

White	Wilson	Young (AK)
Whitfield	Wise	Young (FL)
Wicker	Wolf	Zeliff
Williams	Wyden	Zimmer

NOES—79

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Becerra	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Bishop	Hinches	Poshard
Bonior	Hostettler	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Jefferson	Rush
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Collins (MI)	Klink	Scott
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Seastrand
Costello	Lofgren	Serrano
Coyne	Maloney	Slaughter
DeFazio	Markey	Stark
Dellums	Martinez	Studds
Dingell	Matsui	Thompson
Dixon	McDermott	Thurman
Durbin	McKinney	Torricelli
Engel	Meek	Towns
Evans	Menendez	Velazquez
Farr	Mfume	Waters
Fattah	Mineta	Watt (NC)
Fields (LA)	Mink	Waxman
Filner	Nadler	Woolsey
Fox	Neal	Wynn
Frank (MA)	Obey	Yates
Gejdenson	Olver	
Gordon	Owens	

NOT VOTING—10

Coburn	Reynolds	Tucker
Fields (TX)	Royce	Volkmer
Moakley	Schumer	
Oberstar	Sisisky	

□ 1755

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MATSUI, and Mrs. SEASTRAND changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BONO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. BEILENSEN, and Mr. MILLER of California changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 1617, CAREERS ACT

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1617, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on H.R. 1617, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REFERRAL OF H.R. 2202, IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995, TO SUNDRY COMMITTEES

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 2202, the Immigration in the National Interest Act of 1995, be rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Banking and Financial Services, Economic and Educational Opportunities, Government Reform and Oversight, National Security, and Ways and Means for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 12.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1817, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-251) on the resolution (H. Res. 223) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1817) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2274, DESIGNATING THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-252) on the resolution (H. Res. 224) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2274) to amend title 23, United States Code, to designate the National Highway System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 927, THE CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-253) on the resolution (H. Res. 225) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 927) to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2277, THE LEGAL AID ACT OF 1995

Mr. FLANAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight, Tuesday, September 19, 1995, to file the committee report on the bill, H.R. 2277, the Legal Aid Act of 1995.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was unavoidably detained in Milwaukee during rollcall vote Nos. 664, 665, 666, and 667. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 664, "nay" on rollcall 665, "nay" on rollcall 666, and "nay" on rollcall 667.

PARK REFORM AND H.R. 260

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today the House has an opportunity to remove the "For Sale" sign from our National Park System by voting no on H.R. 260. The administration is against this bill, as well as every environmental organization.

This bill establishes a Park Closure Commission to make recommendations to Congress on which units of the National Park System should be closed, privatized or sold to the highest bidder.

If you can imagine a Walmart in the middle of Valley Forge National Historical Park or a Wendy's inside the gates of Little Bighorn National Battlefield Park, then you have some idea of the brave new world after H.R. 260.

While Congress is poised to sell off our priceless national treasures, the American people we represent are making their voices known in ever-increasing visitation numbers to the parks.

In fact, park visitation, which will hit 270 million this year, is expected to hit 360 million by the year 2000, just 5 years from now.

I urge Congress to heed the concerns of the American people, not the beltway bandits who would rob us of our most precious assets. I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 260.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 16, 1995.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
THIS STATEMENT HAS BEEN COORDINATED BY OMB WITH THE CONCERNED AGENCIES
H.R. 260—National Park System Reform Act of 1995—Hefley and eight cosponsors

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 260 unless amended to delete provisions in sections 101 and 102 that establish a process for identifying National Park System (NPS) units that should be closed. This emphasis on closing existing parks undermines the commitment made by previous generations to protect this Nation's important natural and historic resources. The Administration supports other, forward-looking provisions in H.R. 260 that provide for a NPS Plan and the establishment of a clear process for identifying and evaluating potential new NPS units.

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS,
September 18, 1995.

Re oppose H.R. 260, the National Park System Reform Act.

U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The League of Conservation Voters is the bipartisan, political arm of the national environmental movement. Each year, LCV publishes the *National Environmental Scorecard*, which details the voting records of Members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide and the press.

This Tuesday, the House of Representatives is expected to vote on a motion to suspend the rules and consider H.R. 260, the National Park System Reform Act. Under the guise of reforming and improving the National Park System H.R. 260 creates a politically appointed commission, whose sole responsibility would be to determine which park units should be closed. While there may be units in the National Park System that deserve scrutiny, LCV opposes the creation of a politically appointed parks closure commission and urges you to vote against passage of H.R. 260.

H.R. 260, and the parks closure commission it creates, threatens 315 units of the National Park System including: urban parks, historic sites, national monuments, national seashores, national recreation areas, and Civil War Battlefields. Instead of considering ways to improve the National Park System H.R. 260 unnecessarily creates a new layer of government and an expensive bureaucratic process, when in fact Congress already has the authority to remove units from the National Park System.

LCV views H.R. 260 as an assault on the protection of our cultural and natural heritage. By bringing H.R. 260 to the House floor on the suspension calendar Members are prevented from offering amendments which could significantly improve this flawed legislation. LCV believes that the full House of Representatives, like the House Resources Committee, should have an opportunity to vote on an amendment to delete the park closure commission. LCV urges you to oppose H.R. 260 so that this and other amendments can be offered under regular House procedures. LCV's Political Advisory Committee will consider including a vote on passage of H.R. 260 in compiling its 1995 Scorecard.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue. For further information, please call Betsy Loyless in my office at 202/785-8683.

Sincerely,

FRANK LOY,
Acting President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 19, 1995.

H.R. 260 IS BAD FOR AMERICA—PARK CLOSURE COMMISSION COULD CLOSE PARK UNITS

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The House today is scheduled to vote on H.R. 260, legislation to establish a park closure commission which would have the authority to recommend to Congress which units of the National Park System should be considered for closure, privatization or sale to the highest bidder.

H.R. 260 specifically exempts the 54 units of the National Park System from the closure commission recommendations leaving less visited, smaller budgeted parks and important national monuments like Independence Hall, the Statue of Liberty, Mt. Rushmore, the Washington, Lincoln and Jefferson Monuments and the Martin Luther King Jr. National Historic Site on the chopping block.

Please consult the map and descriptive listing of the 369 units of the National Park System printed on the reverse of this page for more information on the specific units in your district.

H.R. 260 is highly controversial legislation which is opposed by a bipartisan coalition of Americans including the Clinton Administration, editorial boards from newspapers across the nation, and nearly every major national environmental organization. It does not belong on the suspension calendar.

When the House votes on H.R. 260 this morning, I urge a NO vote.

Who Opposes H.R. 260?

The White House.

The Department of Interior.

The National Park Service.

The League of Conservation Voters.

Environmental Action Foundation.

Sierra Club.

The National Parks and Conservation Association.

Defenders of Wildlife.

Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund.

Friends of the Earth.

Izaak Walton League of America.

American Hiking Society.

The Wilderness Society.

What papers have issued editorials against H.R. 260?

The New York Times.

The Salt Lake Tribune.

The Miami Herald.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The Philadelphia Inquirer.

The Wichita Eagle.

The Las Vegas Sun.

Please contact Ben Finzel of my staff (x56190) with any questions or for more information.

With warm regards,

BILL RICHARDSON,
Chief Deputy Whip.

SPEAKER GINGRICH'S OWN PRECEDENTS FOR INVESTIGATING A SPEAKER

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, according to the New York Times today the Committee on Standards of Official

Conduct is beginning to allow and agree that they must appoint an outside counsel to investigate Speaker NEWT GINGRICH. The only question is what kind of authority will this outside counsel have? I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD at this point the Speaker's prior precedents that he had in 1988 when the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct last engaged in an investigation on a prior Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in every single one of the Speaker's demands to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct he said the outside counsel must have full authority. Those eight demands must be followed in this case, too, because no one could have said it better than Speaker GINGRICH said at that time is his letter to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. He said:

The rules normally applied by the Ethics Committee to an investigation of a typical Member are insufficient in an investigation of the Speaker of the House . . . Clearly this investigation has to meet a higher standard of accountability and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, if it was true in 1988, it is true in 1995.

GINGRICH INSISTS ON THOROUGH INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, DC.—Congressman Newt Gingrich (R-GA) today insisted that the House Ethics Committee give the special counsel appointed to investigate House Speaker Jim Wright the independence necessary to do a thorough and complete job. Discouraged by several news reports that special counsel Richard Phelan would be restricted in the scope of his investigation, Gingrich took a series of actions including writing to House Ethics Committee Chairman Julian Dixon (D-CA), forwarding the letter to his colleagues in the House, and speaking on the House floor on the need for a truly independent counsel with full leeway in pursuing the investigation.

In his letter to Chairman Dixon, Gingrich wrote:

"I have a number of concerns regarding the Ethics Committee's contract with and instructions for the special counsel hired to conduct the investigation into Speaker Jim Wright's questionable financial dealings.

"First, I am concerned that the scope, authority, and independence of the special counsel will be limited by the guidelines the Ethics Committee has established."

Gingrich agreed with concerns raised by Common Cause Chairman Archibald Cox in a letter to Chairman Dixon earlier this week. The Common Cause letter urged the Ethics Committee to "commit itself to the following measures:

1. The outside counsel shall have full authority to investigate and present evidence and arguments before the Ethics Committee concerning the questions arising out of the activities of House Speaker James C. Wright, Jr.;

2. The outside counsel shall have full authority to organize, select, and hire staff on a full- or part-time basis in such numbers as the counsel reasonably requires and will be provided with such funds and facilities as the counsel reasonably requires;

3. The outside counsel shall have full authority to review all documentary evidence available from any source and full cooperation of the Committee in obtaining such evidence;

4. The Committee shall give the outside counsel full cooperation in the issuance of subpoenas;