OISS Form 52 (Rev. 11-82)

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD
PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 98TH CONGRESS

HOUSE

BILL	DATE	PAGE(S)
H.R. 1028	Jan 27 1983	H197-200

ACTION

Introduced by Mr. Edwards and Mr. Mineta

month continuing appropriation resolution since even the last Congress—even the last Congress. This would have been not only acceptable, it would have been unallowable, unpermitted, during the era of President Lyndon Johnson.

Let the record show that at least one voice in what appears to be a sea of vituperation toward this man rises in connection with these specific points. The American Congress has in other areas abdicated its responsibility, to the detriment of the public interest, that is, the greatest good of the greatest number, such as in the case of fiscal and monetary policy, in the case of the lack of jurisdiction and control or oversight of the Federal Reserve Board. The same thing is happening and has happened more ominously, let me say, in this other vast area, this great unknown, vast land that former Secretaries of State have described as foreign relations.

But today time will not allow for the element of error, particularly right now, with the Marines in Beirut, with an undetermined mission, what are they supposed to be doing there? Nobody knows for sure. Their duties are clearly not spelled out. The first week they were there, the French commander and the Italian commander called them over and the leaders met, the Marine leader and the others, and said, "Hey, we have got to get together, to find out what it is we are supposed to be doing here."

When the President was asked, "How long will the Marines be there?" he said, "I do not know. It depends upon the Lebanese Government."

Lyndon Johnson would have died a thousand deaths before ever permitting that.

THE ADMINISTRATION FINALLY LOOKS FOR ADVICE

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

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I saw an article in the New York Times last week with a very interesting message—the President, dismayed by all of the catastrophic news about future budget deficits, has decided that it is about time to look for advice from individuals outside of his administration. He is also hoping for a bipartisan agreement on the budget for fiscal year 1984. Although it is somewhat encouraging to learn that he finally admits that Reaganomics is a failure—at least we can now work toward putting a reasonable economic policy in place—I cannot help but be reminded of what damage this economic program has done to our country in the last 18 months.

As you know, this administration initially promised that we would have a balanced budget in fiscal year 1984 if its supply-side economic policy and the 3-year income tax cut was adopted by the Congress. When many of us who feared huge budget deficits questioned the advisability of enacting tax cuts before spending was under control, we were told that any delay in the enactment of the administration's new program would only frustrate the expected recovery. This administation was not willing at that time to listen to those who warned that the economic program would not work. Or that it would lead to tremendous deficits.

Unfortunately, history has shown that the "doomsday prophets" of 1981 have become the realists of today. Early in that year the President revealed that the fiscal year 1981 deficit would be high due to the actions of the past administration. However, he assured the American people that the situation would quickly improve as soon as his policies took effect. As it turned out, the $59.6 billion deficit of that year seems almost minuscule when compared to the figures we now face.

In the administration's budget proposal for fiscal year 1982, the budget deficit was estimated at $45 billion. The actual figure for that year was $110.7 billion—an error of 146 percent. This was also the first time in history that the deficit had gone over $100 billion.

However, this incredible miscalculation did not convince the administration that its economic program was unrealistic. Though the unemployment rate shot up from 7.4 percent in June of 1981 to 9.5 percent—a 28-percent increase—just 1 year later, the administration was not convinced. The President was also not persuaded when this rate reached 10.8 percent in December 1982—an almost 50-percent increase from pre-Reaganomics days.

At last count 6.28 million Americans were collecting unemployment benefits. This is the highest number in history. What is even more alarming about this figure is that, given the unemployment rate, it also indicates that 5.76 million unemployed Americans are not receiving any compensation whatsoever.

I am not sure that even the fact that housing starts last year were at their lowest level since 1946, or that personal income rose at its lowest rate in two decades, made a dent in this administration's unwavering loyalty to its economic policy.

No, what seems to have convinced the President that he needs some fresh advice are the budget deficit estimates for the next 5 years. In its original fiscal year 1983 budget, the administration estimated the deficit at $91.5 billion. The Congressional Budget Office now predicts that the real figure will be near $200 billion. It also estimates that for the four fiscal years 1984–87, the budget deficit will be $1 trillion—$322 billion in fiscal year 1987 alone.

As I find these figures virtually incomprehensible, I have done some quick calculations to try to express them in everyday terms. Each unemployed American could purchase an $83,084 home with $1 trillion. This sum would also pay for 166.67 million $6,000 automobiles.

It is unbelievable to me that the country had to get into an economic crisis of these proportions before the administration realized that it needed to change course. So while I am relieved that the President has finally decided to look for help, I cannot stop wondering about what shape the economy would be in if he had only welcomed this bipartisan exchange of views when we first offered it early in 1981.●

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

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

THE HOME TAPING CONTROVERSY

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

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation designed to resolve fairly and responsibly the home taping controversy.

This year, in contrast to last, I am introducing three separate bills, each of which involves issues that were addressed together in the Home Recording Act of 1982.

I propose three bills, instead of one omnibus bill, this year because the issues raised in these measures address different concerns, each of which merits separate consideration by the Congress.

The first bill, the Home Recording Act of 1983, would provide an exemption from liability for individuals who tape video and audio programing for private use. It also would establish a mechanism for compensating copyright owners for this use of their property. The second and third bills, known respectively as the Consumer Video Sales-Rental Amendment of 1983 and Record Rental Amendment of 1983, would make clear that, under our copyright laws, prerecorded videocassettes and audio records and tapes may not be rented without first seeking the permission of the copyright owner.

Mr. Speaker, intellectual property is entitled to the same rights and privileges afforded more tangible forms of property. The copyright clause of the Constitution and the copyright laws enacted by Congress are premised on the belief that the compensation of creators for the use of their works is both fair and in the public interest in that it will stimulate the creation of new works for the public good.

Mr. Speaker, our copyright laws have been revised and rewritten over the last century in order to keep them responsive to our rapidly changing technology—be it satellite, cable television, or indeed, the printing press. It has been the responsibility of Congress to insure that our laws keep pace both in the sense of encouraging the developing of new technologies and in promoting future artistic achievements. The bills that I am introducing today are true to these twin goals: First, they encourage the development of new media, such as the home video recorder, that aid the communication of ideas, news, and entertainment; and second, they will insure that those who create intellectual property are fairly compensated for the exploitation of their works.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to describe briefly each of these bills.

The Home Recording Act of 1983 responds to the decision of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which found that home taping of copyrighted video programing constituted copyright infringement. This bill would grant an exemption from liability for copyright infringement for individuals who tape such programing off-the-air for private use. In addition, it would grant an exemption to those who tape copyrighted musical works at home for their private use.

Although I stongly endorse an exemption from copyright infringement liability for individual consumers who tape at home, we must recognize that this is only a part of the solution to the home taping controversy. This exemption, if unaccompanied by a mechanism for compensating copyright owners whose creative works are taken by home tapers, would be unfair to those copyright owners and would disserve the public which depends upon and benefits from our copyright system. Moreover, constitutional scholars have confirmed that legislation designed simply to exempt home taping would violate the taking clause of the fifth amendment.

For these reasons, this proposal also would require that the manufacturers and importers of video and audio taping devices and blank tapes pay a copyright royalty fee to copyright owners. Simple fairness dictates that the manufacturers and importers pay these royalty fees because they profit most from home taping. Their machines would have little or no economic value if not for the programing and music produced by the American creative community.

Mr. Speaker, this bill differs from last year's legislation principally in that it relies upon the free market, instead of a government bureaucracy, to establish fair and reasonable royalty rates. Specifically, the bill encourages a private negotiation between the parties to the home taping controversy. A representative panel of all video copyright owners and a similar panel representing all audio copyright owners would be constitute to negotiate with manufacturers and importers of machines and tapes. Voluntary agreements entered into pursuant to this process would be binding on all copyright owners and each manufacturer or importer with whom they reached agreement. I am confident that the natural adversarial interests of the parties to the home taping controversy will insure a fair and reasonable outcome.

Those parties unable to conclude a voluntary agreement would be required to submit to a compulsory binding arbitration under the auspices of the Register of Copyrights. The arbitrated rates would then be open to public comments, confirmation by the Register of Copyrights, and judicial review.

The need for this legislation was made abundantly clear in testimony before the House and Senate Judiciary Committees last year. Virtually every segment of the creative community testified in support of this home taping legislation. Labor unions and guilds, whose members' livelihood depend upon the vitality of the U.S. entertainment industry, endorsed this legislation without exception. As to the consumer interest involved, Mr. Joseph Waz, Jr., then deputy director of the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting, testified:

> Copyright is the mechanism by which we assure a continued flow of video productions to the marketplace. While it is desirable that as many Americans as possible should benefit from the wonders of video, it is unrealistic to think that these wonders emerge from an inexhaustible source. If video artists and producers do not perceive opportunities to benefit fairly from the use and employment of their products, they will be disinclined to create them.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is in the consumers' long-term best interest to establish a fair and reasonable system of compensation in order to insure access to the widest possible diversity of creative works.

Mr. Speaker, the principal argument made against this legislation last year was that copyright owners are not harmed by home taping. First, I would like to point out to my colleagues that copyright infringement springs from use, not demonstrable harm. As David Ladd, the Register of Copyrights, stated in a speech before the American Bar Association:

> Harm is not a separate element of the tort of copyright infringement; to establish a copyright infringement case, one need prove only ownership and copying. (That is often hard enough since proof of copying is frequently inferential.) Nonetheless, "harm," particularly palpable monetary damage, has wrongfully intruded itself into the calculus of liability.

Thus, there is no requirement, nor should there be such a requirement, under our system of copyright laws that the copyright owner prove economic harm in order to establish infringement. If harm were a necessary requisite to maintaining an infringement action, a copyright owner would have to stand by while the economic value of his property was drained away before he could sustain such a burden in a court of law.

Second, I believe that the U.S. entertainment industry clearly has established the present and future harm that it will experience if home taping is permitted to continue without compensating copyright owners.

Mr. Speaker, the motion picture business is fraught with high risks, large capital needs and undertainty. Eight out of ten films produced today do not recoup their investment from theatrical exhibition. Even more striking is the fact that 6 out of 10 films never recoup their total investment. A film such as "E.T." is an anomaly in the motion picture business. Those films that do eventually recoup their investment depend upon the viability of four distinct after-theater markets: prerecorded cassettes and discs; pay cable and pay television; network television; and syndicated television. It is these very markets which are most susceptible to VCR usage.

The most recent study concerning the taping habits of VCR users indicated that among the more than 3 million VCR owners in America at the time of the study, 75 percent "libraried" home-taped programs with the average number of videocassettes owned per household being 26.8. Moreover, the vast majority of VCR households, 86.6 percent, reported that they skipped commercials or erased them.

In light of the fact that by the end of this decade there will be 35 to 40 million VCR's imported into the United States, the present and future impact of these practices are clear and understandable: Those who invest in and own copyrighted films will be unable to rely on existing markets to recoup their investment when their products can be taken off the airwaves for free. Moreover, a significant loss of revenue to the producers of programs shown on television will result because advertisers will reduce their payments for commercial time since their commercials are systematically deleted by VCR users. Major advertisers such as Gillette, Coca-Cola, Frito-Lay, and TWA are on record expressing concern with this problem and are beginning to reevaluate their advertising budgets in light of this burgeoning technology.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the economic harm experienced by the music and recording industries as a direct result of home music taping in recent years is astounding. In testimony before the House Judiciary subcommittee, Dr. Alan Greenspan testified that the record industry is losing record sales of about $900 million each year because of home taping. As a result, record company profits are down; new releases have declined substantially; artist rosters have been cut; retail business is slack; and employment

along the entire production and distribution chain is way down.

Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to focus on the human harm involved in home taping. The American entertainment industry provides hundreds of thousands of jobs to the skilled men and women who make movies and television programs, and who write songs, perform music, and manufacture phonorecords. Uncompensated home taping is robbing them of their just rewards and their livelihoods.

In addition, I hope that my colleagues will consider the harm to every American, if the artistic community no longer has the financial wherewithal to support the efforts of unknown actors, directors, composers, and recording artists to refine their craft. It is a depressing prospect to imagine a future devoid of cultural diversity and experimentation because we failed to act responsibly to preserve the legal foundation on which the creative community sustains itself financially.

Mr. Speaker, the second bill that I am introducing today is the Consumer Video Sales-Rental Amendment of 1983. This legislation addresses an aspect of our copyright laws which needs clarification in light of the development of home video recorders. The so-called first sale doctrine of current law is said by some to permit a video retail outlet to rent a prerecorded videocassette of a motion picture for a fee without sharing the revenue derived from this transaction with the copyright owner.

My proposal would clarify the first sale doctrine to establish explicitly a commercial lending right in the copyright owner so that he could share in the revenues produced in the rental market. This bill would have no impact whatsoever on the first sale doctrine as it applies to the noncommercial use of audiovisual works by the ultimate consumer or in libraries.

Last year, many video retailers expressed the fear that if the first sale doctrine were modified as I have suggested, the motion picture industry would eliminate all rentals of prerecorded videocassettes. It is clearly not the intention of this legislation to eliminate the rental market. Rather, it is in the interest of video retailers, consumers and the motion picture industry for a viable rental market for prerecorded videocassettes to coexist with a sales market for these products.

Mr. Speaker, simple fairness and equity commends this proposal to my colleagues. Rental, not sale, has become the principal means for distributing prerecorded videocassettes to the consuming public. Testimony before the House subcommittee indicates that retailers are renting prerecorded videocassettes 20 to 40 or more times, after having purchased them from the distributor at the wholesale price. Let me reemphasize that under current commercial practice the copyright owner does not share in a single dollar of revenue generated by the rental of his property.

Copyright owners when faced with this problem have taken the only action available to them. They have been forced to add a surcharge to the selling price of their films in order to partially recoup some of the revenues lost to the rental market and thus artificially raise the sale prices of prerecorded videocassettes. For example, some popular tapes retail for as much as $100 in the Washington area.

The effect has been to deny the consumer a real choice between renting or purchasing a movie at reasonable prices. It has been argued that consumers have no interest in purchasing these products. However, Mr. Speaker, a major motion picture studio recently lowered the price on one of its popular tapes to $39.95, and the response from the public was enormous. Unfortunately, the current video marketplace prevents the motion picture producers from lowering the sale prices of its entire inventory of films and cartoons.

The immediate effect of my bill will be to bring the sales price of prerecorded videocassettes down to a reasonable level. In testimony before the House Judiciary Subcommittee, Steve Roberts of 20th-Century Fox and James P. Jimirro of Walt Disney Telecommunications testified that if the first sale doctrine were modified as I have suggested, they would lower the sales price of their movies by as much as 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits to consumers are self-evident. If my bill is enacted, consumers would have a real choice between rental and sale at reasonable prices. Moreover, to the extent that copyright owners are delaying or withholding movies from the marketplace, there no longer would be any incentive to do this.

The benefits of this proposal to video retailers are also very compelling. Testimony from last year indicated that thousands of video retailers have been unable to survive under current market conditions. One of the primary reasons that so many video retailers have gone out of business is the high inventory costs associated with maintaining a tape library. Under my bill, lower wholesale prices will alleviate this problem and video retailers will be able to exploit effectively a growing sales market for these products.

Mr. Speaker, the creative community will benefit under my proposal because they will share in the revenues produced from both the sale and rental of their products. Most importantly, by enacting this bill, Congress will be taking a positive step in promoting the underlying philosophy of our system of copyright laws that has insured a continued flow of quality and diverse entertainment to the marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, the third bill I am introducing today is the Record Rental Amendment of 1983.

This measure addresses the recent phenomenon of commercial record rentals. Today, there are over 200 stores in the country that rent records. In these stores, one can rent a record album for as little as 99 cents, buy a tape on which to copy the album, and then return the record to the rental store.

Put simply, these rental stores offer to the public a way of obtaining music without having to buy a record and without thereby paying a cent to the creator and copyright owner of that music. Record rental means lost royalties to recording artists, musicians, composers, and publishers and lost sales for retail record stores, distributors and manufacturers.

We need only look to Japan to understand the effect of record rentals. The retail record rental business made it first appearance in that country in June 1980. There are now almost 1,500 rental outlets in the country and 97.4 percent of their customers admit that they tape the records they rent. As a result, record sales by retail stores in the vicinity of rental outlets have fallen by 30 percent.

Record rentals are displacing record sales. This practice is unfair to recordmakers whose only source of income is from actual record sales. It is also unfair to the creative artists whose music is taken without any payment to them for their work. it is equally unfair to legitimate record retailers whose record prices include royalties for copyright owners and who cannot fairly compete with those who evade those royalty obligations. Finally, it is unfair to consumers who buy their records and have to pay more for them because other rent and tape them home. Rental stores should not be able to rent records again and again on a commercial basis and for profit—without any payment to the copyright owners and others who created the rented records.

If the law is not brought up to date, the growing rental problem will add to the $1 billion annual loss caused by home music taping—thereby further diminishing the incentive to invest time, effort, and money to create the records that fuel the entire music industry.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is important that my colleagues remember that the U.S. entertainment industry is an important national trade asset of significant and continuing value to the U.S. Treasury. In 1981, the U.S. film and television industry brought back to our country almost $1 billion in surplus balance of payments. I urge my colleagues to consider seriously this fact and realize that the legislation I am proposing today promotes a uniquely American industry which creates products that are admired throughout the world. I urge my col-

leagues to support these three bills and I would welcome their cosponsorship.●

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

Mr. EMERSON, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 60 minutes, January 31.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PEPPER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of California, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. COATS.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington.

Mr. PARRIS in two instances.

Mr. WHITTAKER.

Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. SHUMWAY.

Mr. SCHULZE.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. CAMPBELL in two instances.

Mrs. SNOWE in two instances.

Mr. JEFFORDS.

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE.

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

Mr. CORRADA in five instances.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. APPLEGATE.

Mr. NELSON of Florida.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1983, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

215. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Shipbuilding and Logistics, transmitting notice of the proposed conversion to contractor performance of the custodial services function at the Navy Shipyard, Mare Island, Calif., pursuant to section 502(b) of Public Law 96-342; to the Committee on Armed Services.

216. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting notice of a proposed new records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

217. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, transmitting a report on the Corporation's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1982, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

218. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a report from the Army's Chief of Engineers on Chesapeake City Bridge, Maryland, pursuant to resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of January 26, 1983]

H.R. 984 was introduced by Mr. GILMAN.

[Introduced January 27, 1983]

By Mr. AKAKA:

H.R. 1008. A bill to compensate persons who served as enlisted members in the Philippine Scouts and the insular force of the U.S. Navy during World War II for the difference between their actual pay and allowances and pay and allowances authorized for other enlisted members of the Regular Army and the Regular Navy of corresponding grades and length of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1009. A bill for the relief of certain natives of the Philippines who served in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. LELAND, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. PORTER, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. LOEFFLER):

H.R. 1010. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the movement of coal, including the movement of coal over public lands, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and concurrently to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation for a period ending not later than 30 calendar days following the date on which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs files its report in the House.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. FISH, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. GORE, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MINETA, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. LELAND, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. GARCIA, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. TALLON):

H.R. 1011. A bill to provide encouragement and necessary regulation for the commercial development of space; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BONKER, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, and Mr. CHANDLER):

H.R. 1012. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Northwest Interstate Compact on Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARNARD:

H.R. 1013. A bill to effectuate the congressional directive that accounts established under section 327 of the Garn-St Germain Depository Institutions Act of 1982 be directly equivalent and competitive with money market mutual funds; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 1014. A bill to establish a bipartisan national commission to study ways of improving Federal and State efforts to enforce child support obligations and recoup delinquent child support payments; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONER of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee):

H.R. 1015. A bill to amend section 151 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional exemption for disabled individuals who need assistance in the form of attendant care services or medical devices in order to be employed or whose disabilities are so severe that such assistance would not enable such individuals to be employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount allowed to be deducted each taxable year for expenses incurred in connection with the elimination of architectural and transportation barriers for the handicapped and elderly from $25,000 to $100,000, and to make permanent the allowance of such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORRADA:

H.R. 1017. A bill to provide financial assistance for the transportation of petroleum and petrochemical products and agricultural commodities between ports located in the continental United States and Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1018. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a service pension for veterans of World War I who have annual incomes of less than $10,000 and for certain surviving spouses and dependent children of