speaker, the American people recognize that something is drastically wrong with the way Congress is being run today. An ABC News election day poll taken last November reveals that only 23 percent of the American people approve of the job we are doing while the remaining 77 percent disapprove.

The evidence is all around us that our once vaunted committee system is deteriorating. In fact, "Crumbling Committees" is the title of the award winning article by Richard Cohen in the August 4, 1990, Congressional Journal. In that article Cohen points to all the instances in which the Democratic leadership found it necessary to go around the standing committee system to craft legislation on major issues, including the budget agreement, and the crime, clean air, ethics, and campaign reform packages.

Since that article was written, a number of disgruntled House Democrats have pushed through a caucus rule to require any leadership task force products to be referred to the committees of jurisdiction for at least 5 days before being brought to the floor. So there is clearly concern being evidenced on the part of the majority about the apparent breakdown in the committee system and a deliberative legislative process.

The roots of this breakdown are fairly easy to trace. They go back to the so-called congressional reform revolution of the 70's which attempted to democratize the committee system by allowing for the unbridled proliferation of semiautonomous subcommittees.

Between 1970 and 1990, the number of subcommittees increased by 40 percent from 136 to 158, even though the number of committees remained relatively constant. During that same period, committees' staff rose 186 percent, from 738 to 2,109.

Has Congress been all that more productive legislatively to warrant such increases in subcommittees and staff? Not to judge by the number of bills reported, passed and enacted. House committees reported 635 measures in the last Congress, 44 percent fewer than the 91st Congress two decades ago. The House passed 968 measures in the 101st Congress—162 fewer than the 91st Congress. And we enacted 650 measures into law in the 101st Congress, 45 fewer than the 91st Congress. But that figure is deceptive since 36 percent of our enactments in the 101st Congress were so-called commemorative measures while only 9.8 percent of the enactments in the 91st Congress were commemoratives. That leaves just 418 substantive enactments in the 101st Congress or 33 percent less than the 627 substantive enactments in the 91st Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would be the last person who would argue that Congress should be churning out more laws. If anything, we should be passing fewer. The only point I am trying to make here is that we have long ago reached the point of diminishing returns when it comes to the proliferation of staff and subcommittees. Perhaps the biggest reason for this is the adoption in 1974 of a rule permitting the referral of the same bills to more than one committee while not realigning committee jurisdictions along more functional and rational lines.

It is little wonder the leadership must often resort to extra-committee means to bring legislation to the floor when major bills are sometime hopelessly entangled in five or more committees, each having completely different ideas of what the final version should look like.

Members are also hopelessly stretched out over this rack of tangled committee and subcommittee assignments, so much so that they

are unable to do justice to any one assignment. That in turn has produced in our rules such phantom legislative devices as one-third quorums, proxy voting, and increasing reliance on the use of the suspension of the rules procedure on the floor to pass bills when no one is here. Whereas in the 95th Congress (1977-78) 389 measures passed the House under suspension (or 38 percent of all bills passed by the House), in the 101st Congress 502 measures passed the House under suspension, or 52 percent of all measures passed by the House. This should be cause for considerable concern though little is heard.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are realistic about the limitations of democracy but they are also acutely aware of when we do not live up to our potential as legislators or the system's potential for better representing their interests and the national interest. And make no mistake about it, they are giving us a failing grade at present. It is high time we resolve to do something about it by reforming ourselves before the system collapses on top of us and ends all hope for the success of this great democratic experiment.

My proposal for a 1-year study and report is a modest one yet one which I think will help to put us back on the track toward a more representative, deliberative and accountable legislative process. We must act before it is too late. I urge early action on this proposal for a bipartisan House Commission on Legislative Process Reform.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the text of my resolution, two tables containing data to which I have referred, and the article by Richard Cohen to which I have made reference. The materials follow:

H. RES. —

Resolved, That there is established in the House of Representatives a commission to be known as the House Commission on Legislative Process Reform (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of the current structure and operation of the legislative process in the House of Representatives including, but not limited to—

- (1) the jurisdictions of committees;
- (2) the size of committees;
- (3) the number of subcommittees;
- (4) the number of Member committee and subcommittee assignments;
- (5) the use of select and joint committees;
- (6) the effect of committee rules on the legislative process, including proxy voting, one-third quorums, open meetings and hearings, scheduling and the prior availability of materials for hearings and meetings;
- (7) the size, costs, funding and allocation of committee staff;
- (8) committee budgeting systems and resource allocation;
- (9) the multiple referral of legislation to committees;
- (10) the foreign and domestic travel of committees;
- (11) restrictions on the amendment process in the House;
- (12) the use of the suspension of the rules procedure;
- (13) commemorative legislation;
- (14) unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in appropriations measures;

(15) continuing appropriations resolutions;

(16) waivers of the Budget Act and extraneous matters in reconciliation bills;

(17) oversight of Federal laws, agencies and programs;

(18) the presentment of bills to the President; the prompt consideration of return vetoes; and the appropriate use of the pocket veto.

APPOINTMENT AND MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of twelve members to be appointed by the Speaker as follows: eight current Members of the House equally drawn from the two major political parties, one of whom the Speaker shall designate as chairman; and four former Members of the House equally drawn from the two major political parties.

(b) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) For purposes of this section the term "Members" shall mean any Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the House of Representatives.

AUTHORITY AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 4. (a) For purposes of carrying out this resolution the Commission, or any subunit thereof authorized to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

(b) The provisions of clauses 1, 2, and 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Commission.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives the Commission may incur expenses in connection with its duties under this resolution.

(b) In carrying out its functions under this title, the Commission is authorized to—

- (1) appoint, either on a permanent basis or as experts or consultants, such staff as the Commission considers necessary;
- (2) to utilize the services of the staffs of those committees of the House from which Members have been selected for membership on the Commission;
- (3) to prescribe the duties and responsibilities of such staff;
- (4) to fix compensation of such staff at a single per annum gross rate as provided by clause 6(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives;
- (5) to terminate the employment of such staff as the Commission considers appropriate; and
- (6) to reimburse members of the Commission and of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties and responsibilities for the Commission, other than expenses in connection with any meeting of the Commission held in the District of Columbia.

(c) Members of the Commission who are not current Members of the House shall each be paid at a rate equal to the rate of pay for level III of the Executive Schedule for each day (including travel time) during which they are engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

REPORTS, RECORDS AND TERMINATION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall transmit its final report to the House not later than December 31, 1991, and such report shall con-

tain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission together with its recommendations for such action as it deems advisable, and any such report shall be referred to the committee or committees which have jurisdiction over the subject matter thereof.

(b) The Commission shall cease to exist ninety days after the submission of its final report, at which time its records and files shall be transferred to the Committee on Rules.

TABLE 1.—COMPARATIVE LEGISLATIVE DATA FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(91st, 96th, and 101st Congresses)

Item	91st Cong. 1969-70	96th Cong. 1979-80	101st Cong. 1989-90
Days in session ¹	350	326	281
Hours in session ¹	1,613	1,876	1,688
Avg. hours per day	4.6	5.8	6.0
Total public measures reported ¹	1,137	878	635
Public measures reported but not acted upon ¹	61	131	66
Total public measures passed ¹	1,130	929	968
Unreported measures passed as percent of total	4.8	19.6	41.2
Total public laws enacted ¹	695	613	650
Avg. pages per statute ²	4.2	8.1	NA
Commemoratives enacted ³	68	96	232
Commemoratives as percent of total enactments	9.8	15.7	36
Substantive laws (total minus commemoratives) ³	627	517	418
Rollcall votes ⁴	443	672	878
Average votes per measure passed ⁵	3.8	2.2	1.6
Congressional Record pages of House proceedings	25,855	25,079	23,160
Average record pages per measure passed ⁵	15	17	17
House standing committees	21	22	22
Select committees ⁶	2	5	5
Subcommittees ⁷	136	158	158
House committee staff ⁸	738	2,017	2,109
House appropriations ⁹ (in millions of dollars)	203.1	645.9	1,129

¹ Data taken from "Resume of Congressional Activity," Daily Digest, Congressional Records, & House Calendars, 91st, 96th, and 101st Congresses. "Public measures" are bills and joint resolutions of a public nature, and do not include private bills, nor do they include simple or concurrent resolutions.

² Source: "Indicators of House of Representatives Workload & Activity," CRS Report for Congress by Roger H. Davidson and Carol Hardy, June 8, 1987 (Rept. No. 87-492 S).

³ Commemoratives are isolated here as a subcategory of public laws, to be distinguished from more substantive enactments. The term "commemoratives" includes proclamations, memorials, medals, namings, coins and medals, and recognitions. Source: "Commemorative Legislation," by Stephen W. Stathis & Barbara L. Schwemle, Congressional Research Service, March 30, 1990 (Rept. No. 90-183 GOW).

⁴ Rollcall votes include yea and nay votes and recorded votes, but not recorded quorum calls. Prior to 1971, recorded votes were not permitted on amendments in the Committee of the Whole. Sources: Daily Digest, "Resume of Congressional Activity," final Congressional Records for 91st, 96th, and 101st Congresses.

⁵ "Measures passed" here includes not only bills and joint resolutions, but simple and concurrent resolutions as well.

⁶ Select committees include an ad hoc legislative committee in the 96th Congress.

⁷ Subcommittees include the subcommittees, panels and task forces of standing and select committees. Sources: Vital Statistics on Congress, 1984-85, op. cit.; Congressional Staff Directory, 1970, 1980, 1990; House Administration Committee minority staff for 101st Congress; Report of the Clerk of the House, April-June, 1990 (House Doc. 101-230).

⁸ Figures for staff include statutory and investigative staff of all House standing and select committees plus H.S. staff. Sources: Vital Statistics on Congress, 1984-85, op. cit.; Congressional Staff Directory, 1970, 1980, 1990; House Administration Committee minority staff for 101st Congress; Report of the Clerk of the House, April-June, 1990 (House Doc. 101-230).

⁹ Figures represent the budget authority appropriated for the House in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bills for the 91st (FY 1969-70), 96th (FY 1979-80), and 101st (FY 1989-90) Congresses. Sources: "U.S. House of Representatives and Senate: Budget Authority FY 1962-FY 1988," by Paul Dwyer, Congressional Research Service (Rept. No. 88-260 GOW); Budget of the U.S., Fiscal 1991; and Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, 1991, House Report 101-648.

TABLE 2.—BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PASSED UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES BY THE HOUSE

Item	95th	96th	97th	98th	99th	100th	101st
Total measures passed by House ¹	1,027	929	704	978	973	1,061	968
Total measures passed under suspension of rules ¹	389	340	251	371	349	510	502

TABLE 2.—BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PASSED UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES BY THE HOUSE—Continued

Item	Congress						
	95th	96th	97th	98th	99th	100th	101st
Suspensions as percent of total measures passed	38	37	36	38	36	48	52

¹ "Measures" as used here refers only to bills and joint resolutions and does not include simple and concurrent resolutions which are not presented to the President for his approval or disapproval.

Sources: Final Calendars of the House, 95th-100th Congress; and Table 1 in "Patterns of Floor Consideration in the House of Representatives," by Stanley Bach, Congressional Research Service, Dec. 9, 1989, for the 95th-99th Congresses; and H.S. data for 101st Congress.

[Compiled by the Minority Council, Subcommittee on the Legislative Process, House Committee on Rules.]

[From the National Journal, Aug. 4, 1990]

CRUMBLING COMMITTEES

(By Richard E. Cohen)

Woodrow Wilson would hardly recognize Congress these days. "Congress in its committee rooms is Congress at work," the 32nd President, while a graduate student in 1885, wrote in Congressional Government.

Wilson's book, still a political science classic a century later, talked of how Congress handled most legislation through a hierarchical system dominated by committee chairmen.

In recent years, however, internal changes have quietly revolutionized the sources of legislative power on Capitol Hill, eroding the influence of once all-powerful committees and of their bosses. Today, committees are often irrelevant or, worse yet, obstacles.

Congress has turned to these new arrangements, in part, to ease the lawmakers' burden. "The erosion of the committee process has made life more difficult in the Senate," said a former top Senate aide who is now a corporate lobbyist. But the informal, closed-door sessions that have resulted from this erosion "may be an attribute for Senators working in a fishbowl, where every lobbyist knows what is happening before he does."

There are other reasons for the new procedures, including the reforms of the 1970s that some blame for exacerbating committee turf battles and producing too many subcommittee chairmen. The move away from committee dominance is also driven by non-legislative concerns: On some politically volatile issues, party leaders have simply concluded that the committee process doesn't work.

Here's how Congress, especially the Senate, has gone outside the committee system to handle key legislation during the past year.

This summer's efforts by White House and congressional budget summitters to force deep cuts in the deficits have largely preempted the jurisdiction of congressional committees, notably the tax-writing panels. Although the members of the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees would probably have a major voice in writing the details of any tax bill that emerges from a summit deal, they have already largely relinquished their authority to make the broad decisions. Their chairmen—Rep. Dan Rostenkowski, D-Ill., and Sen. Lloyd Bentsen, D-Texas—have consented to arrangements that allow a wider group of Members to craft tax policy. "All Members see (raising taxes) as a tar baby, and they want to get rid of it," a close observer said.

The Senate version of the clean air bill was drafted early this year during a monthlong series of meetings convened and masterminded by Senate Majority Leader George J. Mitchell, D-Maine. The meetings were held in Mitchell's office, with key Senators and

Bush Administration officials attending. This extraordinary step was taken after it had become clear that the Senate would never approve the legislation written by the Environment and Public Works Committee because of the opposition of the Administration and powerful private interests. Even in the House, where the bill was handled largely by the Energy and Commerce Committee, most of the major issues were resolved privately by the committee's leaders, sparing the full committee and the House from the potentially painful task of choosing sides.

The Senate version of a comprehensive anticrime bill, which was approved in July, came to the floor despite the almost total absence of debate or formal action by the Judiciary Committee and with most of the important decisions made off the floor by party leaders. In the House, where the rules give the majority party added leverage, Judiciary Committee Democrats worked with party leaders on their own version of the bill, which has been sent to the floor.

The internal debate over campaign finance legislation began after Democrats and Republicans developed separate positions and sought—with little success—to bridge the differences in bipartisan negotiations. The House and Senate committees with jurisdiction over the issue have been largely bypassed.

The pay raise-ethics package Congress approved late last year was developed outside the formal committee structure by special leadership-controlled panels in each chamber.

A common feature of these informal arrangements is that all of them have taken shape behind closed doors, with party leaders controlling the process. In at least one aspect, therefore, Wilson's portrayal of Congress remains valid. "One very noteworthy result of this system," he wrote, "is to shift the theater of debate upon legislation from the floor of Congress to the privacy of the committee rooms."

SHIFTING POWER

This topsy-turvy handling of major issues reflects some broader internal changes. They include the breakdown of the seniority system, an erosion of party discipline, the paralysis resulting from divided party control of the White House and Congress, increased partisan sloganeering and the growing influence of 30-second campaign spot commercials.

The new, less formal procedures have led to other shortcomings in the legislative work product. "The committee process is designed to weed out problems," J. Thomas Sliter, a former top Senate Democratic aide, said. "But when bills are put together on an ad hoc basis, the trouble can be that there are no hearings and more staff control, which increases the risk of unintended consequences."

Members of Congress have complained that they have little idea what they are voting on when they are presented on the floor with an anticrime or an environmental bill, for example, that runs several hundred pages. Although tax bills are typically written inside the Ways and Means and Finance Committees, even those panels assign the task of writing the details to the committee staffs. The committees have been embarrassed occasionally when they have learned about the impact of the bills that have emerged.

The crumbling of the committee system has not affected all major bills. In addition to tax measures, appropriations and defense policy legislation are still mostly committee-produced products that generally receive

rubber-stamp approval on the House and Senate floors. Nevertheless, the chairmen of these committees have been forced to be mindful of the wishes of their party leaders and of the full chamber. As the budget negotiations have demonstrated, even influential chairmen can find that their maneuverability is severely limited, often to the benefit of party leaders.

"Budget realities have had an enormous impact on the way tax legislation is written," David H. Brockway, former chief of staff of the congressional Joint Committee on Taxation, said.

"In the not-distant past, the hallmark of the Senate was weak leaders and strong chairmen," said Robert G. Liberatore, who was staff director of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee from 1981-84. "The loss of power by committee chairmen and the increased chaos in the use of Senate rules to promote a Senator's views have required leadership to be more involved in keeping things going."

The altered power relationships have come in response to the often-tumultuous political changes of the 1980s—notably, the division of political power between the White House and Congress and the shifts in control of the Senate in 1980 and again in 1986.

"The institution is groping to find ways to get things done when it's difficult to do anything," said Norman J. Ornstein, a congressional scholar at the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Congress is resorting more frequently to the informal procedures in part because the Bush Administration has been "more aggressive in arguing its views," Sen. Wendell H. Ford, D-Ky., said. "With the Administration leading the [Senate] Republicans almost in lockstep, that means that even if a bill is reported by a committee, the bill often won't move" without further negotiations. The President's effective use of the veto, which he has exercised 13 times without an override, has enhanced his influence at Congress's expense.

In the Senate more than in the House, Democrats have been forced to improvise because of turnover in the ranks of committee chairmen and party leaders. "Prior to 1980, there was an entrenched senior Member-staff structure in the Senate that had been there for more than a decade," said Leon G. Bilings, a lobbyist who was a top aide to then-Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine. "That was seriously disrupted for Democrats in the six-year hiatus [of 1981-87, when the GOP controlled the Senate]. More-junior Senators, who were less well versed on specific issues, took over."

Two key examples are the Senate Budget Committee and the Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Environmental Protection, both of which Muskie chaired until he resigned in 1980 to become Secretary of State. Last year, those panels were taken over by new chairmen with little leadership experience on the issues at hand; in each case, control of these issues has been moving toward the leadership.

Mitchell, who also took office as Majority Leader last year, has denied any significant loss of committee influence. But a process that puts the budget and clean air and other issues in the leadership's hands seems tailor-made for him because he is more issue-oriented than recent Senate leaders.

The Senate Budget Committee has become virtually a nonparticipant in budget policy, as evidenced by the decision this year of chairman Jim Sasser, D-Tenn., not to bring to the Senate floor the committee's annual

resolution setting spending and revenue targets for the next fiscal year.

At the Senate Appropriations Committee, chairman Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va., this year in effect set his own spending ceiling to guide his panel's work.

Though the Senate Environment Committee ultimately lost control of the clean air bill to the Mitchell-sponsored negotiations, the chairman of its Environmental Protection Subcommittee, Max Baucus, D-Mont., has been a central figure in moving the bill; he has worked closely with Mitchell, who preceded him as subcommittee chairman. "The committee could have met the Administration's objections earlier if they had been fully stated," Baucus said. He rejected the view of some observers that his own inexperience was a factor.

Lawmakers also have made many issues more difficult to handle because they want to use legislation to make political statements—for themselves or for their party, as Senate Democrats sought to do on the crime bill. And legislative procedures, never models of efficiency, have become more cumbersome as they are subjected to greater demands.

"The problems we face are becoming more complex, and the solutions don't fit neatly into the baskets represented by the committee system," said David E. Johnson, a former top aide to Mitchell who is now a Washington lobbyist and an informal adviser to the Majority Leader. "When I started working for Muskie in 1973, the Senate was a much different place. There was more respect for seniority and learning your committee assignment. Now, it seems that there is more of an entrepreneurial spirit in the Senate and in politics, generally."

CONSTITUENT COMMITTEES

Wilson's observation in 1885 that committees predominate because "the House is conscious that time presses" remains apt.

Congress functions most smoothly when bills are written in committee with bipartisan support. On most committees, the members generally seek that approach, if only because what they produce is more likely to win support on the House or Senate floor if a consensus has developed.

"Task forces usually are created only after a committee has run into a problem moving a bill," said Thomas A. Daschle of South Dakota, the co-chairman with Mitchell of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee. "They may enhance the influence of a chairman if they can improve his ability to move a bill through the floor."

Members often seek assignments to committees that deal with the issues in which they and their constituents are most interested. And that means that the committees can become captives of the interest groups most affected by their work. Seats on the Agriculture Committees tend to be filled by lawmakers representing farmers, for example, and western and southern Senators gravitate toward the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

"On the key committees that Senators want to be on—Finance, Appropriations, Armed Services—there tend to be more-balanced views," said Liberatore, who is a lobbyist for Chrysler Corp. "Many of the others are constituent committees, which generally have more staff control, and there is less interest by members in the details of programs."

Trouble can arise if committees ignore the views of other Members—for example, industrial state lawmakers who object to environmental controls on power plants—or if they

fail to find common ground on politically polarizing issues.

"There is no concert effort to bypass committees," said Sen. Wyche Fowler Jr., D-Ga., whom Mitchell tapped as assistant floor leader. "That's much more difficult for leadership to manage." The need for informal mechanisms, in part, "has to do with the personalities and effectiveness" of chairmen, Fowler added.

Even seemingly routine action on bills can often become snarled. When the Senate in June 1989 acted on the child care bill—one of the Democrats' top domestic priorities—it was initially written by Labor and Human Resources Committee Democrats, who are mostly sympathetic to organized labor and child care groups. Before the measure could win Senate passage, however, Mitchell was forced to file a floor substitute that substantially watered down the original version and added provisions that the Finance Committee had prepared. Because most Republicans opposed the measure, the support of Orrin G. Hatch of Utah, the Labor Committee's senior Republican, was vital to Senate passage.

Hatch took a more traditional minority role when his strong opposition triggered an angry debate on the pending Civil Rights Act, which the Labor Committee drafted. As a result, committee chairman Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., sought but ultimately failed to work out differences directly with White House chief of staff John H. Sununu. Kennedy and Sununu had conducted similar negotiations a year ago to expedite Senate passage of landmark legislation expanding the rights of disabled persons.

In the House, the two committees with child care jurisdiction—Education and Labor and Ways and Means—were badly split over the financing mechanism. Their differences stemmed, in part, from a jurisdictional fight.

House Speaker Thomas S. Foley, D-Wash., and Majority Leader Richard A. Gephardt, D-Mo., worked for months to resolve those differences but ultimately failed; in March, the House passed a bill that included the two conflicting approaches. Republicans hope that the threat of a presidential veto will give them leverage in a House-Senate conference committee, where they favor the Ways and Means approach of greater tax credits and fewer strings on federal grants.

Some committees and committee chairmen have been ill-equipped to deal with hot-button issues—controversial topics requiring quick action and a sensitivity to partisan implications.

Pay raise and campaign finance bills, for example, have become known as "leadership issues." They require party leaders' extensive participation because "they involve the Members themselves and need bipartisan support," said Rep. Martin Frost, D-Texas, who has served on informal leadership panels dealing with both issues.

The committees with nominal legislative jurisdiction over these issues—chiefly, the House Administration Committee and the Senate Rules and Administration Committee—have become housekeeping panels to which most members devote little time. That represents a change from the early 1970s, when those committees were central in drafting campaign finance laws. But House and Senate party leaders have included members of those committees on the informal pay raise and campaign finance panels.

"These are issues that require the leadership to play a critical role to overcome the parochial interests of individual Members," Common Cause president Fred Wertheimer said. "After 15 years of the parties' battling

each other and incumbents benefiting from the current system, that makes it harder to resolve. . . . On these issues, accountability is not with the committee system, it's with the party leaders."

It's not only the majority leadership that can preempt a committee. According to Ford, who chairs the Rules Committee, he and other Senators from each party earlier this year were working on major parts of the campaign finance bill when Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., forced an end to the negotiations. "We were making progress, and then some other Republicans got their noses out of joint," Ford said. "I understood that it was because of Dole." Dole, who has opposed Democratic efforts to impose strict spending limits, eventually joined Mitchell in creating an informal group that tried but failed to reach a bipartisan agreement.

Sometimes, overlapping committee jurisdictions are obstacles to moving legislation to the floor. Issues such as education, trade and drug control may be in the jurisdiction principally of a single committee of the House or Senate. But several other committees can and often do argue for a share of the jurisdiction so that their members can get a piece of the action.

"There are so many overlapping jurisdictions, which create difficulties in working out problems," Daschle said. "And many more Members desire to be involved, even though they are not on the committee with jurisdiction." That helps to explain, for example, why eight Senate committees and nine House committees worked on parts of the 1988 Trade Act.

Reformers made several efforts in the 1970s to overhaul committee jurisdiction but failed, for the most part, because of opposition from Members who feared a loss of influence. The most far-reaching plan was prepared in 1973-74 by the House Select Committee on Committees, which was chaired by Richard Bolling, D-Mo., who retired in 1982 after serving 34 years as an influential Member.

"It's not possible for many bills to go through the committee system until Congress redoes itself," said Bolling, who has become an adviser of Gephardt. "It's nutty now. But this is not the time to reform, either strategically or politically."

Other major changes in the mid-1970s, which were the culmination of lengthy efforts by Bolling and other Democratic reformers, served to weaken the roles of the once-autocratic committee chairmen. They included the adoption of the new congressional budget process; the election in 1974 of the "Watergate babies," nationally oriented House Democrats with little respect for their elders or for House traditions; and the strengthening of the House Democratic Caucus, which demonstrated its new muscle in 1975 by ousting three senior committee chairmen. Intentionally or not, these changes contributed to Congress's internal gridlock.

Ford said that a study of Senate committee jurisdictions would be timely. "I don't preclude it in the next session," he said.

"Congress prefers strong chairmen," Fowler said. "But the proliferation of chairmen has weakened the committee system. You no longer have the whales on any complex issues. You usually have two to three committee chairmen and eight or nine subcommittee chairmen, all jealous of their turf."

ASSERTIVE MEMBERS

Reduced committee influence can open up many opportunities for rank-and-file Members. Sen. Phil Gramm, R-Texas, may be the

best example. In 1985, as a first-year Senator, he prepared and cosponsored a floor amendment that resulted in radical changes in the federal budget process. Four years earlier, while a second-term House Democrat, Gramm pulled off a similar coup when he successfully sponsored a floor amendment that made major cuts in domestic spending programs.

Those moves did not endear Gramm to the many lawmakers in both parties who take a more traditional view of the legislative process. But they have made him one of Congress's most influential Members.

Many Senators prefer the relative stability of the committee process—when it is working well. "Politicians generally don't like grandstanding and how it affects their colleagues," Billings said. "Most of them want to accomplish the best legislation that they can. That requires a normalized process."

Informal mechanisms that substitute for the more structured committee process often strengthen the hands of individual Members. "A Senator can have more leverage in an extra-committee context," Sliter said. "It's more likely to be free-form because you are not going against the chairman. . . . Task forces can be more democratic in their operation and can prod a chairman not to be autocratic."

In the closed-door negotiations on the clean air bill, for example, individual negotiators—including those from the Administration—could stymie an agreement more easily than they could have done in a standing committee, which is ruled by majority vote.

Baucus justified the informal approach, noting that "it's such a complex bill with so many titles that it was more appropriate to address it on a cohesive basis within the core group. The proof of our success is in the pudding. We met the objective of passing a bill that is a major improvement over current law."

Supporters of more-stringent clean air requirements contend that the cost and complexity of the provisions and the growing number of Members with an interest in the legislation made a battle royal unavoidable, especially in the Senate, where opponents can more easily put up roadblocks. "We knew that there were people in the weeds waiting to make a big fight and that some parts of the committee bill would be whittled away," said Robert Hurley, the Environment Committee's minority staff director. "Had we known the intensity of the opposition, we might have made some adjustments in committee."

In other cases, so many Members want a piece of the action that a chairman willing to work outside the formal structure can turn the chaos to his advantage. When the Senate took up the broad crime bill this spring, for example, Senators offered more than 300 floor amendments. Judiciary Committee chairman Joseph R. Biden Jr., D-Del., worked for days with Strom Thurmond of South Carolina and Hatch, the committee's senior Republicans, to narrow the list to a more manageable 18, half from each party. These private negotiations became, in effect, a makeshift bill-drafting session involving 100 Senators and their aides, not the 14 Judiciary Committee members.

A host of political factors shaped the backroom dickering off the Senate floor. Democrats wanted to place their imprint on a crime bill but also wanted to limit votes on controversial issues that might prove embarrassing to Democratic Senators seeking reelection in the fall. Republicans wanted to

help President Bush get a crime bill, but many of them were unhappy about efforts to expand the bill to include gun control measures. Members of both parties who are up for reelection wanted an opportunity to offer amendments that would display their "law and order" credentials.

"Many Members wanted to offer an amendment so that they could be on C-SPAN or have a 30-second campaign spot," a Democratic aide working on the bill said. "The reality is that this is a big part of the legislative process."

Earlier, Biden had decided to make the fight on the Senate floor rather than in his committee, which never formally acted on the omnibus measure. Still stung by the 1988 presidential campaign, in which Bush scored points by attacking Democratic nominee Michael S. Dukakis on crime issues, Senate Democrats sought to use the bill to make a partisan statement.

"The Biden bill does more to combat crime than the Administration's proposal, while at the same time remaining more sensitive to constitutional concerns," a July 10 handout prepared by Biden's staff declared.

FLEXIBLE LEADERS

New procedures intended to supplement the work of the committees may also enhance the power of congressional leaders, especially those in the Senate. "By picking who is on the team and putting a spin on the outcome, leadership can exert more control," a Senate Democratic source said.

At the same time, the added responsibilities can complicate the lives of party leaders, who already have to balance a range of legislative and political demands. Increasingly, however, Members are selecting leaders—such as Mitchell, Gephardt, Dole and House Minority Whip Newt Gingrich, R-Ga.—who have demonstrated that they can not only speak to national constituencies but can also deal with internal pressures.

In addition, Bush and top White House officials have been more interested in resolving legislative details with congressional leaders than their recent predecessors have—in part, congressional sources suggest, because Bush spends less time than other Presidents did developing a White House legislative agenda.

Until recent years, active Presidents did not have to contend with strong congressional leaders seeking their own podiums. Sam Rayburn of Texas, who was House Speaker in 17 of the years from 1940-61 and was probably the century's most skillful lawmaker, prided himself on his ability to work closely with Presidents and committee chairmen. But to the public at large, he was not very well known.

"Rayburn had half the power" of later Speakers, said Bolling, whom many regarded as Rayburn's protégé. "But he had enormous prestige from the ability to understand what could be done and how to tell a President."

Mitchell may be setting a new model for Senate leaders as he tries to combine the roles of legislative agenda-setter and national party spokesman. Last fall, for example, he engaged in public and private lobbying to kill, virtually single-handedly, Bush's proposed cut in the capital gains tax rate, which was backed by a majority of Senators, including members of the Finance Committee.

"George Mitchell takes a much more flexible approach to leadership," Ornstein said. "This is an era when leaders use whatever tools work and seek new ones, where necessary. . . . They have to be more creative and improvisational."

Byrd, who was Mitchell's predecessor as Majority Leader, used task forces and other ad hoc arrangements chiefly to help establish a party position on issues. But on legislative procedures, Byrd was more inclined to be deferential to committee chairmen. Dole, for his part, has been a more assertive leader than his predecessors and seeks to wield influence from the top.

Mitchell, in effect, has taken elements of each approach. "Sen. Mitchell uses task forces as an opportunity to be more directly involved in negotiations," Daschle said.

Mitchell, in an interview, denied that Senate operations or leadership responsibilities have been overhauled. "The issues are more complex, and individuals are more involved," he said. "But there is not a change in the way the Senate does its business."

For Mitchell and other party leaders, the budget summit has been an important test. With the deficit remaining at high levels and tax and spending issues increasingly difficult to resolve, both the White House and congressional leaders have, in effect, given up on the committee process. They view the summit talks as the best opportunity to break the stalemate.

"I do think that it's a way of highlighting the importance of the issue," said Fowler, whom Mitchell tapped as his budget summit representative. "The President is trying to head off a crisis of budget sequestration," or across-the-board spending cuts.

Many factors have complicated the process of seeking a budget agreement, not the least of which is the relationship between party leaders and committee chairmen. On the one hand, the summitters have wanted to present Congress and the public with a fait accompli that would require a single up-or-down vote in the House and Senate. But they also have sought to develop the framework for an agreement that is politically supportable, while relying on several committees to write the details—chiefly, Appropriations, Armed Services and the tax-writing panels.

A budget accord would make "academic" the money bills that have been working their way through Congress, House Minority Leader Robert H. Michel, R-Ill., said. The Appropriations and tax-writing committees would be working under tight deadlines and following a detailed outline prepared by the summitters as they wrote the legislation.

Whether it is the budget or other issues, party leaders have often said that they do not want to put their own "stamp" on issues. In an increasing number of cases, however, they have found that if they don't, no one else can.

AMENDING FOREIGN AID POLICY OF UNITED STATES TOWARD COUNTRIES IN TRANSITION FROM COMMUNISM TO DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about oil dependency today, and just a few notes on America's oil dependency.

It is very interesting that so often we hear people talking about how horrible it is that the United States is dependent on oil, especially foreign oil, and quite often people who complain the

loudest are those who have opposed over the years the development of America's own energy and oil resources. Those people, for example, who are concerned about our dependency on foreign oil also oppose America's offshore oil development, which is a source of energy that is just there, and it is a potential source of energy that we have just not tapped, even though offshore oil development is actually safer, a safer source of energy than receiving that same oil via tanker.

We also have had, of course, over the years, opposition to nuclear energy, which is another very, very clean source of energy, especially for the air, and in southern California we are very concerned about the atmosphere.

□ 1530

And yet we have seen opposition from liberal circles in the United States to development of nuclear energy to the point that other nations have raced ahead of us in providing their countries with safe and clean nuclear energy. Instead, America, since the 1970's, has heard much from our academic circles about exotic alternatives rather than real alternatives to energy and, at the same time, the development of our own energy, and whether it is oil or whether it is nuclear energy, it has been opposed, and the exotic alternatives have been presented as if they were real alternatives. Quite often they are not.

Let us note that when this philosophy held sway back in the late 1970's, it was said that America was less dependent on oil because of what was happening and the leadership that was provided in the late 1970's, but let us note that that leadership gave America one of the worst economic downturns in American history, decimating the middle class and lower classes and left us in such a bad economic situation that we are just now actually recovering from that economic debacle.

Mr. Speaker, today what I would like to speak about is not as much about domestic issues in terms of domestic energy resources as it is about America's foreign policy and American foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, what has been happening in the Soviet Union has brought us to a point where we have got to make some decisions as to what relationship we will have with Mr. Gorbachev and the current Soviet Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Nation to decide between Mikhail Gorbachev and human freedom, because as much as we may like Mikhail Gorbachev and as much as we may appreciate some of the reforms that have taken place and wish to hang on to the hopes that we had for reform in the Soviet Union, today it is becoming ever more clear that Gorbachev and his clique in

the Kremlin represent the last gasp of communism on this Earth.

The brutal repression of the Baltic States and the ominous return of repression by the Soviet central government demonstrate a need for a fundamental change on how we hand out foreign aid in that part of the world. Today I have introduced the Direct Aid to Democracies Act, legislation that would make it a fundamental policy of the United States to give our aid whenever feasible and to provide that aid through democratically elected constituent republic governments rather than repressive central governments.

Now, since the end of World War II and the introduction of the Marshall plan, we have used foreign aid to help those less fortunate and to further our ideals around the world and, yes, to combat communism and other forms of tyranny. A policy of funneling our aid through a central government like that in the Soviet Union or in Yugoslavia, Communist dictatorships, doing this undermines the very purposes of American foreign aid.

The Baltics are the most prominent but not the only example of this dilemma. Attacks against the forces of democracy in Lithuania and Latvia are but a replay of the massacres of democratic demonstrators in the Republics of Georgia and Azerbaijan in 1989 and 1990. In Yugoslavia there are reports of human rights violations against ethnic Albanians in Serbia, and the threat of military force against efforts to establish an independent and democratic government in both Croatia and Slovenia.

BOB DOLE is the sponsor of my bill in the Senate. He relates how he was told by the Prime Minister of Moldavia of President Gorbachev's threat to cut off U.S. grain to any republic which failed to sign the Union Treaty, and the Union Treaty, of course, is a renunciation of independence and democracy.

U.S. foreign aid must not be used as a club to beat the forces of democracy into submission.

Secretary of State Jim Baker's announcement last week that medical aid will be given directly to the Baltic governments is a welcome step, but what is needed is a complete change of course. The Dole-Rohrabacher Direct Aid to Democracies Act will ensure that our aid furthers our ideals and bolsters the cause of democracy.

I am pleased that this bill is cosponsored in the Senate by both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman, CLAIBORNE PELL, and the ranking Republican, JESSE HELMS.

In the House, original cosponsors include the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], ranking Republican on the

Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the Republican whip, and 24 other Members.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues for their support of this legislation so we can establish once and for all that United States aid must go to help people in Communist countries who are fighting for democracy, not go to Communist dictatorships to try to bolster their control over the people.

We have got many decisions like this to make, and as we see that area of the world go into transition, because, indeed, we are witnessing a transition that is of historic significance in the Eastern block, it is clear to all Americans as we have seen the Berlin Wall come down, as we have seen the vast changes that have gone through Eastern Europe, while those changes are taking place in the Soviet Union today and just as we should have been on the side of democracy in the cases of Eastern Europe, we must be on the side of democracy, and in this great transition that is going on in the Soviet Union.

Unfortunately, the Communist dictatorship lingers on. The last residue of this clique that has maintained control through terror and through a raw exercise of power over these many years remains in the Kremlin. Mr. Gorbachev, unfortunately, seems to be unduly influenced by this clique, if that clique, indeed, has not overwhelmed him.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the United States to go on the record and to make it a matter of policy that in this historic moment we are, indeed, on the side of those who are struggling for democracy in that part of the world, whether it be those people in the Baltics, whether it be those people in Byelorussia or the Ukraine or whether it be those people in Soviet Georgia or Armenia. Those people who would wish to establish independent democracies are the friends of the United States.

Because if we in America do not stand for freedom and we do not stand for those people, what is it that we stand for?

There has been a lot of talk lately about a new world order. What does a new world order mean? Well, if a new world order means that we are in some way casting aside our commitment to freedom and democracy and siding with brave individuals who are struggling for freedom and democracy, then the new world order can count me out. But if, instead, the new world order means that we in the United States will reaffirm that freedom and democracy are the rights of every individual on this planet and that we will struggle to build a planet in which every country guarantees those human rights which we feel are the rights of every man, woman, and child on this planet, then that is the new world order that will receive the allegiance not only of the American people but will capture the

imagination of this planet and, indeed, will not only aid this historic transition but will, indeed, become the spirit of a new era of human history.

I thank the Speaker, and I ask my colleagues to join with me today on this vital piece of legislation.

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. PROVISION FOR DIRECT UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENTS AT THE REPUBLIC LEVEL.

An essential purpose of United States foreign assistance is to foster the development of democratic institutions and free enterprise systems. In regard to United States assistance to those nations which are in transition from communism to democracy, it is the policy of the United States to provide foreign aid, to the extent feasible, directly to democratic governments at the republic level that exist within countries which include a ruling communist majority in other republic governments and/or at the Federal level.

HIGH-SPEED RAIL TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1991

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

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman DON RITTER, in introducing legislation that will move our transportation system into the 21st century, the High-Speed Rail Transportation Policy and Development Act of 1991. There is at least one mode of transportation which, if infused with some vision and innovation, could keep our country moving forward. Mr. Speaker, I am strong in my belief that passenger rail travel, something this country has known well for over 100 years, is a concept whose time has come again.

In 1965, Congress passed the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act, recognizing the need for an efficient, vital transportation network. Under authority granted in that act, and subsequently expanded under the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970, the Federal Railroad Administration initiated a variety of research efforts to evaluate and test new forms of high-speed rail transportation.

The most significant result of these efforts was the development of the linear electric motor, the drive system on which emerging high-speed systems are based today. In 1974, a research vehicle powered by linear induction reached a speed of 255 miles per hour during tests in Colorado. The groundwork for a system we all know and benefit from today, Amtrak's 125-mile-per-hour Metroliner, was also laid at that time. However, Federal funding for these efforts dried up in 1976.

Since then, we've witnessed troubling developments. Our existing transportation system, marvel that it is, has become choked to the point of capacity: airports and interstates are clogged, creating a drag on our economy at the cost of billions of dollars a year. In addition, increasing volumes of car and air travel

are having unknown cumulative effects on the environment.

Germany and Japan, meanwhile, have seized on the innovations we uncovered in the 1960's and 1970's and moved ahead with attempts to advance existing transportation technology to new levels of efficiency. Full-scale magnetic levitation prototypes are in development in both countries; in fact, the German system is up and running, capable of carrying passengers at 300 miles per hour on a test track. France and Japan have fully developed advanced steel-wheel trains that are in revenue service today, carrying riders from city to city at 200 miles per hour.

Our transportation problems are not going to go away. They are things we must reckon with as we seek to maintain our quality of life at home and our competitive position abroad. The legislation we put before the House today represents the culmination of a bipartisan effort begun last Congress to invigorate the Nation's passenger railroad system. Quite simply, it proposes to see through the investment begun by this country 26 years ago.

This bill would require the Federal Railroad Administration to complete indepth economic and technical analyses of existing high-speed rail technology. Among the questions it will seek to answer is which technologies currently at hand would be commercially viable in terms of potential markets here and abroad. In addition it will seek to determine means by which high-speed rail development projects can be undertaken, and their potential construction costs, revenue structures, and operating costs.

Upon completion of the analysis, the Administration would be asked to establish a national high-speed rail policy based on its findings within 6 months. Such policy would be aimed at promoting the competitiveness of U.S. industry in the field of high-speed rail by providing guidance on how technologies could be effectively integrated with the existing transportation system. Lastly, this legislation would amend the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 to make certain provisions within that statute applicable to the development of additional high-speed rail systems.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation represents a sensible approach to moving one significant aspect of the national transportation system forward. It does not ask for massive commitment of Federal resources; instead it aims at developing expertise that will be instrumental to industry, as well as State and local government, in making safe, efficient high-speed transportation a reality. In fact, the level of appropriations authorized in this legislation does not exceed the administration's request for fiscal year 1992. Furthermore, this act does not seek to supercede current efforts to develop high-speed rail technology. Rather, it seeks to complement and enhance those efforts.

Today, we've started to reexamine and build from the progress we made beginning in 1965. A small investment and a little ingenuity back then led to technology that has brought important new transportation systems within reach today. Now it is time to truly benefit from this investment and set forth a policy that will transport America boldly forward.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE FOR THE 102D CONGRESS

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to the rules of the House a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture, which were adopted at the organizational meeting on February 7, 1991. The rules were agreed to by a unanimous voice vote.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

a. *Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.*—The Rules of the House shall govern the procedure of the Committee so far as applicable, and the rules of the Committee shall be interpreted in accordance with the Rules of the House, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are nondebatable motions of high privilege in committees and subcommittees. (See Appendix B for the applicable Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.)

b. *Applicability to Subcommittees.*—The following rules shall apply to meetings, hearings, and other activities of Subcommittees, which are part of the Committee and subject to its authority and direction, only when specifically so stated.

II. COMMITTEE OR SUBCOMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETINGS

a. *Regular and Additional Meetings.*—The Committee shall meet on the first Tuesday of each month while Congress is in session. The Committee also shall meet at the call of the Chairman at such other times as he considers to be necessary, subject to advance notice to all Committee members. Insofar as practicable, an agenda for all regular and additional Committee meetings, setting forth all the measures and matters to be considered, shall be furnished each Committee member prior to the meeting. Items may be placed on the agenda by the Chairman or a majority of the Committee. If the Chairman determines that any meeting convened by him need not be held, he shall give all members of the Committee notice to that effect as far in advance of the meeting day as practicable, and no meeting shall be held on such day. See Rule VI. e. for provisions which apply to meetings of Subcommittees.

b. *Special Meetings.*—If at least three members of the Committee file a written request in the Committee offices that a special meeting be called by the Chairman to consider a specific measure or matter, the Staff Director shall immediately notify the Chairman of the filing of such request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of such request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held at a time within seven calendar days after the filing of such request, a majority of the members of the Committee may file in the Committee offices their written notice that a special meeting will be held at a specified date and hour to consider a specified measure or matter. If such a notice is filed, the Committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of such a notice, the Staff Director shall notify all members of the Committee that such special meeting will be held at the specified date and hour to

consider the specified measure or matter. Only the measure or matter so specified in the meeting notice as filed by the majority of Committee members and transmitted to all Committee members may be considered at a special meeting.

c. *Vice Chairman.*—The member of the majority party on the Committee ranking immediately after the Chairman of the Committee shall be the Vice Chairman of the Committee, and the member of the majority party on each Subcommittee ranking immediately after the Chairman of the Subcommittee shall be the Vice Chairman of that Subcommittee.

d. *Presiding Member.*—If the Chairman is not present at any Committee meeting or hearing, the Vice Chairman or, in the absence of the Vice Chairman, the ranking member of the majority party on the Committee who is present shall preside. If the Chairman is not present at any Subcommittee meeting or hearing, the Vice Chairman or, in the absence of the Vice Chairman, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside.

e. *Committee and Subcommittee Meetings Prohibited.*—The Committee or any of its Subcommittees may not sit, without special leave, while the House is reading a measure for amendment under the five-minute rule.

f. *Open Business Meetings.*—Each Committee or Subcommittee meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, shall be open to the public except when the Committee or Subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No person other than members of the Committee or Subcommittee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee or Subcommittee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session that has been closed to the public. This clause does not apply to Committee or Subcommittee hearings or to any meeting that, as announced by the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

g. *Records and Rollcalls.*—A complete record of all Committee or Subcommittee action shall be kept in the form of written minutes, including a record of the votes on any question as to which a rollcall is demanded. A rollcall vote shall be ordered on demand by one-fifth of the members present. The record of such action and the results of the rollcall votes during each session of Congress shall be made available by the Committee, on request, for public inspection during regular office hours in the Committee offices and on telephone request. The information so available on rollcall votes shall include a brief description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition; the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or other proposition; whether such vote was by proxy or in person; and names of those members present but not voting. A stenographic record of a business meeting of the Committee or Subcommittee may be kept and thereafter may be published if the Chairman of the Committee determines there is need for such a record. The proceedings of the Committee or Subcommittee in a closed meeting other than rollcall votes shall not be divulged unless otherwise determined by a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee. See Rule IV. f. for publication of the minutes of meetings.

h. *Quorum.*—A majority of the members of the Committee or Subcommittee shall con-

stitute a quorum of the Committee or Subcommittee for the purpose of convening meetings, conducting business, and voting on any matter: *Provided*, That the Chairman of the Committee may determine that one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum of the Committee at any meeting for such purpose (other than for the reporting of any measure or recommendation, and voting on the authorization of subpoenas and on the closing of hearings and business meetings to the public) if he gives written notice to that effect to the members prior to the meeting.

i. *Proxy Voting.*—A member may vote by proxy on any matter before the Committee or Subcommittee other than the issuance of a subpoena pursuant to Rule III. c. The proxy authorization shall be in writing, shall assert that the member is absent on official business or otherwise is unable to be present at the Committee or Subcommittee meeting, shall designate the member who is to execute the proxy authorization, and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto. A member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn, or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning the vote and shall contain the date and time of day the proxy is signed as well as the date or dates during which it is to be effective. (See Appendix A for the proxy form required by the Committee or Subcommittee.) In order to be cast in a vote, a proxy shall be filed with the Committee or Subcommittee during such vote and must be placed on file with the Staff Director. Proxies shall not be counted toward a quorum.

j. *Location of Persons at Meetings.*—No person other than a Member of Congress or Committee or Subcommittee staff may walk in or be seated at the rostrum area during a meeting of the Committee or Subcommittee unless the Chairman or a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee determines otherwise.

k. *Consideration of Amendments and Motions.*—A member, upon request, may be recognized at a meeting for not more than five minutes on behalf of an amendment or motion offered by himself or another member, or upon any other matter under consideration, unless he receives unanimous consent to extend the time limit. Every amendment, substitute amendment, amendment to an amendment, or amendment in the nature of a substitute made in Committee or Subcommittee that is substantial as determined by the Chairman shall, upon the demand of any member present, be reduced to writing, and a copy thereof shall be made available to all members present: *Provided*, That such amendment shall remain pending before the Committee or Subcommittee and may not be voted on until the requirements of this section have been met.

l. *Points of Order.*—No point of order, other than a point of order that a quorum is not present, against the hearing or meeting procedures of the Committee or Subcommittee shall be sustained unless it is made in a timely fashion either at the commencement of the hearing or meeting or at the time such occasion for a point of order first occurs.

III. COMMITTEE OR SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

a. *Power to Hear.*—For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rules X and XI, the Committee is authorized to sit and hold hearings at any time or place within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned. See Rule VI. e. for provisions re-

lating to Subcommittee hearings and meetings.

b. Announcement of Hearings.—The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee shall publicly announce the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Committee or Subcommittee or the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or Subcommittee, as applicable, determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date, in which case the announcement of the hearing shall be made by the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee at the earliest possible date. The Staff Director shall notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement has been made and enter the announcement into the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems.

c. Power to Subpoenas.—For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rules X and XI, the Committee is authorized to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. A subpoena may be authorized and issued in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities by the Committee or by a Subcommittee when authorized by a rollcall vote of the majority of the members of the Committee, a majority being present, except that no proxies may be used to vote on the authorization and issuance of such a subpoena. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the Committee or by any other member the Committee may designate. Notice of a meeting to consider a motion to authorize and issue a subpoena shall be given to all members of the full Committee by 5 p.m. of the day preceding the day of such meeting. Compliance with a Committee or Subcommittee issued subpoena may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

d. Scheduling of Hearings and Witnesses.—Except as otherwise provided in this clause, the scheduling of hearings and witnesses and determination of the time allowed for the presentation of testimony and interrogation shall be at the discretion of the Chairman or a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee. Whenever any hearing is conducted by the Committee or Subcommittee on any measure or matter, the Committee's or Subcommittee's minority party members shall be entitled, on request by a majority of them to the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by them to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing.

e. Witnesses' Statements in Advance.—Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or Subcommittee shall, insofar as practicable, file with the Staff Director a written statement of the witness's prepared testimony at least two working days in advance of the witness's appearance in order to permit the testimony to be distributed to and reviewed in advance by Committee or Subcommittee members. Witnesses shall provide sufficient copies of their statement for distribution to Committee or Subcommittee members, staff, and the news media. The Committee or Subcommittee staff shall distribute such written statements to all mem-

bers of the Committee or Subcommittee as soon as they are received as well as any official reports from departments and agencies on such subject matter.

f. Testimony of Witnesses.—The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee or any member designated by him may administer an oath to any witness. Each witness who has been subpoenaed, on the completion of the witness's testimony, may report in person or in writing to the Staff Director and sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees. All witnesses may be limited in their oral presentations to brief summaries of their statements within the time allowed to them, at the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee in light of the nature of the testimony and the length of time available.

g. Questioning of Witnesses.—Committee or Subcommittee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee for that purpose. Each member so recognized shall be limited to questioning a witness (or panel of witnesses) for five minutes until such time as each member of the Committee or Subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness (or panel of witnesses) for five minutes, and, thereafter, the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee may limit the time of further questioning after giving due consideration to the importance of the subject matter and the length of time available. All questions put to witnesses shall be germane to the measure or matter under consideration. Unless the Chairman or a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee determines otherwise, no person shall interrogate witnesses other than members and Committee or Subcommittee staff.

h. Open Hearings.—Each hearing conducted by the Committee or Subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or Subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That the Committee or Subcommittee may, by the same procedure, vote to close one subsequent day of hearing. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony (1) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or violate Rule III. k. or (2) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in Rule III. k. In any event, no Member of the House may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing unless the House by majority vote shall authorize the Committee or Subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its meetings to members by means of the above procedure.

i. Quorum.—The quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence shall be two members of the Committee or Subcommittee.

j. Record of Hearing.—An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all testimony taken at public hearings. Any public witness, during Committee office hours in the Com-

mittee offices and within two weeks of the close of hearings, may examine the transcript of his or her own testimony and make such grammatical or technical changes as will not substantially alter the nature of testimony given. Members of the Committee or Subcommittee shall receive copies of transcripts for their prompt review and correction for return to the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee may order the printing of a hearing record without the correction of any member or witness if he determines that such member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time in which to make such corrections and further delay would seriously impede the consideration of the legislative action that is the subject of the hearing. The record of a hearing closes ten calendar days after the last oral testimony, unless the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee otherwise determines. Any person requesting to file a statement for the record of a hearing must so request before the hearing concludes and must file the statement before the record closes. No written statement becomes part of the record and thus publicly available until such time as it has been approved by the Chairman of the Committee or any Committee staff he designates, and the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee or his designee may reject any statement in light of its length or its tendency to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

k. Investigative Hearings.—The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee at an investigative hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation. A copy of the Committee rules (and the applicable provision of the House Rules set forth in Appendix B) shall be made available to each witness. Witnesses at investigative hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights. The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; but only the full Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt. Whenever it is asserted that the evidence or testimony at an investigatory hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person—

(1) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of Rule III, h., if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or Subcommittee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; or

(2) the Committee or Subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if a majority of the members of the Committee or Subcommittee, a majority being present, determine that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

In either case the Committee or Subcommittee shall afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and the Committee or Subcommittee shall receive and the Committee shall dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

Except as provided above, the Chairman shall receive and the Committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses. No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in

public sessions without the consent of the Committee or Subcommittee. In the discretion of the Committee or Subcommittee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Committee or Subcommittee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearings. A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee or Subcommittee.

1. *Broadcasting and Photography.*—Television, film making, and live radio broadcasting of all or part of any Committee hearing or meeting shall be permitted only when the Committee by a majority vote agrees or, if the Committee cannot be polled in a timely manner, when approved by the Chairman of the Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member. Except as otherwise determined by the Committee, television, film making, and live radio broadcasting of all or part of any Subcommittee hearing or meeting shall be permitted only when the Subcommittee by a majority vote agrees or, if the Subcommittee cannot be polled in a timely manner, when approved by the Chairman of the Committee or the Chairman of the Subcommittee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or Subcommittee. Radio broadcasting that is not live and still photography are permitted of any Committee or Subcommittee meeting or hearing unless otherwise determined by the Chairman of the Committee or applicable Subcommittee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or Subcommittee. *Provided*, That when such radio broadcasting is conducted, written notice to that effect shall be placed on the desk of each Member. Each Committee or Subcommittee Chairman shall determine, in his or her discretion, the number of television and still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room. Any broadcasting, electronic recording, film making, or still photography of all or part of a hearing or meeting shall be subject to the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 3(f), which appear in Appendix B.

IV. THE REPORTING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

a. *Filing of Reports.*—The Chairman shall report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any bill or resolution approved by the Committee and shall take or cause to be taken all necessary steps to bring such bill or resolution to a vote. A Committee report on any bill or resolution approved by the Committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (not counting days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the Staff Director of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the Committee, for the reporting of that bill or resolution. The Staff Director of the Committee shall notify the Chairman immediately when such a request is filed.

b. *Content of Reports.*—Each Committee report on any bill or resolution approved by the Committee shall include as separately identified sections:

- (1) a statement of the intent or purpose of the bill or resolution;
- (2) a statement describing the need for such bill or resolution;
- (3) the results of the rollcall vote on the motion to report such bill or resolution, including the total number of votes cast for and total number of votes cast against such reporting;
- (4) the detailed statement described in section 308(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget

Act of 1974 if the bill or resolution provides new budget authority (other than continuing appropriations), new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2) of such Act, new credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures;

(5) the estimate of costs and comparison of such estimates, if any, prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with such bill or resolution pursuant to section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and submitted in timely fashion to the Committee;

(6) any oversight findings and recommendations made by the Committee or the Committee on Government Operations or both to the extent such were available during the Committee's deliberations on the bill or resolution;

(7) a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy;

(8) an estimate of the costs that would be incurred in carrying out such bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and for its authorized duration or for each of the five fiscal years following the fiscal year of reporting, whichever period is less, together with a comparison of these estimates with those made and submitted to the Committee by any Government agency (the provisions of this clause do not apply if a cost estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 has been timely submitted prior to the filing of the report and included in the report);

(9) the changes in existing law (if any) shown in accordance with Rule XIII, clause 3, of the House Rules;

(10) the determination required pursuant to section 5(b) of Public Law 92-463, if the legislation reported establishes or authorizes the establishment of an advisory committee; and

(11) such other matter as the Chairman of the Committee determines to be useful for public understanding of the intent and effect of the bill or resolution.

c. *Supplemental Minority, or Additional Views.*—If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the Staff Director of the Committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter. The report of the Committee on that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume, which shall:

- (1) include all supplemental, minority, or additional views that have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report; and
- (2) bear on its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under subdivisions (C) and (D) of paragraph (1)(3) of House Rule XI, clause 2) are included as part of the report.

This clause shall not preclude the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by

this clause or the filing by the Committee of any supplemental report on any bill or resolution that may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee on that bill or resolution.

d. *Availability of Printed Hearing Records.*—If hearings have been held on any reported bill or resolution, the Committee shall make every reasonable effort to have the record of such hearings printed and available for distribution to the Members of the House prior to the consideration of such bill or resolution by the House.

e. *Committee Prints.*—All Committee or Subcommittee prints or other Committee or Subcommittee documents, other than reports or prints of bills, that are prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Chairman of the Committee or the Committee prior to public distribution.

f. *Publication of Minutes.*—The Chairman of the Committee, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall cause to be published as a Committee Print on a periodic basis (and insofar as practicable on a semi-annual basis) the minutes of all business meetings and hearings of the Committee and any of its Subcommittees; and such minutes shall include a record of the attendance of members, all recorded votes, and the action on all amendments and motions relating to legislation.

V. OTHER COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

a. *Annual Appropriations.*—The Committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, ensure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. The Committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefore would be made annually.

b. *Budget Act Compliance: Views and Estimates.* (See Appendix C).—The Committee shall, within 6 weeks after the President submits a budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year (under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) that are within its jurisdiction or functions, and (2) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction that it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

c. *Budget Act Compliance: Subdivision of Allocation.* (See Appendix C).—As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the Committee (after consulting with the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate) shall subdivide any allocations made to it in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on such resolution, and promptly report such subdivisions to the House, in the manner provided by section 602 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

d. *Budget Act Compliance: Recommended Changes.* (See Appendix C).—Whenever the Committee is directed in a concurrent reso-

lution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process, it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

e. Conference Committees.—Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman shall determine the number of conferees he deems most suitable and then recommend to the Speaker as conferees, in keeping with the number to be chosen, the names of those members of the Committee who were primarily responsible for the legislation and, to the fullest extent feasible, those members of the Committee who were the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as it passed the House and such other Committee members of the majority party as the Chairman may designate in consultation with the members of the majority party. Such recommendations shall provide a ratio of majority party members to minority party members no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio of majority members to minority party members on the Committee. In making recommendations of minority party members as conferees, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

f. Committee Records.—All Committee or Subcommittee hearing materials, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as Chairman, and such records shall be the property of the House with all Members of the House having access thereto. The Staff Director shall promptly notify the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of any request for access to such records.

g. Archiving of Committee Record.—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

VI. SUBCOMMITTEES

a. Number and Composition.—There shall be such Subcommittees as specified in clause b of this rule each of which shall be composed of the number of members set forth in such clause, including ex officio members. The Chairman may create additional Subcommittees of an ad hoc nature as he determines to be appropriate.

b. Jurisdiction.—The Subcommittees shall have the following general jurisdiction and number of members.

COMMODITY SUBCOMMITTEES

Cotton, Rice, and Sugar (20 members, 12 majority and 8 minority).—Cotton, cottonseed, rice, and sugar matters, generally.

Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry (23 members, 14 majority and 9 minority).—Livestock (including aquaculture), dairy, poultry, and bees, generally.

Peanuts and Tobacco (10 members, 6 majority and 4 minority).—Tobacco and peanut matters, generally.

Wheat, Soybeans, and Feed Grains (20 members, 12 majority and 8 minority).—Wheat,

soybeans, feed grains, oilseeds not otherwise assigned, dry beans, peas, and lentils, generally.

OPERATIONAL SUBCOMMITTEES

Conservation, Credit, and Rural Development (21 members, 13 majority and 8 minority).—Soil and water conservation, small watershed program, commodity futures, agricultural credit, and rural development matters, generally.

Department Operations, Research, and Foreign Agriculture (25 members, 15 majority and 10 minority).—Foreign agricultural programs, agency review and analysis, research, and pesticides, generally.

Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations, and Nutrition (11 members, 7 majority and 4 minority).—Marketing orders, domestic marketing, food stamps, nutrition and consumer programs, generally.

Forests, Family Farms, and Energy (15 members, 9 majority and 6 minority).—Family farming, forestry, and energy matters, generally.

c. Referral of Legislation.—In the case of any measure or matter not specifically described above, or that includes the jurisdiction of two or more Subcommittees, the Chairman may, unless the Committee by a majority vote decides otherwise, refer such measure or matter simultaneously to two or more Subcommittees for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations in the case of any Subcommittee), or divide the matter into two or more parts reflecting different subjects and jurisdiction and refer each part to a different Subcommittee, or refer the matter to an ad hoc Subcommittee appointed by him for the specific purpose of considering that matter and reporting to the Committee thereon, or make such other provisions as may be appropriate. The Chairman, with the approval of a majority of the Committee, shall have authority to discharge a Subcommittee from further consideration of any bill, resolution, or other matter referred thereto and have such bill, resolution, or other matter considered by the Committee. All legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to all Subcommittees of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks unless, by majority vote of the members of the Committee, consideration is to be by the Committee.

d. Service on Subcommittees.—The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall serve as ex officio members of all Subcommittees and shall have the right to vote on all matters before such Subcommittees, but shall not be counted for the purpose of establishing a quorum. Any member of the Committee may have the privilege of sitting with any Subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and participate therein, but shall not have authority to vote on any matter, nor be counted present for the purpose of a quorum for any Subcommittee action, nor, except as the Subcommittee Chairman or a majority of the Subcommittee may permit, participate in questioning of witnesses under the five-minute rule, nor raise points of order unless such member is a member of such Subcommittee.

e. Subcommittee Hearings and Meeting.—Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee Chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their Subcommittees, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and one another, with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Com-

mittee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible. Notice of all such meetings shall be given to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee by the Staff Director. No Subcommittee shall hold meetings or hearings outside of the House unless permission to do so is granted by the Chairman, or a majority, of the Committee. If a vacancy should occur in a Subcommittee chairmanship, the Chairman of the Committee may set the dates for hearings and meetings of the Subcommittee during the period between the date of the vacancy and the date the vacancy is filled. The provisions of Rule II. a. regarding notice and agenda of Committee meetings and of Rule II. b. regarding special meetings shall apply as well to Subcommittee meetings.

f. Subcommittee Action.—Any bill, resolution, recommendation, or other matter ordered reported to the Committee by a Subcommittee shall be promptly reported by the Subcommittee Chairman or any Subcommittee member authorized to do so by the Subcommittee. Upon receipt of such report, the Staff Director shall promptly advise all members of the Committee of the Subcommittee action. The Committee shall not consider any matters reported by Subcommittees until two calendar days have elapsed from the date of reporting, unless the Chairman or a majority of the Committee determines otherwise.

g. Subcommittee Investigation.—Except for the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Research, and Foreign Agriculture, no investigation shall be initiated by a Subcommittee without the approval of the Chairman of the Committee or a majority of the Committee.

VII. COMMITTEE BUDGET, STAFF, AND TRAVEL

a. Committee Budget.—The Chairman, in consultation with the majority members of the Committee, shall for each session of the Congress prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee and Subcommittee thereof. After consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman shall include an amount budgeted to minority members for staff under their direction and supervision. Thereafter, the Chairman shall combine such proposals into a consolidated Committee budget, and shall take whatever action is necessary to have such budget duly authorized by the House.

b. Committee Staff.—The staff of the Committee shall perform such duties as are authorized by law and shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman. Staff assigned to each Subcommittee shall perform such duties as are authorized by law and shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman of the Committee and the Chairman of the Subcommittee. Committee members seeking assistance from the staff shall make their requests through the Chairman or Ranking Minority Member. The Chairman shall ensure that each Subcommittee is adequately funded and staffed to discharge its responsibilities.

c. Committee Travel.—Funds authorized for the Committee under clause 5 of House Rule XI are for expenses incurred in the Committee's activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee and its employers engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States, its territories or possessions. No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of mem-

bers of the Committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose; and the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of the Committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in applicable Federal law; and

(2) Each member or employee of the Committee shall make an itemized report to the Chairman within 60 days following the completion of travel showing the dates each country was visited, the amount of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, and any funds expended for any other official purpose, and shall summarize in these categories the total foreign currencies and appropriated funds expended. All such individual reports shall be filed by the Chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

VIII. AMENDMENT OF RULES

These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed, by a majority vote of the Committee, provided that two legislative days written notice of the proposed change has been provided each member of the Committee prior to the meeting date on which such changes are to be discussed and voted upon.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION FOR THE 102D CONGRESS

(Mr. ROSE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XI, clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit herewith a copy of the rules of the Committee on House Administration for publication in the RECORD. The Committee on House Administration approved the rules at its organizational meeting on February 20, 1991.

RULES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

RULE NO. 1.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House are the rules of the committee and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committees and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the committee is a part of the committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(b) The committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under House Rule X and (subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by House Rule XI, clause 5) to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) The committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

(d) The committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of

the committee under House Rules X and XI during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, of such year.

(e) The committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Congress convenes in each odd-numbered year.

RULE NO. 2.—REGULAR AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee on House Administration shall be the first Wednesday of every month when the House is in session in accordance with Clause 2(b) of House Rule XI. Additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the members of the committee in accordance with Clause 2(c) of House Rule XI. The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the chairman subject to Clause 2(c) of House Rule XI. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered.

(b) If the chairman of the committee or subcommittee is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee the ranking member of the majority party on the committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at the meeting.

RULE NO. 3.—OPEN MEETINGS

As required by clause 2(g), of House Rule XI, each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the committee or its subcommittees, shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public: *Provided, however*, That no person other than members of the committee, and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This provision does not apply to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

RULE NO. 4.—RECORDS AND ROLLCALLS

(a) The result of each rollcall vote in any meeting of the committee shall be made available for inspection by the public at reasonable times at the committee offices, including a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition; the name of each member voting for and against, and whether by proxy or in person; and the members present but not voting.

(b) All Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

(c) In order to facilitate committee compliance with House Rule XI, Clause 2(e)(1), each subcommittee shall keep a complete record of all subcommittee actions which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded. The result of each such rollcall vote shall be promptly made available to the full committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition; the name of each member voting for and against such, and whether by proxy or in per-

son; and the names of members present but not voting.

(d) All subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files, shall be kept distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as chairman of the subcommittee. Such records shall be coordinated with the records of the full committee, shall be the property of the House, and all members of the House shall have access thereto.

(e) House records of the committee which are at the National Archives shall be made available pursuant to House Rule XXXVI. The chairman of the committee shall notify the ranking minority party member of any decision to withhold a record pursuant to the rule, and shall present the matter to the committee upon written request of any committee member.

RULE NO. 5.—PROXIES

A vote by any member in the committee or in any subcommittee may be cast by proxy, but such proxy must be in writing and in the hands of the clerk of the committee or the clerk of the subcommittee, as the case may be, during each rollcall in which such member's proxy is to be voted. Each proxy shall designate the member who is to execute the proxy authorization and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum. The member does not have to appear in person to present the proxy.

RULE NO. 6.—POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rules X and XI, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph)—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings; and

(2) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents; as it deems necessary. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by the chairman, may administer oaths of any witness.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by a committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subparagraph (a)(2) may be delegated to the chairman of the committee pursuant to such rules and under such limitations as the committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by the committee.

(2) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

RULE NO. 7.—QUORUMS

No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House unless a majority of the committee is actually present. For the purposes of taking any action other than re-

porting any measure, issuance of a subpoena, closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders, or changing the Rules of the Committee, the quorum shall be one-third of the members of the Committee. For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

RULE NO. 8.—AMENDMENTS

Any amendment offered to any pending legislation before the committee must be made available in written form when requested by any member of the committee. If such amendment is not available in written form when requested, the chair will allow an appropriate period of time for the provision thereof.

RULE NO. 9.—HEARING PROCEDURES

(a) The chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least 1 week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event the chairman or the subcommittee chairman whichever the case may be shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) Unless excused by the chairman, each witness who is to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee, at least 48 hours in advance of his appearance, a written statement of his proposed testimony and shall limit his oral presentation to a summary of his statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearings thereon.

(d) All other members of the committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearing or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no member who is not a member of the subcommittee shall vote on any matter before such subcommittee.

(e) Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the chairman for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of a witness in both full and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority. The chairman may accomplish this by recognizing two majority members for each minority member recognized.

(f) The following additional rules shall apply to hearings:

(1) The chairman at a hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the committee rules and this clause shall be made available to each witness.

(3) Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(5) If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall—

(A) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness;

(B) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session; and

(C) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in subparagraph (f)(5), the chairman shall receive and the committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(7) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the committee.

(8) In the discretion of the committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The committee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(9) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee.

RULE NO. 10.—PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

(a)(1) It shall be the duty of the chairman of the committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, the report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the committee notice of the filing of that request.

(b)(1) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the committee unless a majority of the committee was actually present.

(2) With respect to each rollcall vote on a motion to report any bill or resolution of a public character, the total number of votes cast for, and the total number of votes cast against, the reporting of such bill or resolution shall be included in the committee report.

(c) The report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall include—

(1) the oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to House Rule X, of

clause 2(b)(1) separately set out and clearly identified;

(2) the statement required by section 308(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the measure provides new budget authority or new or increased tax expenditures;

(3) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of such Act, separately set out and clearly identified, whenever the Director (if timely submitted prior to the filing of the report) has submitted such estimate and comparison to the committee; and

(4) a summary of the oversight findings and recommendations made by the Committee on Government Operations under House Rule X, clause 4(c)(2) separately set out and clearly identified whenever such findings and recommendations have been submitted to the committee in a timely fashion to allow an opportunity to consider such findings and recommendations during the committee's deliberations on the measure.

(d) Each report of the committee on each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by the committee shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

(e) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the committee, any member, of the committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than 3 calendar days, commencing on the day on which the measure or matter(s) was approved, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the committee with respect to that measure or matter. The report of the committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(1) shall include supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(2) shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views and any material submitted under subparagraphs (c)(3) and (c)(4) are included as part of the report. This subparagraph does not preclude—

(A) the immediate filing or printing of a committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by paragraph (c); or

(B) the filing of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the committee upon that measure or matter.

(f) If hearings have been held on any such measure or matter so reported, the committee shall make every reasonable effort to have such hearings printed and available for distribution to the members of the House prior to the consideration of such measure or matter in the House.

RULE NO. 11.—SUBCOMMITTEE OVERSIGHT

The standing subcommittees of the committee shall conduct oversight of matters within their jurisdiction in accordance with House rule X, clauses 2 and 3.

RULE NO. 12.—REVIEW OF CONTINUING PROGRAMS; BUDGET ACT PROVISIONS

(a) The committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, ensure that appropriation for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirement, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. For the purposes of this paragraph a Government agency includes the organizational units of government listed in clause 7(c) of Rule XIII of House Rules.

(b) The committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdictions for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually.

(c) The committee shall, on or before February 25 of each year, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year which are within its jurisdiction or functions, and (2) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the committee (after consulting with the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate) shall subdivide any allocation made to it, the joint explanatory statement accompany the conference report on such resolution, and promptly report such subdivisions to the House, in the manner provided by section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) Whenever the committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RULE NO. 13.—BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The rule for the broadcasting of committee hearings shall be the same as Rule XI, clause 3 of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE NO. 14.—COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE STAFF

Except as provided in House Rule XI, clause 5(d), the staff of the Committee on House Administration shall be appointed as follows:

A. The subcommittee staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the subcommittee chairman within the budget approved for the subcommittee by the full committee;

B. The staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined in such manner as the minority party members of the committee shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee;

C. The employees of the committee not assigned to a standing subcommittee or to the

minority under the above provisions shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the chairman within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee.

RULE NO. 15.—TRAVEL OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of committee members and staff. Travel for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the chairman. Travel may be authorized by the chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the chairman in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the travel;
- (2) The dates during which the travel will occur;
- (3) The locations to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;
- (4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b)(1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the committee or of a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee or pertinent subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the chairman. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the chairman, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

- (A) the purpose of the travel;
- (B) the dates during which the travel will occur;
- (C) the names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;
- (D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and
- (E) the names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) Requests for travel outside the United States shall be initiated by the Chairman and shall be limited to members and permanent employees of the committee.

(3) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each subcommittee (or members and staff attending meetings or conferences) shall submit a written report to the chairman covering the activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(c) Members and staff of the committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel.

RULE NO. 16.—NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) There shall be six Standing Subcommittees. The ratio (majority/minority)

and jurisdiction of the subcommittees shall be:

Subcommittee on Procurement and Printing (4/2)—Matters pertaining to procurement contracts for goods. Matters pertaining to printing, depository libraries, material printed in Congressional Record, and executive papers.

Subcommittee on Accounts. (7/4)—Internal budget matters; expenditures from the contingent fund; changes in amounts of allowances; and consultant contracts for committees.

Subcommittee on Elections. (5/3)—Matters pertaining to the Federal Election Commission (FEC) authorization, FEC regulations, presidential public funding checkoff, federal voter registration provisions, poll closing provisions, Overseas Citizens' Voting Rights Act, and Voter Accessibility Act.

Subcommittee on Personnel and Police. (6/3)—Matters pertaining to House employees and Police, parking, restaurant, barber and beauty shop, and other House facilities and services.

Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials. (4/2)—Matters pertaining to the Library of Congress; statutory and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals; matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.

Subcommittee on Office Systems. (4/2)—Matters pertaining to furniture and furnishings for District offices; approval of all electrical and mechanical office equipment and other accoutrements for use in the offices of Members, Officers or Committees.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee may appoint such ad hoc subcommittees as he deems appropriate.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee and the ranking minority member may serve as ex officio on all subcommittees of the committee and may be counted in determining the presence of a quorum.

RULE NO. 17.—POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the chairman of the full committee and other subcommittee chairmen, with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee or subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible. It shall be the practice of the committee that meetings of subcommittees not be scheduled to occur simultaneously with meetings of the full committee. In order to ensure orderly and fair assignment of hearing and meeting rooms, hearings and meetings should be arranged in advance with the chairman through the clerk of the committee.

RULE NO. 18.—REFERRAL OF LEGISLATION TO SUBCOMMITTEES

All legislation and others matters referred to the committee shall be referred by the chairman to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within 2 weeks, unless by majority vote of the members of the full committee, consideration is to be otherwise effected. The chairman may refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees, consistent with House Rule X, clause 5, for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations), or divide the matter into two or more parts and refer each such part to

a different subcommittee, or refer the matter to an ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the chairman for the specific purpose of considering that matter and reporting to the full committee thereon, or such other provisions as may be considered appropriate. The chairman may designate a subcommittee chairman or other member to take responsibility as "floor manager" of a bill during its consideration in the House.

RULE NO. 19.—OTHER PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

The chairman of the full committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the committee.

RULE NO. 20.—DESIGNATION OF CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE

For the purposes of these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives, the staff director of the committee shall act as the clerk of the committee.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

Mr. DUNCAN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. WEISS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of medical reasons.

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. LEACH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CHANDLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOLOMON, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes each day, on February 26, 27, and 28.

Mr. LEACH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKAGGS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PEASE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHEAT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 60 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 60 minutes each day, on February 26, 27, and 28.

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

Mr. SWIFT of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mrs. BENTLEY.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. GALLO.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. CALLAHAN.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. SUNDQUIST in two instances.

Mr. BUNNING.

Mr. RIGGS.

Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. ROTH.

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

Mrs. LLOYD.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. REED.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. PEASE.

Mr. FUSTER.

Mr. DOWNEY in three instances.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. AUCCOIN.

Mrs. MINK.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. REED.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

Mr. MAVROULES.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. ORTIZ.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. STOKES in three instances.

Mr. TALLON.

Mr. KOPETSKI.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 55. Joint resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of United States-Portuguese diplomatic relations; to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 25, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

689. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's 1990 report on the Supportive Housing Demonstration Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 11387; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

690. A letter from the Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report on Enforcement Issues, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1833; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

691. A letter from the Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to Brazil (Transmittal No. DTC-21-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

692. A letter from the Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially (Transmittal No. DTC-7-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

693. A letter from the U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a report on its activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FASCELL. Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 586. A bill to require regular reports to the Congress on the amount of expenditures made to carry out Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm and on the amount of contributions made to the United States by foreign countries to support Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm; with amendments (Rept. 102-4, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FASCELL. Committee on Armed Services. H. Res. 19. A resolution calling for the submission to the House of Representatives of certain information regarding Operation Desert Shield (Report No. 102-5, Pt. 2). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. APPLEGATE:

H.R. 1046. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase, effective as of December 1, 1991, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1047. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make miscellaneous im-

provements in veterans' compensation and pension programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AUCOIN:

H.R. 1048. A bill to establish within the Department of Education an Office of Community Colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BENTLEY (for herself, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. DYMALLY):

H.R. 1049. A bill to establish radio broadcasts to the peoples of Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 1050. A bill to revise the national flood insurance program to provide for mitigation insurance coverage and claims payments to reduce damages to structures suffering severe or repetitive flooding or subject to shoreline erosion, to promote compliance with requirements for mandatory purchase of flood insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1051. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to make Federal elections more competitive, open, and honest by reducing the influence of nonparty multicandidate political committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 1052. A bill to establish the grade of General of the Army and to authorize the President to appoint Generals Colin L. Powell and H. Norman Schwarzkopf, Jr., to that grade; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLILEY:

H.R. 1053. A bill to extend until January 1, 1993, the existing suspension of duty on 1-(3-Sulfo)pyridinium hydroxide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCE (for himself, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. WISE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ECKART, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 1054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief to utilities installing acid rain reduction equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 1055. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that income of certain spouses will not be aggregated for purposes of the limitations of sections 401(a)(17) and 404(1) of such code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLEMAN of Texas:

H.R. 1056. A bill to rename the El Paso Job Corps Center; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.R. 1057. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a national least-cost energy plan and to prohibit any oil and gas leasing on Federal lands currently withdrawn from, or not available for, oil and gas leasing until such a plan is submitted to the Congress; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE (for himself and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):

H.R. 1058. A bill to designate the Lake Tahoe Basin National Forest in the States of

California and Nevada to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

H.R. 1059. A bill to amend section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide assistance for two meals served daily per person; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ERDREICH:

H.R. 1060. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 1061. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to clarify the burden of proof for unlawful employment practices in disparate impact cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1062. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the establishment of, and the deduction of contributions to, home ownership plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAYDOS (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1063. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to establish an Office of Construction Safety, Health, and Education, to improve inspections, investigations, reporting, and recordkeeping on construction sites, to require the appointment of project constructors to monitor safety on construction sites, to require construction employers to establish safety and health programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HASTERT (for himself, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. ARMEY):

H.R. 1064. 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 Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY):

H.R. 1065. A bill to prohibit land known as the Calverton Pine barrens, located on Department of Defense land in Long Island, NY, from being disposed of in any way that allows it to be commercially developed; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Operations.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. ROE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. YATRON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ECKART, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 1066. A bill to authorize a national program to reduce the threat to human health posed by exposure to contaminants in the air indoors; jointly, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Science, Space, and Technology, and Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COYNE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. PRICE, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 1067. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend qualified mortgage bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEHMAN of California (for himself and Mr. DOOLITTLE):

H.R. 1068. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute and implement a contract for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities in the South Delta, CA, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. LLOYD:

H.R. 1069. A bill to amend section 1201 of title 18, United States Code, to assure a sufficiently severe penalty for kidnappings of children that are not returned unharmed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHTLEY:

H.R. 1070. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a permanent extension of the mortgage revenue bond provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 1071. A bill for the relief of certain importers, wholesalers, and users of industrial fasteners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MORELLA:

H.R. 1072. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program of grants regarding the prevention of acquired immune deficiency syndrome in women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1073. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish programs of research with respect to acquired immune deficiency syndrome in women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage savings by increasing the amount of deductible contributions which may be made to an individual retirement account and to allow distributions from individual retirement accounts to be used without penalty to purchase a first home, to pay for higher education expenses, or to pay for certain medical costs of a catastrophic illness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 1075. A bill to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949 to repeal the reduction in the milk price support for calendar year 1992; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H.R. 1076. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the one-time exclusion on gain from the sale of a principal residence to be taken before age 55 if the taxpayer is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 1077. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny annuity benefits with respect to any Member of Congress convicted of a felony; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1078. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 and the Mineral Leasing Act to promote the production of coal and other extractive energy resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. BARRETT):

H.R. 1079. A bill to authorize funds for mass transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DELAY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. KYL, Mr. RITTER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 1080. A bill to amend the foreign aid policy of the United States toward countries in transition from communism to democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 1081. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces in the same family may request duty assignments so that not more than one member of the family is assigned to an area in which hostile fire or imminent danger pay is paid and to provide similar protection for single parents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ECKART, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TALLON, and Mr. VALENTINE):

H.R. 1082. A bill to require the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and insured depository institutions to provide clear and concise information to depositors concerning the amount of deposit insurance available on deposit at depository institutions; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. JAMES, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GOSS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. PETER-

SON of Florida, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 1083. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make a grant to Stetson University for the construction of library facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York (for herself, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FROST, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FISH, and Mrs. UNSOELD):

H.R. 1084. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to exclude from amounts treated as wages in applying the earnings test remuneration for certain part-time service for a public elementary or secondary school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 1085. A bill to provide disaster loan eligibility to small business concerns owned and controlled by members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1086. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide by imposing a tax on certain fuels based on their carbon content; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWIFT (for himself and Mr. RITTER):

H.R. 1087. A bill to authorize a high-speed rail transportation development and commercialization program, to establish a national high-speed rail transportation policy, to promote development and commercialization of high-speed rail transportation by providing Federal guarantees of certain investments in high-speed rail transportation facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TALLON (for himself, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Mr. SPENCE):

H.R. 1088. A bill to establish on a temporary basis a minimum basic formula price for the computation of class I milk prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WISE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SHARP, and Mr. BLILEY):

H.R. 1089. A bill to limit the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission over local distribution company sales for resale and transportation of natural gas for ultimate consumption as a fuel in motor vehicles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TORRICELLI:

H.R. 1090. A bill to promote environmental remediation of transferred real property and to assess a possible role for the Federal Government in such transfers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1091. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare coverage of wigs and hairpieces for individuals with alopecia that resulted from treatment of malignant disease; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1092. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to assign Department of Defense personnel to assist the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the United States Customs Service perform their border protection functions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 1093. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to provide certain protections under that act for members of the Armed Forces on active duty who have entered into housing leases and are unexpectedly deployed or reassigned to new duty assignments requiring relocation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 1094. A bill to extend until January 1, 1996, the suspension of duty on certain clock radios; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1095. A bill to extend through December 31, 1995, the existing temporary suspension of the duty on diphenyldichlorosilane and phenyltrichlorosilane; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 1096. A bill to authorize appropriations for programs, functions, and activities of the Bureau of Land Management for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995; to improve the management of the public lands; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.R. 1097. A bill to authorize funding for certain alternative fuel source and energy conservation programs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce; Ways and Means; Science, Space, and Technology; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; and Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1098. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to veterans of the Persian Gulf War eligibility for readjustment counseling services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs for Vietnam-era veterans and to ensure that family members of such Vietnam-era veterans may continue to receive such counseling services in a case in which the veteran is subsequently ordered to active duty during the Persian Gulf war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZELIFF:

H.R. 1099. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating segments of the Lamprey River in the State of New Hampshire for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN (for himself and Mr. MINETA):

H.J. Res. 139. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Barnabas McHenry as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HAMILTON, Ms. LONG, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WOLF):

H.J. Res. 140. Joint resolution designating November 19, 1991, as "National Philanthropy Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

H.J. Res. 141. Joint resolution designating the week beginning May 13, 1991, as "National Senior Nutrition Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.J. Res. 142. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 1, 1991, as

"National Campus Crime and Security Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KYL:

H.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that expenditures for a fiscal year shall neither exceed revenues for such fiscal year nor 19 percentum of the Nation's gross national product for the last calendar year ending before the beginning of such fiscal year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MOODY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ASPIN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WISE, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. KLUG, Mr. ECKART, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. BRYANT):

H.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to designate April 22, 1991, as "Earth Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHEAT:

H.J. Res. 145. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEAT (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MFUME, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WASHINGTON, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress regarding racially offensive remarks by officials of the Japanese Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSE:

H. Res. 84. Resolution electing members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H. Res. 85. Resolution to establish a House Commission on Legislative Process Reform; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H. Res. 86. Resolution impeaching George Herbert Walker Bush, President of the United States, of high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H. Res. 87. Resolution calling for freedom and democracy for the people of Kashmir; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. YATRON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr.

BEREUTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GOSS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Res. 88. Resolution condemning Cuba's human rights violations, and commending the United Nations Human Rights Commission for its attention to the human rights situation in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself and Mr. BROOMFIELD):

H. Res. 89. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 1st session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H. Res. 90. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the steps which the United States must take to ensure that all Americans have decent and affordable housing; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. STOKES:

H. Res. 91. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee of Standards of Official Conduct in the 1st session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1100. A bill for the relief of Luis Fernando Bernate Christopher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON:

H.R. 1101. A bill for the relief of William A. Cassity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 1102. A bill to make a technical correction to the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 to provide for the re-liquidation of certain petroleum products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 20: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. LONG, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. MAVROULES, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. EARLY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ROE,

Mr. FROST, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. NOWAK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. FISH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. CARR, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OLIN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Ms. HORN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ECKART, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 26: Mr. CARPER and Mr. HUBBARD.

H.R. 62: Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 63: Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 74: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 77: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. INHOPE, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 78: Mr. DELAY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 83: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 109: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 127: Mr. NATCHER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WISE, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. NAGLE, and Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 134: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. FROST, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. GALLO, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MFUME, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 135: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 150: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 159: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 251: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 252: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WEISS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 357: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. GEREN, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 371: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 376: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 418: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 424: Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.R. 426: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 459: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 467: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 480: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 482: Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 483: Mr. WILSON, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. BEILENSEN.

H.R. 507: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FISH, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 516: Mr. FROST, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 524: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. WEBER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. COX of California, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. McEWEN, and Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 550: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 552: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 557: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ROWLAND, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 565: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PELOSI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 572: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 583: Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 587: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 602: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 617: Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 644: Mr. LaFALCE and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 650: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida and Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.R. 651: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida and Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.R. 667: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LEHMAN of California, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 672: Mr. PEASE, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 673: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 686: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. ROBERTS.

H.R. 700: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. ANDERSON.

H.R. 702: Mr. COMBEST and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 713: Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 738: Mr. EVANS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CARPER, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 741: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ROE, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FASCELL, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 745: Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 751: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HENRY, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 765: Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. PERKINS.

H.R. 766: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. YATES, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr.

FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 789: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ROE, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 811: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 821: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 824: Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 828: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 830: Mr. AuCOIN and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 840: Mr. HENRY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. PENNY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 841: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 842: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 865: Ms. OAKAR, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 866: Mr. LANCASTER and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 888: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. APPLEGATE.

H.R. 906: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 907: Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 916: Mr. VENTO, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 919: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 945: Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. WEBER, Mr. LENT, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. Hyde.

H.R. 974: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. WALSH.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. HAMILTON.

H.J. Res. 18: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.J. Res. 19: Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia.

H.J. Res. 49: Mr. FISH.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. ZIMMER, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. YATRON,

Mr. RITTER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MOODY, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. YATES, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. FROST, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.J. Res. 91: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FISH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. ECKART.

H.J. Res. 92: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VENTO, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. APPLEGATE.

H.J. Res. 101: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. WILSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H.J. Res. 102: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. HATCHER.

H.J. Res. 128: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FALCOMAYAGA, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. PAXON, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. GILMAN.

H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. FORD of Tennessee and Mr. EVANS.

H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RITTER, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FROST, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McNULTY, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H. Res. 64: Mr. HANCOCK.

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. 759: Mr. HEFLEY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

32. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Association of Pacific Island Legislatures, relative to the creation of Association of Pacific Island Legislatures Regional Medical Clinic Task Force, which was referred jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Interior and Insular Affairs.