

out means that any single mistake will cost a good soldier his or her career.

Military planners have a term of art for all of this—they call it turbulence in the force. In fact, it has meant a good deal of turbulence in peoples lives. In my view, the good people who serve in the Armed Forces have suffered through this turbulence for long enough. For years we have told them that the problems that attended the drawdown would ease once the reductions were over. We told them to hang in and that things would get better. I do not believe it is right to ask these people to go through yet another period of such turbulence. To start another drawdown on top of the one just completed is to break faith with the people who serve.

I also think that we cannot afford to reduce force levels for strategic reasons. All of the services are being strained to the breaking point by the multiple requirements imposed on them by the demands, first, to be trained and ready for major wars and, second, meanwhile, to be engaged in the multiplicity of smaller operations which have proliferated since the end of the cold war. Already the Army is short about 40,000 slots in support positions. This has meant that operations in Haiti or Bosnia, for example, require that support personnel be taken out of units that are not deployed abroad in order to fill out units that are being deployed. The remaining support personnel then have to do twice the work they should. Now we are talking about further thinning Army ranks, which, inevitably will make these shortfalls even worse.

#### FOUR GUIDING PRINCIPLES

We should be guided by four principles:

First, I do not believe we should reduce force levels further.

The second principle is, increase weapons investments enough to get back to a steady state replacement rate for major items of equipment. A key goal of the QDR, reportedly, is to find funds to increase weapons procurement substantially—the target that has been set for several years is \$60 billion a year for procurement. This will require an increase of about one-third from current levels—for the past couple of years, we have spent about \$45 billion on procurement. I hope that the QDR will get there—though not at the cost of cuts in the size of the force. I am doubtful, however, that \$60 billion a year will be enough.

To explain my doubts, it will take a little arithmetic. Currently, between them, the Air Force and the Navy have about 3,000 fighter aircraft in their inventories—about 2,000 in the Air Force and 1,000 in the Navy. If we assume a 20 year average service life for fighters—which is getting pretty long-in-the-tooth—then, on average, we have to buy 150 aircraft a year to maintain a steady-state replacement rate. For the past few years, we have bought about 28-42 fighter aircraft a year. So, by my

calculations, we need to increase aircraft procurement by at least 400 percent to get to the right level.

Similarly for the Navy—the Navy now needs a minimum of about 350 battle force ships. If we assume an average service life of 35 years, we need to buy 10 ships a year. Lately we have been buying four or five. So we need to double shipbuilding budgets to get back to a steady state replacement rate.

Add to those increases, the need to increase spending modestly each year in order to exploit new technology. Suffice to say, \$60 billion a year won't do it. So the next question is, what are we giving up by not modernizing as fast as we probably should, and how are we going to adjust to the shortfalls? We may be able to keep some equipment going longer by pursuing upgrades instead of new systems. We may be able to limit cost growth between generations of new weapons by careful attention to cost—as the services plan for the Joint Strike Fighter. But all of these adjustments come at a price in reduced military strength. The compromises should be kept to a minimum.

The third principle is that we should not allow military readiness to decline. On this issue, I am skeptical about DOD budget plans that show operation and maintenance costs declining in the future relative to the size of the force. Some savings, to be sure, may be achieved from base closures and other changes in ways of doing business. But it is unrealistic to expect training costs to decline or to plan on reduced maintenance costs of major weapons.

Fourth, and finally, while I do believe that some savings can be achieved by improving DOD business practices, I am very skeptical about claims that very large savings can be achieved. It may be true that there is waste in defense business practices—but waste is not a line item in the budget that can easily be eliminated. I am very concerned that proponents of revolutionary changes in government procurement practices are vastly overstating the savings that can be made.

#### IN CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, these four principles—maintain force levels; increase weapons modernization funding substantially; protect military readiness; do not overstate savings from improved business practices—force me to conclude that currently projected levels of defense spending are not enough. And as the years go by, if defense spending is frozen at the current inadequate level, I fear that we will see the erosion of U.S. military strength and, as a direct result, the slow decline of U.S. global leadership.

#### MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

(1430)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, President Ronald Reagan was a champion for human rights in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. He spoke up in defense of freedom and democracy. He raised the cases of dissidents during the high-level meetings with Soviet officials. He made passionate and eloquent speeches outlining America's values, but he engaged forthrightly and he backed up engagement with action.

We all remember his famous 1983 speech to the National Association of Evangelicals in Orlando, FL. It was then that he called the Soviet Union the Evil Empire. That courageous speech, ridiculed by some as too belligerent, was a decisive moment in American history and a decisive moment in the cold war.

In that speech, President Reagan says, and I quote, he said, it was C.S. Lewis, who, in his unforgettable Screwtape Letters wrote, "the greatest evil is not done now in those sordid 'dens of crime' that Dickens loved to paint. It is not even done in concentration camps and labor camps. In those we see its final result. But it is conceived and ordered, moved, seconded, carried and minuted, in clear, carpeted, warmed and well-lighted offices, by quiet men with white collars and cut fingernails and smooth-shaven cheeks who do not need to raise their voice."

He went on to say that, well, because these quiet men do not raise their voices, because they sometimes speak in soothing tones of brotherhood and peace, because, like other dictators before them, they are always making, quote, their final territorial demand. So some would have us accept them at their word and accommodate ourselves to their aggressive impulses. But if history teaches anything, it teaches that simpleminded appeasement, where wishful thinking about our adversaries is folly, it means the betrayal of our past and the squandering of our freedom.

Mr. Reagan went on to say, while America's military strength is important, let me adhere that I have always maintained that the struggle now going on for the world will never be decided by bombs or rockets, by armies or military might; the real crisis we face today is a spiritual one. At its root it is a test of moral will and faith. I believe we shall rise to the challenge, he said. I believe that communism is another sad, bizarre chapter in human history whose last pages even now are being written.

"I believe this because our source of strength in the quest for human freedom is not material but spiritual, and because it knows no limitations, it must terrify and ultimately triumph over those who would enslave their fellow men."

□ 1445

I do not know and it would be unfair for me to say how President Reagan would have voted today on most favored nation trading status for China. I

do know, however, that he opposed MFN for the Soviet Union while people of faith were being persecuted and human rights were being grossly violated and the Soviet Union was a military threat to the United States. President Reagan engaged with Soviet leaders, but he did not grant them MFN.

Today in China people of faith, particularly those who choose to worship outside government control, are now being persecuted. Catholic priests are in jail, Catholic bishops are in jail, Protestant pastors are in jail, Buddhist monks and nuns are in jail, churches are raided, monasteries in Tibet are raided, and all the key leaders of the democracy movement are jailed, and many others are harassed and closely watched by the Chinese Government.

President Reagan also opposed MFN for the Romanian Ceausescu-led Communist government in Romania, and as we know, he signed the legislation taking away the most-favored-nation trading status, MFN, for Romania in 1987.

These acts, acts like President Reagan took, these acts do not go unnoticed by the world. The Soviet people knew and the Romanian people heard the evil empire speech and the news of revocation of Romania's MFN on the Voice of America, and they knew that someone cared.

In 1989, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH, and myself visited Perm Camp 35, the last gulag in the Soviet Union, which was in the Ural Mountains. Many of the political prisoners whom we met with told us they knew of President Reagan's efforts and it gave them hope. Even in one of the darkest places in the Soviet totalitarian system, these prisoners knew of President Reagan's support for human rights and religious freedom. It gave them hope that someone was brave enough to stand up to the dictators. It gave them hope that someone was brave enough to stand up for freedom.

Today, what kind of message are we sending to the men and women in China who are longing and hoping that someone will speak up for them? Bringing democracy to China must start with supporting those who are working for a democratic form, and I believe revoking MFN is the first but not the only step in that process.

I want, as a Republican Member of the House, I want the Republican Party to be faithful to the principles of Lincoln and Reagan and stand up for more than just trade. The GOP should stand up for the rights of people instead of only the rights of business. I support free trade. I have been a voter in this Congress for free trade. But I am concerned that trade has become the sole focus of our foreign policy in China and the quest for dollars stifles all other considerations or attempts to influence change.

The losers are those suffering at the hands of the dictators. The Catholic priests, the Catholic bishops, the Buddhist monks, the evangelical pastors,

the people in the house church, the Muslims who are being persecuted in the northwest portion of China, these are the losers suffering at the hands of dictators.

I want today's victims of authoritarianism to hear on Voice of America and Radio Free Asia that the United States is still standing by those principles. Should I ever get the opportunity to visit the prison or the laogai where Wei Jingsheng and Bao Tong and Wang Dan and others who have been arrested, and Bishop Su Chimin, who was beaten by police with a board until it broke in splinters, or Pastor Liu Zhenyang, nicknamed the "heavenly man" for surviving a 70-day fast in protest for his persecution, where they are being held, if I ever get into those prisons I want them to say, "We knew, we knew that the United States stood for us."

The words of freedom and democracy inherently fly in the face of dictators and cause them to brand all its adherents as nationalist or imperialists, but the words "freedom" and "democracy" are the words that bring hope to the thousands around the world who do not enjoy these precious liberties. We must use every means at our disposal to make them a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I saw a portion of a poll that was taken by the Wall Street Journal and NBC, by the two pollsters Hart and Teeter, one a Democrat and one a Republican. In the May 1 poll that was reported in the Wall Street Journal, this is what the question was. The question was: Should China improve human rights status or lose current trade status?

This, Mr. Speaker, is what the American people said. The American people said, on the question maintain good trade relations, 27 percent; demand human rights policy changes, 67 percent. So 67 to 27 percent, the American people stand on behalf of being tough on human rights.

I knew the American people would stand that way. The question is will the Congress stand that way, and will this administration stand that way. Even if the administration does not stand that way, and the indications are that this administration will not stand that way, the Congress should stand that way. The House of Representatives should stand that way. Unconditional MFN is not working. There is more repression in China today than 3 years ago when President Clinton delinked trade from human rights. Let us cease our wishful thinking that this is the best course.

Let us let the Chinese people who are suffering at the hands of dictators—democracy activists, Christians, Tibetans, Muslims, Buddhists, and others—let them know that the United States stands with them, and let us send a strong message by voting to revoke MFN in the House of Representatives.

#### MIDDLE-INCOME AMERICANS NEED A CAPITAL GAINS TAX CUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 50 minutes, the balance of the time, as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time out to talk about the historic budget agreement which was completed just this past week and to say that I have some grave concerns about it.

I, of course, wish very much that we had been able to take on the issue of entitlements. I wish we could have taken on the proposal to eliminate some Cabinet-level agencies. Of course, I wish that we could have brought about broader tax cuts to stimulate job creation and economic growth. As my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, said in his remarks a few minutes ago, I wish we could have had better numbers in the area of our national security.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I have concluded that this agreement is historic. It is very important for us to proceed with it. Obviously, if we had reelected a Republican Congress and elected a Republican, Bob Dole, as President of the United States, the agreement would look much different than it does today. From my perspective it would look much better than it does today. But it is important that we face the reality of governing.

Last November the American people chose to reelect a Republican Congress for the first time in 68 years, and they also chose to reelect Bill Clinton as President of the United States. So that obviously created the situation where we had to do what we could to come to some sort of consensus. It is for that reason that I believe that while not perfect, and I do not like every aspect of it, this is probably the best agreement that could be struck.

Why? Because it does focus on our principal goals of trying to gain control of this behemoth, the Federal Government, heading us down the road toward a balanced budget and at the same time reducing the tax burden on working Americans. So if we take all those things into consideration, while not enough, they clearly are steps in the right direction.

I am most pleased that an item which I have been focusing on for a number of years and which I introduced on the opening day of the 105th Congress is, I hope, going to be part of the basis from which we move ahead with this budget agreement. I am talking, of course, about reducing the top rate on capital gains.

On the opening day of the 105th Congress, I and several of my colleagues, in fact three Democrats and one other Republican, joined with me introducing H.R. 14. We selected the number H.R. 14 because what we do is we take the top rate that now exists of 28 percent on capital gains and we reduce that to a top rate of 14 percent.

I was joined by Democrats, the gentlewoman from Missouri, KAREN

MCCARTHY, the gentleman from Virginia, JIM MORAN, and the gentleman from Texas, RALPH HALL, and my Republican colleague who sits on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, PHIL ENGLISH, and the five of us introduced this measure on the opening day.

I am very happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that with the cosponsorship of my chief colleague, the gentleman from California, MATTHEW "MARTY" MARTINEZ, who represents the same region as I in southern California, we now have over 140 Democrats and Republicans who have joined as cosponsors of H.R. 14.

We have heard lots of figures over the last few days as to exactly where we can go on this reduction of capital gains, and we still have a few naysayers out there who will continue to argue that reducing the top rate on capital is nothing but a tax cut for the rich. But every shred of empirical evidence that we have, Mr. Speaker, proves to the contrary.

In fact, 40 percent of the capital gains realized in this country are realized by Americans who earn less than \$50,000 a year. We continue in our office to get letter after letter from people all over the country who are middle-income wage earners writing to us about how important it is to reduce that top rate on capital.

I would like to share just a couple of those letters with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker. First, this letter came from a middle-income family that needs capital gains tax cuts to use the proceeds from the sale of farm property to restore savings that largely had been lost to farm losses.

Let me read parts of this letter, Mr. Speaker:

"We will soon be married 35 years. We have three grown children and a 5-year-old. After 20 years of marriage we had saved enough money to be able to buy a dairy farm we bought for a total of \$270,000, and we still had a little over \$100,000 in the bank for a rainy day.

"Fifteen years later we owe \$160,000 and have \$1,500 in the bank. We have used everything that we had saved trying to make that farm work. We have an opportunity now to sell our farm," and I will go through the figures that are here: selling price, \$275,000; \$25,000 for equipment; \$60,000 for 85 head of cattle; and the total of the sale proceeds would be \$360,000.

That debt which they referred to in the letter of \$160,000 obviously would have to come off the top, and the estimated capital gains tax is \$75,000.

"We can't even pay off our bills and have any left over to buy a place to live with the \$125,000 remaining. \$75,000 in taxes," this family writes, "that is so unfair. If you can get the rate for capital gains" down to your proposed level, H.R. 14's 14 percent, "at least we would have an additional \$37,500 of our hard-earned money back. We need to start again to try and save enough for our golden years and our 5-year-old."

Here is an example, Mr. Speaker, of a family that may be, in the eyes of some, very rich. They are dairy farmers who have struggled, and yet the capital gains tax is going to jeopardize the future of their 5-year-old child and this family's plan for retirement.

Another example of a middle-income family that needs a capital gains tax cut is for a family that is looking to sell rental property to support an 85-year-old mother.

□ 1500

This letter, Mr. Speaker, goes as follows:

My wife and I, both retired, are responsible for the care and well-being of my 85-year-old mother-in-law. She is a widow, suffers from Alzheimer's disease, needs round-the-clock care and pays a substantial tax on her Social Security income. She has been living on the income from some very modest residential rentals. We are no longer able to operate those rentals profitably and have to sell. If capital gains taxes were indexed and left at the rate they were when the property was purchased, right around 15 percent, she could just barely continue in her current situation. Now, the difference between whether my mother-in-law will be able to get along on the proceeds from her previously purchased assets or be obligated to rely on Medicaid or some other forms of Government assistance will be determined by how much will be taken away from her by the capital gains tax. This is not a rich versus poor proposition. The amount of tax taken from the proceeds of her hard-earned rental property will affect her lifestyle, will affect what other taxpayers will have to contribute to her care, will affect the quality of her retirement years and the retirement years for my wife and for me and my daughter's college options.

So once again, Mr. Speaker, here is a clear example of this not being the rich versus poor or us versus them, class warfare argument. Reducing the top rate on capital gains will in fact have a beneficial impact for middle income wage earners.

But let us look even further than that. As we look at the stated goals of a capital gains tax cut, we know that not just middle income wage earners but top Government officials, including the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, have stated that the ideal tax on capital would be zero, not 14 percent, the middle ground that we are offering with H.R. 14, but in fact it would be zero.

In fact, before the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said,

I think while all taxes impede economic growth to one extent or another, the capital gains tax, in my judgment, is at the far end of the scale and so I argue that the appropriate capital gains tax rate was zero and short of that any cuts, and especially indexing, would, in my judgment, be an act that would be appropriate policy for this Congress to follow.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14 not only takes that top rate on capital gains from 28 to 14 percent, but it also does index to ensure that working Americans are not forced into higher income tax brackets

as they realize some kind of appreciation on their capital investment because of inflation.

Also I should state that if we look at the priorities that we have in dealing with this issue of capital gains, what is it that we want to do? We want to encourage economic growth. We want to do everything that we possibly can to increase the take-home pay of working Americans, and, of course, we want to balance the Federal budget.

There are some in this Congress and some out there who say you cannot talk about reducing the tax on capital and at the same time be serious about your quest for a balanced budget. We also, as we looked at this balanced budget agreement that has come out over the past several days, have looked at the cost of cutting the top rate on capital gains taxes.

Well, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the projection of the cost, which I do not buy by any means, is about \$44 billion. Now, if we look at every bit of empirical evidence that we have had throughout this entire century, every time we have reduced the tax rate on capital what has happened? It has not cost the Treasury anything. It has not cost \$44 billion, as the CBO has estimated.

What has happened? We have seen a dramatic increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury, going all the way back to 1921, when Treasury Secretary Andrew Mellon, in the Warren G. Harding administration, brought about a reduction of the tax on capital.

What happened? We saw a dramatic increase in the flow of revenues to the Treasury through the roaring twenties. We also have to look back at the Kennedy tax cuts. In 1961, there was not a cost to reducing the top rate on capital. What happened was, we saw an increase in the flow of revenues to the Treasury.

More recently, in 1978, the famous Steiger capital gains tax rate reduction, we saw, for the years between 1979, when that rate reduction went into effect, and 1987, when we saw an increase in the capital gains tax, we saw a 500-percent increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury, from \$9 to \$50 billion coming in from that period of time. And then we saw, in 1987, a concurrent drop in the flow of revenues to the Treasury when the tax rate on capital gains was increased.

We also have to look at studies that have been done most recently of our package. The Institute for Policy Innovation did a study just a few years ago showing that a rate cut like that that we have in H.R. 14 would bring about a very dramatic increase in the flow of revenues to the Treasury.

In fact, they have stated that they would increase by \$211 billion. That obviously is not going to cost anything.

The reason for that increase, Mr. Speaker, is that we have today between \$7 and \$8 trillion of locked-up capital. There are so many people, like the retirees who wrote me these letters and

others, who have said, gosh, with a 28-percent rate on capital gains, I cannot afford to sell this item.

So what happens? There is this lock-in effect. It is projected today that there is between \$7 and \$8 trillion that is locked in because that tax is so punitive. Once again, 40 percent of those are held by people with incomes of less than \$50,000 a year.

We also have to look at the argument that has been going on over the past several days about the need for a broad-based family tax cut. We hear talk regularly about how we have got to help families.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I argue that H.R. 14, putting that top rate at 14 percent, would do more to boost the wages of the average working family than virtually any of the so-called family tax cuts that have already been proposed. Yes, I am not opposing those, but I believe that the capital gains tax cut, which would be permanent, would increase it. In fact, that same study done by the Institute for Policy Innovation found that going to a 14-percent rate on the capital gains tax would boost the average family's take-home pay by \$1,500 a year over a 7-year period.

So if we recognize again that what we are trying to do here is increase economic growth, boost the take-home pay of working Americans and at the same time balance the Federal budget, we can in fact, with a capital gains tax rate reduction, do those things.

I mentioned the Federal Reserve Board in that statement. Some have said that tax proposals would, in fact, be received, tax cut proposals would be received less than favorably by the Federal Reserve. Well, those words from the chairman demonstrate that H.R. 14 would be a Fed-friendly tax cut and would not send anything other than a very positive signal.

So as we look at where we are headed now in these budget negotiations, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the fair, the balanced, the middle-road position for us to take would be a top rate of 14 percent on capital gains.

I will say that I am very encouraged by the words that have come from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the fact that we have so many Democrats and Republicans joining in this Congress to cosponsor H.R. 14, it signals to me that we can, in fact, have a tremendous benefit, a great win for the American people if, as we proceed with these talks and the final details that the Committee on Ways and Means will report out, that we have a tax that is no higher than 14 percent.

I do not claim that cutting the capital gains tax rate will be a cure-all for all the ailments of society. One might conclude from what I have said that I believe that it is a panacea for every problem that we face. I do not think it is. But if we do look at the goals of ensuring that our children and grandchildren are not going to be saddled with horrendous debt in the future, if

we look at our desire to increase the take-home wages for working Americans and if we look at our goal of boosting economic growth to ensure that the United States of America will be able to remain competitive internationally, it seems to me that going from 28 to 14 percent is the right thing to do.

And for my colleagues who have yet to cosponsor H.R. 14, I hope very much that they will respond to the many letters that my Democratic and Republican colleagues and I have sent around and join in cosponsoring this very important legislation.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COLLINS, for 5 minutes, on May 16.

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes each day, on May 6 and 7.

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, on May 6.

Mr. SNOWBARGER, for 5 minutes, on May 6.

Mr. NEY, for 5 minutes, on May 6.

Mr. ROGAN, for 5 minutes, on May 6.

Mr. SUNUNU, for 5 minutes, on May 7.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. KUCINICH.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DREIER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BONO.

#### SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 543. An act to provide certain protections to volunteers, nonprofit organizations, and governmental entities in lawsuits based on the activities of volunteers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to design and construct a permanent addition to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial in Washington, DC, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

May 2, 1997:

H.R. 1001. An act to extend the term of appointment of certain members of the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission and the Physician Payment Review Commission.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 6, 1997, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3070. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Karnal Bunt Regulated Areas [Docket No. 96-016-19] (RIN: 0579-AA83) received May 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3071. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's "Major" final rule—Karnal Bunt; Compensation for the 1995-1996 Crop Season [Docket No. 96-016-17] (RIN: 0579-AA83) received May 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3072. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Pink Bollworm Regulated Areas [Docket No. 97-023-1] received May 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3073. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Zoological Park Quarantine of Ruminants and Swine Imported from Countries Where Foot-and-Mouth Disease or Rinderpest Exists [APHIS Docket No. 94-136-2] received May 1, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3074. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Genetically Engineered Organisms and Products; Simplification of Requirements and Procedures for Genetically Engineered Organisms [APHIS Docket No. 95-040-4] (RIN: 0579-AA73) received May 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3075. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Electronic Filing of Disclosure Documents with the Commission [17 CFR Part 4] received May 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.