

yond anything imposed even in World War II.

Some of the problems encountered by the pools are comical, but they illustrate the limitations of the pool concept. One pool recently was led by a military escort who had no maps and no compass. The pool spent 6 hours in the desert, finally stumbling on an American military base. However, the pool reporters could not get into the base to find out their location because the escort did not know the proper password.

Third, reporters on military bases must be accompanied by military escort at all times. This means that the Pentagon even selects which soldiers will be interviewed and a military information officer stands by while the interview is being conducted.

What we are seeing in the Persian Gulf is a highly refined version of rules that were used in the Grenada and Panama invasions to keep from the American public important information that was not militarily sensitive. For example, during the Panama invasion, the Pentagon flatly denied that there were any casualties during a parachute drop. It was not until a month later that the Army admitted that 86 paratroopers had been hurt in the air drop. The military also kept from reporters information on civilian casualties, so that even today we do not know how many civilians died in Panama as a result of the invasion.

I am afraid that the current Pentagon leadership does not accept the role of the media in a free society. In fact, according to former Reagan defense official Fred Hoffman, Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney personally hamstrung media coverage of the Panama invasion by refusing to activate the press pool until it was too late for the press to get any reports about the initial invasion. Not a single photograph, strip of film, or eyewitness account was ever published about the combat in Panama.

The American people are financially supporting the military deployment and many have sons and daughters, husbands and wives serving in the Persian Gulf. The people at home and the troops in the gulf have a right to an objective accounting of the hostilities, not a version controlled by the Pentagon.

There may be some who argue that censorship is necessary to maintain the morale of the troops. I believe that just the opposite is true. One of the most disturbing aspects of the Pentagon's censorship program is the negative effect it is having upon the morale of our own troops in the gulf. As an Army captain stationed in the gulf observed, "it's the lack of news that gets people anxious * * *. You start to wonder what they are keeping from us."

The Pentagon may feel that the public will turn against the war if failures

are reported. To the contrary, Mr. Speaker, public support for the war is going to disappear if the public gets the impression that it is being given only the good news. The public will rapidly grow suspicious and stop believing anything. In the long run, a censorship program will damage the Nation's trust in the wisdom of the war and the competence of the military.

By creating an atmosphere of unreal optimism, the Pentagon is actually magnifying the future effects on the public of even a small military reverse. We have already seen this happen. The Pentagon initially contended that Allied air sorties were enjoying an 80-percent success rate. Officials later admitted that sorties included many noncombat air missions wholly within Saudi Arabia, including transport and refueling missions. This disclosure led to doubts about the air war's effectiveness, doubts that would have been less serious had the military not overinflated expectations in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, concern about the press restrictions is not a partisan issue. It is not a question of liberals versus conservatives. A former Pentagon official in the Reagan and Bush administration, Fred S. Hoffman, said earlier this month that the security review was not justified. He said it "is censorship by the Government and could be abused to protect the military from criticism or embarrassment." David Gergen, White House communications director under Presidents Ford and Reagan, also noted, "there is too strong a tendency—in the Pentagon—to lean toward less coverage."

In a democracy, it is precisely in matters of the gravest national importance, such as war, when the freedom of the press is most important. I urge the Pentagon to revise these press restrictions and allow the American public a fuller picture of this war.

□ 1500

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS], and at this point I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] who organized and wrote a very excellent letter outlining the problem and our disagreement with many Members of the House with current policy which was signed by many Members of the House and forwarded recently to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS], and commend him and associate myself with his initial remarks and those of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] who preceded me.

Mr. Speaker, there are days when many of us here in this Chamber would like to avoid the searing hypercritical analysis of the press—prevent them from scathing treatment of Congress,

control the press to write positively, fairly about our work and wonderful membership.

But we resist that temptation and for a good reason—the American public has a right to uncensored information and opinion both that which is positive and negative. Such right, such freedom of expression is so central to our democracy that it is protected by the first amendment to our Constitution, perhaps the most important provision in our basic document.

Today that right is being undermined and challenged at an especially critical time in our Nation's history with a war in the Persian Gulf. The American public is being denied complete, timely, objective, and accurate information on the war in the Persian Gulf and the administration is hoping that the American public will not notice. But many Americans do recognize the fatal flaw and the danger of such action and are taking note.

One Minnesotan wrote to me:

We, the American public are going to pay for that war in lives and dollars, and have a right to know what is happening.

We all understand why the temptation to control the press becomes greater during the time of war but we must also realize the increased importance of accurately informing the public. The American news media serve as the eyes and ears of the American people. This role becomes even more essential in time of war when the public relies almost solely on the media to provide objective information about daily events in remote areas of the globe. Without such objective information, the public cannot make informed judgments about the status and conduct of the war.

There is a legitimate need for withholding certain information for national security purposes, but the prior restraint and information control the Defense Department is enforcing goes well beyond national security and protecting the well-being of U.S. service men and women.

For example: One correspondent reported that military censors objected to his use of the word "giddy" to describe the mood of fighter pilots returning from a bombing mission. The censors changed the word "giddy" to "proud." It is easy to see that the motive for changing that word had more to do with political security rather than national security.

In fact, the military is so obsessed with control of the news that it has canceled the public honors ceremonies at Dover Air Force Base for those service men and women who lose their lives in the Persian Gulf war. This appears to be a thin-veiled attempt to shield the American people from the human face of war—to present this war as painless and without sacrifice. It is unconscionable that the Pentagon has taken its public relations efforts so far

as to deny the honor and recognition traditionally provided to those who sacrifice their lives for their country.

There is no place in a free society for this "see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil" Pentagon policy. We cannot tolerate the Pentagon dictating the words and images the public is allowed to receive. The Pentagon must stop trying to spoon feed us sanitized sound bites and start allowing information to flow freely.

The Pentagon, Congress, and the administration simply must trust the people, that's right, Mr. Speaker, I said "trust" the American people with the objective information about the Persian Gulf war. Such trust, such objective flow of information, is the basic tenet, the foundation, of our Nation and our democracy. An informed electorate depends upon the news media for information. The administration is not entitled to prior restraint, censorship, sanitization, or spin control of the news. When all aspects of the information and news become issues of national security and absolute control is employed, then the basic trust and support for our National Government will crumble.

The Armed Forces should be allowed to concentrate on the military campaign rather than this overzealous public relations control campaign. The destructive weapon of censorship the Pentagon is employing to control the press is rapidly chiseling away at our democratic rights. If this dangerous public relations campaign is not stopped, truth could end up as another casualty of the Persian Gulf war.

I insert the following two letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 16, 1991.

Secretary DICK CHENEY,
Department of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Defense Department guidelines you have established for the press coverage of the Persian Gulf crisis seriously undermine First Amendment rights and may well prevent the American public from receiving accurate and objective information on this international crisis.

The American people are financially supporting the military deployment and many have sons and daughters serving in the Persian Gulf. They have a right to an objective accounting of the hostilities, not a version controlled by the Pentagon.

Ironically, subjecting the media to prior review, you are in effect abridging the democratic rights and values we are pledged to preserve in this region of the world. We cannot tolerate the Pentagon dictating the words and images the public is allowed to receive.

The American news media serves as the eyes and ears of the American people. This role increases in importance in time of war when the public relies almost solely on the media to provide objective information about daily events in remote areas of the globe. Without such objective information, the public would be denied the opportunity to make informed judgments about the status and conduct of the military deployment.

We understand the legitimate need for withholding certain information for national security purposes and to protect our troops, but the prior restraint and information control you are enforcing goes well beyond that protection and could result in outright censorship. We urge you to immediately re-evaluate the guidelines in a manner that recognizes the legitimate military security concerns but does not infringe on our free society's right to have timely accurate and uncensored reporting concerning any Persian Gulf activities.

Sincerely,

[From the Peoples Press, Owatonna, MN,
Jan. 19, 1991]

VENTO SUPPORT

This is to offer some comments on a letter which Bruce Vento is planning to send to other legislators and which he hopes will carry other significant signatures along with his own—it is a letter protesting the possible curtailment of journalistic freedom in the theater of the Persian Gulf War, should there be one.

Like millions of others throughout our country and over the world, I share the deep and dreadful concern for the lives of our young men and women who have rallied to the nation's call. There is a real probability that the casualty list will be staggering and proportionately beyond any figure that we have ever known in conflict. However, this may be, there is the possibility of another horrendous casualty which is receiving little or no attention and in fact is being promoted—that is the casualty of truth which would surely come to pass if the rules for wartime journalism are changed by imposing limitations on freedom of the press unknown in World War I, World War II, the Korean Conflict or the Vietnam War.

I am not writing this letter as one who has any vested interest in the news business—nor have I ever made one cent as a writer, as the quality of this letter would aptly prove. What is more, I am not unaware of the shortcomings and weaknesses of reporters; i.e., bad taste, biased presentation, unfair reporting, meddling with certain events best left alone and a host of violations of decency and sensitivity. It may even be that on the Day of Judgment that reporters and journalists will be the last to enter—if they do.

Having said all this, and no matter how I may be angered or offended by the treatment of news, I recognize the absolute need of a free press to a free society. A muzzled press in Nazi Germany prevented its general populace from ever knowing about the death camps and from ever knowing that their nation was being swept down the current to destruction. To realize the extent to which truth can be twisted at the expense of many lives when it is kept out of the public forum and denied to the general public, one only has to read that well documented little book in the public library, 'Chernobyl. The End of the Nuclear Dream,' by an award-winning team of investigative, scientific, environmental writers. In that book, international scientists of great repute predict that over the next 30 years one simple accident in the Soviet Union is going to cost more lives than were lost in the entire Vietnam War. The nuclear barons have tightly controlled the news of 169 accidents which have taken place in American nuclear plants, of which there are 93. Any one of those accidents could have become another Chernobyl, which has been described as the greatest and the most disastrous accident in all of industrial history.

We need a free press even with all of its weaknesses and shortcomings to expose the corruption of government and industry and the press has done just that on more than one occasion. It was the press which brought down Sen. Joe McCarthy; it was the press which brought to light the Watergate and Iran Contra affairs and ended the secret shady career of Olly North. The press, not the government, exposed the S&L swindle and the HUD crime and the Pentagon's generous payment of taxpayers' funds to the manufacturers of toilet seats and washers. It is the press alerting us to the possibility of financial failure in banking, insurance and investment industries. It was the press which put out of business a string of crooked TV evangelists who had actually succeeded in deceiving millions of people.

There is nothing on record that would even remotely suggest that we ever lost a war because of journalistic irresponsibility, but there is plenty of evidence that a free press in a free society and other news media have resulted in a growing number of people opposed to war. It is a lot easier to sanction war when its horrors are never made known or visible.

I only wish that I were a significant somebody to add my signature to Vento's plea, but at least I can give all my blessing and prayers to his effort to preserve my right as a citizen in a free society to know what is happening through out the course of the Persian Gulf conflict. We, the American public, are going to pay for that war in lives and dollars, and have a right to know what is happening.—Gerald E. Huff.

MILITARY FAMILIES SUPPORT

NETWORK IN MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, MN, January 24, 1991.

Representative BRUCE VENTO,
Rayburn Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE VENTO: As the co-chair of the Military Families Support Network in Minnesota, I would like to extend a note of thanks to you for your recent efforts to call for more truth and less censorship in the news coverage of the war. The Military Families Support Network in Minnesota is whole heartedly supportive of our troops and hopes that their courageous efforts will soon result in an end of the war. We will also, however, continue to ask questions about the President's policy (unlike some other support groups) and to hold our elected Government accountable for all its decisions. We are, consequently, very aware of the extensive censorship and the disturbing paucity of true information about the war.

Your political courage in this matter has not gone unnoticed with us, here in Minnesota. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS P. GRANATH,
Cochair.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] for his excellent remarks and at this time yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS].

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Speaker, I voted on January 12 to authorize the use of force in the Persian Gulf because I believe some of our most cherished principles are at stake there.

I rise today out of a deep concern that in waging this war, we not violate another cherished principle—that of a free and independent press.

Nearly 20 years ago I sat in the Press Gallery above us as a young journalist.

It is with that perspective that I speak today—with a commitment to the first amendment and with a passion for true freedom of the press.

Is the media being insensitive or even unpatriotic by bringing the harsh realities of war to our living rooms and breakfast tables? I say no. War is harsh. War is real. We don't just need the good news. We need all the news, good and bad.

Of course the media has an obligation to act responsibly. And of course the Pentagon should not be expected to reveal battle plans or other information that would endanger our troops. But in my view the Pentagon has taken steps that go well beyond these basic security needs.

Why must reporters be restricted to tightly controlled pools that see and hear only what Government officials choose? Why must Government review panels go so far as to tinker with individual words within press dispatches? Is this protecting security or engaging in unwarranted censorship?

If the administration is truly convinced of the rightness of this cause, as I am, then it has nothing to fear from open press coverage. I trust the American people to make informed judgments. We all must understand that sometimes we must pay a terrible price to defend the values we hold dear.

Undue restrictions of the press pose a far greater threat to long-term public support for this war than does accurate and objective reporting. The American people will have more faith in our elected officials and more confidence in our military leaders if they believe they are receiving credible information about the war's consequences, no matter how disturbing that information may be.

A sanitized, overly optimistic version of the hostilities can only lead to disillusionment when the realities of war become apparent later. And surely they will, especially if we have to wage a ground campaign to achieve our aims.

Our best refuge is the truth. And maintaining our historical and constitutional allegiance to freedom of the press is by far the best way to assure that we know the truth.

Thomas Jefferson once said:

Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.

I would make the same choice as Jefferson. For, like Jefferson, I know that without a free press we would not have a free government.

□ 1510

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] for his excellent remarks.

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

Mr. OWENS of Utah. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS] for providing us this opportunity to talk about something very serious, with tremendous implications for this Nation, and I hope that America will listen to this discussion and will set aside our passions about other issues surrounding this war and concentrate on the very fundamental freedoms that we cherish and that in fact we really are willing to die for in this country, the fundamental freedoms of speech and press.

We are going through a very difficult time in our land as we worry day after day about the safety of our men and women in the Persian Gulf, and we pray for them to come home safely.

Before this war we were told by this administration that it would not be wise for us to debate whether or not this country should go to war. The assumption was made that if somehow we wanted to discuss and debate this issue, we were not being patriotic, that the President as Commander in Chief did not have to come to this Congress and that there did not need to be any debate and we should just move forward. But there were many of us on both sides of the aisle, no matter how we felt about this issue, who believed that it was the proper role of Congress to debate this war that is unfolding day, after day, after long day. We debated it here in this Chamber, and I believe that debate made us stronger as a country.

When I am in California and I listen to my constituents, they say, "Barbara, I watched that entire debate, and however I felt about the issue, I was proud that in this great Nation we could look at an issue so honestly and openly and dissect it and discuss it and decide what was best for our country."

I think that debate made us stronger as a nation, not weaker. They do not debate in Iraq. Iraq is ruled by fear. If we took a poll in this country today and we asked people, "What makes this the greatest Nation in the world?" I believe they would say, "Our Constitution," I believe they would say, "Our freedoms," I believe they would say, "Our free press."

I was a journalist in the 1970's myself, and I must say that my best stories and the ones that informed the most—and, yes, maybe they were controversial—were the ones where I interviewed someone 1 on 1 and got their feelings and got their emotions and got their opinions. If I had someone sitting next to that person, as our military is now, requiring an escort, I could say that you would not have that relationship that develops between a reporter and the person you are interviewing, that you would not get the real story, that you would not get the real emotion, and that you would not get the

real words. Yet that is what our Pentagon is doing. Not only do they have a military security review panel that reads the copy of these reporters, as my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS], has pointed out, there is a military escort next to our young men and women who listens to everything they are saying.

This has nothing to do with security, I say to my friends, nothing at all, because the copy is submitted to the censors after that. I think it is some type of intimidation, some type of prior restraint, and we cannot let that stand. If we stand for anything in this Congress, it is to preserve and protect the Constitution and the freedoms we hold dear.

I have a resolution, House Resolution 37, and it calls on the Pentagon to do two things: One is to expand the number of press pools allowed at the front. Right now there are only two pools of 18 reporters each, but there are more than 250 reporters in Saudi Arabia. These are brave Americans, these reporters. They are not afraid to die. They are patriotic. Many of them served in wars themselves. They are not going to give anything away to the enemy.

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

Mr. OWENS of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there are many on this floor and others who are looking at this and saying, "Wait a minute, how much more news coverage do you want?" You get 24 hours a day on this famous CNN channel, and you had hours and hours a day in the first few days of the conflict from hotel balconies in both Riyadh and Baghdad. It looks like for all intents and purposes it was just a fireworks show that was going on and not the human face that belongs in this.

All of us recognize these points, but I would just suggest that the reporters in Baghdad, Peter Arnett and others that were there, including Bernard Shaw from CNN, someone we are all familiar with, I think, and others, including Mr. Simon who was just recently in Riyadh and who we understand is in Kuwait City now, they are there in spite of those rules. They are there reporting, not because the Pentagon wanted them to. We would not have that information if they followed the types of rules that exist. We would have that much less information.

I think that the American people are better off to have that information, censored as it may be, limited as it may be. But that is the way we are getting information on this conflict, through unauthorized sources, unless we think that getting the information from a hotel balcony in Riyadh or Dhahran or someplace else is adequate. I think it is not. I think my constitu-

ents and the people in this country have a right to know far more than that.

We watch a lot of television, we see a lot of news on television, and it does not necessarily add up to the facts of the news. I would just point that out because many, I am sure, say that we are inundated and we have so much information. But what we are concerned about is that we should let the system work that has stood for over 200 years and made this country what it is today. I say, let that system work, Mr. Cheney, let that system work, President Bush, let that system work, the U.S. Congress, the House and the Senate. We want it to work.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] for her resolution and for her efforts in this matter.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for his contribution. This is an emotional subject because there we have our young men and women in imminent danger of losing their lives, and they are there defending freedom and stopping aggression. That is why they are there, and yet this country through the Pentagon is not even allowing their words to be given to the people here.

□ 1520

They are restricting these pools, and in addition to restricting these pools, having military escorts standing next to them. There is something very, very wrong with that.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have not heard the gentlewoman's whole discussion. I just heard a bit of it. But I was a newspaper woman for 25 years. I also covered the war in Vietnam. So I was there. I was on the scene.

Let me say, the one thing the press does have is a responsibility as well. I am getting lots of calls from constituents who are complaining that our press is giving out too much information that is endangering the lives of those young people over there. I have that opinion also. That is one of the reasons why the Pentagon has been a little tough on it. They want to protect those people. The press can go too far.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, may I say to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] that if there is any information endangering anyone, the Pentagon approved it, because there is no information going out from the scene that does not get submitted to the censors.

I would also like to say to the gentlewoman that this has been in effect since the war started. The gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] as a former reporter is at odds with the

American Society of Newspaper Editors who are very distressed and disturbed at this, and who have helped me work on my resolution. As a former reporter myself, and I was only one for a few years, and I was a radio talk show host as well, I feel it is outrageous that when a reporter, and American patriotic reporter, is interviewing someone in the military, that there needs to be an escort standing next to that individual, and in addition the words have to be submitted to a censor.

If the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] supports that approach as a former reporter, I am truly very surprised. But I do respect her point of view, if she feels there needs to be an escort standing next to our young men and women. If they can be sent to the front line to die, they ought to be able to express how they feel without having somebody standing over them and giving them an intimidating look. I do not think that is the right thing to do.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I yield further to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for giving me this time. I do not believe in intimidation. I do think that escorts were also provided in part because of the dangers of the press going out on their own. In fact, we have three missing who went out on their own. CBS is very disturbed that their reporters are missing, but they decided to go without the escort. I think they do like to protect even the press over there.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] that absolutely they want to protect the press. But I would point out to the gentlewoman that any time a military individual is interviewed, it is my understanding, whether they are in a danger zone or not, there is an escort next to that individual. So I think that argument is not valid in each and every case.

Mr. Speaker, we can always make excuses as to why we should limit freedom. It is real easy to do it. But one day you wake up and you find out life just is not the same. I think it is very important that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS] has taken this special order, and I want to commend him for it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put into the RECORD specific instances that we have from Scripps-Howard, the Detroit Free Press, and a number of others, who are very upset at what is going on.

The military blocked a New York Times report on how allied bombing had destroyed most of Iraq's nuclear capability. The Pentagon later disclosed the same information in Washington. The Pentagon wants to manipulate the good news.

The military delayed a Scripps-Howard reporter's interview with Saudi pilots for more than two days.

The military censor changed a Detroit Free Press reporter's word in a story from "giddy" to "proud" to describe U.S. pilots' emotions after a raid.

Mr. Speaker, these people are very upset at what is going on, when the things they wrote, which had absolutely nothing to do with the security of our operation, nothing to do at all with the safety of the individuals, and yet they were censored. It took them days to appeal this to the Pentagon in Washington.

For God's sake, if we stand for anything, it has got to be for freedom. Let us not allow Saddam Hussein to intimidate us from carrying out our Constitution, our freedom. Because, if we do, we have made a grave, grave error.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS] for taking this time.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman for her contribution today and her resolution, as well as her leadership in this vital issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues, Mr. OWENS, for reserving time to discuss this important issue, and Mr. EDWARDS, who has always been at the forefront of issues regarding infringement on the rights of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed regarding Department of Defense censorship of news from the battlefields of the Persian Gulf. Press coverage of the return to the United States of the bodies of our brave men and women who have lost their lives in combat is prohibited, and, the Department of Defense has now also prohibited the long-standing solemn arrival ceremonies at Dover Air Force Base for combat victims. These restrictions infringe upon the rights of reporters to obtain and provide news coverage, and the rights of American families who have loved ones on the front lines of battle to accurate, timely information regarding casualties.

The Defense Department has published guidelines for media coverage of the war in the gulf. Media reports will be censored, as will pictures of combat. Reporters may accompany military units only in approved media pools. Reporters would then be required to submit reports to military public affairs officers for security review before transmission. Information about the casualties of war will also be managed by the Defense Department. For example, the term "body bag" has reportedly been stricken from the official vocabulary at the Pentagon. Instead, Defense officials prefer the more euphemistic term "human remains pouches." In another case of Pentagon censorship, in a reporter's dispatch describing pilots returning from a bombing mis-

sion, the reporter described how pilots returned "giddy." Pentagon censors reportedly changed the word "giddy" to "proud."

The Defense Department maintains that its media guidelines are not intended to hinder reporting. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the media guidelines do restrain the press and will ultimately create a special hardship for families who must depend on media reports.

Since the Revolutionary War, and not without considerable risks to their lives, reporters have been at or near the front lines of battle, providing full reports for the American people of what was happening to our soldiers at war. Reporters have historically played a vital role by providing the public independent accounts of military action, distinct from reports issued by Government officials.

The ability of the media to report about military operations has not been without challenge. For example, the civilian press was not permitted to join the invasion force in Grenada in 1983. Thus, the history of open press access to U.S. military conflicts came to a screeching halt. After the invasion, what we heard were numerous reports that military authorities withheld significant facts, impeded the efforts of journalists to verify information regarding casualties, and disseminated inaccurate information about the invasion. Subsequent, revealing media accounts about the invasion created a public uproar, underscoring the critical role of the media.

After the Grenada invasion, the Defense Department established a system of selecting a pool of reporters who would cover the early stages of a military operation and share the information with other news organizations. When Panama was invaded, the media pool system was first tested. Reportedly, the pool failed to reach Panama until 4 hours after the fighting began, and journalists were unable to file their reports until 6 hours after that. The media pool system failed miserably. Yet, the Defense Department insists on using media pools to cover the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, freedom of the press is not absolute. I concede that the right to know is outweighed by the need to protect classified information and information about military operations which might endanger the lives and security of American forces. I am well aware of this, as former chairman of the House Intelligence Committee. I also know that members of the media appreciate the need for security. However, the Defense Department media guidelines go substantially beyond the limitations required for the protection of national and operational security. For example, information on the most important question on the minds of American families—the number of casualties anticipated from the war—is

not classified, nor does it jeopardize operational security.

The media have a constitutional right to access to information regarding the war in the Persian Gulf. For this reason, I have introduced a concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 38 that states the sense of the Congress that the Defense Department guidelines should be revised. Furthermore, the resolution states that the media should have timely access, in as complete a manner as possible, to all unclassified information and activities, other than information and activities that, if disclosed, would endanger the lives or security of U.S. forces. Upon issuing revised guidelines, the Secretary of Defense should issue a statement explaining the rationale for restrictions imposed on news media coverage of military activities in the Persian Gulf.

In August of last year, shortly after the conflict in the Persian Gulf erupted and United States troops were being mobilized to Saudi Arabia, Secretary Dick Cheney told reporters at a news conference that he felt it was "important that we have an adequate flow of information * * * about what our young men and women—in the Persian Gulf—are doing." Secretary Cheney promised to arrange this. We must hold the Secretary to this commitment to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, a free press is a necessity in a free society. As James Madison once said:

A popular government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or, perhaps both.

This is a very difficult time for all Americans. We can only hope that when we wake up in the morning, we will rise to a world at peace and American troops on their way home from the gulf. Until that day actually comes, we must stand behind our heroes and heroines fighting courageously for peace and also support the rights of the families at home awaiting their arrival.

□ 1530

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

Mr. OWENS of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from California for his resolution, which I have cosponsored.

I just want to call my colleagues' attention to a letter that just has been handed to me from the Minnesota Military Families Support Network in Minnesota, and they said they wanted to thank me for my work with regards to providing for less censorship in the news coverage of the war. These are the military families who support wholeheartedly our troops in their courageous efforts, which they hope will

soon result in an end to the war. It goes on to say that they are questioning some of the policies, but these are the military families. They want the information, and I think that is one of the problems.

I guess for some people, in a democracy, that is the right that we uphold that is so important. That is fundamentally one of our differences in our society, but I think it is a strength, not a weakness, and I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership and for his comments. It is clear that the task that we are about this afternoon is not a popular task at this point in time.

Yesterday at noon I did a live television interview in Salt Lake City and I spoke of this issue. As I returned from lunch, I learned that I had 20 calls, all in opposition to my position.

I think 2½ weeks ago when we debated this issue and voted on it, I think that was cathartic to the American people, and I sense there is a greater degree of unity now, though it is not unanimous, behind the war such that the American people are afraid that the goals of that war might be compromised if we allow unfettered access to the troops in terms of reportage by the journalists who are there, and that simply is misperception, and the gentleman from Ohio has pointed that out very lucidly. Nobody wants anything released which would compromise the safety and lives of the troops or the effectiveness of our war effort. That outweighs the need to know. What we are criticizing here is the policy which in a very clumsy manner in essence errs very far on the side of security and compromises the ability of the right to know those materials and that information, record of successes and failures, which will tell us at home, we who are entitled to the truth in the Congress as well as in the public at large, what is actually going on, but which does not compromise the troops or the effectiveness of future actions.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. STOKES. I might just say in terms of the gentleman's comment with reference to the timeliness of our taking this special order and speaking out on this subject, and the fact that at this particular time it may not be the most popular subject in the country, about a week ago when I first filed my concurrent resolution with the House, several newspaper reporters called me and discussed my resolution with me. I raised a question with them, since they were part of the media, why they were not themselves speaking out more forcefully on this issue, and in each case they indicated to me that, "Well,

we feel like you do about this thing, but it's just not timely," they said.

Then I noticed a few days later the news media itself beginning to get a little more courage to speak out on this issue, and now we have seen several night programs on it, Ted Koppel and others who have begun to speak out on this issue, and I think we are doing the country a favor, frankly, here in the Congress, where we do have the responsibility to stand up on issues and to call attention to discussions and debate in our country, to take the position we have taken to bring this matter to the floor and begin an earnest discussion of it so that the American people, through us, begin to have a voice on this very sensitive and important issue affecting their families.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

I am delighted to yield at this point to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT].

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues for calling this special order and I want to express my support for their efforts.

War is an extraordinary act, and for a nation it becomes an extraordinary test of its character and strength. We have not yet learned how to prevent wars, but we have learned more about how to conduct them. Some lessons, however, must be painfully relearned.

One lesson I believe our country is learning is that civil liberties may not be suspended in the name of national security. We found out the hard way how easy it is to let our fears overrule our principles. We cannot round up citizens arbitrarily, as we did with the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II. We cannot harass and abuse protesters as the FBI did during the 1960's. And we cannot deceive the American people with false propaganda as the Government did during the Vietnam war.

I believe the President when he says this will not be Vietnam. I am sure he will not knowingly and willfully mislead Congress and the American people on the progress of this war. Yet he has surely learned another lesson of Vietnam—that bringing the reality of war home to Americans through television and other sources forces them to confront the cost and pain of real war. People may then question whether, in fact, the price is worth it.

It appears to me that this administration and the last may have learned this lesson too well, for both demonstrated a disturbing pattern of press censorship during previous conflicts. Where were the press during Grenada? Where were the press during Panama? Was the public adequately informed about these operations?

We all understand that some restrictions must be imposed on military information. The press understands this as well. We understand also the dif-

ficulty of feeding an insatiable press appetite for conflict and controversy, for instant news and analysis. Thus far, it would appear that most officials have offered remarkably sober and cautious assessments of this war.

Yet recent reports indicate that the administration is falling into the same traps others have suffered. There are reports that it is holding up timely news dispatches for no good reason, flatout censoring some news that is neither classified nor sensitive, attempting to soften negative perceptions, releasing information that is contradictory or inadequate, and not providing sufficient documentation for some of its claims. I would like to submit for the RECORD an article from the Washington Post this weekend that examines some of these claims.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 26, 1991]

CORRESPONDENTS CHAFE OVER CURBS ON NEWS—RULES MEANT TO PROTECT TROOPS, OFFICIALS SAY

(By Howard Kurtz)

Carol Morello, a Philadelphia Inquirer reporter, was aboard a U.S. aircraft carrier when it was announced over a loudspeaker that the Persian Gulf War had begun. Pilots on board started cheering and giving each other high-fives. But Morello said she and other reporters were quickly hustled below by their U.S. military escort.

"He rounded us up in this little room for that first crucial hour," Morello said. "I tried begging, I tried arguing, I tried banging my head against the wall. I said, 'History is being made.' By the time we got out, that initial euphoria had died down."

Journalists and military officials in the gulf have engaged in a series of low-level skirmishes over the Defense Department's restrictions on media coverage. Reporters in combat pools must submit stories for "security review," and military escorts must accompany all reporters in the region.

Some reporters say the censors have limited their access, changed phrases, deleted facts and refused to approve dispatches until they were old news. For example:

New York Times reporter Malcolm W. Browne said officers told him that U.S. air strikes had destroyed much of Iraq's nuclear capability but that a unit commander blocked his pool report, saying it would aid Iraqi intelligence. Defense officials later disclosed the same information at a press news briefing. "The Pentagon is clearly eager to be the first to report the most newsworthy information," Browne wrote.

Peter Copeland, a Scripps-Howard reporter, said military officials delayed his reporting with Saudi pilots for 53 hours. "The worst nightmare for a journalist is to have a great story and not be able to tell it," he told Knight-Ridder Newspapers.

Frank Bruni of the Detroit Free Press said he filed a story describing returning pilots as "giddy" but that a military censor changed the word to "proud."

Pilots aboard the aircraft carrier USS John F. Kennedy told an Associated Press reporter that they had been watching pornographic movies before flying bombing missions, according to Morello. She said the censor deleted the information, saying it "would be too embarrassing" and also excused one pilot's use of an obscenity.

A New York Times pool dispatch reported "stealth" bombers striking Baghdad on the war's first day, but military officials referred the article to "stealth" headquarters in Nevada for review. The news was stale by the time it was cleared a day later.

Defense Department spokesman Pete Williams has maintained that the rules are meant to protect U.S. forces. In any event, he said, news organizations make the final decision on what to publish or broadcast. But news executives say the process is so cumbersome that important news is delayed and note that the department can revoke the credentials of offending reporters.

A senior military official said some reporters had inadvertently disclosed sensitive information. One television report, he said, described how a French unit was moving parallel to an American unit. "It tells the battle guys on the other side how we're lining up," he said.

Public sympathy for the media's complaints appears limited. Many people complain that aggressive reporting is harming the war effort. "I don't know why you're so intent on proving massive failures of some kind," White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater told reporters Wednesday.

A survey by Frank Magid Associates found that 24 percent of those polled believe that the media has too much freedom, 17 percent said the restrictions should be eased and 54 percent said the rules were about right.

Thirteen publications and writers, including the Village Voice, the Nation, Harper's and authors William Styron and E.L. Doctorow, have sued the Defense Department, charging that the rules are unconstitutional. Fifteen members of Congress, led by Rep. Bruce F. Vento (D-Minn.), criticized the restrictions in a letter to Defense Secretary Richard B. Cheney.

Correspondents also must contend with Saudi and Israeli censorship. After an Iraqi missile attack yesterday, Cable News Network's Gary Strieler said from Tel Aviv, "We're awaiting word from the censors on what we can say."

Some reporters are pleased with the U.S. pool arrangements, saying military officials have cleared more than 200 pool reports with few incidents. "Most of us are amazed by how much they're letting get through," said Molly Moore, a Washington Post staff writer in Saudi Arabia.

But Morello said that, on the USS Kennedy, her stories were subjected to "a triple review" by her military escort, the ship's public affairs officer and the commanding officer. "The only way you can appeal is to hold up your story for days if not weeks," she said.

"This is a total, complete news blackout," said Ron Nessen, vice president of Mutual Broadcasting System and a former White House press secretary. "We've seen airplanes taking off and airplanes landing, and occasionally they bring a pilot out to talk about his adventures."

Nessen, a former NBC correspondent in Vietnam, said military officials believe that negative coverage of the Vietnam War undermined public support at home, and "they've just decided they're not going to let that happen again."

Newsday reporter Patrick Sloyan said he would not join a military pool because he did not want "a flack hanging over my back intimidating the guy I'm talking to. I think the pools are a trap. They'll take you only where they want to go, let you see what they want you to see."

Ultimately, the American people must evaluate the information they receive on this war, and it will be they—not the President or the generals—who must judge the progress and success of our mission. They will need as much information as is practical to do this.

They say the first casualty of war is the truth. Because of the extraordinary sacrifice of human lives during war, it becomes imperative that we not sacrifice the truth as well. We learned in Vietnam that you cannot deceive the American people. Eventually, the truth will come out. I trust the American people to make their own judgments, as democracy demands, when they have the best information available.

Sometimes that truth will be painful, ugly, and disturbing. I believe, as Patrick Henry said:

It is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope * * * [but] for my part, whatever anguish of spirit it might cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.

□ 1540

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Washington, for those excellent remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and cousin, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah and congratulate him on the presentation of this special order on censorship.

I think it is important to note what the meaning of censorship is. Overwhelmingly, the American people, according to recent polls, support censorship. They say, "We need more censorship instead of less." I think the American people conceive of censorship as being a control of information in order to protect our troops in the field, in order to protect our pilots who are flying, in order to protect our naval vessels, that the control of information is to protect them and if that information were not tightly controlled they would, in some way, be in danger.

A few days ago there was a television forum, and the reporter, Syd Schanberg, who distinguished himself in reporting on the war in Vietnam and the war in Cambodia, Syd Schanberg, stated that in no instance in Vietnam was any reporter, any journalist ever accused of releasing information that jeopardized the safety of the troops and the war effort. He also said that in World War II and in Korea no journalist was ever accused of releasing information that endangered the war effort, that endangered the troops in the field. They are not guilty; American journalists are not guilty of releasing information that jeopardizes our troops.

So why do we need the censorship? Why do we need the control? They understand very well, and their conduct in the past has demonstrated that they

will abide by a code which says that they will do nothing to jeopardize the safety of our troops.

I do not think that the rules that have been imposed are for the purpose of protecting the safety of our troops. The rules that have been imposed are for the purpose of controlling what Americans in this country receive and controlling the way we think about the war, and in the process of trying to make that kind of control or maintain that kind of control, we have situations which have already backfired on us, because the tendency, the temptation of the military if they have full control is to exaggerate and to distort. And the reporting of what happened during the first few days of the war was exaggerated and distorted in ways which forced certain Americans who were less experienced with this kind of situation to experience a bit of trauma when they suddenly discovered that the euphoria of the first few days of the war, when it appeared that we had soundly destroyed the enemy, that Iraq was at a point where it could not rise from the ashes and it was only a matter of days before it would all be over, that is the kind of reporting we got as a result of total control by the military. The military did not bother to tell us about the inadequacies or the limitations of their own capacity to assess the damage that they had done. They have told us about that now, many days later; they tell us, "Well, we have a limited capacity to assess the damage," but the first few days the damage was done according to them. "We have destroyed the command-and-control potential of Iraq." It was all done. The military did not bother to tell us about decoys and the way decoys may deceive the people who are dropping the bombs and who are in the air.

Nevertheless, a few days ago I read an article which showed that American military officers had been in Italy interviewing some of the people who specialized in making decoys, and one of the places that they went to was a place which made decoys of any kind of armaments from anywhere in the world, and Iraq had purchased a large number of decoys from this place. Our military had been there. They knew about this place. They knew about the possibility of decoys deceiving American pilots and, yet, they never mentioned this in the first few days of the war. It only comes out later. It is a deliberate withholding of certain information.

I do not mind a delay in information if the military concedes that that delay is going to safeguard the well-being of our troops, but delays of information merely to create an atmosphere and a kind of sense of victory is a distortion which will backfire eventually, and even the American people who now overwhelmingly vote for more censor-

ship will come to distrust their own Government, distrust all the reporting and, in the final analysis, they will lose faith in our effort, our war effort.

What we have is a situation where the quantity of information, the quantity of what is coming over the television stations and the radio stations is certainly sufficient. The problem is not quantity. The problem is diversity and quality, selectivity. We can see the same canned interviews on every station two or three times a day, and in the process of canned interviews, the military does a very bad job of it. It looks like a canned interview. It looks like a rehearsal. It looks like we have degraded this war to theater, third-class theater, where they are showing us how good a certain weapon is or they are showing us how the troops are training and how they are preparing themselves, and it looks so canned, because they have set it up in such a rigid way that an air of unreality takes over, and we have a situation where we are getting plenty of information. We are watching a war in our living rooms on television, but the whole thing is very unreal.

How do the American people make decisions in an unreal situation like this when they are given an unreal picture of the developments as they take place? It is important not only for the Congress, people who make vital decisions, the Government officials to have the right information, but since in this democracy public opinion drives so much of what we decide and do at this level, so much of what our Government decides to do, we should not, you know, set that public opinion up by giving it the wrong information. We should not distort what is being fed to the public so that we get a result and a reaction which is based on false assumptions.

We should not set all of us up for situations where the truth, when it comes out, makes it appear that the enemy has some kind of unusual, exceptional, supernatural powers. The enemy that was supposed to have been destroyed in the first few days of the war suddenly arises, and they have all kinds of tricks. It appears that they are stronger and more clever than they are. We were supposed to have destroyed the Scud missile launchers and, yet, they bounced back. We now admit that we have no way of knowing that we have destroyed the stationary Scud missile launchers, and they did not tell us about the mobile ones until later. So now there are mobile ones and stationary ones, and we think that we have destroyed almost none of the mobile ones, while we might have destroyed quite a number of the stationary Scud launchers. Why could we not have the same information at the beginning?

The enemy appears to be more competent, far more clever than he really is as a result of distortions of information.

I hope this war is ended soon. I hope that we do not have a bloodbath as the land war is forced to take place. I hope that we can find some solution which will minimize the number of casualties.

But, in the meantime, let us not be driven by the kind of hysteria that tells us that everything the military does is correct and that the military, when they censor the press and they block us from receiving information from a diverse number of sources, they are doing the right thing to protect our troops. They are not protecting our troops. They are distorting the truth. They are distorting the view of the war that we get. They are placing this democracy in greater jeopardy than it needs to be placed in.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his excellent remarks.

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

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my brother from Utah, my good friend, for taking this time so that we can come over here and talk about something that I think a relatively small number of us are concerned about in the Congress and the country.

□ 1550

That is, the efforts of the Pentagon and the White House to politicize this war and to make it look a whole lot better than it is, and to make it appear as if it is going a whole lot better than it is. That troubles me very deeply, not only because it is wrong in the case of this war but because it goes to the very heart of our democratic system, and what this country is all about.

While I do not generally regard myself as somebody who does not trust the Government, and I am not in the camp of those people who are antipolitician or antigovernment or anti-Washington, when it comes to this subject, I do not trust the Government. I do not think the Government is going to give Members information which will make the Government look bad. That is why we have a free press in this country, so that we can get an accurate picture of what is going on.

To the extent that the Pentagon and the White House has succeeded in diminishing that capability on the part of the American press, they have done a tremendous disservice to our country, and I think they have done a disservice to the military, and they have done a disservice to themselves.

Very briefly, there are really three rules that trouble me. The first is the pool rule, which says that the press cannot travel around the country individually to get news. They have to go in a pool. It is a rotating pool. It is anywhere between 12 and 15 people. Sometimes it is not that large. Of course, generally the big networks get

picked up and the big papers in the big cities get picked up, and the wire services get picked up, and some of the small magazines, those very small magazines that have filed suit against this procedure do not get picked up. So the coverage really is slanted.

Of course, it prevents people from digging around and finding out what they want to find out, and rooting around and asking questions which the Government does not want asked. Of course, that is what being a reporter is all about. That is the job. That is what we ought to be doing.

Second, all of the print media, all of the film, all of the voice, is censored. Most of it is allowed to come back to this country. It has not proven to be a big problem, but I cannot figure out why the U.S. Government should have the right to censor the news that we are putting in the American newspapers or on television or on the radio, with the obvious exception of giving away information which would jeopardize our troops. That is not at issue here. Of course, that is what people always say, "Well, aren't you worried about giving Saddam Hussein some information that is going to jeopardize our troops?" Of course we are, and of course, we do not want that to happen.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago, Senator Hiram Johnson observed, "The first casualty when war comes is truth." I do not wish to see that metaphor become fact during the current war in the Persian Gulf because war managers in the Pentagon have appointed themselves news managers as well.

What is the truth? We don't know. That is what we expect print and broadcast journalists to ferret out. We do know it is not some managed dog-and-pony show orchestrated by vested interests—whether it is some Pentagon public affairs officer looking over the shoulder of journalists or shocking television pictures of battered American pilots being paraded before the world by a despot.

Journalists are every much patriots as the audiences who anxiously await their reports. Journalists understand and, for the most part, will play by the rules of responsible restraint. Let us not wait for later to demand why we did not find our sooner.

Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Colin Powell says, "Trust me." I do. But I also trust the media. We have unleashed the "dog of war," as Jefferson put it. Let us also take the muzzle off the free press.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

AGENT ORANGE COMPROMISE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering two bills of vital importance

to the veterans' community. The first bill, H.R. 556, directs the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to obtain an independent scientific review of the available scientific evidence regarding associations between diseases and exposure to dioxin and other chemical compounds in herbicides.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 556 is an important step in ending the long and divisive battle over the agent orange issue. For the last decade, a battle has raged between the Federal Government and our Vietnam veterans. Unfortunately, the same battle has been fought among our Nation's veterans' service organizations.

The legislation we are now considering is a compromise. It is a compromise between those groups who want compensation for various disabilities and those groups who believe that more time is needed to assess the scientific evidence surrounding the agent orange issue. I believe this bill has the potential to quell some of the bitterness that divides these two groups.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that H.R. 556 enjoys the support of the Secretary of Veteran Affairs, Edward Derwinski, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and a combination of Members of Congress who in the past have fought each other tooth and nail over this issue. It reflects a sincere and realistic attempt to determine whether exposure to herbicides in Vietnam has caused any of the various disabilities now present in the veterans' community.

Specifically, this legislation codifies a prior administrative decision by Secretary Derwinski to deem three conditions service-connected for compensation purposes. It will also ask the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a comprehensive review of all the available and future evidence on the long-term health effects of exposure to various herbicides. Based on the conclusions of this review, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs will be expected to decide whether any further presumptions for any disease should be granted.

The debate on whether compensation should be provided for illness related to the exposure to agent orange has gone on far too long. It's time to settle the issue, so we can move on to other serious problems that now plague our veterans. I believe that H.R. 556 goes a long way toward achieving this goal, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my remarks I want to express my support for a second bill we will be voting on here today. That bill is H.R. 555. This legislation amends the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940 to improve and clarify the protections provided to our soldiers under the act.

Mr. Speaker, during the 101st Congress, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee held hearings to determine what adjustments were needed to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act in order to meet the needs of the service people called to active duty as a result of Operation Desert Storm. I believe that H.R. 555 goes a long way toward alleviating most of the domestic concerns of those men and women now serving in the gulf.

Specifically, this bill suspends premium payments on professional liability insurance to assist those doctors who have been called to ac-

tive duty. It also guarantees the reinstatement of private health insurance for service members and their families upon their return from active duty. This provision will ensure that service members do not lose their health insurance as a result of their service.

Furthermore, H.R. 555 will increase the protection against possible eviction for families paying rent from \$400 to \$1,200 per month. This adjustment reflects the dramatic increase in housing costs over since the inception of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act in 1940. Finally, this bill protects service people from pending legal proceedings while they are in the gulf.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 555. It's simply the least we can do for those brave young men and women who are now risking their lives in the Persian Gulf.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER] so he may continue the special order on the subject of reporting the war.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Finally, the rule that a reporter cannot interview a GI alone, they have to have somebody from the military along while they are interviewing a GI. If a reporter wants to ask him if the food is any good, they cannot interview any GI alone. No GI will be perfectly candid with the reporter when somebody who is their superior is there while he is being questioned.

A person on my staff finally spoke yesterday to a fellow named Barry Zoratian, who from 1964 to 1968 was the chief press officer in Vietnam for military. He said that then there were about 650 reporters in the area. Now there are about 750 reporters in the area. That is 100 more. This is not a matter of logistics. There was a voluntary list. It worked in Vietnam. He says there were he believes about 6 disclosures all totally inadvertent.

This is an effort to make this war look better than it is, not an effort to protect the troops or to protect this country. This is an effort of the White House, of the President, and by the Pentagon to influence, I think very favorably, the coverage of the war in the Persian Gulf. It is wrong. The Congress ought to be a good deal more outraged about it than we are. The country ought to be more outraged about it than we are, and I am delighted there were a few Members here in the House, especially the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS] who remember why the people in our district sent each member here, and to ask others in the country, and especially in the press, that rolled over and played dead in the

whole issue, while we are not asking some tough questions.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank all those who have participated in this special order. It is interesting to note, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that there were those people who really believe, apparently, that the war in Vietnam was lost because of the press. To that allegation, I cite the Army's own history of the Vietnam war:

What alienated the American public in both the Korean and Vietnam wars was not news coverage but casualties.

Wrote Army historian William L. Hammond. He said:

It is undeniable that press reports were more often accurate than the public statements or the administration in portraying the situation in Vietnam. In the end, President Johnson and his advisers put too much faith in public relations.

To that, Mr. Speaker, I add this verdict: Too little faith in the ability of the American people to recognize and accept truth.

LESSON 2: WAR AND OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as the war in the Persian Gulf enters its third week, two fundamental issues confront the American people.

The first is how we Americans conduct ourselves toward one another as this war continues. On the homefront, this is a time for brotherhood and sisterhood in America. War breeds strong emotions. It engages our attention; and as we know during the Vietnam war, war can be divisive. But this is not a time for people to lash out in anger at fellow citizens who, in their own way, are expressing their views on this war. I have seen anger where there should be tolerance; I have seen prejudice, where there should be understanding. There is much we can do to be helpful, rather than hurtful, at this time when national unity demands the finest that is in us all. As our sons and daughters stand poised for battle, mutual respect must rule the day here at home.

As this war continues, people's emotions and opinions about the war are only going to get stronger. It is, therefore, imperative for all Americans to remind ourselves that the definition of patriotism cannot be limited—that who is patriotic and who is not—cannot be defined or limited by any self-appointed group of Americans.

A second issue. It is imperative that the American people come to understand the causes for this war. That they know why brave men and women are in battle. We need to fully understand the patterns of economic power,

the institutional arrangements, and the power of the multinational oil companies—a private power axis largely hidden from public view. These have helped to shape our policy in the Middle East in the course of the last three decades. We need to know the lessons of history so once this war is over, we will never again have to send our troops in harm's way for barrels of oil.

Let me speak to each of these issues.

First, protecting the right of dissent in times of war. Dissent is not disloyalty. The Constitution upholds the right of all Americans, regardless of their views on this war, to be heard in the public forum.

The Bill of Rights, as we all know, does not define who is a patriot and who is not. The Bill of Rights defines our right to be patriotic. It does not define what is patriotic. Nor does it limit the ability of any American to express those rights in a time of war.

□ 1600

That is what makes America unique. Free speech, including the right to approve as well as dissent is at the very core of our constitutional principles. It goes to the very heart of who we are as a people.

Let me reiterate, there is a strong distinction between dissent and disloyalty, and as one of my constituents has said, "A patriot is more than a missile."

It is, therefore, unacceptable to question the patriotism of any American, and it is not acceptable to assert that Americans who dissent in any way, directly or indirectly, are helping Saddam Hussein prolong this war. Long after Saddam Hussein has come and gone, the Bill of Rights will remain. It will remain because it is a document of breadth and vision and it will remain only if all Americans, regardless of their views on this war, subscribe to the principles encapsulated in it.

I therefore applaud President Bush for his recent remarks on the rights of all Americans to dissent, even against a policy that he believes is the right course.

This is a time for Americans to treat one another with dignity, respect and tolerance. There remains an enormous disquietude in America about the "why" of this war. Every pollster knows it. That disquiet and sense of unease is just under the very big numbers supporting the President. Those Americans who articulate that disquiet are no less patriotic than any Member of this House. All Members, regardless of their views, on the "why" of this war recognize the sacrifices our troops are making in the gulf. Supporting our troops is not the issue. All Americans support our troops.

The issue is America's long-term role in the Middle East.

Last week I spoke at some length about the power of oil in shaping and

defining the American experience in the Middle East. I said that this war, an economic war, had been a long time in coming. The American people need to know the lessons of history to understand why at this particular juncture in time America is fighting its first oil war. This crisis is just one of a series of oil shocks in the last three decades that have brought the United States and its allies to the edge of war.

This war is not an aberration, Mr. Speaker, not an aberration at all. It is a continuation of an economic struggle that has engaged American policymakers since World War II.

Saddam Hussein lit the fuse for this war when he invaded Kuwait on August 2, make no mistake about it.

Saddam Hussein is brutal and calculating and a dictator who seems to think only of his own ambition, but this war is not just a war to drop a bomb on Saddam Hussein's ego or to deflate his megalomania; no, nor is it in truth a war to end brutality in Kuwait, for America has on more than one occasion turned its back on people in other lands who were under the thumb of very brutal dictators. If brutality alone was the sole rationale for intervention, the United States long ago would have gone after the dozens of brutal dictators and killers who have denied the very humanity of their own people in our 20th century; but as we know all too well, the mass killings of an Idi Amin in Uganda or a Pol Pot in Cambodia did not provoke us into war. No, Mr. Speaker, this is an economic war, a war for oil security. It is a war to protect the wellhead and our continued access to the long-term proven oil reserves under the sands of the Middle East. It is a struggle to gain access to a secure source of oil from a region of the world that has historically been unstable, a region that at times has been hostile to American interests and is becoming more so.

It is a struggle, Mr. Speaker, that has demanded the attention of every American President, Democrat and Republican, since the end of World War II. At times this struggle has been simply economic. At times it has led to war; but make no mistake about it, this is an oil war, an economic war.

From the "Politics of Oil," a book written by Robert Engler back in the late 1960's or early 1970's, we learned, "Oil has long been the key reason for western intervention in the Middle East."

In the summer of 1958, a military-led and middle-class dominated coup overthrew a pro-western reactionary dictatorship in Iraq. The one Arab country in the Baghdad pact, this oil-rich country had been a center of British influence in the Middle East and a recipient of considerable American military aid.

Then American Marines landed in Lebanon and British paratroopers descended upon Jordan in an effort to

contain the revolt and to bolster the collapsing western design for the Middle East.

The United States explained that its action was taken to protect American lives and prevent the indirect aggression of assassins in plainclothes seeking to place Lebanon under the domination of Nassir's United Arab Republic. During this time, a New York Times dispatch from Beirut reported a highly experienced military analyst as guessing that the job of smashing the headquarters of the opposition to the government might be done with two tanks alone.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union delegate told the United Nations that he detected an acute smell of oil underlying the troop movements, and the New York Times further reported a series of conferences at which President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles and Foreign Secretary Selwin Lloyd of Britain had agreed to limit their military action in the Middle East for the time being to Lebanon and Jordan, quoting, "As long as intervention will not be extended to Iraq, as long as the revolutionary government in Iraq respects western oil interests," said the front page dispatch.

This gunboat diplomacy was clearly in line with the State Department's commitment to pipelines and oil profits.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking about the power of oil for the second week in a row because the people of the United States need to know why we are fighting this war. They want to know. They deserve the facts. Their children are going to die. Their sons and daughters are on the front lines as we speak.

So this is my way to help this understanding, to remind Americans about the lessons of history, those we learned and those we did not learn, so that once this war is over we will never ever have to send our troops again into battle for oil.

We need to fully understand the patterns of economic power, the institutional arrangements and the power of the multi-national oil giants in shaping our policy in the Middle East over the last three decades.

Last week I spoke at some length about how the power of oil dominated the economic history of the 20th century. I quoted Churchill who best embodied the quest for oil where it has been said, "Mastery itself was the prize of the venture."

I went on to read into the RECORD the prologue of Daniel Yergin's important new book entitled "The Prize, the Epic Quest for Oil, Money and Power," the book that defines the 20th century as the century of oil, a book with three great themes: The power of oil in the rise and development of capitalism in modern business, the power of oil as a commodity intimately intertwined with national strategies and global pol-

itics and power, and third, the power of oil to shape and define our society to such an extent that man and woman, himself and herself, could aptly be defined in the language of anthropologists as hydrocarbon man and woman.

I also spoke about the many crises that have preceded the war that now currently demands our attention.

I spoke about the Suez crisis of 1956, of how Kuwait and Iraq, then allies, cut off our oil supplies in 1967 because of our support for Israel in the Six-Day War.

I described how the Arab nations began to nationalize western oil companies, to demand a re-definition of established rules of oil pricing and who got the profits.

The American people need to hear more about the role of Gulf Oil Corp. and British Petroleum in Kuwait. Our people need to hear more about the role of Exxon and Mobil in Iraq, and we need to learn more about Aramco, the Saudi Arabian oil company with historic ties to Exxon, Chevron, Texaco, and Mobil.

It does not surprise me at all that the new Texaco ads on television attempt to spruce up Texaco's image, or that Mobil has taken out big newspaper ads even in our congressional newsletter called Roll Call, explaining how puny their profits really are.

□ 1610

The profits of the big multinational oil companies have been skyrocketing since Iraq invaded Kuwait. Some companies are making big profits on this war.

Chevron's earnings rose by 860 percent in 1990. Chevron earned \$633 million in the fourth quarter compared with a loss higher than that in the fourth quarter of 1989.

Exxon's earnings in 1990 rose about 8 percent. But if the expenses from the 1989 cleanup of the Valdez oil spill and a one-time accounting change are included, earnings rose 43 percent.

Mobil has stated that its profits rose 7 percent in 1990, led by a sharp increase in fourth-quarter results caused by rising oil prices. But in the fourth quarter of last year Mobil earned \$651 million, which is up 46 percent from its profits a year ago.

Texaco, not to be outdone, reported a 35 percent increase in profits for the fourth quarter of \$388 million.

Now, let me cite an example: Texaco and the Saudi Arabian oil company, Aramco, have a relationship that is extremely vertically integrated. Texaco has agreed to buy something along the order of 600,000 barrels of oil per day from Aramco at predetermined prices. This assures Aramco access to the market controlled by Texaco at stable prices and, in turn, gives Texaco assured access to that oil.

The relationship is cemented by the joint venture company of Star Enterprises.

These relationships, once developed, can be very exclusive.

As evidence of this, Texaco's profits have risen dramatically while Ashland Corp.'s profits, which does not have access to crude oil, have been tumbling.

Some smaller oil-producing countries with less oil to move may outright buy refining capabilities and market access.

Kuwait is a good example of this, as they bought out Santa Fe International in our own country for this purpose.

Thus these countries become even more representative of monopolies of old, having fully integrated the process from production to selling it at the gas pumps that our citizens go to every week.

The relationship between oil-producing countries and their governments and oil corporations is relatively simple in design but exceedingly complex in organization. In short, they have covered their bases well.

After this war ends, there will be a real movement toward direct investment by these oil companies in the Gulf States. Having been closed to direct foreign investment for some time now, this will represent a marked change in policy and an increasingly influential role in the area for oil corporations that can afford to invest the capital.

In actuality, it will be a reversal back to the past.

So the war we are in today has everything to do with who and which countries and companies control the enormous profits, and I mean enormous, involved in the sale of Middle East oil.

Last week I talked about the rise of OPEC, the Middle Eastern consortium of those nations and their companies, and how that new cartel and its oil card was played against the American consumer in our country back in 1973.

It is no secret how our economy went into an economic tailspin resulting from higher oil prices when the oil-producing nations, whose populations were and are largely poor, organized together to ask more money for a barrel of oil.

Let me give you some figures: In 1973 the price of a barrel of light crude oil went from \$3.12 a barrel to \$4.90 a barrel in October 1973. In December, then, prices rose again from \$5.11 to \$11.65. So that was a rise of almost quadrupling from \$3.12 up to \$11.65 a barrel.

Prior to that, in nations like Kuwait this is what it cost the oil companies to lift a barrel of oil. So let us look at what they made in profits on a barrel. It cost Western-owned oil companies 8 cents a barrel, 8 cents per barrel, to lift a barrel of oil. That oil was then marketed internationally, most of it to the United States, for \$2.48 a barrel. Half of

that profit, \$1.24 of it, went as royalties to the kings or emirs of those nations, thus the name "royalty."

For every royalty, for every penny of royalty paid to a king, the U.S. company striking that deal got, and gets until today, an enormous U.S. tax break in the form of a straight and full deduction from taxes owed to the U.S. Government on all of its revenues paid as royalties. That is a very important word, "royalties," very special treatment in our tax laws.

America has never fully recovered as a result of the 1973 recession, and every day the taxpayers of our country are subsidizing through the tax system the payment of these royalties to the kings and emirs of the Middle East.

The defining year is 1973, the very break point in the economic history of the United States following World War II.

Prior to 1973 it could be said that the United States was indeed a nation that reigned supreme economically. Despite the cold war, the Vietnam war and all the political turbulence of the post-World War II era, the United States prior to 1973 was a country that remained above the economic turbulence of the rest of the world. But as we all know and know all too well, that time has come and gone.

The oil shock of 1973 is the oil shock that changed America. Today, over half of the U.S. trade deficit with the rest of the world is due to what we have to pay for imported oil, fully 55 percent of our national trade deficit falls in the category of imported oil.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time America took stock of itself and moved in a new direction toward energy independence from foreign supplies?

Mr. Speaker, 1973 seems a very long time ago, but even then the threat of war, the linkage between our energy situation and the Palestinian question was ever on the minds of far-sighted experts.

Last week David Warsh, a columnist for the Boston Globe, wrote an insightful column in the business section of the Washington Post entitled "Oil Remains the Driving Force of the Persian Gulf War."

The text of the article referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 23, 1991]

OIL REMAINS THE DRIVING FORCE OF THE PERSIAN GULF WAR
(By David Warsh)

Twenty years, three oil shocks, three global recessions: The Persian Gulf War that began last week may have been about borders. It may have been about civility. But deep down, its purpose is to take away the "oil weapon" from the nations that have exercised it since 1971.

Though not officially stated in such terms, the idea involves eliminating the government that has reached for the weapon most recently and intimidating the others. But President Bush had little to say the night war broke out in describing his war aims re-

garding the slow growth and the cycles of boom and bust that have plagued the international order since the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries gained control of prices.

Instead, the president repeatedly stressed the brutality of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Only obliquely did he refer to the stakes (that could ultimately make the war worthwhile).

"While the world waited, while Saddam stalled, more damage was being done to the fragile economies of the Third World, the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe, to the entire world, including to our own economy," the president said. That brief mention notwithstanding, when the history books are written, the period of instability that began with the "oil embargo" of 1973 is likely to form the core of the story of the Gulf war.

How might this war help the world economy free itself from the periodic stranglehold on oil that has been exercised by the oil-rich nations? It helps to go back to one of the basic economic stories of the last 20 years. Few technical issues are more susceptible to argument than the provision and distribution of energy in the world economy. But the broad outlines of a story acceptable to most experts was related by energy economist M.A. Adelman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in congressional testimony last autumn.

For most of a century after its discovery in 1859, Adelman said, oil's world price was held well above the cost of finding new reserves by the multinational oil companies. Then, in the years after World War II, oil's inflation-adjusted price fell by 80 percent. It hit bottom in 1970. It was then that the cartel of sovereign governments known as OPEC discovered it could exercise control of the price of oil through a combination of output cuts, threats and the shrewd manufacture of crises.

There is reason to believe, Adelman said, that the OPEC nations were abetted in their early efforts by the Nixon administration, which was anxious at the time to arm the nations of the Middle East—Iran in particular—against the Soviet Union.

Slowly at first, then in a series of sharp increases, the cartel of nations raised the price of oil 15-fold, adjusted for inflation, between 1970 and 1971, to markups far beyond those ever contemplated by the companies that had administered the oil market. The result of this governmental gouging was, as Adelman said, worldwide suffering on a grand scale. Among the consequences he noted:

Industrial nations tumbled into steep recessions twice, in 1974 and 1981. The latter slowdown in Europe turned into a six-year depression. The lost output cost the world hundreds of billions of dollars. Declining productivity growth translated into stagnant living standards that strained normally confident societies.

Less-developed countries devastated their forests for fuel. They ran up staggering debts in a vain attempt to outrun the oil shocks—debts whose ultimate uncollectability shut down new lending for worthy purposes and ultimately threatened the banking system of the West.

Arab nations invested huge portions of their oil revenues in armaments. Petrodollars financed the eight-year Iraq-Iran war, for example, with 1 million dead and 3 million casualties and refugees.

The third oil shock, which began last summer, was no different from the earlier two, Adelman argued. Last June, oil was selling

for about \$13 a barrel and the market verged on the brink of a further steep decline. Two months later, when Iraq invaded Kuwait, prices skyrocketed toward \$40 a barrel. Over-ripe after eight years of debt-financed expansion, the United States paused momentarily on the brink, then tumbled into recession. Sales fell, unemployment rose sharply, the budget deficit soared, the banking system threatened to collapse.

Although Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan has said that he thought the recession just might have bottomed out, much depends on the price of oil—and so on the outcome of the war.

Just how, then, might a successful gulf war stabilize the price of oil? And at what level? With no one in the Bush administration talking much about war aims other than "the liberation of Kuwait," it is difficult to say.

But the very unanimity with which the United Nations reached its votes, and with which 28 nations assembled their military mission in the gulf suggests the extent to which a stable world economic order is desired. Predictable oil prices would form a significant part of such a world—and precisely those nations threatened by Saddam Hussein's August invasion, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, are thought to be most deeply committed to a policy of stable prices.

It's not gas-guzzling cars and fast boats that are the issue. Nations are free to tax the use of energy as heavily as they see fit. Indeed, they can confidently be expected to do so if an environmental crisis looms. Rather, it is the freedom from sudden and disruptive shocks arising from cartel shenanigans that is desired by Bush and the leaders of the 27 nations that joined him.

On the morning after the war began, oil prices plummeted a long way toward what the markets figure might be their long-term price of \$15 or less, and the possibility arose that the war might be more or less self-financing, through stronger-than-expected economic growth. So why, then, did Bush have so little to say about the economic basis of the war? Well, for one thing, the state of economic understanding of the processes of growth and development is hardly such that he could firmly base moral claims of life and death upon it. It is much better to base your policy on the promise that it will stop the torture of children than on your hope that it will enhance industrial and agricultural productivity.

Moreover, the gulf war offers no quick fix for slow global growth. Even if the war goes well for the coalition, much remains to be done to stitch together the new world order of which the president spoke.

Then, too, questions having to do with energy consumption are highly charged emotionally. For many people, economic growth means the greenhouse effect and nothing more.

Finally, it can hardly be said that all of America's problems—nor those of any of the other industrial nations—stem from gyrations of the price of oil, important as that strut of the story has been.

But barring a disaster, the likelihood is that the institutional arrangements of the post-Cold War world are being laid in the ashes of the war against Iraq. Not since the end of World War II has there been so much to gain from a possible victory.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to include this column because it defines again in the most clear terms why oil is the reason that we are involved in the current war in the Middle East.

Whether America should have gone to war over imported oil is for historians to contemplate years hence. Our task today, however, is not to ignore but to recognize the reason that we are at war.

The core of the problem of why America is at war is that the United States, as a nation, believes itself to be desperately dependent upon oil, and foreign sources of it, for its continued well-being.

This shared premise began as an artificially created notion through the efforts of private interests, largely oil companies.

Now, we consume a lot of oil, and certain sectors of our economy are overly dependent on it. But let me ask why, why do we depend on imported oil so very much when the technology and natural resources, the alternatives available in this country abound?

Coal alone, we have more coal under the ground in America, more Btu's, British thermal units, under the ground in America in recoverable coal than the Middle East has Btu's, British thermal units, underground in oil.

□ 1620

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, "Why haven't we developed that resource and cleaned up coal where we know we can do it? Why haven't we used our fields and farms to produce new alcohol and agriculturally related fuels?"

Mr. Speaker, we are the most productive Nation on Earth. Our farmers have corn and all types of products rotting in storage bins across this country, so I ask, "Why haven't we, as a country, begun to develop this tremendous resource? Or solar power, where we have learned so much through NASA? Or photovoltaics? Why haven't we perfected that technology, or hydrogen power, or hydroelectric power in those areas where we front on waterways? Why have we been so slow to develop these technologies? Could it be perhaps that those cartels that have created this dependence that America now finds herself wed to foreign sources of supply have found it more profitable in the short run to seek higher profits for those companies than to invest here in America for the betterment of the good old U.S. of A.? Why do we continue to use inefficient practices and machines like the internal combustion engine without inventing a new generation of engines for motor vehicles for the 21st century? Do you mean to tell me a nation that landed a man on the moon in 10 years couldn't completely redo our form of motor transportation?"

Mr. Speaker, it is very possible. In fact, it is achievable.

I ask, "Why haven't we had the will to do that, and why is it the public is continually expected to swallow arguments for such an inefficient system

when access to all the facts are not forthcoming?"

Back in 1975, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger produced something he called his strangulation theory. He said then that oil is worth fighting for because it is the lifeblood of our economy and our way of life, and yet, as he strongly advocated that very position, at the very same time, in 1975, a joint Senate committee was denied information by the Under Secretary of the Interior at that time, Hollis Dole, on how much natural gas actually underlies the public lands in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, let me end by saying that a military strategy is no replacement for an energy strategy. It can very well serve as the impetus to overcome objections by vested interests, largely our oil corporations, to enable a national energy policy to come into being. But what a price to pay for 20 and 30 years of neglect. The public should be able to expect not to have to go to war again so America can heat her homes, so that we can operate our automobiles, and that we can run our factories.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, "Why should we have to go to war to get the fuel to do that?" Energy self-sufficiency made right here at home by developing our own resources should be our top priority agenda as we move toward the 21st century. Once the shooting stops, that must be our No. 1 priority.

TECHNOLOGY SAVES LIVES

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of this Nation's greatest current challenges is the determination of how, in the wake of our new relationship with the Soviet Union and the current war with Iraq, we should spend our money to defend this Nation.

Not long ago, many in Congress were caught up in the euphoria of the Soviet Union's new openness and restructuring and in our new, less threatening relationship with them. To many it seemed that because the cold war was apparently over, we could feel free to tear down our military piece by piece. To them, not only were we free from the major military threat to our national security, but we were free from almost any military threat.

Shouts for massive defense cuts and "peace dividends" were vibrating off Capitol walls. Calls for the systematic dismantling of our military and wholesale elimination of new weapon systems were the battle cries in many political campaigns.

Then, amidst the euphoria came an unnerving shock: Iraq invaded Kuwait.

In August, as some Congressmen and congressional candidates instantly became military experts, many of them espoused theories about how we had sacrificed our conventional warfare capabilities by concentrating on the development and production of high technology weapons for a potential conflict with the Soviet Union. The strategic defense initiative [SDI] was among the first targets of antidefense rhetoric. Claims were made that defending against incoming missiles was a thing of the past, and that the money could be better used elsewhere.

As recently as last November, people have blamed me and others for participating in House Armed Services Committee decisions to spend money on sophisticated weaponry such as SDI, cruise missiles, and stealth technology. Our critics claimed that there was a misguided emphasis on high technology which evolved during the Reagan administration and that we should have learned from our lessons in Vietnam that high-tech air power cannot defeat an enemy force on its home terrain.

But on January 16, 1991, reality impinged upon political rhetoric and theory, and fact met fiction.

Since the early stages of the campaign to drive Saddam from Kuwait, sophisticated high-tech weapons and aircraft have performed brilliantly. Navy Tomahawk cruise missiles launched from warships in the Persian Gulf strike with amazing accuracy at military targets in downtown Baghdad. Laser guided missiles shot from F117A Stealth fighter bombers have been precisely directed down narrow buildings and directly through doors.

High technology weapons give our Armed Forces the ability to make surgical strikes, eliminating much of the death and destruction among civilians and their property near the targets. This is in stark comparison to Iraq's hopelessly inaccurate Scud missile which is fired in the general direction of crowded cities in hope of killing civilians for the sole purpose of terrorism.

Not only does this precise accuracy reduce collateral damage at the target, but it ultimately saves the lives of our airmen and soldiers by allowing us to destroy targets with few missions and by dramatically reducing Saddam's ability to wage war long before we send in ground troops. The cost of these weapons may be significant, but what is the price of saving U.S. lives and protecting our freedom?

Even after January 16, many still suggest that the strategic defense initiative is an enormous waste of money. To them, I would suggest a talk with those in Saudi Arabia and Israel who were spared facing an exploding Scud missile because a U.S. Patriot missile destroyed it in the air. The develop-

ment of the Patriot is the same theory as SDI.

To those who suggest that we learn lessons from Vietnam, I submit that while they and others were standing on the sidelines, we did learn valuable lessons from that conflict.

We learned that we must support our troops with the best technology and the best logistical support and power we can muster. We learned that high technology can save lives of our American servicemen and women. And we learned that we must not only provide them with the best weapons, but that we must show strength, and hence our ability to defend this great Nation, lies not only in our technology and in our people, but in our willingness to support both.

But there are lessons still to be learned by many. There are too few in Congress who recognize that the Soviet Union is not the only threat to this Nation's security. We can no longer ignore the likes of a Saddam Hussein, a Mu'ammarr Qadhafi and other dictators known and unknown as potential threats to the security of this Nation. Just one nuclear warhead and one intercontinental ballistic missile in their hands could prove devastating to our homes without a means to defend against it.

"Peace through strength" is much more than a hollow platitude. It has been a guiding principle during much of this Nation's history since George Washington said that the best way to keep the peace is to be prepared for war.

President Reagan understood this concept when he took office in 1980. He grabbed the reins of a dated, demoralized, and underfunded military, and steered it back to a position of strength. He realized that technology could be the answer to keeping the peace, and so we began investing heavily in it.

The results speak for themselves. The Soviet Union found that it faced a determined opponent in the United States whose technology would ever outpace its own. The Soviets recognized strength, and knew that they could no longer spend the sums necessary to keep up. And now, through the Iraqi crisis, we can see the wisdom of Reagan's—and Bush's—vision that the path to peace is truly through strength.

Let this sobering event teach us that we must not tear down our military capability in the face of a lessened threat from the Soviet Union. Instead we should carefully and prudently build down while continually developing our technological capabilities, so that we are never caught without a defense adequate to defend our Nation against any threat.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. SNOWE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of a death in the family.

Ms. 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. CAMP) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORRISON, for 5 minutes, each day on February 5 and 6.

Mr. HANSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, on January 30.

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

Mr. ECKART, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KENNELLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NOWAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MOODY, for 60 minutes, on January 30.

Mr. RANGEL, for 60 minutes, on February 5.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 60 minutes, on February 20.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. SHAYS.

Mr. DOOLITTLE.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. GALLO.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.

Mr. ACKERMAN in two instances.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. MATSUI.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

Mr. STARK.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. KOLTER.

Mr. RAHALL in three instances.

Mr. SLATTERY.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

[Omitted from the Congressional Record of Monday, January 28, 1991.]

Mr. ROSS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise, effective as of January 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, and

H.R. 4. An act to extend the time for performing certain acts under the internal revenue laws for individuals performing services as part of the Desert Shield Operation.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

[Omitted from the Congressional Record of Monday, January 28, 1991.]

Mr. ROSS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On January 25, 1991:

H.R. 3. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise, effective as of January 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, and

H.R. 4. An act to extend the time for performing certain acts under the internal revenue laws for individuals performing services as part of the Desert Shield Operation.

□ 1630

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PICKETT). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 24, 1991, the House will stand in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 46 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, the Honorable James T. Molloy, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT];

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY];

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER];

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR];

The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO];

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS];

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL];

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH];

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS];

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS];

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VANDER JAGT]; and

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL];

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD];

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR];

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON];

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON];

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN];

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN];

The Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM]; and

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved from them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

THE STATE OF THE UNION—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the United States Congress. I come to this House of the people, to speak to you and to all Americans, certain that we stand at a defining hour.

Halfway around the world, we are engaged in a great struggle in the skies and on the seas and sands. We know why we're there. We are Americans: part of something larger than ourselves.

For two centuries, we've done the hard work of freedom. And tonight, we lead the world in facing down a threat to decency and humanity.

What is at stake is more than one small country; it is a big idea: a new world order—where diverse nations are drawn together in common cause, to achieve the universal aspirations of mankind: peace and security, freedom, and the rule of law. Such is a world worthy of our struggle and worthy of our children's future.

The community of nations has resolutely gathered to condemn and repel lawless aggression. Saddam Hussein's unprovoked invasion—his ruthless, systematic rape of a peaceful neighbor—violated everything the community of nations holds dear. The world has said this aggression would not stand—and it will not stand.

Together, we have resisted the trap of appeasement, cynicism, and isolation that gives temptation to tyrants. The world has answered Saddam's invasion with 12 United Nations resolutions, starting with a demand for Iraq's immediate and unconditional with-

drawal—and backed up by forces from 28 countries of six continents. With few exceptions, the world now stands as one.

The end of the Cold War has been a victory for all humanity. A year and a half ago, in Germany, I said that our goal was a Europe whole and free. Tonight, Germany is united. Europe has become whole and free—and America's leadership was instrumental in making it possible.

Our relationship to the Soviet Union is important, not only to us, but to the world. That relationship has helped to shape these and other historic changes. But like many other nations, we have been deeply concerned by the violence in the Baltics, and we have communicated that concern to the Soviet leadership.

The principle that has guided us is simple: our objective is to help the Baltic peoples achieve their aspirations, not to punish the Soviet Union. In our recent discussions with the Soviet leadership, we have been given representations, which, if fulfilled, would result in the withdrawal of some Soviet forces, a reopening of dialogue with the Republics, and a move away from violence.

We will watch carefully as the situation develops. And we will maintain our contact with the Soviet leadership to encourage continued commitment to democratization and reform.

If it is possible, I want to continue to build a lasting basis for U.S.-Soviet cooperation, for a more peaceful future for all mankind.

The triumph of democratic ideas in Eastern Europe and Latin America—and the continuing struggle for freedom elsewhere all around the world—all confirm the wisdom of our Nation's founders.

Tonight, we work to achieve another victory—a victory over tyranny, and savage aggression.

We in this Union enter the last decade of the 20th century thankful for our blessings, steadfast in our purpose, aware of our difficulties, and responsive to our duties at home and around the world.

For two centuries, America has served the world as an inspiring example of freedom and democracy. For generations, America has led the struggle to preserve and extend the blessings of liberty. And today, in a rapidly changing world, American leadership is indispensable. Americans know that leadership brings burdens and sacrifice.

But we also know why the hopes of humanity turn to us.

We are Americans: we have a unique responsibility to do the hard work of freedom. And when we do—freedom works.

The conviction and courage we see in the Persian Gulf today is simply the American character in action. The indomitable spirit that is contributing to

this victory for world peace and justice is the same spirit that gives us the power and the potential to meet our toughest challenges at home.

We are the resolute and resourceful. If we can selflessly confront the evil for the sake of good in a land so far away, then surely we can make this land all that it should be.

If anyone tells you that America's best days are behind her, they're looking the wrong way.

Tonight, I come before this House, and the American people, with an appeal for renewal. This is not merely a call for new government initiatives, it is a call for new initiative in government, in our communities, and from every American—to prepare for the next American century.

America has always led by example. So who among us will set the example? Which of our citizens will lead us in this next American century? Everyone who steps forward today, to get one addict off drugs. To convince one troubled teenager not to give up on life . . . to comfort one AIDS patient . . . to help one hungry child.

We have within our reach the promise of a renewed America. We can find meaning and reward by serving some purpose higher than ourselves—a shining purpose, the illumination of a thousand points of light. And it is expressed by all who know the irresistible force of a child's hand, of a friend who stands by you and stays there—a volunteer's generous gesture, an idea that is simply right.

The problems before us may be different, but the key to solving them remains the same: it is the individual—the individual who steps forward. And the state of our Union is the union of each of us, one to the other: the sum of our friendships, marriages, families, and communities.

We all have something to give. So if you know how to read, find someone who can't. If you've got a hammer, find a nail. If you're not hungry, not lonely, not in trouble—seek out someone who is.

Join the community of conscience. Do the hard work of freedom and that will define the state of our Union.

Since the birth of our Nation, "We the people" has been the source of our strength. What government can do alone is limited—but the potential of the American people knows no limits.

We are a Nation of rock-solid realism and clear-eyed idealism. We are Americans: We are the Nation that believes in the future. We are the Nation that can shape the future.

And we've begun to do just that—by strengthening the power and choice of individuals and families.

Together, these last two years, we've put dollars for child care directly in the hands of parents, instead of bureaucracies. Unshackled the potential of Americans with disabilities. Applied

the creativity of the marketplace in the service of the environment, for clean air. And made homeownership possible for more Americans.

The strength of a democracy is not in bureaucracy. It is in the people and their communities. In everything we do, let us unleash the potential of our most precious resource—our citizens. We must return to families, communities, counties, cities, states, and institutions of every kind the power to chart their own destiny, and the freedom and opportunity provided by strong economic growth and that's what America is all about.

I know, that tonight, in some regions of our country, people are in genuine economic distress and I hear them.

Earlier this month, Kathy Blackwell of Massachusetts wrote me about what can happen when the economy slows down, saying "My heart is aching, and I think that you should know—your people out here are hurting badly."

I understand. And I'm not unrealistic about the future. But there are reasons to be optimistic about our economy.

First, we don't have to fight double-digit inflation. Second, most industries won't have to make big cuts in production, because they don't have big inventories piled up. And third, our exports are running solid and strong. In fact, American businesses are exporting at a record rate.

So let's put these times in perspective. Together, since 1981, we've created almost 20 million jobs, cut inflation in half, and cut interest rates in half.

And yes, the largest peacetime economic expansion in history has been temporarily interrupted. But our economy is still over twice as large as our closest competitor.

We will get this recession behind us, and return to growth—soon. We will get on our way to a new record of expansion and achieve the competitive strength that will carry us into the next American century.

We should focus our efforts today on encouraging economic growth, investing in the future, and giving power and opportunity to the individual.

We must begin with control of Federal spending and that's why I'm submitting a budget that holds the growth in spending to less than the rate of inflation. And that's why, amid all the sound and fury of last year's budget debate, we put into law new, enforceable spending caps—so that future spending debates will mean a battle of ideas, not a bidding war.

Though controversial, the budget agreement finally put the Federal government on a pay-as-you-go plan—and cut the growth of debt by nearly 500 billion dollars. And that frees funds for saving and job-creating investment.

Now, let's do more. My budget again includes tax-free family savings accounts; penalty-free withdrawals from

I.R.A.'s for first-time home-buyers; and, to increase jobs and growth, a reduced tax for long-term capital gains.

I know there are differences among us about the impact and the effects of a capital gains incentive. So tonight, I am asking the congressional leaders and the Federal Reserve to cooperate with us in a study—led by Chairman Alan Greenspan—to sort out our technical differences so that we can avoid a return to unproductive partisan bickering.

But just as our efforts will bring economic growth now, and in the future, they must also be matched by long-term investments for the next American century.

That requires a forward-looking plan of action—and that's exactly what we will be sending to the Congress. We have prepared a detailed series of proposals that include:

A Budget that promotes investment in America's future—in children, education, infrastructure, space, and high technology.

Legislation to achieve excellence in education—building on the partnership forged with the 50 governors at the Education Summit—enabling parents to choose their children's schools—and helping to make America No. 1 in math and science.

A blueprint for a new National Highway System—a critical investment in our transportation infrastructure.

A research and development agenda that includes record levels of Federal investment and a permanent tax credit to strengthen private R&D and to create jobs.

A comprehensive National Energy Strategy that calls for energy conservation and efficiency, increased development, and greater use of alternative fuels.

A banking reform plan to bring America's financial system into the 21st century—so that our banks remain safe and secure and can continue to make job-creating loans for our factories, our businesses and home-buyers. You know I do think there has been too much pessimism. Sound banks should be making more sound loans, now—and interest rates should be lower, now.

In addition to these proposals, we must recognize that our economic strength depends on being competitive in world markets. We must continue to expand American exports. A successful Uruguay Round of world trade negotiations will create more real jobs and more real growth—for all nations. And you and I know that if the playing field is level, America's workers and farmers can out-work, out-produce anyone, anytime, anywhere.

And with a Mexican Free Trade Agreement, and our Enterprise for the Americas Initiative, we can help our partners strengthen their economies and move toward a free trade zone throughout this entire hemisphere.

The budget also includes a plan of action right here at home to put more power and opportunity in the hands of the individual and that means new incentives to create jobs in our inner cities, by encouraging investment through enterprise zones. It also means tenant control and ownership of public housing. Freedom and the power to choose should not be the privilege of wealth. They are the birthright of every American.

Civil rights are also crucial to protecting equal opportunity. Every one of us has a responsibility to speak out against racism, bigotry, and hate. We will continue our vigorous enforcement of existing statutes, and I will once again press the Congress to strengthen the laws against employment discrimination without resorting to the use of unfair preferences.

We're determined to protect another fundamental civil right—freedom from crime and the fear that stalks our cities. The Attorney General will soon convene a Crime Summit of our Nation's law enforcement officials. And to help us support them, we need tough crime control legislation, and we need it now.

And as we fight crime, we will fully implement our National Strategy for Combatting Drug Abuse. Recent data show that we are making progress, but much remains to be done. We will not rest until the day of the dealer is over, forever.

Good health care is every American's right and every American's responsibility. And so we are proposing an aggressive program of new prevention initiatives—for infants, for children, for adults, and for the elderly—to promote a healthier America and to help keep costs from spiralling.

It's time to give people more choice in government, by reviving the ideal of the citizen politician who comes not to stay, but to serve. And one of the reasons that there is so much support for term limitations is that the American people are increasingly concerned about big-money influence in politics. So we must look beyond the next election, to the next generation. And the time has come to put the national interest above the special interest—and to totally eliminate Political Action Committees.

That would truly put more competition in elections, and more power in the hands of individuals. And where power cannot be put directly in the hands of the individual, it should be moved closer to the people—away from Washington.

The Federal government too often treats government programs as if they are of Washington, by Washington, and for Washington. Once established, Federal programs seem to become immortal.

It's time for a more dynamic program life cycle: Some programs should

increase. Some should decrease. Some should be terminated. And some should be consolidated and turned over to the States.

My budget includes a list of programs for potential turn-over totalling more than \$20 billion. Working with Congress and the Governors, I propose we select at least \$15 billion in such programs and turn them over to the States in a single consolidated grant—fully funded—for flexible management by the States.

The value of this turn-over approach is straightforward. It allows the Federal government to reduce overhead. It allows States to manage more flexibly and more efficiently. It moves power and decision-making closer to the people. And it reenforces a theme of this Administration: appreciation and encouragement of the innovative powers of "States as Laboratories."

This Nation was founded by leaders who understood that power belongs in the hands of people. And they planned for the future. And so must we—here and all around the world.

As Americans, we know that there are times when we must step forward and accept our responsibility to lead the world away from the dark chaos of dictators, toward the brighter promise of a better day.

Almost 50 years ago we began a long struggle against aggressive totalitarianism. Now we face another defining hour for America and for the world.

There is no one more devoted, more committed to the hard work of freedom, than every soldier and sailor, every Marine, airman, and Coast-guardsmen—every man and woman now serving in the Persian Gulf. [Applause.] Oh, how they deserve it. What a fitting tribute to them. You see, what a wonderful fitting tribute to them.

Each of them has volunteered to provide for this Nation's defense—and now they bravely struggle, to earn for America, for the world, and for future generations, a just and lasting peace.

Our commitment to them must be the equal to their commitment to their country. They are truly America's finest.

The war in the Gulf is not a war we wanted. We worked hard to avoid war. For more than five months we, along with the Arab League, the European Community, the United Nations, tried every diplomatic avenue. U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar; Presidents Gorbachev, Mitterrand, Ozal, Mubarak, and Bendjedid; Kings Fahd and Hassan; Prime Ministers Major and Andreotti—just to name a few—all worked for a solution. But time and again, Saddam Hussein flatly rejected the path of diplomacy and peace.

The world well knows how this conflict began and when: It began on August 2nd, when Saddam invaded and sacked a small, defenseless neighbor.

And I am certain of how it will end. So that peace can prevail, we will prevail. Thank you.

Tonight, I am pleased to report that we are on course. Iraq's capacity to sustain war is being destroyed. Our investment, our training, our planning—all are paying off. Time will not be Saddam's salvation.

Our purpose in the Persian Gulf remains constant: to drive Iraq out of Kuwait, to restore Kuwait's legitimate government, and to ensure the stability and security of this critical region.

Let me make clear what I mean by the region's stability and security. We do not seek the destruction of Iraq, its culture, or its people. Rather, we seek an Iraq that uses its great resources, not to destroy, not to serve the ambitions of a tyrant, but to build a better life for itself and its neighbors. We seek a Persian Gulf where conflict is no longer the rule, where the strong are neither tempted nor able to intimidate the weak.

Most Americans know instinctively why we are in the Gulf. They know we had to stop Saddam now, not later. They know that this brutal dictator will do anything; will use any weapon; will commit any outrage, no matter how many innocents suffer.

They know we must make sure that control of the world's oil resources does not fall into his hands, only to finance further aggression. They know that we need to build a new, enduring peace—based not on arms races and confrontation, but on shared principles and the rule of law.

And we all realize that our responsibility to be the catalyst for peace in the region does not end with the successful conclusion of this war.

Democracy brings the undeniable value of thoughtful dissent—and we have heard some dissenting voices here at home—some, handful, reckless, most responsible. But the fact that all voices have the right to speak out is one of the reasons we've been united in purpose and principle for 200 years.

Our progress in this great struggle is the result of years of vigilance, and a steadfast commitment to a strong defense. Now, with remarkable technological advances like the Patriot missile, we can defend against ballistic missile attacks aimed at innocent civilians.

Looking forward, I have directed that the SDI program be refocused on providing protection from limited ballistic missile strikes—whatever their source. Let us pursue an SDI program that can deal with any future threat to the United States, to our forces overseas, and to our friends and allies.

The quality of American technology, thanks to the American worker, has enabled us to successfully deal with difficult military conditions and help minimize loss of precious life. We have

given our men and women the very best. And they deserve it.

We all have a special place in our hearts for the families of our men and women serving in the Gulf. They are represented here tonight by Mrs. Norman Schwarzkopf. We are very grateful to General Schwarzkopf and to all those serving with him. I might also recognize one who came with Mrs. Schwarzkopf, Alma Powell, wife of the distinguished Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. And to the families, let me say our forces in the Gulf will not stay there one day longer than is necessary to complete their mission.

The courage and the success of the RAF pilots—of the Kuwaiti, Saudi, French, the Canadians, Italians, the pilots of Qatar and Bahrain—all are proof that for the first time since World War II, the international community is united. The leadership of the United Nations, once only a hoped-for ideal, is now confirming its founders' vision.

I am heartened that we are not being asked to bear alone the financial burdens of this struggle. Last year, our friends and allies provided the bulk of the economic costs of Desert Shield, and now having received commitments of over \$40 billion for the first three months of 1991, I am confident they will do no less as we move through Desert Storm.

But the world has to wonder what the dictator of Iraq is thinking. If he thinks that by targeting innocent civilians in Israel and Saudi Arabia, that he will gain advantage—he is dead wrong. And if he thinks that he will advance his cause through tragic and despicable environmental terrorism—he is dead wrong. And if he thinks that by abusing the coalition prisoners of war, he will benefit—he is dead wrong.

We will succeed in the Gulf. And when we do, the world community will have sent an enduring warning to any dictator or despot, present or future, who contemplates outlaw aggression.

The world can therefore seize this opportunity to fulfill the long-held promise of a new world order—where brutality will go unrewarded, and aggression will meet collective resistance.

Yes, the United States bears a major share of leadership in this effort. Among the nations of the world, only the United States of America has both the moral standing, and the means to back it up. We are the only Nation on this earth that could assemble the forces of peace.

This is the burden of leadership—and the strength that has made America the beacon of freedom in a searching world.

This Nation has never found glory in war. Our people have never wanted to abandon the blessings of home and work, for distant lands and deadly conflict. If we fight in anger, it is only because we have to fight at all. And all of

us yearn for a world where we will never have to fight again.

Each of us will measure, within ourselves, the value of this great struggle. Any cost in lives any cost is beyond our power to measure. But the cost of closing our eyes to aggression is beyond mankind's power to imagine.

This we do know: Our cause is just. Our cause is moral. Our cause is right.

Let future generations understand the burden and blessings of freedom. Let them say, we stood where duty required us to stand.

Let them know that together, we affirmed America, and the world, as a community of conscience.

The winds of change are with us now. The forces of freedom are together united and we move toward the next century, more confident than ever that we have the will at home and abroad to do what must be done—the hard work of freedom.

May God bless the United States of America.

Thank you very, very much.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 9 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m., the President of the United States, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 30, 1991, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

526. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report of surplus real property transferred or leased for public health purposes in fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 484(c), was taken from the Speakers table and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. CLAY:

H.R. 678. A bill to guarantee the right of law enforcement officers to organize and bargain collectively; jointly, to the Committee on Education and Labor and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 679. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and the Federal Credit Union Act to establish a limit of \$100,000 on the amount of deposit insurance which may be paid to any person during any 36-month period; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.R. 680. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish in the program of block grants regarding drug abuse and mental health a requirement regarding the approval of statewide drug treatment plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 681. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish criminal penalties for failure to obey an order to land an aircraft issued by a Federal law enforcement officer enforcing controlled substances laws, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on the Judiciary, Public Works and Transportation, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 682. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a minimum tax of 5 percent of gross income on foreign and foreign-owned corporations which do not provide sufficient information to accurately determine their taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 683. A bill to increase the maximum reward for information concerning acts of international terrorism against the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself and Ms. MOLINARI):

H.R. 684. A bill to terminate most-favored-nation treatment for the products of Iraq; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WISE:

H.R. 685. A bill to establish a Data Protection Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 686. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to meet the growing challenge of America's infrastructure needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORNAN of California (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 687. A bill to amend the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide that any re-

scission of budget authority proposed by the President take effect unless specifically disapproved by the adoption of a joint resolution; jointly, to the Committee on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. GALLO (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey):

H.R. 688. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide protection for sole source aquifers; jointly, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H.R. 689. A bill to extend nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of Bulgaria and Romania for 3 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DEFALZO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. PARKER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HATCHER):

H.R. 690. A bill to authorize the National Park Service to acquire and manage the Mary McLeod Bethune Council House National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACHTLEY (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 691. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide disaster loan eligibility to small business concerns located in States in which one-third or more of the depository institutions have been simultaneously closed for a period of at least 5 days; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 692. A bill to provide for the preservation, restoration, and interpretation of the historical, cultural, and architectural values of the town of Bramwell, WV, for the educational inspirational benefit of present and future generations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 693. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to provide for public interest improvements in the management of Federal coal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 694. A bill to amend the Black Lung Benefits Act to provide special procedures for certain claims due to pneumoconiosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine):

H.R. 695. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to alleviate the loss of earnings of a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces who is called or ordered to active duty in connection with operations in the Persian Gulf region; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 696. A bill to provide an exclusion from gross income for certain military pay, and automatic extensions of time, for mem-

bers of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in connection with Operation Desert Shield; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 697. A bill to amend the International Banking Act of 1978 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for fair trade in financial services; jointly to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 698. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an additional occupational tax on manufacturers and importers of cigarettes and to provide that the amounts collected under this tax be used to reimburse the Medicaid Program for providing care and treatment for smoking-related cancers, circulatory system diseases, and respiratory system diseases; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. LIFINSKI, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 699. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an additional occupational tax on manufacturers and importers of cigarettes and to provide that the amounts collected under this tax be used to reimburse the Medicare Program for providing care and treatment for smoking-related cancers, circulatory system diseases, and respiratory system diseases; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 700. A bill to defer congressional pay adjustments until the first March 1 following the beginning of the Congress next following the Congress during which certain actions with respect to pay rates are taken, to provide that appropriations of funds for congressional pay be considered separately from appropriations for other purposes, to require a recorded vote in each House on such appropriations, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, Rules, and House Administration.

By Mr. THOMAS of California (for himself and Mr. LAGOMARSINO):

H.R. 701. A bill to authorize the President to lease Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 and thereby assure the efficient production of oil, natural gas, and other hydrocarbon resources at that property; to ensure the Federal Government receives fair market value for leasing that property; to upgrade the Nation's energy security assets by establishing a defense petroleum inventory; and to provide for the equitable sharing with the State of California of revenues from Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Armed Services.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia (for himself, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. RITTER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. BAKER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PACKARD, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):

H.R. 702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for amounts contributed to a health care savings account and to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a high deductible and protection against catastrophic medical care expenses for individuals who have established such accounts; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia:
H.R. 703. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts otherwise includible on the surrender or cancellation of any life insurance policy which are used to pay long-term care insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 704. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts withdrawn from individual retirement plans for payments of long-term care insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 705. A bill to make long-term care insurance available to civilian Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Texas:
H.R. 706. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a fee on imported petroleum products and derivatives, to provide incentives for oil and natural gas exploration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri):

H.R. 707. A bill to improve the regulation of futures trading, authorize appropriations for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GAYDOS:
H.R. 708. 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. SHAW (for himself, Mr. PENNY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. POSHARD, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROE, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GEJDE-ENSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas):

H.R. 709. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide reduced rates of interest under the Guaranteed Student Loan Program to individuals who enter the teaching profession; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANTHONY:
H.R. 710. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of bonds eligible for certain small issuer exceptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCDADE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILEY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Ms. LONG, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PARKER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New

York, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WOLF):
H.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to designate the week of September 15, 1991, through September 21, 1991, as "National Rehabilitation Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. WHEAT):
H.J. Res. 96. Joint resolution to designate June 12 through June 19, 1991, as "Negro Baseball Leagues Recognition Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. OAKAR:
H.J. Res. 97. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning March 4, 1991, as "Federal Employees Recognition Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SOLOMON:
H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Fort Crailo in Rensselaer, NY, should be designated as the home of "Yankee Doodle"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. VENTO):

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution condemning Iraq's ecoterrorism in the Persian Gulf; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DYMALLY (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. MORAN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Federal agencies should not engage in discrimination that threatens the civil liberties of Arab Americans and should assist in protecting Arab Americans from hate crimes and related discrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSS (for himself and Mr. LAGOMARSINO):

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution deploring the release of millions of gallons of oil into the Persian Gulf and declaring that Saddam Hussein and Iraq should be held legally, morally, and financially accountable for this cruel act against the environment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBS:
H. Res. 47. Resolution providing for enclosing the galleries of the House of Representatives with a transparent and substantial material; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PICKETT:
H. Res. 48. Resolution condemning Iraq for violations of internationally recognized human rights and the law of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

8. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to support for the United States troops in the Persian Gulf, condemning the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, and urging the President to achieve a peaceful solution to the Persian

Gulf crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9. Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to support of negotiations to end the Persian Gulf crisis without war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:
H.R. 711. A bill to validate conveyances of certain lands in the State of California that form part of the right-of-way granted by the United States to the Central Pacific Railway Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHAW:
H.R. 712. A bill for the relief of Patricia A. McNamara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 51: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.
H.R. 53: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 68: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BLIRAKIS, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PENNY, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. KYL, Mr. FIELDS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. SANTORUM.
H.R. 86: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. INHOPE, and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 113: Mr. STOKES.
H.R. 123: Mr. BARRETT.
H.R. 135: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. COX of California, Mr. WEBER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 179: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 193: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ROE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WISE, Mr. LENT, and Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 217: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 233: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. APPELGATE, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 252: Mr. BORSKI and Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 300: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 317: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 318: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 325: Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MRAZEK, Ms. LONG, Mr. VENTO, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 327: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. OLIN, Mr. NAGLE, and Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 328: Mr. DANNEMEYER and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 329: Mr. YATES, Mr. PEASE, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 357: Mr. EVANS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. SHARP, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 381: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ECKART, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MINETA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H.R. 382: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 384: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 385: Mr. EVANS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 392: Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. OLIN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SABO, Mr. SOLARZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 394: Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. OLIN, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 415: Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 426: Mr. WASHINGTON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 431: Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 447: Mr. ECKART, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 460: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 473: Mr. ALLARD, Mr. DELAY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 474: Mrs. BYRON, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 482: Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. LENT.

H.R. 519: Mr. BERREUTER.

H.R. 538: Mr. HORTON, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. KYL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BARNARD, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 555: Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HAMMERSCHEIDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. PAXON, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 556: Mr. OBEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. PRICE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 560: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. PENNY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 574: Mr. RAVENEL and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 585: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, and Mr. BENNETT.

H.R. 596: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. COX of California, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 598: Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SLATTERY, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 601: Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. RITTER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ESPY, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 602: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 611: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. KYL, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 614: Mr. WILSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 643: Mr. IRELAND and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 644: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 652: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JONES of Georgia, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. CAMP and Mr. STUMP.

H.J. Res. 30: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. HATCH-

ER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. SAVAGE, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KASICH, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. HENRY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MOODY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. YATRON, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. MINETA, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. VOLKMEYER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PRICE, Mr. CARR, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. FURSELL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. STOKES, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.J. Res. 92: Mr. BONIOR.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CLINGER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROE, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GALLO, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MOODY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. REGULA.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. EVANS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FROST, and Mr. HUTTO.

H. Res. 14: Mr. KYL, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. PRICE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LEWIS, of California, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Ms. PELOSI.

H. Res. 36: Mrs. SCHROEDER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

20. The SPEAKER presented petition of 90 different disciplines at various German universities, the Federal Republic of Germany, relative to the Persian Gulf crisis, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—Tuesday, January 29, 1991

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1991)

The Senate met at 8:30 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable KENT CONRAD, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:
 * * * and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end * * *—Isaiah 9:6, 7.

Eternal God, perfect in wisdom, justice, and love, thank Thee for Isaiah's word promising Messiah who will bring a perfect government and everlasting peace. As we gather this evening with the awful cloud of war permeating everything, everyday, we ask for special manifestation of Thy presence. Cover the Capitol with a spirit of grace and love. Grant to the President, the Congress and all gathered in the House Chamber the awareness that Thou art present and manifest. Help us to realize that Thou art the sovereign Lord overruling the affairs of nations and people.

We remember prayerfully all who are engaged in combat in the Middle East, ally and enemy. And in spite of the circumstances grant, Lord, that tonight will have great significance in the life of our Nation and the world.

In the name of Him who is the Prince of Peace. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
 PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
 Washington, DC, January 29, 1991.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KENT CONRAD, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
 President pro tempore.

Mr. CONRAD thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the two leaders be reserved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for morning business.

INTERPRETIVE SERVICES FOR STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there can be no question that, given the situation in the gulf, tonight's State of the Union speech is one of great interest to America. Therefore, it is especially important that all of our citizens are able to hear the President's words.

For this reason, I was especially delighted that for the first time in the history of the Presidential State of the Union Address, interpreter services for hearing-impaired individuals had been made available.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the networks apparently will not take advantage of this service.

My colleague from Wisconsin, Senator KASTEN—who worked with me on this matter—and I are confident, however, that in the future, the networks will join with the Senate in allowing all Americans to participate fully in future Presidential addresses.

DEAF INTERPRETER FOR PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, tonight the President of the United States will make a major State of the Union Address to America. It is important that all of our citizens—including the 24 million U.S. citizens who are hearing impaired—hear the President's words.

For the first time in the history of the Presidential State of the Union Address, interpretive services for the hearing impaired will be available.

Mr. President, there are students at Delavan School for the Deaf in Wisconsin who have loved ones sacrificing their lives in the Persian Gulf. Those students, along with thousands of other hearing-impaired Americans, want to have an opportunity to "listen" to their President speak.

By airing the interpretive services made available by the U.S. Senate, the television networks can ensure that, for the first time, millions of hearing-impaired Americans can fully participate in the President's report to the Nation.

My friend and colleague from Kansas, Senator DOLE, and I are proud of the role we have played in making this service available. I am very hopeful that the networks will join with us in taking this historic step.

COMMENDING SOLDIERS OF FORT JACKSON AND COMMUNITY LEADERS OF COLUMBIA, SC

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, last Friday, January 25, 1991, I was fortunate enough to be able to visit Fort Jackson, SC, and spend some time with its soldiers and the community leaders of Columbia, SC.

I have now been associated with the Army for some 52 years—from joining ROTC at the Citadel in 1938, through service in World War II, and continuing as Governor and now as a U.S. Senator. I have seen the Army mobilize and demobilize, grow large or grow small, many times. Now, because of Operation Desert Storm, both the Army and Fort Jackson are again growing. They greet civilian recruits and in a short 9 weeks send them out as confident, proud, and able young soldiers, as Fort Jackson always has.

But they are also bringing Army reservists and National Guard soldiers, men and women, processing them and readying them for deployment to Southwest Asia. I learned this is a complex operation, running the gamut from boots being issued to teeth being repaired. We as a country are truly indebted for the fine work Maj. Gen. John Renner, Command Sgt. Maj. Russell Anderson, and their superb staff of officers, noncommissioned officers, and civilians are accomplishing to support Operation Desert Storm.

Commendations are also in order for the citizens of the Columbia area, including the Association of the U.S. Army, led by Mr. Bob McCoy; to the former mayor of Columbia, Mr. Patton Adams; to television station WIS, and to many others, for the great job they did taking care of soldiers at Fort Jackson over the 1990 holiday period. Over \$32,000 was raised for use of the soldiers, and their holiday season was made much more joyous because of the caring concerns of Columbia's citizenry.

Mr. President times such as these bring out the best in Americans as demonstrated, once again, by the soldiers and citizens in and around Columbia, SC. We are eternally grateful for their service to our Nation.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1991, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 24, 1991, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received on January 24, 1991 are printed in today's RECORD at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

STATE OF THE UNION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table:

To the Congress of the United States:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the United States Congress. I come to this House of the people, to speak to you and all Americans, certain that we stand at a defining hour.

Halfway around the world, we are engaged in a great struggle in the skies and on the seas and sands. We know why we're there. We are Americans: part of something larger than ourselves.

For two centuries, we've done the hard work of freedom. And tonight, we lead the world in facing down a threat to decency and humanity.

What is at stake is more than one small country; it is a big idea: a new world order—where diverse nations are drawn together in common cause, to achieve the universal aspirations of mankind: peace and security, freedom, and the rule of law. Such is a world worthy of our struggle and worthy of our children's future.

The community of nations has resolutely gathered to condemn and repel lawless aggression. Saddam Hussein's unprovoked invasion—his ruthless, systematic rape of a peaceful neighbor—violated everything the community of nations holds dear. The world has said this aggression would not stand—and it will not stand.

Together, we have resisted the trap of appeasement, cynicism, and isolation that gives temptation to tyrants. The world has answered Saddam's invasion with 12 United Nations resolutions, starting with a demand for Iraq's immediate and unconditional withdrawal—and backed up by forces from 28 countries of six continents. With few

exceptions, the world now stands as one.

The end of the Cold War has been a victory for all humanity. A year and a half ago, in Germany, I said our goal was a Europe whole and free. Tonight, Germany is united. Europe has become whole and free—and America's leadership was instrumental in making it possible.

Our relationship with the Soviet Union is important, not only to us, but to the World. That relationship has helped to shape these and other historic changes. But like many other nations, we have been deeply concerned by the violence in the Baltics, and we have communicated that concern to the Soviet leadership.

The principle that has guided us is simple: our objective is to help the Baltic peoples achieve their aspirations, not to punish the Soviet Union. In our recent discussions with the Soviet leadership, we have been given representations, which, if fulfilled, would result in the withdrawal of some Soviet forces, a reopening of dialogue with the Republics, and a move away from violence.

We will watch carefully as the situation develops. And we will maintain our contact with the Soviet leadership to encourage continued commitment to democratization and reform.

If it is possible, I want to continue to build a lasting basis for U.S.-Soviet cooperation, for a more peaceful future for all mankind.

The triumph of democratic ideas in Eastern Europe and Latin America—and the continuing struggle for freedom elsewhere around the world—all confirm the wisdom of our Nation's founders.

Tonight, we work to achieve another victory—a victory over tyranny, and savage aggression.

We in this Union enter the last decade of the 20th century thankful for our blessings, steadfast in our purpose, aware of our difficulties, and responsive to our duties at home and around the world.

For two centuries, America has served the world as an inspiring example of freedom and democracy. For generations, America has led the struggle to preserve and extend the blessings of liberty. And today, in a rapidly changing world, American leadership is indispensable. Americans know that leadership brings burdens and requires sacrifice.

But we also know why the hopes of humanity turn to us.

We are Americans: we have a unique responsibility to do the hard work of freedom. And when we do—freedom works.

The conviction and courage we see in the Persian Gulf today is simply the American character in action. The indomitable spirit that is contributing to this victory for world peace and justice

is the same spirit that gives us the power and the potential to meet our toughest challenges at home.

We are resolute and resourceful. If we can selflessly confront evil for the sake of good in a land so far away, then surely we can make this land all that it should be.

If anyone tells you America's best days are behind her, they're looking the wrong way.

Tonight, I come before this House, and the American people, with an appeal for renewal. This is not merely a call for new government initiatives, it is a call for new initiative in government, in our communities, and from every American—to prepare for the next American century.

America has always led by example. So who among us will set this example? Which of our citizens will lead us in this next American century? Everyone who steps forward today, to get one addict off drugs. To convince one troubled teenager not to give up on life . . . to comfort one AIDS patient . . . to help one hungry child.

We have within our reach the promise of a renewed America. We can find meaning and reward by serving some purpose higher than ourselves—a shining purpose, the illumination of a thousand points of light. It is expressed by all who know the irresistible force of a child's hand, of a friend who stands by you and stays there—a volunteer's generous gesture, an idea that is simply right.

The problems before us may be different, but the key to solving them remains the same: it is the individual—the individual who steps forward. And the state of our Union is the union of each of us, one to the other: the sum of our friendships, marriages, families, and communities.

We all have something to give. So if you know how to read, find someone who can't. If you've got a hammer, find a nail. If you're not hungry, not lonely, not in trouble—seek out someone who is.

Join the community of conscience. Do the hard work of freedom. That will define the state of our Union.

Since the birth of our Nation, "We the people" has been the source of our strength. What government can do alone is limited—but the potential of the American people knows no limits.

We are a Nation of rock-solid realism and clear-eyed idealism. We are Americans: We are the Nation that believes in the future. We are the Nation that can shape the future.

And we've begun to do just that—by strengthening the power and choice of individuals and families.

Together, these last two years, we've put dollars for child care directly in the hands of parents, instead of bureaucrats. Unshackled the potential of Americans with disabilities. Applied the creativity of the marketplace in

the service of the environment, for clean air. And made homeownership possible for more Americans.

The strength of a democracy is not in bureaucracy. It is in the people and their communities. In everything we do, let us unleash the potential of our most precious resource—our citizens. We must return to families, communities, counties, cities, states, and institutions of every kind the power to chart their own destiny, and the freedom and opportunity provided by strong economic growth. That's what America is all about.

I know, tonight, in some regions of our country, people are in genuine economic distress. I hear them.

Earlier this month, Kathy Blackwell of Massachusetts wrote me about what can happen when the economy slows down, saying "My heart is aching, and I think that you should know—your people out here are hurting badly."

I understand. And I'm not unrealistic about the future. But there are reasons to be optimistic about our economy.

First, we don't have to fight double-digit inflation. Second, most industries won't have to make big cuts in production, because they don't have big inventories piled up. And third, our exports are running solid and strong. In fact, American businesses are exporting at a record rate.

So let's put these times in perspective. Together, since 1981, we've created almost 20 million jobs, cut inflation in half, and cut interest rates in half.

Yes, the largest peacetime economic expansion in history has been temporarily interrupted. But our economy is still over twice as large as our closest competitor.

We will get this recession behind us, and return to growth—soon. We will get on our way to a new record of expansion and achieve the competitive strength that will carry us into the next American century.

We should focus our efforts today on encouraging economic growth, investing in the future, and giving power and opportunity to the individual.

We must begin with control of Federal spending. That's why I'm submitting a budget that holds the growth in spending to less than the rate of inflation. And that's why, amid all the sound and fury of last year's budget debate, we put into law new, enforceable spending caps—so that future spending debates will mean a battle of ideas, not a bidding war.

Though controversial, the budget agreement finally put the Federal government on a pay-as-you-go plan—and cut the growth of debt by nearly 500 billion dollars. And that frees funds for saving and job-creating investment.

Now, let's do more. My budget again includes tax-free family savings accounts; penalty-free withdrawals from I.R.A.'s for first-time home-buyers;

and, to increase jobs and growth, a reduced tax for long-term capital gains.

I know there are differences among us about the impact and the effects of a capital gains incentive. So tonight, I am asking the congressional leaders and the Federal Reserve to cooperate with us in a study—led by Chairman Alan Greenspan—to sort out our technical differences so that we can avoid a return to unproductive partisan bickering.

But just as our efforts will bring economic growth now, and in the future, they must also be matched by long-term investments for the next American century.

That requires a forward-looking plan of action—and that's exactly what we will be sending to the Congress. We have prepared a detailed series of proposals that include:

- A budget that promotes investment in America's future—in children, education, infrastructure, space, and high technology.
- Legislation to achieve excellence in education—building on the partnership forged with the 50 governors at the Education Summit—enabling parents to choose their children's schools—and helping to make America #1 in math and science.
- A blueprint for a new National Highway System—a critical investment in our transportation infrastructure.
- A research and development agenda that includes record levels of Federal investment and a permanent tax credit to strengthen private R & D and create jobs.
- A comprehensive National Energy Strategy that calls for energy conservation and efficiency, increased development, and greater use of alternative fuels.
- A banking reform plan to bring America's financial system into the 21st century—so that our banks remain safe and secure and can continue to make job-creating loans for our factories, businesses and home-buyers. I do think there has been too much pessimism. Sound banks should be making more sound loans, now—and interest rates should be lower, now.

In addition to these proposals, we must recognize that our economic strength depends upon being competitive in world markets. We must continue to expand America's exports. A successful Uruguay Round of world trade negotiations will create more real jobs and more real growth—for all nations. You and I know that if the playing field is level, America's workers and farmers can out-work and out-produce anyone, anytime, anywhere.

And with a Mexican Free Trade Agreement, and our Enterprise for the Americans Initiative, we can help our partners strengthen their economies

and move toward a free trade zone throughout this entire hemisphere.

The budget also includes a plan of action right here at home to put more power and opportunity in the hands of the individual. That means new incentives to create jobs in our inner cities, by encouraging investment throughout enterprise zones. It also means tenant control and ownership of public housing. Freedom and the power to choose should not be the privilege of wealth. They are the birthright of every American.

Civil rights are also crucial to protecting equal opportunity. Every one of us has a responsibility to speak out against racism, bigotry, and hate. We will continue our vigorous enforcement of existing statutes, and I will once again press the Congress to strengthen the laws against employment discrimination without resorting to the use of unfair preferences.

We're determined to protect another fundamental civil right—freedom from crime and the fear that stalks our cities. The Attorney General will soon convene a Crime Summit of our Nation's law enforcement officials. And to help us support them, we need tough crime control legislation, and we need it now.

As we fight crime, we will fully implement our National Strategy for Combatting Drug Abuse. Recent data show we are making progress, but much remains to be done. We will not rest until the day of the dealer is over, forever.

Good health care is every American's right and every American's responsibility. So we are proposing an aggressive program of new prevention initiatives—for infants, for children, for adults, and for the elderly—to promote a healthier America and to help keep costs from spiraling.

It's time to give people more choice in government, by reviving the ideal of the citizen politician who comes not to stay, but to serve. One of the reasons there is so much support for term limitations is that the American people are increasingly concerned about big-money influence in politics. We must look beyond the next election, to the next generation. The time has come to put the national interest above the special interest—and totally eliminate Political Action Committees.

That would truly put more competition in elections, and more power in the hands of individuals. And where power cannot be put directly in the hands of the individual, it should be move closer to the people—away from Washington.

The Federal government too often treats government programs as if they are of Washington, by Washington, and for Washington. Once established, Federal programs seem to become immortal.

It's time for a more dynamic program life cycle: Some programs should increase. Some should decrease. Some should be terminated. And some should be consolidated and turned over to the States.

My budget includes a list of programs for potential turnover totalling more than \$20 billion. Working with Congress and the Governors, I propose we select at least \$15 billion in such programs and turn them over to the States in a single consolidated grant—fully funded—for flexible management by the States.

The value of this turn-over approach is straightforward. It allows the Federal government to reduce overhead. It allows States to manage more flexibly and more efficiently. It moves power and decisionmaking closer to the people. And it reinforces a theme of this Administration: appreciation and encouragement of the innovative power of "States as Laboratories."

This Nation was founded by leaders who understood that power belongs in the hands of people. They planned for the future. And so must we—here and around the world.

As Americans, we know there are times when we must step forward and accept our responsibility to lead the world away from the dark chaos of dictators, toward the brighter promise of a better day.

Almost 50 years ago we began a long struggle against aggressive totalitarianism. Now we face another defining hour for America and the world.

There is no one more devoted, more committed to the hard work of freedom, than every soldier and sailor, every Marine, airman, and Coastguardsman—every man and woman now serving in the Persian Gulf.

Each of them has volunteered to provide for this Nation's defense—and now they bravely struggle, to earn for America, for the world, and for future generations, a just and lasting peace.

Our commitment to them must be the equal of their commitment to their country. They are truly America's finest.

The war in the Gulf is not a war we wanted. We worked hard to avoid war. For more than five months we, along with the Arab League, the European Community, and the United Nations, tried every diplomatic avenue. U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar; Presidents Gorbachev, Mitterrand, Ozal, Mubarak, and Bendjedid; Kings Fahd and Hassan; Prime Ministers Major and Andreotti—just to name a few—all worked for a solution. But time and again, Saddam Hussein flatly rejected the path of diplomacy and peace.

The world well knows how this conflict began and when: It began on August 2nd, when Saddam invaded and sacked a small, defenseless neighbor.

And I am certain of how it will end. So that peace can prevail, we will prevail.

Tonight, I'm pleased to report that we are on course. Iraq's capacity to sustain war is being destroyed. Our investment, our training, our planning—all are paying off. Time will not be Saddam's salvation.

Our purpose in the Persian Gulf remains constant: to drive Iraq out of Kuwait, to restore Kuwait's legitimate government, and to ensure the stability and security of this critical region.

Let me make clear what I mean by the region's stability and security. We do not seek the destruction of Iraq, its culture, or its people. Rather, we seek an Iraq that uses its great resources, not to destroy, not to serve the ambitions of a tyrant, but to build a better life for itself and its neighbors. We seek a Persian Gulf where conflict is no longer the rule, where the strong are neither tempted nor able to intimidate the weak.

Most Americans know instinctively why we are in the Gulf. They know we had to stop Saddam now, not later. They know this brutal dictator will do anything; will use any weapon; will commit any outrage, no matter how many innocents must suffer.

They know we must make sure that control of the world's oil resources does not fall into his hands, only to finance further aggression. They know that we need to build a new, enduring peace—based not on arms races and confrontation, but on shared principles and the rule of law.

And we all realize that our responsibility to be the catalyst for peace in the region does not end with the successful conclusion of this war.

Democracy brings the undeniable value of thoughtful dissent—and we have heard some dissenting voices here at home—some reckless, most responsible. But the fact that all voices have the right to speak out is one of the reasons we've been united in purpose and principle for 200 years.

Our progress in this great struggle is the result of years of vigilance, and a steadfast commitment to a strong defense. Now, with remarkable technological advances like the Patriot missile, we can defend against ballistic missile attacks aimed at innocent civilians.

Looking forward, I have directed that the SDI program be refocused on providing protection from limited ballistic missile strikes—whatever their source. Let us pursue an SDI program that can deal with any future threat to the United States, to our forces overseas, and to our friends and allies.

The quality of American technology, thanks to the American worker, has enabled us to successfully deal with difficult military conditions and help minimize loss of life. We have given our men and women the very best. And they deserve it.

We all have a special place in our hearts for the families of our men and women serving in the Gulf. They are represented here tonight by Mrs. Norman Schwarzkopf. We are very grateful to General Schwarzkopf and to all those serving with him. And to the families, let me say our forces in the Gulf will not stay there one day longer than is necessary to complete their mission.

The courage and success of the RAF pilots—of the Kuwaiti, Saudi, French, the Canadians, Italians, the pilots of Qatar and Bahrain—all are proof that for the first time since World War II, the international community is united. The leadership of the United Nations, once only a hoped-for ideal, is now confirming its founders' vision.

I am heartened that we are not being asked to bear alone the financial burden of this struggle. Last year, our friends and allies provided the bulk of the economic costs of Desert Shield, and having now received commitments of over \$40 billion for the first three months of 1991, I am confident they will do no less as we move through Desert Storm.

But the world has to wonder what the dictator of Iraq is thinking. If he thinks that by targeting innocent civilians in Israel and Saudi Arabia, that he will gain advantage—he is dead wrong. If he thinks that he will advance his cause through tragic and despicable environmental terrorism—he is dead wrong. And if he thinks that by abusing the coalition POW's, he will benefit—he is dead wrong.

We will succeed in the Gulf. And when we do, the world community will have sent an enduring warning to any dictator or despot, present or future, who contemplates outlaw aggression.

The world can therefore seize this opportunity to fulfill the long-held promise of a new world order—where brutality will go unrewarded, and aggression will meet collective resistance.

Yes, the United States bears a major share of leadership in this effort. Among the nations of the world, only the United States of America has had both the moral standing, and the means to back it up. We are the only Nation on this Earth that could assemble the forces of peace.

This is the burden of leadership—and the strength that has made America the beacon of freedom in a searching world.

This Nation has never found glory in war. Our people have never wanted to abandon the blessings of home and work, for distant lands and deadly conflict. If we fight in anger, it is only because we have to fight at all. And all of us yearn for a world where we will never have to fight again.

Each of us will measure, within ourselves, the value of this great struggle. Any cost in lives is beyond our power to measure. But the cost of closing our

eyes to aggression is beyond mankind's power to imagine.

This we do know: Our cause is just. Our cause is moral. Our cause is right.

Let future generations understand the burden and the blessings of freedom. Let them say, we stood where duty required us to stand.

Let them know that together, we affirmed America, and the world, as a community of conscience.

The winds of change are with us now. The forces of freedom are united. We move toward the next century, more confident than ever that we have the will at home and abroad to do what must be done—the hard work of freedom.

May God bless the United States of America.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 29, 1991.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1991, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 25, 1991, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 3. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise, effective as of January 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; and

H.R. 4. An act to extend the time for performing certain acts under the internal revenue laws for individuals performing services as part of the Desert Shield Operation.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1991, the enrolled bills were signed on January 25, 1991, during the recess of the Senate, by the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1991, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 29, 1991, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the President of the United States announcing that pursuant to the provisions of 20, United States Code, 42 and 43 the Speaker appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. CONTE.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 1505 of Public Law 99-498, the Speaker appoints to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 2(a) of the National

Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(a)), the Speaker appoints as members of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. YATES, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. MCDADE.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b) of Public Law 93-642, the Speaker appoints as members of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. SKELTON and Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-459. A communication from the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the use of contracts for legal services by the Farmers Home Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-460. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 1990 report on advisory and assistance services; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-461. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the wildfire rehabilitation report for lands administered by the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1989; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-462. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice that he has granted authority to the service Secretaries to order to active duty units and individual members not assigned to units of the Ready Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-463. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, documentation from the Government of Brazil relative to the lease of the naval landing ship ALAMO; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-464. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the expansion of foreign policy controls on certain chemicals which can be used in the production of chemical weapons; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Development.

EC-465. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the extension export controls maintained for foreign policy purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-466. A communication from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the projection of real economic growth of less than zero in the last calendar quarter of 1990 and the first calendar quarter of 1991; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-467. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Energy (Conservation and Renewable Energy), transmitting, pursuant

to law, notice of the delay in the submission of a report on research and development activities under the Steel and Aluminum Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-468. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a project negotiated under the Clean Coal Technology Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-469. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a project negotiated under the Clean Coal Technology Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-470. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a project negotiated under the Clean Coal Technology Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-471. A communication from the U.S. Trade Representative, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the International Coffee Agreement for coffee year 1989/90; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-472. A communication from the Administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to prospective payments for hospital outpatient services; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-473. A communication from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States in the 60-day period prior to January 17, 1991; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-474. A communication from the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Private Sector Revolving Fund for fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-475. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and a Presidential determination with respect to El Salvador; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-476. A communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating that Israel is not being denied its right to participate in the activities on the International Atomic Energy Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-477. A communication from the Chairman of the Board for International Broadcasting, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board for fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-478. A communication from the Chairperson of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls in effect during fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Government Affairs.

EC-479. A communication from the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls in effect during fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-480. A communication from the Executive Secretary of the Barry M. Goldwater

Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls in effect during fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-481. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls in effect during fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-482. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Farm Credit System Assistance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls in effect during fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-483. A communication from the Chairman of the Postal Rate Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls in effect during fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-484. A communication from the Executive Director of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls in effect during fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-485. A communication from the U.S. Commissioner of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls in effect during fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-486. A communication from the Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls in effect during fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-487. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls in effect during fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-488. A communication from the Administrator and Chairman of the Cost Accounting Standards Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report of the Cost Accounting Standards Board, to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-489. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of the reports issued by the General Accounting Office during December 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-490. A communication from the Chairman and the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting jointly, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls in effect during fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-491. A communication from the Chairman of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls in effect during fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-492. A communication from the Deputy Assistant to the President for Management and Director of the Office of Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the system of internal accounting and adminis-

trative controls in effect for each of the Executive Office of the President for fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-493. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, recommendations relative to coordination of overall policy and development of objectives and priorities for all Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-494. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Immigration Management—Strong Leadership and Management Reforms Needed to Address Serious Problems;" to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-495. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the biennial report of the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect covering fiscal years 1987 and 1988; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-496. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth report of the Department of Health and Human Services Council on Alzheimer's Disease; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-497. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Small Business.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-7. A resolution adopted by the City Council of Seattle, Washington calling for a negotiated settlement in the Middle East and a redirection of resources to the cities of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-8. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"JOINT RESOLUTION

"Whereas, the firm commitment and courageous dedication of American men and women in the United States Armed Forces deserve the nation's highest respect and commitment to a just and peaceful resolution of the Persian Gulf Crisis; and

"Whereas, the United Nations has condemned Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait, has called for the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait, has imposed strict sanctions against Iraq, and has authorized all necessary means after January 15, 1991, to gain Iraq's compliance with the United Nations' resolutions; and

"Whereas, war between Iraq and the United States and its allies will lead to much bloodshed and the loss of life of thousands of servicemen and servicewomen, as well as civilians, on all sides of the conflict; and

"Whereas, the economic impact of war in the Persian Gulf could cost the United States and its allies \$1 billion a day, cause serious international economic disarray and prolonged worldwide recession, and divert necessary funds from health care, housing, education, economic development, and human services; and

"Whereas, war between Iraq and the United States and its allies may expand to a conflict beyond the borders of Iraq and Kuwait; and

"Whereas, more than 1,000 Montanans from the active forces, reserves, and national guard have been deployed to support Operation Desert Shield, leaving behind their homes and families. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the state of Montana:

(1) That this Legislature endorse the actions of the United Nations.

(2) That the Legislature recognize the sacrifices and hardships of separation on Montana families who have sons or daughters, mothers or fathers, and sisters or brothers called to service in the present crisis.

(3) That this Legislature express its heartfelt support and gratitude to all men and women serving our country in Operation Desert Shield and offer its sincere prayer for their safe return.

(4) That it is the hope and prayer of the people of Montana that the leadership of Iraq, the United States, and all nations involved in the Persian Gulf Crisis negotiate a just and peaceful solution to the dispute for the mutual security of all people.

(5) That this Legislature call upon Congress and the President of the United States to continue to work together, thereby resolving this conflict peacefully.

(6) That copies of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of the United States Senate, and to each member of Congress."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. Res. 19. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, I also report favorably three nomination lists in the Coast Guard which were printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, 1991, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar, that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SARBANES:
S. 273. A bill to recognize the organization known as the 29th Division Association, Incorporated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:
S. 274. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to the procedures relating to the approval of deposit insurance and risk based premium assessments; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DURENBERGER, and Mr. MOYNIHAN) (by request):
S. 275. A bill to provide for the implementation of a tariff preference regime affecting certain articles from Andean countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DANFORTH (for himself and Mr. BOND):
S. 276. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 1520 Market Street in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "L. Douglas Abram Federal Building"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SIMON:
S. 277. A bill to assure equal justice for women in the courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):
S. 278. A bill to provide for certain notice and procedures before the Social Security Administration may close, consolidate, or recategorize certain offices; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRYAN (for himself, Mr. GORTON, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. DODD, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. FELL, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBB, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SIMON, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WIRTE):
S. 279. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act to require new standards for corporate average fuel economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. SASSER, and Mrs. KASSEBAUM):
S. 280. A bill to provide for the inclusion of foreign deposits in the deposit insurance assessment base, to permit inclusion of non-deposit liabilities in the deposit insurance assessment base, to require the FDIC to implement a risk-based deposit insurance premium structure, to establish guidelines for early regulatory intervention in the financial decline of banks, and to permit regulatory restrictions on brokered deposits; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DODD, Mr. SIMON, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. PELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KOHL, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. METZENBAUM):
S. 281. A bill to provide school-based education and support services and comprehensive family support services to families of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who are serving on active duty, to provide continued coverage under group

health plans for the families of members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty during the Persian Gulf conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BINGAMAN:
S. 282. A bill to direct the Director of the General Services Administration to make paper with recycled content available to the Secretary of Agriculture and for the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a pilot program within the Forest Service for the use of paper with recycled content; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KOHL:
S. 283. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations with respect to the stationing of military personnel who are solely responsible for dependents at locations where facilities for dependents are not reasonably available; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SARBANES:
S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to designate 1991 as the "Year of Public Health" and to recognize the 75th Anniversary of the founding of the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY (for himself and Mr. DURENBERGER):
S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to designate April 6, 1991, as "National Student-Athlete Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. GLENN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. NUNN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SASSER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. PELL, Mr. BOREN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. GORE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. REID, and Mr. DODD):
S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning March 4, 1991, as "Federal Employees Recognition Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DECONCINI:
S.J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to designate the months of April 1991 and 1992 as "National Child Abuse Prevention Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. JOHNSTON from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:
S. Res. 19. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 273. A bill to recognize the organization known as the 29th Division Association, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

29TH DIVISION ASSOCIATION, INC.

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am reintroducing legislation today with my colleague from Maryland, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, which provides recognition to the 29th Division Association, Inc. and grants the association a Federal charter. The 29th Division has a long and remarkable history and a close association with the citizens of Maryland. I am proud to introduce this bill recognizing one of our Nation's most notable military organizations.

The 29th Division Association, Inc. is a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey. Its objects and purposes as expressed in its articles of incorporation, include: First, the promotion of fellowship among its members; second, the perpetuation of the record of the 29th Division, U.S. Army, in the World Wars; third, the promotion of the welfare of its members; fourth, the consideration of questions concerning the military policy of the United States; fifth, to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. The 29th Division Association was organized in 1921 by veterans of World War I who served with the 29th Division in Europe. It now has a membership of 3,500 including veterans from World War I and World War II, as well as young men and women now serving in the 29th Division.

The 29th Infantry Division was organized at Camp McClellan, AL in August 1917 during World War I. Comprised of National Guard units of citizen soldiers from Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and New Jersey, the division consisted of two brigades with two infantry regiments, an artillery brigade and supporting units. The division arrived in France in June 1918 and fought in the Alsace and Meuse-Argonne campaigns, suffering over 5,700 casualties.

In World War II, the 29th Division was mobilized in February 1941 at Fort Meade, MD. This time it included soldiers from Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and Pennsylvania. The division sailed for England in 1942 after stateside training. Further training ensued in England. On D-day, June 6, 1944, the 29th Infantry Division stormed ashore on Omaha Beach to win a beachhead, taking heavy casualties in the process. The division then participated in four major campaigns including Normandy, Northern France, Rhineland, and Central Europe, suffering 19,814 killed, wounded, and missing. It compiled one of the most distinguished war records of any of our infantry divisions.

In 1985 the division was again reactivated as the 29th Infantry Division (Light) with citizen soldiers from Maryland and Virginia. It is continuing the proud tradition established by the 29th in two World Wars.

The 29th Infantry Division has played a key role in the defense of this country and is still doing so. It is my hope that this legislation to grant the 29th Infantry Division Association a Federal charter will be approved, and I urge my colleagues to join in this effort to honor this distinguished military unit.●

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 274. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to the procedures relating to the approval of deposit insurance and risk-based premium assessments; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

BANK DEPOSIT INSURANCE LEGISLATION

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, this Congress will be asked to take a series of actions designed to solidify, to strengthen, and to make less vulnerable the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation [FDIC] fund, so that in the fall of 1992 we will not be bemoaning the fact that we had again missed the clear clarion call for action.

There are a number of legislative actions that need to occur to assist the fund. Some of that legislation was advanced last fall and will again be put forward this spring. The bill I am introducing today will do two things. First, it will give the FDIC the authority to deny insurance coverage to nationally chartered and State chartered Federal Reserve System member banks. Second, the bill will give FDIC the authority to implement a risk-based insurance system.

The concept that I introduced last year as S. 3075 and which I am again introducing today should, I think, be part of any legislation. It would give the FDIC the authority to deny insurance to any newly chartered national banks and Federal Reserve System member banks. This concept would carry out a recommendation that has been made by the current Chairman of the FDIC, Mr. William Seidman. Mr. Seidman, on July 31 of last year, speaking before the Senate Banking Committee, said that he believed "that as a basic principle the insurer should decide which institutions it insures and that that is the ultimate protection that ought to be afforded to the taxpayer. So we have that now with the savings and loans. We don't have that with the banks." "As a matter of principle, the insurer should determine what institutions qualify for insurance."

Currently the FDIC is required to provide insurance coverage to newly chartered national banks, and State chartered banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System. Also all savings associations chartered after August 9, 1989, and all newly chartered State nonmember banks must apply for FDIC coverage.

The bill today conforms the FDIC's current authority that it acquired for savings associations under the 1989 savings and loan bill to banks.

Second, Mr. President, if we are going to make the FDIC fund truly an insurance fund and not a disgusted subsidy, then the premiums paid in this fund must meet some actuarial standards of adequacy in proportion of the risk assumed. If you are a good driver, you pay lower premiums than a driver who has had a series of accidents. If you are older, you pay higher life insurance rates than younger individuals. If you operate a risky business, you pay higher premiums than that individual who operates a more tranquil enterprise.

We ought to be moving forward with a proposal to make the insurance premiums risk based; that is to relate the degree of risk for individual institutions to the amount of premiums that those institutions pay. In March 1989, Chairman Seidman stated that he felt that the FDIC should have the authority to develop a risk-based insurance system. We did not act on his request in March 1989. I hope we will not miss the opportunity to do so this Congress.

Mr. President one of the lessons we have learned from the savings and loan debacle is the fact that we cannot allow the deposit insurance fund to remove from the management of institutions their sense of personal responsibility and financial accountability for their actions. The way the insurance fund has operated in the past has been characterized as privatizing profits and socializing losses—that is, if things went well the institution would reap the benefit of the profit. If things went badly, that was the taxpayers' responsibility. That is an unacceptable allocation of risk and reward.

The legislation I have filed today will fill two pieces of that anomaly by providing to the Federal deposit insurance fund the capacity to deny coverage where it feels that a federally chartered institution does not warrant that degree of Federal assumption of financial responsibility and to set up a risk based insurance premium system.●

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DURENBERGER and Mr. MOYNIHAN) (by request):

S. 275. A bill to provide for the implementation of a tariff preference regime affecting certain articles from Andean countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

ANDEAN TRADE INITIATIVE ACT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce President Bush's Andean Trade Initiative Act.

As we all know too well, the Andean nations are engaged in a serious struggle to combat narcotics trafficking within their borders. As the preferred customer, I believe it is important that the United States aid and encourage

these efforts with economic incentives to replace the unfortunately lucrative narcotics trade.

This legislation authorizes the President to offer legitimate trading opportunities, comparable to the trade preferences granted to our Caribbean Basin neighbors, to reward those Andean nations which join us in the fight to eliminate the production, processing, and shipment of illegal drugs. It will also increase the prospects for economic growth and prosperity in the Andean region and throughout the hemisphere.

Under this initiative, direct imports from a beneficiary nation are eligible for duty-free treatment if at least 35 percent of their value was added in one or more of the beneficiary countries, including the CBI countries.

Products which are particularly import sensitive and are excluded under the CBI are also excluded under this initiative. These include textiles and apparel, footwear, petroleum and petroleum products, canned tuna, watches and watch parts. Other sensitive items are subject to the gradual duty reductions already provided in the CBI.

Finally, the legislation provides for import relief to safeguard domestic industries, such as producers of live plants, cut flowers, fruits, vegetables, and juices.

Mr. President, if we are to win the war on drugs, we must support the efforts of our Andean neighbors. Their struggle is our struggle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 275

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Andean Trade Initiative Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO GRANT DUTY-FREE TREATMENT.

The President may proclaim duty-free treatment for all eligible articles from any beneficiary country in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. BENEFICIARY COUNTRY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "beneficiary country" means any country listed in subsection (b) of this section with respect to which there is in effect a proclamation by the President designating such country as a beneficiary country for purposes of this Act. If the President designates any country as a beneficiary country for purposes of this Act, he shall notify the House of Representatives and the Senate of such designation, together with the considerations entering into such decision, no later than 30 days after the date of such designation.

(2) The term "entered" means entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, in the customs territory of the United States.

(3) The term "HTS" means the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (19 U.S.C. 3007).

(b) DESIGNATION OF BENEFICIARY COUNTRY.—In designating countries as "beneficiary countries" under this Act, the President shall consider only the following countries or successor political entities:

Bolivia
Ecuador
Colombia
Peru

(c) CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION.—In determining whether to designate any country as a beneficiary country under this Act, the President shall take into account—

(1) whether such country is a Communist country;

(2) whether such country—

(A) has nationalized, expropriated or otherwise seized ownership or control of property owned by a United States citizen or by a corporation, partnership, or association which is 50 percent or more beneficially owned by United States citizens,

(B) has taken steps to repudiate or nullify—

(i) any existing contract or agreement with, or

(ii) any patent, trademark, or other intellectual property of, a United States citizen or a corporation, partnership, or association, which is 50 percent or more beneficially owned by United States citizens, the effect of which is to nationalize, expropriate, or otherwise seize ownership or control of property so owned, or

(C) has imposed or enforced taxes or other exactions, restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or other measures with respect to property so owned, the effect of which is to nationalize, expropriate, or otherwise seize ownership or control of such property, unless the President determines that—

(i) prompt, adequate, and effective compensation has been or is being made to such citizen, corporation, partnership, or association,

(ii) good-faith negotiations to provide prompt, adequate, and effective compensation under the applicable provisions of international law are in progress, or such country is otherwise taking steps to discharge its obligations under international law with respect to such citizen, corporation, partnership, or association, or

(iii) a dispute involving such citizen, corporation, partnership, or association, over compensation for such a seizure has been submitted to arbitration under the provisions of the Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes, or in another mutually agreed upon forum;

(3) whether such country fails to act in good faith in recognizing as binding or in enforcing arbitral awards which are in favor of United States citizens or a corporation, partnership, or association which is 50 percent or more beneficially owned by United States citizens, and which have been made by arbitrators appointed for each case or by permanent arbitral bodies to which the parties involved have submitted their dispute;

(4) whether such country affords preferential treatment to the products of a developed country, other than the United States, and whether such preferential treatment has, or is likely to have, a significant adverse effect on United States commerce, unless the President has received assurances satisfactory to the President that such preferential treatment will be eliminated or that

action will be taken to assure that there will be no such significant adverse effect;

(5) whether a government-owned entity in such country engages in the broadcast of copyrighted material, including films or television material, belonging to United States copyright owners without their express consent or such country fails to work towards the provision of adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights;

(6) whether such country is a signatory to a treaty, convention, protocol, or other agreement regarding the extradition of United States citizens;

(7) whether such country has or is taking steps to afford internationally recognized worker rights (as defined in section 502(a)(4) of the Trade Act of 1974, 19 U.S.C. 2462(a)(4)) to workers in the country (including any designated zone in that country);

(8) whether such country has met the narcotics cooperation certification criteria set forth in section 4E1(h)(2)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291(h)(2)(A)) for eligibility for United States assistance;

(9) an expression by such country of its desire to be so designated;

(10) the economic conditions in such country, the living standards of its inhabitants, and any other economic factors which the President deems appropriate;

(11) the extent to which such country has assured the United States it will provide equitable and reasonable access to the markets and basic commodity resources of such country;

(12) the degree to which such country follows the accepted rules of international trade provided for under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, as well as applicable trade agreements approved under section 2(a) of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2503(a));

(13) the degree to which such country uses export subsidies or imposes export performance requirements or local content requirements which distort international trade;

(14) the degree to which the trade policies of such country as they relate to other beneficiary countries are contributing to the revitalization of the region;

(15) the degree to which such country is undertaking self-help measures to promote its own economic development;

(16) the extent to which such country provides under its law adequate and effective means for foreign nationals to secure, exercise, and enforce exclusive rights in intellectual property, including patent, trademark, and copyright rights;

(17) the extent to which such country prohibits its nationals from engaging in the broadcast of copyrighted material, including films or television material, belonging to United States copyright owners without their express consent; and

(18) the extent to which such country is prepared to cooperate with the United States in the administration of the provisions of this Act.

(d) PRODUCTS OF INSULAR POSSESSIONS.—General Note 3(a)(iv) of the HTS (relating to products of the insular possessions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(E) Subject to the provisions in section 4 of the Andean Trade Initiative Act goods which are imported from insular possessions of the United States shall receive duty treatment no less favorable than the treatment afforded such goods when they are imported from a beneficiary country under such Act."

(e) WITHDRAWAL OF SUSPENSION OF DESIGNATION.—

(1) The President may—

(A) withdraw or suspend the designation of any country as a beneficiary country, or

(B) withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under this Act to any article of any country, if, after such designation, the President determines that as a result of changed circumstances such a country should be barred from designation as a beneficiary country.

(2)(A) The President shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the action the President proposes to take under paragraph (1) at least 30 days prior to taking such action.

(B) The United States Trade Representative shall, within the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the President publishes under subparagraph (A) notice of proposed action—

(i) accept written comments from the public regarding such proposed action,

(ii) hold a public hearing on such proposed action, and

(iii) publish in the Federal Register—

(I) notice of the time and place of such hearing prior to the hearing, and

(II) the time and place at which such written comments will be accepted.

SEC. 4. ELIGIBLE ARTICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Unless otherwise excluded from eligibility by this Act, the duty-free treatment provided under this Act shall apply to any article which is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary country if—

(A) that article is imported directly from a beneficiary country into the customs territory of the United States; and

(B) the sum of (i) the cost or value of the materials produced in a beneficiary country or two or more beneficiary countries under this Act, or a beneficiary country under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, or two or more such countries, plus (ii) the direct costs of processing operations performed in a beneficiary country or countries (under this Act or the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act) is not less than 35 percent of the appraised value of such article at the time it is entered.

For purposes of determining the percentage referred to in subparagraph (B), the term "beneficiary country" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands. If the cost or value of materials produced in the customs territory of the United States (other than the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) is included with respect to an article to which this paragraph applies, an amount not to exceed 15 percent of the appraised value of the article at the time it is entered that is attributed to such United States cost or value may be applied toward determining the percentage referred to in subparagraph (B).

(2) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out subsection (a) including, but not limited to, regulations providing that, in order to be eligible for duty-free treatment under this Act, an article must be wholly the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary country, or must be a new or different article of commerce which has been grown, produced, or manufactured in the beneficiary country; but no article or material of a beneficiary country shall be eligible for such treatment by virtue of having merely undergone—

(A) simple combining or packaging operations, or

(B) mere dilution with water or mere dilution with another substance that does not

materially alter the characteristics of the article.

(3) As used in this subsection, the phrase "direct costs of processing operations" includes, but is not limited to—

(A) all actual labor costs involved in the growth, production, manufacture, or assembly of the specific merchandise, including fringe benefits, on-the-job training and the cost of engineering, supervisory, quality control, and similar personnel; and

(B) dies, molds, tooling, and depreciation on machinery and equipment which are allocable to the specific merchandise.

Such phrase does not include costs which are not directly attributable to the merchandise concerned or are not costs of manufacturing the product, such as (i) profit, and (ii) general expenses of doing business which are either not allocable to the specific merchandise or are not related to the growth, production, manufacture, or assembly of the merchandise, such as administrative salaries, casualty and liability insurance, advertising, interest, and salesmen's salaries, commissions or expenses.

(4) Pursuant to section 223 of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Expansion Act of 1990, if the President considers that the implementation of revised rules of origin for products of beneficiary countries designated under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), would be appropriate, the President may include similarly revised rules of origin for products or beneficiary countries designated under this Act in any suggested legislation transmitted to the Congress that contain such rules of origin for products of beneficiary countries under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act.

(b) **LIMITATION ON DUTY-FREE TREATMENT.**—The duty-free treatment provided under this Act shall not apply to—

(1) textile and apparel articles which are subject to textile agreements;

(2) footwear not designated at the time of the effective date of this Act as eligible for the purpose of the generalized system of preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974;

(3) tuna, prepared or preserved in any manner, in airtight containers;

(4) petroleum, or any product derived from petroleum, provided in heading 2709 or 2710 of the HTS;

(5) watches and watch parts (including cases, bracelets, and straps), of whatever type including, but not limited to, mechanical, quartz digital, or quartz analog, if such watches or watch parts contain any material which is the product of any country with respect to which HTS column 2 rates of duty apply;

(6) articles to which reduced rates of duty apply under subsection (c); or

(7) sugars, syrups, and molasses classified in subheading 1701.11.03, 1701.12.02, 1701.99.02, 1702.90.32, 1806.10.42, or 2106.90.12 of the HTS.

(c) **REDUCTION IN CERTAIN RATES OF DUTY.**—

(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the President shall proclaim reductions in the rates of duty on handbags, luggage, flat goods, work gloves, and leather wearing apparel that—

(A) are the product of any beneficiary country; and

(B) were not designated on August 5, 1983, as eligible articles for purposes of the generalized system of preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974.

(2) The reduction provided for under paragraph (1) in the rate of duty on any article may—

(A) result in a rate that is equal to 80 percent of the rate of duty that applies to the article on December 31, 1991, except that, subject to the limitations in paragraph (3), the reduction may not exceed 2.5 percent ad valorem; and

(B) be implemented in 5 equal annual stages with the first one-fifth of the aggregate reduction in the rate of duty being applied to entries, or withdrawals from warehouse for consumption, of the article on or after January 1, 1992.

(3) The reduction provided for under this subsection with respect to the rate of duty on any article is in addition to any reduction in the rate of duty on that article that may be proclaimed by the President as being required or appropriate to carry out any trade agreement entered into under the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations; except that if the reduction so proclaimed—

(A) is less than 1.5 percent ad valorem, the aggregate of such proclaimed reduction and the reduction under this subsection may not exceed 3.5 percent ad valorem, or

(B) is 1.5 percent ad valorem or greater, the aggregate of such proclaimed reduction and the reduction under this subsection may not exceed the proclaimed reduction plus 1 percent ad valorem.

(d) **SUSPENSION OF DUTY-FREE TREATMENT.**—

(1) The President may by proclamation suspend the duty-free treatment provided by this Act with respect to any eligible article and may proclaim a duty rate for such article if such action is provided under chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251–2253) or section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1862).

(2) In any report by the International Trade Commission to the President under section 202(f) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2252(f)) regarding any article for which duty-free treatment has been proclaimed by the President pursuant to this Act, the Commission shall state whether and to what extent its findings and recommendations apply to such article when imported from beneficiary countries.

(3) For purposes of section 203 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2253), the suspension of the duty-free treatment provided by this Act shall be treated as an increase in duty.

(4) No proclamation providing solely for a suspension referred to in paragraph (3) of this subsection with respect to any article shall be taken under section 203 of the Trade Act of 1974 unless the United States International Trade Commission, in addition to making an affirmative determination with respect to such article under section 202(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, determines in the course of its investigation under such section that the serious injury (or threat thereof) substantially caused by imports to the domestic industry producing a like or directly competitive article results from the duty-free treatment provided by this Act.

(5)(A) Any action taken under section 203 of the Trade Act of 1974 that is in effect when duty-free treatment pursuant to section 1 of this Act is proclaimed shall remain in effect until modified or terminated.

(B) If any article is subject to any such action at the time duty-free treatment is proclaimed pursuant to section 1 of this Act, the President may reduce or terminate the application of such action to the importation of such article from beneficiary countries prior to the otherwise scheduled date on which such reduction or termination would occur pursuant to the criteria and procedures of section 203 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(e) **PETITION FILED WITH THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—

(1) If a petition is filed with the United States International Trade Commission pursuant to the provisions of section 202 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2252) regarding a perishable product and alleging injury from imports from beneficiary countries, then the petition may also be filed with the Secretary of Agriculture with a request that emergency relief be granted pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection with respect to such article.

(2) Within 14 days after the filing of a petition under paragraph (1) of this subsection—

(A) if the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that a perishable product from a beneficiary country is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to be a substantial cause of serious injury, or the threat thereof, to the domestic industry producing a perishable product like or directly competitive with the imported product and that emergency action is warranted, the Secretary shall advise the President and recommend that the President take emergency action; or

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture shall publish a notice of the Secretary's determination not to recommend the imposition of emergency action and so advise the petitioner.

(3) After the President receives a recommendation from the Secretary of Agriculture to take emergency action pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection, the President may issue a proclamation withdrawing the duty-free treatment provided by this Act or publish a notice of the President's determination not to take emergency action.

(4) The emergency action provided by paragraph (3) of this subsection shall cease to apply—

(A) upon the taking of action under section 203 of the Trade Act of 1974,

(B) on the day a determination by the President not to take action under section 203(b)(2) of such Act becomes final,

(C) in the event of a report of the United States International Trade Commission containing a negative finding, on the day the Commission's report is submitted to the President, or

(D) whenever the President determines that because of changed circumstances such relief is no longer warranted.

(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term "perishable product" means—

(A) live plants and fresh cut flowers provided for in chapter 6 of the HTS;

(B) fresh or chilled vegetables provided for in headings 0701 through 0709 (except subheading 0709.52.00) and heading 0714 of the HTS;

(C) fresh fruit provided for in subheadings 0804.20 through 0810.90 (except citrons in subheading 0805.90.00, tamarinds and kiwi fruit in subheading 0810.90.20, and cashew apples, mameyes colorados, sapodillas, soursops, and sweetsops in subheading 0810.90.40) of the HTS; or

(D) concentrated citrus fruit juice provided for in subheading 2009.11.00, 2009.19.40, 2009.20.40, 2009.30.20, or 2009.30.60 of the HTS.

(f) **FEES IMPOSED UNDER AGRICULTURE ADJUSTMENT ACT.**—No proclamation issued pursuant to this Act shall affect fees imposed pursuant to section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 624).

SEC. 5. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) General Note 3(c)(i)(A) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States

is amended by adding at the end of the table the following new item:

"Andean Trade Initiative Act F or F**".

(b) General Note 3(c) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(ix) Products of Countries Designated as Beneficiary Countries for Purposes of the Andean Trade Initiative Act (ATIA).

"(A) The following countries or successor political entities are designated beneficiary countries for the purposes of the ATIA, pursuant to section 3 of that Act;

"Bolivia
"Colombia
"Ecuador
"Peru

"(B)(1) Unless otherwise excluded from eligibility by the provisions of subdivisions (c)(ix)(D) or (c)(ix)(E) of this note, any article which is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary country shall be eligible for duty-free treatment if that article is provided for in a subheading for which a rate of duty of 'Free' appears in the 'Special' subcolumn followed by the symbol 'F' or 'F*' in parentheses, and if—

"(I) that article is imported directly from a beneficiary country into the customs territory of the United States; and

"(II) the sum of (A) the cost or value of the materials produced in a beneficiary country or two or more beneficiary countries under the ATIA, or a beneficiary country under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, or two or more such countries, plus (B) the direct costs of processing operations performed in a beneficiary country or countries (under the ATIA or the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act) is not less than 35 percent of the appraised value of such article at the time it is entered.

For purposes of determining the percentage referred to in subparagraph (II), the term 'beneficiary country' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands. If the cost or value of materials produced in the customs territory of the United States (other than the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) is included with respect to an article to which this paragraph applies, an amount not to exceed 15 percent of the appraised value of the article at the time it is entered that is attributed to such United States cost or value may be applied toward determining the percentage referred to in subparagraph (II).

"(2) Pursuant to section 4(a)(2) of the ATIA, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out subdivision (c)(ix) of this note including, but not limited to, regulations providing that, in order to be eligible for duty-free treatment under the ATIA, an article must be wholly the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary country, or must be a new or different article of commerce which has been grown, produced, or manufactured in the beneficiary country, and must be stated as such in a declaration by the appropriate party; but no article or material of a beneficiary country shall be eligible for such treatment by virtue of having merely undergone—

"(I) simple combining or packaging operations, or

"(II) mere dilution with water or mere dilution with another substance that does not materially alter the characteristics of the article.

"(3) As used in subdivision (c)(ix)(B) of this note, the phrase 'direct costs of processing operations' includes, but is not limited to—

"(I) all actual labor costs involved in the growth, production, manufacture, or assembly of the specific merchandise, including fringe benefits, on-the-job training and the cost of engineering, supervisory, quality control, and similar personnel; and

"(II) dies, molds, tooling, and depreciation on machinery and equipment which are allocable to the specific merchandise.

Such phrase does not include costs which are not directly attributable to the merchandise concerned or are not costs of manufacturing the product, such as (aa) profit, and (bb) general expenses of doing business which are either not allocable to the specific merchandise or are not related to the growth, production, manufacture, or assembly of the merchandise, such as administrative salaries, casualty and liability insurance, advertising, interest, and salesmen's salaries, commissions or expenses.

"(C) Articles provided for in a provision for which a rate of duty of 'Free' appears in the 'Special' subcolumn followed by the symbols 'F' or 'F*' in parentheses are eligible articles for purposes of the ATIA pursuant to section 4 of that Act. The symbol 'F' indicates that all articles provided for in the designated provision are eligible for preferential treatment except those described in subdivision (c)(ix)(E) of this note. The symbol 'F*' indicates that some articles provided for in the designated provision are not eligible for preferential treatment, as further described in subdivision (c)(ix)(D) of this note. Whenever an eligible article is imported into the customs territory of the United States in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (c)(ix)(B) of this note from a country or territory listed in subdivision (c)(ix)(A) of this note, it shall be eligible for duty-free treatment as set forth in the 'Special' subcolumn, unless excluded from such treatment by subdivision (c)(ix)(D) or (c)(ix)(E) of this note.

"(D) Articles provided for in a provision for which a rate of duty of 'Free' appears in the 'Special' subcolumn followed by the symbol 'F*' in parentheses shall be eligible for the duty-free treatment provided for in subdivision (c)(ix) of this note, except textile and apparel articles—

"(1) of cotton, wool, or fine animal hair, man-made fibers, or blends thereof in which those fibers, in the aggregate, exceed in weight each other single component fiber thereof; or

"(2) in which either the cotton content or the man-made fiber content equals or exceeds 50 percent by weight of all component fibers thereof; or

"(3) in which the wool or fine animal hair content exceeds 17 percent by weight of all components fibers thereof; or

"(4) containing blends of cotton, wool, or fine animal hair, or man-made fibers, which fibers, in the aggregate, amount to 50 percent or more by weight of all component fibers thereof;

except that beneficiary country exports of handloom fabrics of the cottage industry, or handmade cottage industry products made of such handloom fabrics, or traditional folklore handicraft textile products, if such products are properly certified under an arrangement established between the United States and such beneficiary country, are eligible for the duty-free treatment provided for in subdivision (c)(ix) of this note.

"(E) The duty-free treatment provided under the ATIA shall not apply to watches and to watch parts (including cases, bracelets, and straps), of whatever type including, but not limited to, mechanical, quartz digital, or quartz analog, if such watches or

watch parts contain any material which is the product of any country with respect to which column 2 rates of duty apply."

SEC. 6. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION REPORTS ON IMPACT OF THE ANDEAN TRADE INITIATIVE ACT.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The United States International Trade Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Commission") shall prepare, and submit to the Congress, a report regarding the economic impact of this Act on United States industries and consumers during—

(1) the twenty-four month period beginning with the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) each calendar year occurring thereafter until duty-free treatment under this Act is terminated under section 8(b).

For purposes of this section, industries in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the insular possessions of the United States shall be considered to be United States industries.

(b) CONTENT OF REPORT.—

(1) Each report required under subsection (a) shall include, but not be limited to, an assessment by the Commission regarding—

(A) the actual effect, during the period covered by the report, of this Act on the United States economy generally as well as on those specific domestic industries which produce articles that are like, or directly competitive with, articles being imported into the United States from beneficiary countries; and

(B) the probable future effect that this Act will have on the United States economy generally, as well as on such domestic industries, before the provisions of this Act terminate.

(2) In preparing the assessments required under paragraph (1), the Commission shall, to the extent practicable—

(A) analyze the production, trade and consumption of United States products affected by this Act, taking into consideration employment, profit levels, and use of productive facilities with respect to the domestic industries concerned, and such other economic factors in such industries as it considers relevant, including prices, wages, sales, inventories, patterns of demand, capital investment, obsolescence of equipment, and diversification of production; and

(B) describe the nature and extent of any significant change in employment, profit levels, and use of productive facilities, and such other conditions as it deems relevant in the domestic industries concerned, which it believes are attributable to this Act.

(c) DATE FOR SUBMITTING REPORT.—

(1) Each report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Congress before the close of the nine-month period beginning on the day after the last day of the period covered by the report.

(2) The Commission shall provide an opportunity for the submission by the public, either orally or in writing, or both, of information relating to matters that will be addressed in the reports.

SEC. 7. IMPACT STUDY BY SECRETARY OF LABOR.

The Secretary of Labor, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, shall undertake a continuing review and analysis of the impact that the implementation of the provisions of this Act has with respect to United States labor; and shall make an annual written report to Congress on the results of such review and analysis.

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE AND TERMINATION OF DUTY-FREE TREATMENT.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **TERMINATION OF DUTY-FREE TREATMENT.**—No duty-free treatment extended to beneficiary countries under this Act shall remain in effect on or after the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

• **Mr. ROTH.** Mr. President, I am pleased to join the distinguished Republican leader in introducing the Andean Trade Initiative Act, which is being introduced on behalf of the administration. In helping to promote greater economic opportunities for the four Andean countries, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru, this legislation will fulfill the commitment made by our President during the Cartagena summit last summer, and is a critical component to supporting these countries' efforts to eliminate the production, processing, and shipment of illicit drugs.

The provisions of this act establish a trade preference regime for certain products from the Andean countries. It is closely modeled after the Caribbean Basin Initiative [CBI], which was renewed and extended by Congress just last year. It is carefully crafted to take into account the need for protecting highly import sensitive products by maintaining duties on such products.

In addition to helping eliminate the illegal drug business, the United States will benefit from other provisions contained in this legislation. For example, the President must consider various factors important to U.S. business and labor concerns prior to designating a beneficiary country. These include the extent to which such country provides adequate protection of intellectual property rights, assures equitable and reasonable market access to U.S. goods and services, and is taking steps to afford internationally recognized worker rights. These and other criteria should prompt positive constructive economic change in the region.

If we expect Andean countries to eliminate their significant economic dependency on, and involvement in, illegal drugs, then we must be willing to help them bring about an expanding pattern of normal economic growth and development. Ultimately, we will reap substantial benefits through growing export opportunities and reduced illegal drug activity. The Andean Trade Initiative Act will be a strong step in this direction and I urge my colleagues to support it. •

By Mr. DANFORTH (for himself and Mr. BOND):

S. 276. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 1520 Market Street in St. Louis, MO, as the "L. Douglas Abram Federal Building"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

L. DOUGLAS ABRAM FEDERAL BUILDING

• **Mr. DANFORTH.** Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Mr. BOND, I am introducing legislation to designate the Federal building at 1520 Market Street, St. Louis, MO, as the "L. Douglas Abram Federal Building."

Mr. Abram, a special agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, was killed in the line of duty on January 19, 1990. Special Agent Abram entered on duty as an agent on June 6, 1976. During his 14-year career with the FBI, he had been assigned to the Columbus, OH, Resident Agency and Washington Field Office. In 1983, he was assigned to the St. Louis office and was a member of the special weapons and tactics [SWAT] team.

Mr. Abram lost his life in a shootout that began when officials tried to serve a search warrant on a suspected bank robber's home. Special Agent Abram was the first agent in the St. Louis office to die in the line of duty, and the 40th in the Nation.

Mr. Abram was an outstanding, dedicated professional who gave his life in the performance of his duty. He was known for his courage and loyalty and was considered a role model by many of the agents he helped train.

The war against drugs and crime is on-going. It is the dedication and persistence of our men and women in the law enforcement arena that will enable us to win this war. Special Agent Abram gave his life in the service of his country and I think he deserves to be honored in a significant way.

I offer this tribute to one of our Nation's heroes and urge your support of this bill. •

By Mr. SIMON:

S. 277. A bill to assure equal justice for women in the courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EQUAL JUSTICE FOR WOMEN IN THE COURTS ACT

• **Mr. SIMON.** Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Equal Justice for Women in the Courts Act of 1991. This bill addresses one of the remaining barriers to equal justice in our State and Federal judicial proceedings—gender bias by judges and court personnel. I first introduced this bill in the 101st Congress, and it was unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee as an amendment to Senator Biden's Violence Against Women Act.

The Equal Justice for Women in the Courts Act authorizes funding for the State Justice Institute and the Federal Judicial Center to develop and disseminate model programs designed to train judges and their personnel on rape laws, sexual assault, domestic violence, and crimes of violence motivated by gender.

Training would include such topics as the physical, economic, and psychological effects of rape and domestic violence on the victim and the resulting

costs to society; statistics on the nature and incidence of domestic violence; and the application of the rape shield laws and other limits on the introduction of evidence in court. Both the State and the Federal model programs would be developed with the assistance of law enforcement officials, victim's advocates, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and recognized experts on gender bias in the courts.

The Federal Courts Study Committee report released in April 1990 noted the crucial need for the type of judicial education and training this bill will provide. The study committee found that studies of many State systems reveal the presence of gender bias in State judicial proceedings. The committee concluded, "[w]e believe education is the best means of sensitizing judges and supporting personnel to their own possible inappropriate conduct and to the importance of curbing such bias when shown by attorneys, parties, and witnesses."

Two and one-half years ago, the Illinois State Bar Association, the Illinois Women's Bar Association, and the Chicago Bar Association established the task force to study gender bias in the courts. Last year the task force released its exhaustive study of the manifestations of gender bias in domestic relations cases, criminal cases, civil damage awards, and courtroom dynamics in the Illinois system. The report notes such specific instances of bias as a judge's comments in a case where a man chased his estranged wife and her companion by car. The woman and her companion were killed while trying to elude the defendant. As he sentenced the defendant to probation, the presiding judge stated, "[t]his was no drunken idiot trying to run someone off the road. This was a sober man trying to reclaim his wife."

But this is just one of many examples of blatant gender bias uncovered by the task force. The report also cites other, far more subtle, instances of gender bias throughout the justice system and strongly recommends judicial education as an important part of any meaningful effort to eliminate such bias.

I, too, believe that educational training for State and Federal judges on the legal issues and practical aspects surrounding sexual assault, domestic violence, rape, and crimes of violence motivated by gender is vital if judges and court personnel are to have a true understanding of the traumatic effects of these crimes on the victims.

Mr. President, last year my colleague, Senator BIDEN of Delaware, introduced the first comprehensive measure aimed at making our Nation's streets, college and university campuses, and homes safer for women. Following extensive hearings, the Judiciary Committee unanimously approved the Violence Against Women Act. The

Equal Justice for Women in the Courts Act was included as an amendment to the bill. Senator BIDEN has reintroduced the Violence Against Women Act this year, and I am pleased to note that the Equal Justice for Women in the Courts Act is included as title V of the bill.

Statistics compiled by the Judiciary Committee reveal that in 1989, more women were abused by their husbands than the number of women who got married. Since 1974, the rate of assaults against young women age 20 to 24 has risen 48 percent. In that same period of time, assaults against young men age 20 to 24 dropped 12 percent. In my home State of Illinois, the rate of sexual assaults has risen roughly 18 percent since 1986.

Yet rape is the most under-reported of all major crimes—it is believed that only about 7 percent of all rapes are reported to the police. One of the reasons they go unreported is the actual and perceived insensitivity of law enforcement officers and officers of the court to the victims of these crimes.

Enactment of the Equal Justice for Women in the Courts Act will provide meaningful protection to the rights of those who are victimized by sex crimes, domestic violence, and crimes of violence motivated by gender and take us one step closer to making equal justice under the law a living reality.

Mr. President, I commend this bill to my colleagues and invite their cosponsorship and support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following this statement.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 277

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Equal Justice for Women in Courts Act of 1991".

TITLE I—EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR JUDGES AND COURT PERSONNEL IN STATE COURTS

SEC. 101. GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

The State Justice Institute is authorized to award grants for the purpose of developing, testing, presenting, and disseminating model programs to be used by States in training judges and court personnel in the laws of the State on rape, sexual assault, domestic violence, and other crimes of violence motivated by the victims' gender.

SEC. 102. TRAINING PROVIDED BY GRANTS.

Training provided pursuant to grants made under this title may include current information, existing studies, or current data on—

- (1) the nature and incidence of rape and sexual assault by strangers and nonstrangers, marital rape, and incest;
- (2) the underreporting of rape, sexual assault, and child sexual abuse;
- (3) the physical, psychological, and economic impact of rape and sexual assault on

the victim, the costs to society, and the implications for sentencing;

(4) the psychology of sex offenders, their high rate of recidivism, and the implications for sentencing;

(5) the historical evolution of laws and attitudes on rape and sexual assault;

(6) sex stereotyping of female and male victims of rape and sexual assault, racial stereotyping of rape victims and defendants, and the impact of such stereotypes on credibility of witnesses sentencing and other aspects of the administration of justice;

(7) application of rape shield laws and other limits or introduction of evidence that may subject victims to improper sex stereotyping and harassment in both rape and nonrape cases, including the need for sua sponte judicial intervention in inappropriate cross-examination;

(8) the use of expert witness testimony on rape trauma syndrome, child sexual abuse accommodation syndrome, post-traumatic stress syndrome, and similar issues;

(9) the legitimate reasons why victims of rape, sexual assault, and incest may refuse to testify against a defendant;

(10) the nature and incidence of domestic violence;

(11) the physical, psychological, and economic impact of domestic violence on the victim, the costs to society, and the implications for court procedures and sentencing;

(12) the psychology and self-presentation of batterers and victims and the implications for court proceedings and credibility of witnesses;

(13) sex stereotyping of female and male victims of domestic violence, myths about presence or absence of domestic violence in certain racial, ethnic, religious, or socioeconomic groups, and their impact on the administration of justice;

(14) historical evolution of laws and attitudes on domestic violence;

(15) proper and improper interpretations of the defenses of self-defense and provocation, and the use of expert witness testimony on battered women syndrome;

(16) the likelihood of retaliation, recidivism, and escalation of violence by batterers, and the potential impact of incarceration and other meaningful sanctions for acts of domestic violence including violations of orders of protection;

(17) economic, psychological, social and institutional reasons for victims' inability to leave the batterer to report domestic violence or to follow through on complaints, including the influence of lack of support from police, judges, and court personnel, and the legitimate reasons why victims of domestic violence may refuse to testify against a defendant;

(18) the need for orders of protection, and the implications of mutual orders of protection, dual arrest policies, and mediation in domestic violence cases;

(19) recognition of and response to gender-motivated crimes of violence other than rape, sexual assault and domestic violence, such as mass or serial murder motivated by the gender of the victims; and

(20) current information on the impact of pornography on crimes against women, or data on other activities that tend to degrade women.

SEC. 103. COOPERATION IN DEVELOPING PROGRAMS IN MAKING GRANTS UNDER THIS TITLE.

The State Justice Institute shall ensure that model programs carried out pursuant to grants made under this title are developed with the participation of law enforcement of-

ficials, public and private nonprofit victim advocates, legal experts, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and recognized experts on gender bias in the courts.

SEC. 104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1991, \$600,000 to carry out the purposes of this title. Of amounts appropriated under this section, the State Justice Institute shall expend no less than 40 percent on model programs regarding domestic violence and no less than 40 percent on model programs regarding rape and sexual assault.

TITLE II—EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR JUDGES AND COURT PERSONNEL IN FEDERAL COURTS

SEC. 201. EDUCATION AND TRAINING GRANTS.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Federal Judicial Center shall conduct a study of the nature and extent of gender bias in the Federal courts, including in proceedings involving rape, sexual assault, domestic violence, and other crimes of violence motivated by gender. The study shall be conducted by the use of data collection techniques such as reviews of trial and appellate opinions and transcripts, public hearings, and inquiries to attorneys practicing in the Federal courts. The Federal Judicial Center shall publicly issue a final report containing a detailed description of the findings and conclusions of the study, including such recommendations for legislative, administrative, and judicial action as it considers appropriate.

(b) **MODEL PROGRAMS.**—(1) The Federal Judicial Center shall develop, test, present, and disseminate model programs to be used in training Federal judges and court personnel in the laws on rape, sexual assault, domestic violence, and other crimes of violence motivated by the victim's gender.

(2) The training programs developed under this subsection shall include—

(A) all the topics listed in section 102 of title I; and

(B) all procedural and substantive aspects of the legal rights and remedies for violent crime motivated by gender including such areas as the Federal penalties for sex crimes, interstate enforcement of laws against domestic violence and civil rights remedies for violent crimes motivated by gender.

SEC. 203. COOPERATION IN DEVELOPING PROGRAMS.

In implementing this title, the Federal Judicial Center shall ensure that the study and model programs are developed with the participation of law enforcement officials, public and private nonprofit victim advocates, legal experts, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and recognized experts on gender bias in the courts.

SEC. 204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1991, \$400,000 to carry out the purposes of this title. Of amounts appropriated under this section, no less than 25 percent and no more than 40 percent shall be expended by the Federal Judicial Center on the study required by section 201(a) of this title.●

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself
and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 278. A bill to provide for certain notice and procedures before the Social Security Administration may close, consolidate, or recategorize certain offices; to the Committee on Finance.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION SERVICES
PRESERVATION ACT

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing legislation

that would establish procedures to be used when the Social Security Administration proposes to close or move a field office.

My legislation, the Social Security Administration Services Preservation Act of 1991, would establish a process for ensuring that interested organizations, employees, and social security beneficiaries all receive adequate notice of proposed changes in field offices.

This bill would also require the agency to list, as part of its annual budget submission, those offices which have been closed in the preceding year as well as any that the agency plans to close. Currently, there is no readily available source of this information even though it is clearly important if we in Congress are to be informed about the agency's service to the American people.

The procedures in this legislation are based both on procedures employed by the U.S. Postal Service for office closings and on guidelines that the Social Security Administration issued on April 25, 1980. Those guidelines, part of an administrative directives system, outlined the agency's policy and I want to quote briefly from them:

The prime purpose of any service area or facility change will be to directly improve public service, increase operational or administrative efficiency, or both. The assumption is that improvements in operational or administrative efficiency can be shown to result at least indirectly in improved public service, but where change would bring these two concepts or goals into conflict with one another, public service considerations should be carefully weighed in light of the costs involved.

The guidelines go on to specify that shifts in population, demand for personal service, socioeconomic changes, transportation availability, and public reaction to the proposal should all be considered in decisions to close or relocate facilities. If the Social Security Administration consistently adhered to these guidelines, the need for the legislation I am introducing would not be as pressing. However, the guidelines have been repeatedly revised and, more importantly, there have been a number of cases where the agency has violated its own procedures.

Mr. President, public confidence in the Social Security Program is vital to its effectiveness and is based largely on the service the agency provides. The agency's extensive network of offices plays an important role in providing quality service to the millions of Americans who depend upon Social Security programs. The agency recognized, as early as 1958, that the location of its offices around the country contributes both to public confidence and to public cooperation.

As my colleagues know, the Social Security Administration closed, moved, and recategorized a number of service offices during the 1980's. A

number of those closings, including one in my own State of Maryland, were made without adequate consideration of the public interest.

In the fall of 1987, the agency decided to close its Dunbar office located on the east side of Baltimore. That office had been opened in the late 1960's as part of an effort to provide a variety of community services at one central location—a former high school in the Dunbar community. The Social Security office served as the focal point of the center and received frequent referrals from State and local agencies located there. The demand for services from this community was noticeably high.

With the closing of that office, residents of the area still receive many other services from the Dunbar location. However, it is now necessary for them to go outside of their community for Social Security assistance. The Dunbar office served a community that includes many elderly and disabled residents who find it almost impossible to travel across town to other offices.

The agency's decision to close this particular office was never fully justified. They maintained that their quality of service and operating efficiency would be enhanced by telephone and computer modernization. However, Mr. President, I do not need to remind this body of the widespread reports of serious problems with the new equipment and with telephone accessibility. Many serious concerns about the teleservice program have been expressed to me and to my casework staff.

Even assuming that problems with the telephone systems are eventually resolved, the agency itself noted that more than 15 percent of households in the east Baltimore area do not have telephones. Therefore, those residents now have no choice except to travel the extra distance to the downtown office. The agency's arguments for closing the Dunbar office were especially unconvincing since it had been handling a heavy caseload very efficiently and effectively. At the time it was shut down, the branch office employed eight people who had a reputation throughout the Baltimore area for the quality of their service and the personal assistance they provided for clients.

The service delivery review that the agency used to justify the closing of the office included little serious analysis and did not consider alternative field office arrangements. However, the most surprising thing about the review process was its failure to involve the community in assessing its own service needs. The agency did not provide community groups or Social Security beneficiaries in the Dunbar area with an opportunity to participate in the service review process.

The Social Security Administration clearly did not follow its written procedures in this particular decision to

close an office. Mr. President, I am confident that many of my colleagues are aware of situations in their own States in which a service office was closed or downgraded without input from community groups and without adequate consideration of the public interest. As many of us so painfully remember, the last Administration proposed closing more than 750 service offices in mid-1985. Thanks to the congressional and public outrage sparked by that proposal, the mass closings were not done. However, since that time the agency has continued to target many of those same offices for closure or recategorization.

My legislation would assure that the need for personal attention of many Social Security beneficiaries, such as senior citizens and handicapped persons, is considered before an office is closed. It recognizes that residents of areas that are characterized by low levels of income or education often have a greater need for personal assistance. In the 1960's and 1970's, the agency opened many offices in areas that are socially or economically disadvantaged. It disturbs me that many of those very offices are among the ones that the agency has targeted for closure in recent years.

This act would also ensure that all decisions to close, recategorize, or move a Social Security office are considered using a fair process. It would prevent the Administration from basing such decisions on political interests instead of on the needs of this Nation's citizens.

Mr. President, I am pleased that my colleague from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, is again joining as a sponsor of this legislation. It is my hope that all of my other colleagues will join us in supporting this important bill so that it can be promptly approved by the Senate.●

By Mr. BRYAN (for himself, Mr. GORTON, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. DODD, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. PELL, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBB, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SIMON, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WIRTE):

S. 279. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act to require new standards for corporate average fuel economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL EFFICIENCY ACT

• Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, today I, together with 34 original cosponsors, am introducing the Motor Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Act of 1991. It is one of the most effective energy conservation measures available to reduce our growing dependence on imported oil.

These are tense and frustrating days for all of us. We all have struggled with the proper response to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, and now that war has begun we all hope and pray for a quick resolution and for peace. At the same time, we know that this war may continue for some time, with a painfully high human and economic cost.

We are limited in what we can do in the short term to assist in the day-to-day war effort. But there is much we can do in the longer term to change the conditions that make us so dependent on the unstable Middle East, and on the oil that we know ultimately is a finite resource. We have been without an energy policy in this country for over 10 years. We now import well over 40 percent of the oil we use, and we import more of our oil from the Persian Gulf than we did at the time of the 1973 embargo. The fuel economy of passenger vehicles is declining, rather than improving, at a rate of 4 percent in just the last 2 years.

These patterns are deeply troubling, and inaction in the face of these facts would be irresponsible. The consequences of such inaction, for the citizen individually and for the Nation as a whole, can be severe. The legislation I introduce today is one step, and indeed the first step for the 102d Congress, to reverse the pattern of inertia that has existed for much too long.

This legislation is very similar to S. 1224, which I introduced in the 101st Congress, and which had the support of 57 Members of the Senate. It will improve the fuel efficiency of the new passenger vehicle fleet by 40 percent over the next decade by requiring increases in the corporate average fuel efficiency, or CAFE, requirements of current law. By 2005, these improvements will save more than 2 million barrels of oil each day. This is over four times the amount of oil we imported from Iraq and Kuwait prior to the invasion. This legislation also addresses the serious environmental threat of global warming. Since each gallon of gasoline burned emits almost 20 pounds of carbon dioxide, these savings will dramatically reduce emissions of this greenhouse gas by 500 million tons per year.

While this bill will require effort on the part of the auto industry, it also has been crafted with industry's needs in mind. No increase is required until model year 1996, an additional year beyond that which would have been required by legislation that I introduced in the last Congress. This is in recognition of the considerable lead time the

industry says it needs to alter its product plans. The bill does not require precise annual increases, as the current CAFE law did, but sets standards 5 years apart to permit the industry maximum flexibility in reaching the standards.

In recognition of the fact that surgical precision in setting standards 10 years in the future is difficult, the bill provides considerable discretion to the Department of Transportation to increase or reduce the standards to the maximum feasible levels of fuel economy. However, it provides strict guidance to the agency in carrying out this responsibility, to prevent the abusive and unnecessary reductions in the standards that were permitted by the administration in the late 1980's.

The legislation also will correct the unfairness in the current CAFE law, which is unduly burdensome to those manufacturers who make a full range for vehicle sizes. It will require each manufacturer to improve by the same percentage, so that all those who sell cars in the United States will have to do their fair share toward energy conservation. However, it also contains a numerical maximum, or cap, on the standards, so that those manufacturers who already have high fuel economy achievements will not be unreasonably affected.

On the other hand, the bill contains necessary deterrents to discourage violation of the standards. The bill adjusts the civil penalties chargeable to violators by an inflation factor, since the penalties have not been increased since 1975 and now are worth about one-half of what they were when enacted. Additionally, since some manufacturers repeatedly ignore the standards and simply pay penalties every year, the bill will make the standards more difficult to ignore by doubling the penalties for such repeat violators.

Finally, the bill will require several studies—on the technological potential for fuel economy improvements beyond the next decade; on the optimum formula for establishing CAFE standards; and on the accuracy of EPA fuel economy testing procedures. These studies will give Congress the information it needs to continually improve both fuel economy and the structure of our energy policy.

The standards set by this bill strike a balance between the needs of the country to save oil and reduce carbon dioxide emissions, and the needs of the industry and the consumer for a full range of vehicle types and sizes, and for the time necessary to improve the product. The standards can be achieved even if no new technology becomes available within the next 10 years, and without significant changes in the size mix of the fleet. However, there are extremely promising technologies, such as the two stroke engine, on the verge of coming into production, which will

enhance the ability of manufacturers to meet these standards.

Many have suggested that by establishing increased fuel economy standards this bill mandates a new kind of vehicle fleet for the American consumer. Rather, the flexibility and lead time provided by this bill lets the industry and the consumer determine the type of fleet that will be driven into the next decade, and that is as it should be. These standards insure only that the fleet of the future is as fuel efficient as possible. One way to achieve that is to hold the line on horsepower. The horsepower of the fleet has increased by 10 percent in just 2 years—between 1988 and 1990. This, and a 6-percent weight increase, has resulted in a 4-percent decline in fuel economy. Such declines are not acceptable given the need for conservation. In my view, the elimination of one tenth of a second off the 0-to-60-miles-per-hour record should not be national policy. However, under my bill if increased horsepower and speed is provided by the industry, it must be done without sacrificing fuel economy.

Many have joined the cry for conservation, particularly since the war began in the Persian Gulf. Yet there is a disturbing tendency by some to suggest that conservation should be practiced by everyone else, or that proven conservation measures should not be instituted until conservation measures for every sector of the economy are in place. The auto industry may make such suggestions in response to this legislation. However, it is important to recognize that we cannot significantly reduce our oil use without addressing the transportation sector. The light-duty-vehicle fleet covered by this legislation accounts for almost 40 percent of U.S. oil consumption. It must be part of the solution.

In addition, CAFE standards are a proven means of conservation in this area—many say the most effective conservation measure ever enacted in this country. Since enactment in 1975, CAFE standards—and the industry's impressive achievement in meeting them—have saved 1.8 million barrels of oil each day, and \$40 billion of consumers' money. There is no rational reason to delay further improvements while other conservation measures are debated. This one works, it will not preclude other measures later, and it needs some lead time for implementation. We can, and should, move forward now.

Some suggest that the cost of improved fuel economy is too high, and that the consumer and the industry cannot bear such a burden. Evidence indicates that the cost of meeting these standards would be well under \$500 per car, a cost largely offset by fuel savings. But I would suggest that we have paid, and will continue to pay, a much higher cost for ignoring con-

servation. In purely economic terms, the Department of Defense estimates that, prior to the beginning of the War, Operation Desert Shield had already cost \$10 billion in calendar year 1990 alone. The taxpayers—including automobile consumers and the auto industry—will pay these costs, which will undoubtedly increase dramatically. The much higher price, of course, is paid in noneconomic terms—by the presence of half a million U.S. troops deployed in the Persian Gulf.

We must get serious about energy policy and conservation, and we must do it now. Solutions to this problem take time. We cannot wait to begin.

I want to acknowledge the assistance and support of the chairman of the Commerce Committee, Senator HOLLINGS, who had the foresight to recognize the original need for fuel economy standards and lead the way to their enactment in 1975. I also want to thank the ranking Republican member of the Consumer Subcommittee, Senator GORTON, who has worked with me on this legislation from its inception in the last Congress and whose hard work and support has been vital to the progress of this proposal. I urge my colleagues to join me and the 34 original cosponsors in supporting this legislation, and ensuring its expeditious enactment into law.●

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer my strong support to my Commerce Committee colleague Senator BRYAN, and to be an original cosponsor of this legislation to increase the corporate average fuel economy, or CAFE, standards. I also was an original cosponsor of S. 1224, which had the support of a majority of the Senate in the last Congress. Today we continue the work we began in the 1970's on fuel economy for the passenger vehicle fleet.

In 1975, I cosponsored legislation that established the current CAFE standards. At the time that legislation was proposed, it was an untested and unprecedented plan. However, we believed we could effectively promote national energy security by mandating that the passenger vehicle fleet achieve a certain fuel economy.

At that time, we heard predictions from the automobile industry about the consequences of the legislation on the U.S. economy and on the consumer's choice of vehicles. It was suggested then that, if we adopted the standards that are now law, everyone would have to drive a vehicle the size of a Ford Pinto. Of course, the events of the last decade have proven that the automobile industry has the ability to meet such a challenge.

I am glad we were not deterred by those predictions, and that we proceeded to legislate fuel economy standards, which have made a significant contribution to energy conservation. They have resulted in a doubling of the

fuel economy of the fleet without any loss of interior size or performance of the vehicles. It is estimated that these improvements in fuel economy save 2.5 million barrels of oil per day, and save the consumer at least \$40 billion per year in gasoline costs.

We need to continue the work we started 15 years ago. The levels of fuel economy established by that law have not increased since 1985, and the fuel economy of some manufacturers' fleets is actually decreasing. In the meantime, the need for energy conservation has not diminished. Rather, we have been forcefully reminded that we cannot rely on unlimited imported oil. The oil is not really unlimited, and the owners of that oil are fully prepared to hold us hostage to obtain it. If we are prepared to send our troops to risk their lives in the Middle East, the least we can do is continue to use our best technology at home to reduce our reliance on imported oil.

Imported oil is often over 50 percent of consumption, and we recently have seen what happens to gasoline prices when there is even a threat to that supply. Of equal concern to me is the fact that energy imports are major contributors to our intolerably high trade deficit, adding almost \$40 billion per year.

In addition to the ongoing, and increasing, problem of national energy security, we have another reason to continue the progress in fuel efficiency—the threat of global warming. Every gallon of gasoline that is burned emits almost 20 pounds of carbon dioxide, and we know that carbon dioxide is a primary contributor to global warming. While we may not be certain of all the consequences of the warming that is predicted, we are certain that concentrations of carbon dioxide are increasing.

I am working to enhance the research necessary to know more about the effects of this warming. In the last Congress we enacted the Global Change Research Act of 1990, which I introduced. This legislation provides for improved coordination of the research efforts to understand the Earth system and effects of changes in that system. This legislation also provides for a national plan to advance this research.

However, I am convinced that, while this research proceeds, we must immediately take the steps available to us to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Since the transportation sector is responsible for about one-third of the country's carbon dioxide emissions, fuel economy is an important part of the solution to this problem.

The auto industry is saying the same things it said in 1975—that the standards will force all Americans into tiny cars. That did not happen as a result of that legislation, and it will not happen as a result of this legislation. In Commerce Committee hearings on this subject in the last Congress, we heard im-

pressive testimony from a variety of experts, including the Department of Energy, that the technology exists to accomplish considerable improvements in fuel economy without noticeable size reductions or unreasonable cost.

This bill is fair, it is practical, and it balances the needs of the national energy security, the environment, the economy, and the consumer. It is the product of thoughtful work in the Commerce Committee, where we have spent years developing an expertise in the area of fuel economy. I urge my colleagues to support this important response to the country's long-term energy needs.●

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to join with several of my colleagues in introducing the Motor Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Act. This legislation is similar to S. 1224 which died at the end of the 101st Congress.

The perilous situation in the Persian Gulf has served once again to highlight our dangerous reliance upon imported oil. It appears as if the lessons of the 1970's have been forgotten, or worse, ignored in the 1990's. Instead of getting better, our dependence has only gotten worse. In 1973, we imported 37 percent of our oil. In 1990, we imported 50 percent of our oil. Now, more than ever, we must begin to focus on ways to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, look to other sources of energy, and enact serious energy conservation measures.

Unfortunately, New York and the entire Northeast, rely very heavily upon imported oil. The New York State Energy Office reported in 1989 that foreign oil provided more than 70 percent of New York's petroleum needs. That figure is up from 60 percent from only 3 years ago. Obviously, New York is very vulnerable in the face of oil supply disruptions or price escalations. For this reason, corporate average fuel economy standards are important for New York and the rest of the Northeast.

Much has been said about our lack of a comprehensive energy plan. While the Department of Energy has presented such a plan to President Bush, its implementation will come too late to be of any assistance in our present situation. Nevertheless, it is essential that any energy plan incorporate a diversity of energy options and fuels. While we cannot immediately end our love affair with oil, we can focus our attention and efforts upon other energy sources such as natural gas, coal, nuclear, and renewables such as wind and solar.

The Motor Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Act presents us with a unique opportunity. It will allow us to curb our reliance on foreign oil, while at the same time help to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from vehicles which contribute to global warming. This legislation proposes to increase the current corporate average fuel economy, or CAFE,

requirements for new cars and light trucks sold in the United States by 40 percent in 2001, with an interim increase of 20 percent in 1996. This would save 2.8 million barrels of oil when fully implemented.

Since 1975 when Congress first enacted CAFE standards, the auto industry has been fighting them. The current CAFE standards have not increased since 1985, and were actually reduced between 1986 and 1989. In 1974, the year before Congress passed a fuel efficiency law that raised new car miles per gallon from 12.5 to 27.5 over 10 years, the auto industry claimed that higher gas mileage would "outlaw most full-sized sedans and station wagons" and require all cars to be "sub-Pinto sized." Obviously that prediction has proved quite false. Yet this has not prevented the industry from making this and other claims today. Questions about the feasibility of higher CAFE standards are currently being addressed in a National Academy of Sciences study. I look forward to the results of this study which is due to be released in June of this year.

We must not overlook the environmental benefits that will come with the enactment of this legislation. It is a known fact that vehicular emissions contribute to our global warming problem. A tank of gasoline produces up to 400 pounds of carbon dioxide, a major greenhouse gas. Although the world's motor vehicles now produce only 14 percent of all CO₂ derived from fossil fuels, the vehicular contribution in industrialized countries is higher, reaching a peak of 24 percent in the United States. Enacting this legislation would be the single largest step to curbing global warming by reducing CO₂ emissions by 20 percent by the year 2000.

The Motor Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Act represents just one step we can take to free ourselves from the shackles of foreign oil while at the same time addressing the problem of global warming. I urge my colleagues to join with us in supporting this important legislation.

• Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague, Senator BRYAN, the chairman of the Consumer Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, in introducing the Motor Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Act. As the ranking Republican of the Consumer Subcommittee, I am happy to continue my work with Senator BRYAN on this vital legislation.

With America's attention focused on the events in the Persian Gulf, it is difficult to maintain a focus on the everyday workings of the Congress. Yet, there are actions we should actively pursue to make us less dependent on both foreign oil and a region of the world which contains approximately two-thirds of the known oil reserves. Let me make it clear at the onset; we are not engaged in a war in the Persian

Gulf for cheap oil. Our intervention on behalf of Kuwait is to support the U.N. resolution and the overwhelming number of nations of the world who condemn the unprecedented and abhorrent aggression of Saddam Hussein.

Nonetheless, even before Saddam Hussein's intolerable actions, it was very clear that America was sliding toward a dangerous dependence upon foreign oil. In 1973, during the OPEC oil embargo, we imported 36 percent of our oil. In January 1990, we imported 54 percent of the oil we consumed. Two years ago, former President Reagan informed the Congress under section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act that, "Petroleum imports threaten to impair the national security." Those words ring only too true today. Saddam Hussein would have had little interest in Kuwait if the world was not so dependent upon Middle East oil.

The first CAFE bill was enacted in 1975. At that time, automobiles averaged only 13.5 miles per gallon (mpg). Despite the auto companies' claims that the standards could not be met, manufacturers did reach the act's goal of 27.5 mpg by 1985. The CAFE bill is considered one of the most efficient energy saving measures ever enacted. But CAFE has not increased in the last 6 years and was actually rolled-back for a few years in the mid-eighties. Fuel efficiency for all models sold in America peaked at 28.7 mpg in 1988; the average for all 1990 models has dropped to only 28.2 mpg. Deep concern both with energy security and environmental degradation require a reversal of this trend.

The bill we are introducing today requires that each manufacturer to increase its fleet performance by 20 percent by 1996 and by 40 percent by the year 2001. It will also require light trucks, the fastest selling vehicles today, to increase their fuel economy by a like percentage over their 1988 fuel efficiency levels. When fully implemented, this bill will save 2.8 million barrels of oil per day—significantly less than the 17 million barrels of oil we presently use each day.

While today's events tend to focus our attention on the importance of ridding our Nation of our dependence on imported oil, we should not overlook the very beneficial effects this bill would have on the environment. By lessening our dependence on imported oil, we will decrease the number of supertankers in our waters and lower the chances of a disastrous oilspill. When fully implemented, the Bryan-Gorton bill will eliminate 852 trips per year by a supertanker the size of the *Exxon-Valdez*.

Of all the steps that we can take to reduce global warming, this bill is thought to be the most important. Each gallon of gasoline used typically produces 18 pounds of carbon dioxide. Carbon dioxide is the primary green-

house gas which contributes to global warming. Over its lifetime, an 18 mpg car pumps 58 tons of carbon dioxide into the air; a 40 mpg car emits 26 tons, less than half that amount.

Last year, Senator BRYAN and I led the debate in support of increased CAFE requirements. A majority of Senators, 57, supported our attempt to pass this vital legislation. I hope that, especially now given the events in the Persian Gulf, many more Senators will see the necessity of taking a step forward toward energy independence.

In the future, there may be many difficult votes this body will take in addressing our country's energy and environmental needs. Approving this bill, however, should not be a difficult decision. This is a modest measure, the goals of which can be achieved with technology already used in fuel efficient cars today. To me, it makes sense to use our resources wisely and to practice conservation. The Bryan-Gorton CAFE bill is a responsible measure which I hope will have the widespread support of my colleagues in the Senate.

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, as co-chairman of the Congressional Energy and Environmental Study Conference, I am acutely aware of the need for a comprehensive energy policy. We certainly cannot continue to be so heavily dependent on oil, as recent events have dramatically illustrated. To its credit, the administration began working on such a policy even before Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. I am looking forward to reviewing their recommendations.

In the meantime, I believe that this legislation sends a clear and unambiguous message to the citizens of the United States that we are serious about moving forward with a strategy to reduce energy consumption. Any comprehensive energy plan involves conservation, and given that the transportation sector accounts for over 60 percent of our oil consumption, improving the fuel efficiency of the vehicles on our roads must be an integral part of our efforts.

While I wholeheartedly believe we must increase the fuel efficiency of passenger cars and light trucks, I do remain somewhat concerned about the issue of safety. Despite the testimony given by various expert witnesses to the Commerce Committee during the last session of Congress, the automobile manufacturers continue to maintain that the standards set forth in this bill cannot be achieved without significantly downsizing their fleets. That is, by making smaller and lighter weight, and, therefore more unsafe, vehicles.

Much of this rhetoric is the same that was heard 15 years ago when CAFE standards were first enacted. Regardless of these claims, however, fuel economy has doubled since that time, with no loss of interior volume or per-

formance. Interior space and vehicle weight have been constant since 1979. In addition, traffic fatalities have been reduced from 3.5 per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in 1974, when CAFE was first enacted, to 2.4. I hope, as in our prior experience, that the automobile manufacturers' assertions will prove unfounded.

Some manufacturers also continue to voice objections to the percentage approach taken in the bill. They believe it unfairly impacts those who have already done the most to attain higher standards. We have tried to address this issue by placing a "cap" on the maximum level of fuel economy required. We have also given the Secretary of Transportation the discretion and flexibility to reduce the established standards. I recognize that some industry members still may not find this to be the best solution. Perhaps, as we debate the issue this year, we can craft an approach that addresses their continuing concerns.

Mr. President, I believe that the goals embodied in this legislation represent clear and positive steps toward realizing a sensible, economically and environmentally sound energy policy. It is imperative that we move forward to solve our long-term energy problems through conservation and the development of alternative fuels. This bill is an excellent starting place, and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this effort.●

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to join Senator BRYAN and others in introducing the Motor Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Act. The bill would increase fuel economy standards by 40 percent over the next decade, saving 2.8 million barrels of oil per day. It builds on the success of the Corporate Average Fuel Economy or CAFE law enacted in 1975—one of the most effective energy efficiency measures ever passed by Congress.

We are the most wasteful society in the world. The United States uses twice the amount of energy per unit of GNP than Japan or West Germany. Mr. President, if we trimmed oil consumption by just 15 percent, we would displace all the oil America imports from the Persian Gulf. This bill alone once fully implemented would more than achieve that drop in oil consumption.

That's why Senator BRYAN's bill is so important. It expands on the original 1975 Corporate Average Fuel Economy [CAFE] Act which has been one of the most important steps we've taken to protect the global environment and promote a healthier U.S. economy. It resulted in more efficient vehicles and reducing our dependence on foreign oil than it otherwise would have been. Since the CAFE measures were enacted there has been an approximate doubling in automobile fuel efficiency. It has saved 2.5 million barrels of oil per day and \$40 billion per year for con-

sumers. Despite the auto industry's fears that the standards would harm them, they managed to meet those standards.

But fuel efficiency in the United States is slipping and legislation is necessary to continue the progress in energy conservation, environmental protection, and balancing the trade deficit that was initiated by the 1975 CAFE law. Unfortunately, the success of the 1975 CAFE standards began to level off in 1985. The average new vehicle fuel efficiency in 1988 was actually lower than the standards set in 1985. And we have witnessed a decline in fuel efficiency of some manufacturers.

The Bryan bill will reverse this decline. And it establishes standards which are technologically feasible. The Office of Technology Assessment says that the technology exists now to make these improvements without sacrificing performance or switching to smaller cars.

Higher fuel efficiency makes sense for many other reasons. This Nation faces considerable economic difficulties because of our trade deficit. Forty percent of our trade deficit is due to oil imports alone! Driving cars that consume less fuel will help wean the United States from our dependence on foreign oil.

In addition to saving oil, the Bryan bill is an important step in saving our planet. Carbon dioxide emitted from motor vehicles is a significant contributor to the threat of global warming or "the greenhouse effect." The combustion of a single gallon of gas produces almost 20 pounds of carbon dioxide. And it is estimated that an average car emits about 58 tons of CO₂ over its lifetime. The United States emits more CO₂ than any other nation—about 20 percent of the world's CO₂ emissions. Automobiles account for 25 percent of the U.S. contribution of CO₂ emissions.

Carbon dioxide is accountable for almost half of the gases that contribute to the greenhouse effect. As greenhouse gases become trapped in the Earth's atmosphere, temperatures will increase around the globe. The impacts are far reaching. Mass extinctions will result as species are unable to adapt to rapidly changing environmental conditions. Reduced soil moisture and altered weather patterns will disrupt U.S. and world agricultural cycles. Rising sea levels due to melting of the polar ice caps will inundate coastal areas around the world, resulting in loss of low lying coastal lands where millions of people reside.

Although there is some disagreement as to the rate and magnitude of change, there is a remarkable degree of scientific consensus that global climate change is upon us. This change presents a serious threat to the continuation of life on Earth as we know it.

The standards proposed in this bill would decrease carbon dioxide by about 500 million tons per year by the year 2005. By setting these new CAFE standards, the United States can assume a leadership role for the development of efficient technologies that can help us to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and address the problem of global climate change.

Mr. President, the Motor Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Act gives us the opportunity to fight wasteful energy consumption and unstable supplies of oil, to reduce our trade imbalance and curb global warming. The decline in auto fuel efficiency poses a serious threat to the Nation's economy, to our national security and to the health of the global environment. Increasing auto fuel efficiency is the single most important step Congress can take to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, enhance our economy and protect the natural systems that support life on this planet. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.●

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil can no better be illustrated than by witnessing what is at stake in the Persian Gulf.

I rise today to join with Senator BRYAN and more than 30 of my colleagues in refile legislation to jumpstart the auto fuel efficiency program. The legislation we are reintroducing today is absolutely critical in order to improve the Nation's energy situation, reduce air pollution, protect our consumers and enhance our national security.

The issue of conserving gasoline is one that many of us tried to raise during the Clean Air debate; and it is an issue that holds equal importance today, particularly in view of the energy situation in the Gulf.

The energy situation in the Middle East has sadly made this debate a timely one. Our dependence on foreign oil is demonstrated each day by the news we receive from the gulf—by the risks being taken by our soldiers in the desert—and by the fears of their families and friends each day at home. At home, every one of us notices the additional costs to us from our dependence on foreign oil, from the direct cost of gasoline at the pump, to those passed on costs for heating and transportation that increase the price of airline travel, food, health care, and every manufacturing industry in the Nation.

The United States is the largest consumer of oil in the world, accounting for almost 25 percent of the consumption. Oil imports have grown from 28 percent consumption in 1982 to more than 50 percent this year. That amount exceeds our previous high of 48 percent set in 1977. This excessive dependence on foreign oil clearly reflects a lost decade with no national energy strategy. The President is expected to make

reference to his forthcoming energy strategy tonight in the State of the Union Address. However, if the stories coming out of the White House are true, the President's energy strategy will provide an economic infusion for the ailing domestic oil business and stalled nuclear power industry, and reflects a myopic view of a few advisors that conservation and renewables be excluded from the energy equation. Such shortsighted vision during the Reagan years resulted in the unfortunate situation we find ourselves in today.

Many recall that during the oil embargo of 1973 Democrats and Republicans alike got serious about conservation and renewable energy resources. In 1975 Congress, through the leadership of Senator HOLLINGS and others, enacted CAFE standards which increased automobile fuel efficiency from 14 miles per gallon to today's 27.5 miles per gallon. Funds poured into research and development for renewable sources. Congress passed tax credits for conservation initiatives. Today after a decade of neglect, a decade with no energy policy, we have arrived at the economically risky and environmentally dangerous position we are in today. In the past decade funds for renewable energy sources were cut from \$557 million in 1981 to \$94 million last year. Meanwhile the price of the Persian Gulf war ranges from \$500 million to \$1 billion a day. In the 1980s tax credits for renewables such as the solar hot water heating were eliminated. And as our R&D dollars dried up for America's universities and research institutions the Japanese and the Germans passed us by to become the world's leaders in exporting technologies. It is disgraceful that complacency and the lack of an energy crisis permitted not only our competitive edge to slip away, but shelved the Nation's conservation efforts.

With new problems come new opportunities. The Persian Gulf war highlights the need for action, and provides a new chance to renew our conservation effort and to continue to curb environmental degradation.

Mr. President, before we debate the merits of the CAFE approach, I want to address the fact that many of my colleagues have received frightening and distorted and exaggerated assessments of the measuring impact on our automobile industry. Let me put this into perspective.

Fifteen years ago Congress enacted legislation which adopted CAFE standards designed to improve automobile fuel efficiency by 100 percent in just a decade. Ten years later the automobile industry to their credit, achieved that 100 percent improvement standard and in some instances went beyond.

Let's review what the automobile industry told us 15 years ago when CAFE

standards first passed. In 1974 the Ford Motor Co. told us:

This proposal would require a Ford product line consisting of either all sub-Pinto-sized vehicles or some mix of vehicles ranging from a sub-sub-compact to perhaps a Maverick.

Chrysler stated that the provision "would outlaw a number of engine lines and car models, including most full-size sedans and station wagons."

Needless to say, these dire predictions proved false. But that does not prevent the automobile manufacturers from recycling them again. For example, General Motors has suggested that the new CAFE targets "would force us to consider drastic measures, such as cutting production of our larger, family-sized cars."

Well, Mr. President, they were wrong in 1974 and they are wrong now. Because of the success of the CAFE standards, new cars rolling off the assembly line today average over 28 versus only 14 miles per gallon in 1975.

More important, these standards have saved the Nation 2.5 million barrels of oil every day and, in 1989 alone, lowered carbon dioxide emissions by over 360 million tons. This means savings from the pocket book of virtually every American family, not some abstract national oil account.

Contrary to what the auto industry says, the availability of this fuel saving technology means that the size of vehicles need not be reduced and that there is no trade off of fuel economy with safety. In fact, the Center for Auto Safety, long time watchdog of auto safety, assures us that this amendment will not compromise safety. Moreover, experts tell us that our bill will offer buyers the same size and comforts as automobile models from 1987. Certainly consumers will continue to have choices in the cars they buy.

Increasing our fuel efficiency will decrease our dependence on foreign oil. This dependency not only poses the economic threat to consumer pocketbooks, as we witnessed in October when oil prices rose to \$40 a barrel, but is a direct threat to the overall economic security of our Nation. Oil imports account for close to 55 percent of our trade deficit. If you eliminate oil imports and automobile imports, we actually have a national trade surplus.

The legislation before us today will reduce our Nation's oil consumption by 2.8 million barrels of oil per day by 2006. This accounts for close to four times the amount of oil we have been importing from Kuwait and Iraq combined.

Increasing our fuel efficiency also makes sense because it will decrease the pressure to drill in environmentally sensitive areas, such as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. Some predict that if we reduce our oil consumption by 2.8 million barrels per day as set out in this legisla-

tion, by the year 2006 we will save 10 times the amount of oil they expect to produce in ANWAR. It will minimize the need for off shore oil and gas drilling in environmentally sensitive coastal areas such as Georges Bank and the California coast.

Increased fuel efficiency would save consumers hundreds of dollars every year at the gas pump. It is estimated that the additional cost to produce a car achieving 40 miles per gallon may be \$500. This sum would be offset by savings of more than \$2,000 per year from lower gas use. And with continued rising prices of gasoline maybe even more.

In addition to saving oil, raising our CAFE standards is the single biggest step Congress can take to reduce global warming.

There is no one panacea for addressing global warming. Although experts may disagree on the extent of global warming no one will dispute the overall benefits of reducing carbon dioxide. We need a broad strategy to achieve CO₂ reduction. Our utilities must be made more efficient. We must take action to promote industrial efficiency. Deforestation must be limited while reforestation should become a priority. But cars and light trucks are the major contributors to global warming and we must move immediately to improve their efficiency.

Today, the United States is responsible for 23 percent of all carbon dioxide emissions produced by human activities worldwide. Cars and light trucks generate about 20 percent of the Nation's carbon dioxide emissions.

Every single gallon of gasoline our cars and light trucks burn produces nearly 20 pounds of carbon dioxide, the primary global warming gas. According to calculations by Environmental Action Foundation, the average car on the road today produces 58 tons of CO₂ over its lifetime. In stark contrast, cars averaging 40 mpg would emit only 26 tons of CO₂ over their lifetimes. That's right. Each and every car will produce 32 tons less CO₂ if this legislation is enacted.

More than half of America's Nobel laureates and 700 members of the prestigious National Academy of Sciences earlier last year called global warming "the most serious environmental threat of the 21st century."

These distinguished scientists were not extreme to express such alarm. Last spring a meeting of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change confirmed the general consensus of the world's scientific community: the earth's temperature is expected to rise 3 to 8 degrees by the early part of the next century.

Such a temperature rise could have devastating consequences for the Earth's fragile environment—sea levels could rise; droughts may occur; and extreme weather conditions could pre-

vail. The economic, social, and political implications of these climatic changes would be enormous, even apart from the environmental losses.

The legislation that we are introducing today requires each manufacturer to increase the fuel efficiency of its fleet by 20 percent over 1988 levels by 1996 and by 40 percent by 2000. These increases would result in an overall national new car average of 34.4 mpg in 1996 and 40 mpg in 2000. The measure also sets new efficiency standards—an average of 25 mpg in 1995, 30 in 2000—for light trucks. Raising the efficiency of light trucks is especially critical since they currently account for a third of all new vehicle sales, yet on average are 25 percent less efficient than cars. By 2006, these standards would help curb global warming by reducing U.S. carbon dioxide emissions by over 300 million tons per year.

Mr. President, we need to act now and move this bill through the 102d Congress as soon as possible. The Motor Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Act of 1991 is not just about energy efficiency, but also about our national security, improving our environment, and protecting our consumers.●

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join today as an original cosponsor of the Motor Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Act, which Senator BRYAN is introducing today. I am cosponsoring this bill because it realizes important energy and environmental goals.

This legislation is an essential part of what must now be a renewed effort towards fuel efficiency and conservation. The crisis in the Persian Gulf reminds all of us just how vulnerable the United States is to political disruptions in oil-producing countries.

Mr. President, the oil embargoes of the seventies gave us our first warnings of the dangers of dependence on foreign oil. For a time, the Federal Government and consumers focused on conservation as one solution. But, again, in the eighties we were lulled into complacency about the future of the energy supply with cheap prices and plentiful supplies. It is my strong hope that, this time, the United States will heed the most recent alarm by making some serious efforts at energy conservation.

As Senator BRYAN has indicated, the Motor Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Act would require that current corporate average fuel economy [CAFE] standards be improved by 40 percent over the next decade. When fully implemented, the savings in fuel will be many times the amounts that used to be imported from Iraq and Kuwait combined.

Mr. President, in addition to addressing our energy conservation needs, the Motor Vehicle Efficiency Act seeks to solve a serious environmental problem as well. Requiring improvements in fuel economy will force a significant decrease in emissions of carbon diox-

ide, a greenhouse gas that many scientists have found contributes to global warming.

I had hoped that the 101st Congress would have included a carbon dioxide emissions standard in the final clean air bill that was sent to the President. I was a strong backer of a CO₂ standard, because it would have begun to address the global warming problem, while bringing about much-needed energy conservation at the same time.

Unfortunately, the carbon dioxide standard became too controversial and was dropped. Then, at the end of the Congress, Senator BRYAN's bill amending the CAFE law was also derailed, despite his persistent efforts and the support of many Senators, myself included.

Senator BRYAN, I commend you for your leadership on this important subject, and for bringing this legislation back before the Senate early in the new Congress. I plan to work with you and the many other cosponsors of this bill to make this year the year we improve automobile fuel efficiency.●

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the fuel economy bill introduced by Senator BRYAN of which I am privileged to be an original cosponsor. I commend my colleague from Nevada for his leadership and perseverance on this very crucial issue to the Nation's energy, environmental, and economic problems.

This is a critical bill for energy conservation. Fuel economy measures must be a central part of a national energy strategy. Oil is a finite resource, and most of it comes from a region of the world which is politically unstable, to say the least. This bill would, when fully implemented save 2.8 million barrels of oil per day, and that would have a profound impact on our economy, and on our national security.

This is also a critical bill for the environment because it takes a large step forward in addressing the potentially catastrophic consequences of global warming. By making millions of automobiles burn less gas, we can dramatically reduce the amount of carbon dioxide that goes into the atmosphere. We can take 500 million tons of CO₂ out of our air each year and that will have dramatic, positive effect on our efforts to reduce global warming.

This bill also means economic relief for millions of American motorists. Simply put, the better the fuel efficiency of automobiles, the less money consumers will have to pay to operate them.

American consumers and our economy are being held hostage by the big oil and OPEC oil producers. We must act now to break their hold over us. There are short term measures we can pursue. But in the long term, we need to reduce our dependence on oil itself. Raising the fuel efficiency of automobiles is one major way to do just

that. We as a nation depend too much on oil, no matter where it comes from. It does us little good to reduce reliance on foreign oil if the price of oil from Alaska or Texas still goes through the roof everytime the global price of crude goes up. We need to reduce our reliance on all oil. And by reducing how much gasoline goes into the tanks of our cars, we can do just that.

Despite the oil shock of the 1970's, the Nation has not responded by reducing our dependence on petroleum in vehicles. While records show that oil consumption has declined in many major sectors of our economy: In electricity generation it is down 50 percent, industrial use of oil has dropped 10 percent, but the use of petroleum in transportation has grown 20 percent since the boycott of 1973. In 1989, transportation accounted for 63 percent of the total oil consumed in this country every day, with more than half the amount allocated to transportation consumed by automobiles.

The energy conservation numbers associated with this bill are dramatic. The Department of Transportation estimates that if we pass the bill now by the year 2000 we would save a total of more than 49 billion gallons of gasoline. By 2005, the bill would save more than 2.8 million barrels of oil every single day.

Mr. President, these savings would have dramatic effects on protecting the independence of our economy and our ability as Americans to protect the quality of our life and our standard of living.

I believe it is especially significant that we are introducing this bill several days before the start of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on a Framework Convention on Climate Change which will be held in Washington. That committee is seeking a world agreement on reducing greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide. Many other countries throughout the world already have acted and committed to reducing carbon dioxide emissions. Yet this administration has steadfastly refused to make any such commitment.

Prime Minister Brundtland of Norway, I think said it well when he stated:

The importance of climate change may be greater and more drastic than any challenge mankind has faced, with the exception of nuclear war.

In a handful of generations our scientists are now telling us, we have unleashed a potentially lethal mix of pollutants into our atmosphere which will literally—not just symbolically—threaten us for generations to come.

Nothing in history provides us with precedents to deal with this kind of threat. But the bill before us allows us to act decisively and responsibly to address global climate change by signifi-

cantly reducing carbon dioxide emissions.

Carbon dioxide is, everyone agrees, a dangerous greenhouse gas. It accounts for almost 50 percent of the gases that contribute to global warming. The United States, with about 5 percent of the world's population, generates more than 20 percent of all manmade emissions of carbon dioxide. We are doing more than our part, unfortunately, to pollute the atmosphere.

Transportation accounts for almost one-third of all of the American carbon dioxide emissions. Remarkably, we in this country generate more than most other developed countries produce from all sources.

This bill is the biggest single step that we can take to control the carbon dioxide emissions that contribute to global warming.

The testimony of scientific experts clearly indicates that it is time for us to act on this problem. Last year, 49 Nobel laureates and 700 members of the National Academy of Sciences called on Members of Congress to act as soon as possible to prevent the warming of the planet. In May 1990 the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued a report, adopted by delegates from 39 countries which concluded that scientists were certain that emissions resulting from human activities are substantially increasing the greenhouse effect, and that if nothing were done, the global mean temperature would rise by 5.4 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the next century, bringing the Earth to its warmest level in at least 150,000 years.

The report states that with this temperature rise, ocean water would expand and ice at the poles would melt, raising the level of the sea by as much as 25.6 inches. That would be enough to submerge the Maldives and inundate the coastal planes.

An average temperature rise of only 5 percent Fahrenheit could, in addition to causing the thermal expanding of oceans, cause the melting of land-based ice and increase sea levels by 2.5 feet, which is more than enough to flood vast unprotected coastal lands, inundate low-lying areas, erode shorelines, worsen coastal flooding, and increase the salinity of rivers, bays, and aquifers.

The cost of holding back the sea in countries such as The Netherlands and ours—where a large and growing proportion of the population lives in coastal areas, cannot even be estimated in this country.

This administration's failure to take any leadership role on global warming stands in sharp contrast to the conclusions of its own Environmental Protection Agency. In its recently released report "Reducing Risk: Setting Priorities and Strategies for Environmental Protection," EPA's Scientific Advisory Board examined and ranked 31 environ-

mental risks. Global warming ranked as one of the four highest risks to our natural ecology and human welfare. Administrator Reilly told the Environment and Public Works Committee last week that the areas of highest risks are those where he believes the Nation should be devoting its resources.

Mr. President, this is what we have the opportunity to stall and hopefully over time overcome, by taking an enormous step forward in the effort to control carbon dioxide emissions.

The automobile industry will argue that the improvements from this bill are not possible and that improved fuel economy requires smaller, less safe vehicles. But the evidence is clear that the standards in this bill can be accomplished by using the full range of fuel economy technology currently available and that consumers will not be forced into smaller or less safe cars.

There's been a lot of talk about our advances in weaponry lately and I am extremely proud of what American technology has accomplished in helping our military forces respond more quickly, accurately and efficiently in wartime.

But if we can make smart bombs, we can make smart cars. We can use American technology to improve the performance of America's automobiles, to make our environment cleaner, to conserve energy, to save consumers money, and to protect our national security. We can make our cars more fuel efficient; all we need now is a policy to make it happen.

In conclusion, Mr. President, mandating better fuel economy is one of the most effective ways to deal with the oil crises that continue to wreak havoc with our lives and our environment.●

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. SASSER, and Mrs. KASSEBAUM):

S. 280. A bill to provide for the inclusion of foreign deposits in the deposit insurance assessment base, to permit inclusion of nondeposit liabilities in the deposit insurance assessment base, to require the FDIC to implement a risk-based deposit insurance premium structure, to establish guidelines for early regulatory intervention in the financial decline of banks, and to permit regulatory restrictions on brokered deposits; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

DEPOSIT INSURANCE FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, today I am joining with my distinguished colleagues, Senator KASSEBAUM and Senator SASSER, in introducing legislation which will inject a strong dose of fairness into our Nation's deposit insurance system. For too long, banks have competed on a playing field which is tilted heavily in favor of the large money center and superregional insti-

tutions, at the expense of smaller, community-based banks.

Without a doubt, the too-big-to-fail doctrine is alive and well today. How many times do we need to see Federal banking regulators protect all liabilities at the large banks, like the Bank of New England, and then tell depositors at a smaller institution, like the Freedom National Bank of Harlem, that they are subject to the \$100,000 insurance limit? How can we justify "making whole" unassessed deposits in the Bahamian branch of the National Bank of Washington, while depositors in a failing community bank somewhere in rural America do not receive the same guarantee? Mr. President, the too-big-to-fail doctrine has created a two-tiered deposit insurance system, one that protects big banks and treats community banks as "too small to save." That's unfair. The system must be changed.

Mr. President, the Deposit Insurance Fairness Act of 1991 attempts to level the deposit-insurance playing field in the following five ways.

First, it mandates the assessment of insurance premiums on foreign deposits in the overseas branches of U.S. banks. It simply isn't fair that foreign deposits receive de facto insurance coverage when they are not subject to insurance premiums. In addition, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that assessments on foreign deposits will provide at least \$1.5 billion in much-needed revenue for the bank insurance fund over the next 5 years.

Second, the Deposit Insurance Fairness Act gives the FDIC discretion to assess premiums on nondeposit liabilities, such as bank notes and promissory notes, which are "securities-type" instruments issued by banks to raise capital. Although they are technically uninsured, nondeposit liabilities, like foreign deposits, receive de facto insurance coverage in large bank failures. And like foreign deposits, nondeposit liabilities should be assessed if they are going to enjoy insurance protection.

Third, this legislation requires the FDIC to develop and implement a risk-based deposit insurance premium structure within 6 months of the date of enactment. Premiums would be determined largely by capital levels, but the FDIC would have the discretion to take into account other factors in a bank's risk profile, such as diversity in its investment portfolio and the default rates on certain investment instruments. It is just simple common sense that those banks posing the greatest risk to the deposit insurance fund should be assessed higher premiums.

Fourth, the Deposit Insurance Fairness Act requires the FDIC to establish within 6 months a system for early regulatory intervention in banks with weak or deteriorating capital levels.

This provision gives regulators the authority not only to act quickly to stanch the flow of capital from unhealthy banks, but also to help banks develop sound strategies to return to financial health. If we can learn one lesson from the savings and loan debacle, it's that early action in preventing bank failures could help save the taxpayers billions of dollars.

And finally, this legislation gives Federal banking regulators the authority to restrict, or prohibit, insured depository institutions from accepting brokered deposits. Experience shows that brokered deposits are often used by troubled institutions as a quick-fix solution to improve weak capital positions. Unfortunately, this quick-fix often turns to quicksand as healthy, regional competitors are forced to draw from capital reserves to offer customers inflated, but competitive, interest rates on deposits.

Mr. President, the bill I am introducing today addresses the fundamental issue of deposit insurance fairness. The small and medium-sized banks of America are a vital part of our national and regional economies. And I can certainly attest to the importance of these banks to the small towns and rural communities of my home State of Kansas. It's time we put an end to the two-tiered deposit insurance system and achieve a level playing field for all banks, regardless of size. Mr. President, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Deposit Insurance Fairness Act of 1991 be inserted in the RECORD immediately after my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that a recent letter to Secretary of the Treasury Nicholas Brady, which outlines some of my concerns about deposit insurance fairness, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 280

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Deposit Insurance Fairness Act of 1991".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—

TITLE I—FDIC ASSESSMENT AMENDMENTS

Sec. 101. Foreign deposits included in assessment base.

Sec. 102. Non-deposit liabilities included in assessment base.

Sec. 103. Risk-based assessments.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL INSTITUTION EARLY INTERVENTION

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Early intervention.

TITLE III—RESTRICTION OF BROKERED DEPOSITS

Sec. 301. Restriction of brokered deposits.

TITLE I—FDIC ASSESSMENT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. FOREIGN DEPOSITS INCLUDED IN ASSESSMENT BASE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1881 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(l)(5) by striking "the following" and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (B), and inserting "obligations to a Federal Reserve Bank or a Federal Home Loan Bank shall not be deposits for any of the purposes of this chapter, or be included as part of the total deposits of an insured deposit."; and

(2) in section 7(b)(5)(B) by striking all through "except" and inserting the following:

"(B) any deposits or other obligations which would constitute deposits under section 3(l), and which are received in any office of the depository institution, except".

(b) **ASSESSMENT RATE.**—Section 7(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(b)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(2) by inserting a new clause (iii) as follows:

"(iii) The annual assessment rate applicable to obligations and deposits described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 3(l)(5) shall be not less than 75 percent of the assessment rate applicable to domestic deposits."

SEC. 102. NON-DEPOSIT LIABILITIES INCLUDED IN ASSESSMENT BASE.

Section 3(l)(5) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(l)(5)) is amended by inserting ", including non-deposit liabilities, such as notes, bonds and other similar liabilities," after "such other obligations".

SEC. 103. RISK-BASED ASSESSMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 7(b) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(10) **ASSESSMENTS BASED ON RISK CRITERIA.**—

"(A) **ESTABLISHMENT OF RISK-BASED ASSESSMENT STRUCTURE.**—The Corporation shall, by regulation, establish and implement a risk-based deposit insurance premium structure for insured depository institutions.

"(B) **AMOUNT OF ASSESSMENT BASED ON RISK.**—The assessment made by the Corporation against an insured depository institution under paragraph (1) in any year shall be determined by the Corporation on the basis of the Corporation's evaluation of the risk posed by such institution in accordance with the criteria established under subparagraph (C).

"(C) **RISK ASSESSMENT CRITERIA; CAPITAL.**—In establishing a risk-based insurance structure in accordance with subparagraph (A), the Corporation shall establish criteria for assessing the risk posed to the Bank Insurance Fund or the Savings Association Insurance Fund by an insured depository institution, based on such institution's capital levels. In assessing such risk, the Corporation may consider—

"(i) the diversity of investments made by the institution;

"(ii) the institution's history of default on particular types of its investment instruments; and

"(iii) the comparative risk posed to the Bank Insurance Fund and the Savings Association Insurance Fund by each type of investment made by such institution."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The Corporation shall promulgate final regulations to imple-

ment the amendment made by subsection (a) not more than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act. Such regulations shall become effective with respect to the first semiannual assessment period that commences on or after the expiration of 6 months following the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—FINANCIAL INSTITUTION EARLY INTERVENTION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Financial Institution Early Intervention Act of 1991".

SEC. 202. EARLY INTERVENTION.

(a) **SYSTEM OF EARLY REGULATORY AGENCY INTERVENTION.**—The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 35. EARLY REGULATORY INTERVENTION.

"(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to ensure that the problems of insured depository institutions are resolved at the earliest practicable time, and at no cost, or at the lowest cost possible, to the Bank Insurance Fund or the Savings Association Insurance Fund.

"(b) **EARLY REGULATORY AGENCY INTERVENTION REQUIRED.**—In order to carry out the purpose of this section, each appropriate Federal banking agency shall—

"(1) take prompt action to curtail investments by insured depository institutions that pose a risk to the Bank Insurance Fund or the Savings Association Insurance Fund;

"(2) work with insured depository institutions with weak or deteriorating capital positions to develop capital building strategies; and

"(3) take prompt corrective action to resolve the problems of insured depository institutions,

as described in subsections (c) and (d).

"(c) **RESTRICTIONS ON UNDERCAPITALIZED INSTITUTIONS.**—With respect to an undercapitalized insured depository institution, the appropriate Federal banking agency may, by regulation or order—

"(1) restrict capital distributions by such institution;

"(2) require such institution to submit a capital restoration plan that specifies how the institution will satisfy capital standards, without increasing the risk (including credit risk, interest-rate risk, and other types of risk) to which the institution is exposed;

"(3) prohibit such institution from increasing its total assets, except to the extent of increases in capital or net interest credited on deposits, as determined by the agency;

"(4) appoint a conservator or receiver for the institution to protect the interests of the Bank Insurance Fund or the Savings Association Insurance Fund;

"(5) restrict any material transactions by the institution that would pose any risk of failure for the institution;

"(6) require periodic monitoring of the institution, including review of any capital restoration plan; or

"(7) impose any other requirements or restrictions that the agency determines to be necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

"(d) **FAILURE TO COMPLY.**—With respect to an insured depository institution that fails to comply with or implement any regulations or orders issued in accordance with subsection (c), the appropriate Federal banking agency may—

"(1) require the institution to sell any or all of its shares or obligations in order to meet capital requirements;

"(2) restrict the institution's activities, including the payment of dividends, transactions with the institution's affiliates, and increases in the compensation of executive officers of the institution; or

"(3) restrict the interest rates the institution may pay on deposits.

"(e) DEFINITIONS RELATING TO CAPITAL COMPLIANCE.—For purposes of this section:

"(1) UNDERCAPITALIZED.—An insured depository institution is undercapitalized if it is not in compliance with all currently applicable capital standards prescribed by the appropriate Federal banking agency.

"(2) SATISFYING CAPITAL STANDARDS.—An insured depository institution satisfies capital standards only if it is in compliance with all currently applicable capital standards prescribed by the appropriate Federal banking agency.

"(f) GAO REVIEW.—The General Accounting Office shall from time to time—

"(1) review any reports required to be made by undercapitalized insured depository institutions in accordance with subsection (c); and

"(2) recommend any improvements in the supervision of insured depository institutions (including the implementation of this section)."

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision shall each promulgate final regulations to implement the amendment made by subsection (a) not more than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. Such regulations shall become effective not more than 6 months after their promulgation in final form.

TITLE III—RESTRICTION OF BROKERED DEPOSITS

SEC. 301. RESTRICTION OF BROKERED DEPOSITS.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 36. RESTRICTION OF BROKERED DEPOSITS.

"In addition to any actions authorized under section 35 with respect to undercapitalized depository institutions, the appropriate Federal banking agency is authorized by order to impose restrictions on, or to prohibit, the acceptance of funds obtained, directly or indirectly, by or through a deposit broker, as defined in section 29(f)(1), by an insured depository institution."

U.S. SENATE,

OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER,

Washington, DC, January 16, 1991.

Hon. NICHOLAS F. BRADY,

Secretary, Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC.

DEAR NICK: As the Treasury Department concludes its study of the deposit insurance system, I thought it would be appropriate at this time to highlight several issues of particular concern for me.

Too-Big-to-Fail. It is my hope that the reform package that Treasury will soon transmit to Congress will adequately address the so-called "too-big-to-fail" issue.

I will not give you yet another lengthy explanation of the inequities of too-big-to-fail. As you probably know, these inequities were vividly highlighted by the FDIC itself, in three recent board decisions. In two of these decisions, the FDIC concluded that it was appropriate to make whole all of the depositors of two fairly large banks—the Bank of New England (depositors with accounts of \$100,000 were protected) and the National Bank of

Washington (depositors in NBW's Bahamian branch were protected even though these deposits were not assessed insurance premiums). These decisions were in sharp contrast to the FDIC's less-than-fair treatment of Freedom National Bank of Harlem. As you know, the FDIC liquidated Freedom National, but gave its uninsured depositors only 50 cents on the dollar.

It appears that Freedom National's only "crime" was that it happened to be a relatively small community bank, much like the hundreds of small community banks throughout my home State of Kansas.

As you know, one way to reduce the inequities inherent in too-big-to-fail is to assess foreign deposits. Assessing foreign deposits is not only a matter of simple fairness, but it is also a way to raise revenues for the dangerously undercapitalized Bank Insurance Fund. According to a recent preliminary estimate of the Congressional Budget Office, the potential revenue raised through an assessment of foreign deposits could be significant: Assuming a rate increase to 19.5 cents per \$100 of insured deposits on January 1, 1991, and a subsequent increase to 23 cents per \$100 of insured deposits on January 1, 1992, the CBO estimates cumulative savings of \$2.16 billion over a five-year period.

Deposit Insurance Coverage. Any limitation on deposit insurance coverage makes sense if, and only if, the too-big-to-fail doctrine is excised from the lexicon of federal banking regulators. For example, proposals to limit insurance coverage to \$100,000 per individual consumer, without taking significant steps to eliminate too-big-to-fail, will have a very negative effect on our nation's small and mid-sized banks. It's just simple common sense that individuals with deposits in excess of \$100,000 will feel more comfortable placing their deposits in a large bank, believing—perhaps correctly—that federal regulators will not let a large bank fail or leave depositors uninsured. This problem will only be exacerbated if we limit deposit insurance coverage without equalizing the deposit insurance system's treatment of large and small banks.

Interstate Branching. Finally, any proposal to lift the current restrictions on interstate branching must be carefully crafted to take into account the legitimate concerns of our community bankers. It's one thing to encourage competition; it's something quite different to uproot banks that have ably served local communities for generations.

As always, Nick, thank you for your kind attention to these concerns and suggestions. I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

BOB DOLE.

• Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I rise with my colleague the Republican leader to introduce the Deposit Insurance Fairness Act of 1991. This reform legislation addresses the weaknesses in the deposit insurance system that contributed to the savings and loan crisis and ensures that this tragic situation is not repeated with the commercial banks and their insurance fund.

Our bill, if enacted, will help restore fairness and stability to the banking system. I believe that this is particularly important now, at a time when our economy is in recession. Our bill will ensure the safety of the savings of

millions of American families. It also will rebuild the financial resources of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation [FDIC] and in doing so reduce the Federal budget deficit.

The central thrust of the bill is a requirement that depository institutions pay for the insurance protection that they receive from the Government in direct proportion to their protection. The bill ensures that premiums flow into the FDIC commensurate with the risk to which the FDIC is exposed.

Mr. President, William Seidman, Chairman of the FDIC, has projected that the bank insurance fund will dwindle to \$4 billion in reserves by the end of 1991. Just a few years ago the FDIC had over \$18 billion in reserves. This situation calls for urgent action; adoption of our bill will be a major step in the right direction.

The bill has five major provisions that work together to achieve its goals. First, deposits of U.S. banks in foreign branches would be levied against by the FDIC the same as are domestic deposits. Second, the FDIC would be required to restructure deposit insurance premiums so that they directly correspond to the level of risk at individual banks. Third, the FDIC would have the authority to assess premiums against so-called nondeposit liabilities of banks. Fourth, Federal regulators would be given more power for early intervention to clean up banks before they become wards of the U.S. taxpayer. And last, this bill would eliminate the abusive and dangerous practice of weak banks accepting brokered deposits.

The most prominent application of our principle, that banks should pay for the risks they assume, would be to apply insurance premiums to deposits at foreign offices of U.S. banks. I think few would dare argue that foreign deposits are not in fact insured by the FDIC. The recent rescue of the Bank of New England included \$600 million in foreign depositors. After the collapse of the National Bank of Washington, the FDIC paid out \$37 million offshore. I don't think there has ever been a foreign depositor in a U.S. bank that has not been bailed out. Indeed, it is the stated policy of the FDIC to cover foreign deposits.

Yet currently, deposit insurance premiums are only assessed against domestic deposits of U.S. banks. In effect, foreign depositors get free deposit insurance protection from the U.S. taxpayer. This leads to a radically inequitable situation—two banks with the same amount of deposits will pay totally different sums in premiums to the FDIC depending on whether or not the deposits are held offshore.

Why is this a problem? Because the banks with offshore deposits tend to be the larger banks that the regulators are very reluctant to actually close. Because of this so-called too-big-to-fail

policy of the Federal banking regulators, we have a situation where a big bank has total protection for all its deposits, but a small bank depositor is only covered up to \$100,000. The bigger bank isn't paying for the full measure of deposit insurance coverage it receives.

Indeed, according to President Bush's 1991 budget, large institutions receive greater protection against failure than small ones while paying premiums on a smaller proportion of their liabilities.

A bank with significant foreign accounts pays less in insurance premiums, and therefore has a lower cost of funds, than a bank with predominantly domestic deposits. It gives such a bank a competitive advantage over other banks, thus further contributing to instability and inequity in the banking system.

In sum, Mr. President, assessing foreign deposits will help ensure that the FDIC has the funds available to pay on its liabilities.

The second major provision of our bill—risk-based assessments—goes even further to bring premiums into accordance with coverage.

Under the present system, banks pay a flat rate for deposit insurance no matter how they invest their funds. In other words, if a bank makes a loan to Donald Trump, it pays the same premiums on its deposits as does a bank that makes a loan to a young family to buy a home. These loans imply two very different risk scenarios. Yet, no matter how risky the loan portfolio at the first bank may be, it pays the same rate for deposit insurance protection as the bank with the more prudent lending practices. Premiums do not vary according to the known level of insured risk.

As a result, Mr. President, deposit insurance under the current structure does not provide an incentive to make a safe loan. There's a moral hazard because there's no reward for pursuing avenues that place the FDIC at the least risk.

The present system flies in the face of the basic principles of insurance. If bank deposit insurance practices were applied to auto insurance, drivers with clean records would pay the same as reckless drivers.

The situation is illogical. The Government may well have to pay off deposits, but it doesn't have adequate tools to protect itself from the disaster of speculative investments gone sour.

Mr. President, our legislation addresses this issue directly. It requires the FDIC to assess premiums against an institution based on an evaluation of the specific risk posed by that institution.

Making banks pay more on funds that they may use on speculative investments will decrease the likelihood that they'll make such investments. But if they do, risk-based assessments

will ensure that there's money in the fund to pay for the losses.

The third major provision of our legislation is a clearly delineated procedure for early intervention. This provision forces regulators to take action against weak banks well before they fail and cause the insurance fund to incur losses.

The bill gives the regulators authority to keep an undercapitalized bank from paying dividends. Under the bill, the regulators can require weak institutions to submit a capital restorative plan and to curtail growth. Indeed, the regulators will be required to prohibit activities they deem to present a risk to the insurance fund.

The fourth major provision of the bill gives the FDIC discretionary authority to assess deposit insurance premiums against nondeposit liabilities of banks. This issue is similar to that of foreign deposits. To an increasing extent, larger banks are relying on financial instruments to raise funds that are substitutes for traditional deposits. Even though these funds are not deposits, they are however insured under the too-big-to-fail policy.

For instance, at the Bank of New England, nondeposit liabilities amounted to \$2 billion. While not one nickel was paid into the FDIC fund by the Bank of New England to cover these liabilities, they were covered in full by the FDIC when the bank collapsed.

Lastly, Mr. President, our bill provides authority to restrict the acceptance of brokered deposits by undercapitalized banks. Mr. President, brokered deposits are very large denomination certificates of deposit that are placed into failing financial institutions by money brokers. The availability of this financing has permitted weak banks and savings and loans to make risky loans and further compound the fragile financial condition of the institution. Brokered deposits have greatly increased the cost of the savings and loan clean up; our bill will prevent them from exacerbating the condition of the FDIC.

Mr. President, this legislation is a significant first step toward resolving many of the problems in our banking system and protecting the savings of American families. It does not cut back on the \$100,000 level of insurance coverage, and therefore would not diminish public confidence in banks, particularly small banks. The bill addresses the flaws and excesses of the current system without unravelling the core.

Although our bill does not explicitly address the too-big-to-fail policy, it does so implicitly. It does not tie the regulators hands, but by imposing risk-based assessments, assessing foreign deposits, requiring earlier intervention, and restricting brokered deposits, it makes it far less likely that banks

get into a situation leading to an expensive bailout.

Mr. President, there will obviously be much debate on these issues as the year progresses. This is a matter of significant importance to the administration and I anticipate that they too will have far reaching proposals in this area.

This bill is meant to be a statement of our intentions—of the policies we would like to see upheld. I am sure that there are refinements that could be made, and I am open to any suggestions for improvements.●

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 282. A bill to direct the Director of the General Services Administration to make paper with recycled content available to the Secretary of Agriculture and for the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a pilot program within the Forest Service for the use of paper with recycled content; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

NATIONAL FOREST RECYCLED PAPER ACT

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to direct the General Services Administration to make paper with recycled content available to the Secretary of Agriculture for use by the Forest Service.

It is a disturbing fact that 5 billion acres of the Earth's forest have been cut and not replaced. What makes this fact even more disturbing is that most of this destruction has occurred in this century. We all know that forest provide many benefits and this trend must be reversed.

Fortunately, trees are a renewable resource and paper can be recycled. I believe we must take the challenge and encourage measures which will improve forest conservation and the use of recycled paper products.

I have always considered the USDA Forest Service as a leader in forest conservation. As a part of this leadership role of a forest in my home State of New Mexico, the Carson National Forest, has proposed using recycled paper for their general office operations. To my surprise this proposal was denied by the General Services Administration which would not allow the forest to purchase recycled paper.

There is obviously a problem when the Agency directed to conserve the Nation's forests is not allowed to utilize recycled paper. The bill I have introduced today will authorize the Forest Service to purchase and use recycled paper as a pilot test program for 1 year. At the end of 1 year the General Services Administration will report to Congress on the results of the pilot program and the opportunity to expand the program government-wide.

I urge my colleagues to consider the importance of recycling and the use of recycled products as a practical means of saving energy and conserving natu-

ral resources by reducing the use of raw materials.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 282

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Forest Recycled Paper Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) one third of the earth's forests, 5,000,000,000 acres, have been cut and not replaced;

(2) each man, woman and child in the United States annually uses enough paper and packaging to equal 7 trees;

(3) paper with recycled content is available for many types of uses;

(4) while many people have begun to recycle paper, a stronger market needs to be developed for the use of paper with recycled content;

(5) the General Services Administration does not offer or allow the purchase of paper with recycled content;

(6) the mission of the Forest Service is to manage and conserve forests for the future generations; and

(7) the Forest Service should be a leader in the use of recycled paper because of their leadership role in the forestry conservation.

SEC. 3. PILOT PROJECT AND REPORT BY THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **PILOT PROJECT.**—

(1) For a period of one year, the Director of the General Services Administration shall make available to the Secretary of Agriculture paper with varying amounts of recycled content for all standard uses. If available, other departments and agencies of the Government may also request on to use paper with recycled content and purchase this paper through the General Services Administration.

(2) The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, shall use paper with recycled content for paperwork and printing during the one-year project authorized by this subsection.

(b) **REPORT.**—At the end of the one year authorized by subsection (a), the Director of the General Services Administration shall report back to the Congress on the results of the pilot program and the opportunity to expand the program government-wide. Included in the report shall be an assessment from the Chief of the Forest Service describing environmental benefits of the pilot project.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.●

By Mr. KOHL:

S. 283. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations with respect to the stationing of military personnel who are solely responsible for dependents at locations where facilities for dependents are not reasonably available; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MILITARY FAMILY PRESERVATION ACT

● Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, today I introduce the Military Family Preservation Act of 1991.

Perhaps the most heart-wrenching scenes from the Persian Gulf crisis have been the pictures of parents leaving their children so that those parents could serve their country. Even young infants, weeks or months old, have been handed over by teary-eyed mothers and fathers en route to the gulf. That strikes many Americans as somehow not being right, even though we recognize that a soldier's duty requires sacrifice. I think we have a new reality in our Armed Forces, and this bill attempts to address it.

By no longer relying exclusively on young males for military service, the military has become a fundamentally changed institution. This bill addresses some of those changes by acknowledging that our military, while meeting its primary responsibility of defending our national security, also has a responsibility to those children, elderly, and disabled persons who are dependent on a military member. The military, if it is to employ both parents, single mothers and fathers, incurs an obligation as an institution to its dependents. This bill suggests that the changing composition of American military families necessitates addressing the dynamic needs of those families.

The bill is simple and straightforward. It calls on the military to develop regulations, within the constraints of its primary mission, to prohibit placement of personnel who are solely, or together with a spouse also in the military, responsible for minor children, dependent elderly and disabled dependent adults in locations where facilities for the dependent are not reasonably accessible. For example, if both parents in a family are called up for deployment, the regulations might presumably specify that one be sent to a location where minor children could accompany one parent. The bill would ask DOD to do its best to see that single parents are not unreasonably called away from their children or dependent parents. It is not the intent of this legislation to waive the obligations of members of the armed services, nor is it the intent to deny those individuals who seek to fulfill their obligations of that right and responsibility. It is simply the intent that, to the extent possible, we do all we can to keep some semblance of family for these men, women, and dependents during current and future deployment. I believe that this proposal leaves the Defense Department plenty of room to develop these regulations in a way that will be least disruptive to military requirements.

Mr. President, I do not mean to imply that our Armed Forces have been callous to the needs of its dependents. There are many services available

to families, from DOD schools to CHAMPUS to child care to shopping at military exchanges. But I think the deployment for Operation Desert Storm opened our awareness that more needs to be done—both on the front end and upon return and readjustment.

For example, the Clare Ansberry and Carol Hymowitz article titled "Left Behind" that appeared on the front page of today's Wall Street Journal poignantly outlines the problems of children whose parents are called away to service. Fred Rogers said that "Nothing is more difficult for a child to deal with." The Army itself acknowledges in the article that thousands of children are being left without parents. We all know that reservists and active duty personnel have always been required to designate someone to care for their child in the event their duty calls them away, but I don't think we really have thought through all the implications for these children or the parents. Nor have we prepared for the reality that increasing numbers of military personnel are women, often with spouses who are also members of the Armed Forces. It is, frankly, a phenomenon which we have not had to deal on such a large scale in previous wars. It is not, in this Senator's mind, merely a matter of protecting children from becoming orphans—it is a matter of family preservation.

In the above mentioned article, a therapist from the National Childhood Grief Institute was quoted as saying that separation from warbound parents can place kids at risk for low self-esteem, chronic sorrow, substance abuse, and other self-destructive behavior. Can we stop anywhere short of doing all we can to see that the next generation of military children grow up in as healthy an environment as possible?

Mr. President, the care of dependents of our service personnel is an issue which we must begin to face. The reasoned approach in this bill will go a long way toward supporting the people and families that make up the proud Armed Forces of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be placed in the RECORD immediately following my statement.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 283

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

SECTION 1. TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Military Family Preservation Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the first obligation of the Department of Defense is to meet the military needs of the United States;

(2) the military effectiveness of members of the Armed Forces is increased when they know that their families are taken care of; and

(3) the Department of Defense has an interest in and responsibility for protecting the best interests of dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations with respect to the stationing of members of the Armed Forces with dependents. Those regulations shall, to the extent possible and consistent with military requirements, prohibit the stationing at a location at which facilities for dependents are not reasonably available of a member of the Armed Forces who is solely responsible for (or who together with a spouse also in the Armed Forces is solely responsible for) minor children, dependent elderly persons, or disabled dependent adult children.

(b) **ASSISTANCE FOR ALTERNATIVE PLANS.**—When a member of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a), at his or her request or when such deployment is otherwise required, is to be stationed at a location at which facilities for dependents are not reasonably available, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall provide assistance to the member and the member's family members to develop alternative plans for the care of the family members during the period that the member is stationed at such location.

(c) **APPLICABILITY.**—The regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (a) shall apply with respect to current and future deployments.●

By Mr. SARBANES:

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to designate 1991 as the "Year of Public Health", and to recognize the 75th anniversary of the founding of the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DESIGNATION OF "YEAR OF PUBLIC HEALTH" AND ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF JOHNS HOPKINS SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, the Johns Hopkins University will celebrate the 75th anniversary of the founding of its School of Public Health from April 1991 to April 1992. In conjunction with this celebration, I am introducing a joint resolution to designate 1991 as "the Year of Public Health," and to recognize the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health for its leadership in the campaign for global health. I am pleased to have Senator MIKULSKI as an original cosponsor of this important measure.

Since its founding in 1916 by Dr. William Welch, the Johns Hopkins University School of Public Health has grown to be the largest school of public health in the world with activities extending across every continent and involving faculty, students, and alumni from over 75 countries. Its integration of research, training, and community service has served as the prototype for other institutions around the world.

In an effort to take the results of 75 years of public health research and discoveries to the world and to continue its global leadership in public health, the Hopkins School of Public Health is launching a major public awareness

campaign by working with the Congress to declare 1991 "the Year of Public Health." Hopkins' 75-year heritage is a testimony to its ability to lead this campaign to further global health, with its past achievements coincident with many of the most important developments in public health to date. Since its founding, the school has pioneered:

The development of vaccines against many of the most debilitating and infectious diseases;

The delivery of safe drinking water through chlorination and effective sewage disposal;

The control of disease-bearing vectors;

Improved nutrition through research culminating in the discovery of Vitamins A and D;

Education of the public regarding appropriate diets;

Improved occupational and environmental health;

The establishment of family planning and well-baby clinics;

The use of entertainment to strengthen health communication;

The development of health policy financing initiatives which have led to improvements in Medicare and Medicaid programs; and

The establishment of the first injury prevention research and education program in the Nation.

The need for an increased awareness of the pressing problems facing our Nation in the area of public health has never been greater than it is today. Public health campaigns which educate people to prevent diseases and promote health, and which extend resources and services like immunization and prenatal care of all segments of society can provide simple, cost-effective, and comprehensive solutions to the Nation's health problems.

Increasing global awareness of public health is equally important. Global trends and the enormous cost in dollars and quality of life caused by not preventing disease and its consequences have increased the need for worldwide public health solutions. The Johns Hopkins University School of Public Health is uniquely situated to lead a campaign to generate an awareness of public health on a worldwide basis. The school's international health program is by far the largest in an academic center anywhere in the world, and a full partner in the new emphasis on improving world health. Work in the school's 10 academic departments has earned global recognition, and as a result the school serves as a participant in six World Health Organizations centers.

Mr. President, a promising new era in public health awaits us. New technologies, shared international research, and modern communications abilities have maximized the potential for a national and global public health

campaign. As Dr. William Welch, the founder of the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health, said in 1916:

There are no social, no industrial, no economic problems which are not related to public health.

We can ill-afford to ignore the critical need for increased national and global awareness in the area of public health. We must expand public health initiatives in order to extend a higher quality of life to all segments of society in every corner of the world. To this end, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the important resolution I have introduced today to recognize and further these critical efforts.●

By Mr. BRADLEY (for himself and Mr. DURENBERGER):

S.J. Res. 50. Joint Resolution to designate April 6, 1991, as "National Student-Athlete Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL STUDENT-ATHLETE DAY

● Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a joint resolution designating April 6, 1991, as "National Student-Athlete Day". Joining me today is my colleague from Minnesota, Mr. DURENBERGER.

Mr. President, this day focuses attention on the positive role that sports can have on the physical and mental development of young people. Within the proper framework of a school program, sports can build confidence, cooperation, integrity and maturity. These qualities are necessary for our future leaders.

In spite of all the positive aspects of sports, over-emphasis on sports can cause serious harm to young people, even those who pursue sports professionally. The single-minded devotion to athletics among our Nation's schools and colleges too often leads to exploitation and abuse of the student-athlete. Only 1 in 10,000 high school athletes who dream of a career in professional sports ever realize that aspiration, while those who do can expect a professional sports career of less than 4 years. Too many young people sacrifice academic achievement to the dream of professional athletics. And all too frequently schools are willing accomplices—demonstrating no interest in students' academic progress and keeping students eligible even when their real academic achievement levels do not warrant it. Students must realize that education is a lifelong asset, and schools have to remember that their primary responsibility is education.

Mr. President, I understand that all 50 States along with the District of Columbia proclaim April 6 as "Student-Athlete Day." With the help of a broadened observance of National Student-Athlete Day, educators will be able to promote the role of sports within education to stress the need for a balance between academics and athletics. This

effort will direct young people away from the idea that sports can be a substitute for education. The programs planned include having professional athletes, who have returned to college to complete their degree, speaking to students about the importance of education. Since athletes are role models for many young people, the day will stress the positive role sports can play in development of personal character. Athletes will also speak frankly to students about the dangers of alcohol and drug abuse that threaten our society.

In supporting this important effort we, the U.S. Senate, join with coaches, parents, and educators throughout the Nation to encourage the pursuit of excellence in both academics and athletics.

On behalf of Senator DURENBERGER and myself I ask that the attached resolution be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 50

Whereas the student-athlete represents a role model worthy of emulation by the youth of this Nation;

Whereas the past athletic successes of many business, governmental, and educational leaders of this Nation dispel the myth that successful athletes are one-dimensional;

Whereas such worthy values and behaviors as perseverance, teamwork, self discipline, and commitment to a goal are fostered and promoted by both academic and athletic pursuits;

Whereas participation in athletics, together with education, provides opportunities to develop valuable social and leadership skills and to gain an appreciation of different ethnic and racial groups;

Whereas in spite of all the positive aspects of sport, overemphasis on sport at the expense of education may cause serious harm to the future of an athlete;

Whereas the pursuit of victory in athletics among the schools and colleges of this Nation too often leads to exploitation and abuse of the student-athlete;

Whereas less than 1 in 100 high school athletes have the opportunity to play Division 1 college athletics;

Whereas although college athletes graduate at the same rate as other students, fewer scholarship athletes in revenue producing sports graduate from college;

Whereas only 1 in 10,000 high school athletes ever realize an aspiration of a career in professional sports, and those students who become professional athletes may expect a professional sports career of less than 4 years;

Whereas thousands of the youth of this Nation sacrifice academic achievement to the dream of professional athletics;

Whereas the practice of keeping athletes eligible for participation on a team, even at the high-school level, must be abandoned for a policy of ensuring a meaningful education and degree;

Whereas coaches, parents, and educators of student-athletes must express high expectations for academic performance as well as for athletic performance; and

Whereas there is a need in this Nation to reemphasize the student in the term "student-athlete": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 6, 1991, is designated as "National Student-Athlete Day" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.●

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. GLENN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. NUNN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SASSER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. PELL, Mr. BOREN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. GORE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. REID, and Mr. DODD):

S.J. Res. 51. Joint Resolution to designate the week beginning March 4, 1991, as "Federal Employees Recognition Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RECOGNITION WEEK

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, today I am introducing a joint resolution to designate the week beginning March 4, 1991, as "Federal Employees Recognition Week." Senators GLENN, ROTH, MIKULSKI, WARNER, ROBB, ADAMS, BUMPERS, BRADLEY, HEINZ, BURDICK, CONRAD, CHAFEE, LAUTENBERG, WELLSTONE, JEFFORDS, RIEGLE, MOYNIHAN, NUNN, MURKOWSKI, HOLLINGS, AKAKA, THURMOND, SASSER, LEAHY, D'AMATO, PELL, BOREN, KERRY, STEVENS, LEVIN, GORE, KENNEDY, DECONCINI, REID, COHEN, and DODD are joining me in introducing this measure. I have introduced similar resolutions in previous Congresses to honor the men and women who work in jobs that are so critically important to the strength and vitality of our Nation.

I am indeed proud to bring special attention to the dedicated individuals who have chosen public service as a career and who, through years of hard work, have helped to contribute to our Nation's growth and prosperity. Their important work includes protecting our Nation, keeping our food supply safe, participating in medical and scientific research, and maintaining highway and air safety. The excellent service provided by Federal employees to their country often goes unrecognized and it is only when these services become necessary for an individual or when the services are unavailable that people truly recognize the importance of Federal employees. It is with this in mind that I again want to thank and

recognize the more than 3 million men and women in the Federal work force who perform these extremely important jobs every day.

I view public service as a honorable career and a high calling, and I am proud that our Government has such a conscientious and highly qualified work force. Despite previous attempts to undervalue the ideals which make public service rewarding and attractive to many, Federal employees continue to work positively and responsibly, while also accomplishing many valuable tasks. As John F. Kennedy once stated:

Let the public service be a proud and lively career. And let every man and woman who works in any area of our national government, in any branch, at any level, be able to say with pride and honor in future years: "I served the United States Government in that hour of our Nation's need."

The Nation as a whole and others throughout the world have benefited from the many wonderful achievements of Federal employees. By setting aside a week as "Federal Employee Recognition Week," we will all have an opportunity to give Federal employees the recognition which they greatly deserve. I am very pleased to introduce legislation today which acknowledges and commends such a worthy and committed group of men and women and I urge my colleagues to join in support of this resolution.●

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to co-sponsor this resolution which would designate the week of March 4-11, 1991, as "Federal Employees Recognition Week."

All too often, Federal employees are taken for granted without giving much thought to the fact that the success of Government programs depends heavily upon the expertise, quality, and commitment of professional career employees.

Thomas Jefferson is quoted as saying that:

There is a debt of service due from every man to his country proportional to the bounty which nature and fortune have measured to him.

Without those in Government service who are willing to make sacrifices and go the extra mile to do a job well, our country would not be able to solve the serious problems we face today.

Mr. President, with this resolution, we can and should say: Keep up the good work, and we salute those dedicated public servants who are paying their debt to this country.

I commend the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] for introducing this resolution.●

By Mr. DECONCINI:

S.J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to designate the months of April 1991 and 1992 as "National Child Abuse Prevention Month;" to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH

● Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I am introducing today a joint resolution to declare the months of April 1991 and 1992 as National Child Abuse Prevention Month. I am hopeful that a great number of my distinguished colleagues will join me in this important effort.

Mr. President, despite the fact that agencies and organizations serving our children have made notable contributions over the past few years in improving the lives of our youth—by re-vamping rules and regulations, pinpointing issues, disseminating information and increasing public awareness—child abuse is still on the increase.

Recent data makes it abundantly clear that our Nation's poor children are the high-risk victims for abuse, neglect, and other poverty related problems. The families of these children are caught in a web of strife, stress, and strain in their attempt to merely survive from day to day. Their struggle is compounded by lack of resources, both spiritual and physical, to reduce the burden imposed by their state of poverty.

Mr. President, America's child abuse problem does not stop there. It appears in every State in the Union and cuts across all socioeconomic groups. From the impoverished ghettos of our urban centers to the stately manors across the Nation, millions of America's children are not getting a fair chance to grow into productive adults. Many children in the United States are growing up in wholesome, nurturing environments. However, millions more are not blessed with that good fortune. Every child in the world needs and deserves food, shelter, and love in order to survive and prosper.

The evidence of child abuse and neglect is both alarming and overwhelming. The best available statistics estimate that three of every four cases of child abuse go unreported and the number of reported incidents continues to rise. The data collected by the National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect organization and others show that 2.4 million cases of child abuse are reported, so as many as 6 million of our Nation's children are being tragically abused. When I introduced this resolution in 1986, I cited national statistics which stated that reports of child abuse and neglect were up 39.8 percent. Today, I regret to report that the incidence rate has increased 78 percent between 1981 and 1987. And all experts agree that the numbers will escalate further since victims in turn, will likely victimize their own children and others.

Mr. President, despite the best efforts of the social service providers, like Child Help U.S.A., Parents Anonymous, and other members of the National Child Abuse Coalition, the entire Nation is threatened by the continued growth in child abuse and neglect. The

only all day, every day, national crisis counseling hotline staffed totally by medical and clinical professionals received over 126,000 calls in 1986 compared with only 8,600 calls when it was established in 1982. The Child Help U.S.A. phone system was at capacity in 1986. Since then, it has had to expand to accommodate an increasing number of calls.

As I have stated previously, Members of Congress have an opportunity to assist the many individuals, organizations, and agencies that are striving to rid our Nation of the epidemic of child abuse and to assist the victims as well. We can help focus public attention on goals and objectives of these agencies and improve the general welfare of our children.

The declaration of April 1990 and April 1991 as National Child Abuse Prevention Month, is a significant way in which we in Congress can emphasize the importance of increasing public awareness and education for the benefit of our troubled families and suffering children. There is help available in communities throughout the Nation, but we need to get the message out to the abused as well as the abusers. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to have April 1990 and April 1991 designated as National Child Abuse Prevention Month.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

s. 2

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 2, a bill to promote the achievement of national education goals, to establish a National Council on Educational Goals and an Academic Report Card to measure progress on the goals, and to promote literacy in the United States, and for other purposes.

s. 3

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 3, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a voluntary system of spending limits for Senate election campaigns, and for other purposes.

s. 8

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 8, a bill to extend the time for performing certain acts under the internal revenue laws for individuals performing services as part of the Desert Shield operation.

s. 9

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 9, a bill to amend the

foreign aid policy of the United States toward countries in transition from communism to democracy.

s. 10

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HINZ] was added as a cosponsor of S. 10, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to phase out the earnings test over a 5-year period for individuals who have attained retirement age, and for other purposes.

s. 16

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 16, a bill to provide emergency Federal assistance to drug emergency areas.

s. 24

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] were added as cosponsors of S. 24, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the exclusion from gross income of educational assistance provided to employees.

s. 26

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] were added as cosponsors of S. 26, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income the value of certain transportation furnished by an employer, and for other purposes.

s. 65

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to make the 65 miles-per-hour speed limit demonstration project permanent and available to any State.

s. 107

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 107, a bill to increase the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans; and for other purposes.

s. 140

At the request of Mr. WIRTH, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS] were added as cosponsors of S. 140, a bill to increase Federal payments in lieu of taxes to units of gen-

eral local government, and for other purposes.

S. 173

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 173, a bill to permit the Bell Telephone Companies to conduct research on, design, and manufacture telecommunications equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 175

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 175, a bill to amend the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act to improve procedures for the implementation of State compacts providing for the establishment and operation of regional disposal facilities for municipal and industrial solid waste, and for other purposes.

S. 215

At the request of Mr. JOHNSTON, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 215, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a fee on the importation of crude oil or refined petroleum products.

S. 217

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 217, a bill to clarify the Congressional intent concerning, and to codify, certain requirements of the Communications Act of 1934 that ensures that broadcasters afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance.

S. 237

At the request of Mr. NUNN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON] were added as cosponsors of S. 237, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pay for duty subject to hostile fire or imminent danger.

S. 239

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the names of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] were added as cosponsors of S. 239, a bill to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia.

S. 250

At the request of Mr. FORD, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Washington [Mr. ADAMS], the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr.

DODD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 250, a bill to establish national voter registration procedures for Federal elections, and for other purposes.

S. 255

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 255, a bill to require Congress to purchase recycled paper and paper products to the greatest extent practicable.

S. 270

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 270, 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.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 21

At the request of Mr. SASSER, the names of the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 21, a joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Department of Commerce should utilize the statistical correction methodology to achieve a fair and accurate 1990 Census.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 35

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 35, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to contributions and expenditures intended to affect congressional and Presidential elections.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 36

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. ADAMS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 36, a joint resolution to designate the months of November 1991, and November 1992, as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, a concur-

rent resolution condemning Iraq's unprovoked attack on Israel.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, a concurrent resolution demanding that the Government of Iraq abide by the Geneva Convention regarding the treatment of prisoners of war.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, a concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the President should review economic benefits provided to the Soviet Union in light of the crisis in the Baltic States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 19—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 19

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized from March 1, 1991, through February 29, 1992, and March 1, 1992, through February 28, 1993, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. (a) The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 1991, through February 29, 1992, under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,844,527, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganizations Act of 1946, as amended), and not to exceed \$2,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period March 1, 1992, through February 28, 1993, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,949,780, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and not to exceed \$2,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 1992, and February 28, 1993, respectively.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, the payment of long distance telephone calls, or for the payment of stationary supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationary, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from March 1, 1991, through February 29, 1992, and March 1, 1992, through February 28, 1993, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations."

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet in SR-301, Russell Senate Office Building, on Wednesday, February 6 and Thursday, February 7, 1991, at 9:30 a.m. on each day, to receive testimony from committee chairman and ranking members on their 1991 and 1992 committee funding resolutions.

For further information concerning these hearings, please contact Carole Blessington of the Rules Committee staff on extension 40278.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet in SR-301, Russell Senate Office Building, on Wednesday, February 20, 1991, at 9:30 a.m., to markup Senate committees' funding resolutions for 1991 and 1992. The committee will also consider other legislative and administrative business pending on its agenda.

For further information concerning this business meeting, please contact Carole Blessington of the Rules Committee staff on extension 40278.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

AFL-CIO: TIME FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

• Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to examine the AFL-CIO's recent report, "The Case for Health Care Reform." This report provides an excellent overview of the health care crisis facing our Nation.

Last fall, the AFL-CIO conducted a series of eight regional hearings to determine the human toll of this crisis. As the AFL-CIO's health care hearings so dramatically reveal, the Nation's health care system is in a state of crisis.

More and more, access to affordable health care is as serious a problem for middle-class families as for low-income citizens.

We start with the almost unbelievable fact that in this rich land of 250 million Americans, 37 million of our fellow citizens, including 24 million working men and women and their dependents, have no health insurance at all.

An additional 26 million Americans will have no insurance for substantial periods of time this year, often as long as 6 or 7 months. And there are 60 million more Americans who have insurance, but whose insurance is so poor that even the Reagan administration said it was inadequate.

Those who are adequately insured today are only one missed heartbeat away from losing their coverage—one management cost-cutting decision away—one pink unemployment slip away in this recession—from joining the ranks of the uninsured. Virtually all Americans are at risk—but it is low- and middle-income families who are most at risk.

Every year millions of citizens are turned down for needed health care or do not even seek it because they cannot afford it. Four out of every 10 hospital admissions in Washington, DC, could be avoided if patients had obtained timely medical care when their symptoms first began. Four out of 10 American children do not even get basic childhood immunizations against disease.

Americans are also paying more and more for health care, and getting less-and-less value for the dollar. We spend more on health care than any other country—40 percent more per person than Canada, 90 percent more than Germany, and twice as much as Japan.

This is the year for action. Labor, business, hospitals and physicians, and consumers are mobilized as never before, and it is time for Congress to act.

I commend Lane Kirkland and the unions of the AFL-CIO for their leadership in calling for reform of our national health care system. Together we must work to make health care a basic right for all, not just an expensive privilege for the few.

Providing access to decent health care for all Americans takes on even greater urgency because of the war in the Persian Gulf. One of the best ways to support our soldiers fighting in the gulf is for us to work harder here at home to achieve the ideals they are fighting to defend.

I ask unanimous consent that the attached remarks from AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland be included in the RECORD.

The material is as follows:

STATEMENT BY LANE KIRKLAND

The state of America's health care system is deplorable.

The AFL-CIO conducted a series of eight public hearings in cities throughout the nation in an effort to assess the human toll of America's health care crisis.

What we found—and what the hearing record shows—is a growing problem that is no longer exclusive to the fringes of our society.

It's now hitting at the solid, working middle-class—the backbone of the country—people who do their level best to pay their bills and meet their obligations.

Medical costs which soar upward at 18 to 30 percent a year are putting basic health care beyond the reach of a steadily increasing number of Americans. As many as one in three Americans has either inadequate health insurance or none at all.

Consequently, millions of working people are living under the threat of financial disaster striking at any moment with the illness or injury of a family member.

Many of the under-insured simply pray for good health. Others postpone needed medical care. Those who can't often find themselves buried in medical bills they'll be paying for the rest of their lives.

Everywhere we looked, Americans who need health care are losing their homes, their life savings and their dignity.

Clearly, now is the time for fundamental changes in our nation's health care system. We need a comprehensive program of reform that will make basic health care available to all who need it—without bankrupting them in the process.

The AFL-CIO is firmly committed to the task of working with members of Congress and the business community to address this crisis and thereby alleviate this grave threat to our standard of living and the economic vitality of the nation.●

TERRY ANDERSON

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to inform my colleagues that today marks the 2,145th day that Terry Anderson has been held captive in Lebanon.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

• Mr. PELL. Mr. President, 73 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Republic declared its independence, and established a democratic government guaranteeing many of the basic rights which we in the United States enjoy. Regrettably, just a few years later, the young republic was overtaken and incorporated into the new Soviet regime.

Last year, we witnessed many promising developments in Ukraine. We welcomed the steps toward greater religious freedom, the organization of political parties and civic organizations, and the adoption of a declaration of sovereignty in July. During the last few months, however, there have been disturbing signals about Soviet actions in Ukraine, including the arrest of political dissenters. And of course, after the bloody crackdowns in the Baltic States, the people of Ukraine cannot help but question whether their young democratic movement will be destroyed by the old Soviet regime.