

Lewis (CA)	Parker	Smith (TX)
Lewis (KY)	Paxon	Smith (WA)
Lightfoot	Petri	Solomon
Lincoln	Pombo	Souder
Linder	Portman	Spence
Livingston	Pryce	Stearns
LoBiondo	Quillen	Stockman
Longley	Quinn	Stump
Lucas	Radanovich	Talent
Manzullo	Ramstad	Tate
Martini	Regula	Tauzin
McCollum	Riggs	Taylor (MS)
McCrery	Roberts	Taylor (NC)
McHugh	Roemer	Tejeda
McInnis	Rogers	Thornberry
McIntosh	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Torkildsen
Metcalf	Roth	Traficant
Meyers	Royce	Upton
Mica	Salmon	Vucanovich
Miller (FL)	Sanford	Walker
Molinari	Saxton	Wamp
Montgomery	Scarborough	Ward
Moorhead	Schaefer	Watts (OK)
Myers	Schiff	Weldon (FL)
Myrick	Seastrand	Weldon (PA)
Nethercutt	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Neumann	Shadegg	White
Ney	Shaw	Whitfield
Norwood	Shays	Wicker
Nussle	Shuster	Wolf
Ortiz	Skeen	Young (AK)
Oxley	Skelton	Young (FL)
Packard	Smith (MI)	Zeliff
Pallone	Smith (NJ)	Zimmer

NAYS—177

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Nadler
Ackerman	Gunderson	Neal
Baesler	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Obey
Barcia	Hamilton	Olver
Barrett (WI)	Hastings (FL)	Orton
Bateman	Hefner	Owens
Beilenson	Hilliard	Pastor
Bentsen	Hinchey	Payne (NJ)
Bereuter	Hostettler	Payne (VA)
Berman	Houghton	Pelosi
Bishop	Hoyer	Peterson (FL)
Boehlert	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Pickett
Borski	(TX)	Pomeroy
Boucher	Jacobs	Porter
Brewster	Jefferson	Poshard
Brown (CA)	Johnson (CT)	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Johnson (SD)	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Reed
Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Richardson
Campbell	Kanjorski	Rivers
Cardin	Kaptur	Roukema
Clay	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Clement	Kennelly	Sabo
Clinger	Kildee	Sanders
Clyburn	Kleczka	Sawyer
Coleman	Klink	Schumer
Collins (IL)	LaFalce	Schutt
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Serrano
Conyers	Leach	Sisisky
Costello	Levin	Skaggs
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lipinski	Spratt
DeLauro	Lofgren	Stark
Dellums	Lowe	Stenholm
Deutsch	Luther	Stokes
Dicks	Maloney	Studds
Dingell	Manton	Stupak
Dixon	Markey	Tanner
Doggett	Martinez	Thomas
Dooley	Mascara	Thompson
Durbin	Matsui	Thurman
Edwards	McCarthy	Torres
Engel	McDermott	Torricelli
Eshoo	McHale	Velazquez
Evans	McKinney	Vento
Farr	McNulty	Visclosky
Fattah	Meehan	Volkmer
Fazio	Meek	Walsh
Filner	Menendez	Waters
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Watt (NC)
Frank (MA)	Minge	Waxman
Frost	Mink	Williams
Furse	Moakley	Wise
Gejdenson	Mollohan	Woolsey
Gephardt	Moran	Wynn
Gibbons	Morella	
Gillmor	Murtha	

NOT VOTING—12

Becerra	Ford	Thornton
Chapman	McDade	Towns
Fields (LA)	Rose	Wilson
Flake	Schroeder	Yates

So, two-thirds of those present not having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution was not passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby said joint resolution was not passed was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

§39.18 UNFINISHED BUSINESS—APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. RIGGS, pursuant to clause 5, rule I, announced the unfinished business to be the question on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal of Friday, March 29, 1996.

The question being put, viva voce, Will the House agree to the Chair's approval of said Journal?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. RIGGS, announced that the yeas had it.

So the Journal was approved.

§39.19 MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—VETO OF H.R. 1561

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. RIGGS, laid before the House a message from the President, which was read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1561, the "Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1996 and 1997."

This legislation contains many unacceptable provisions that would undercut U.S. leadership abroad and damage our ability to assure the future security and prosperity of the American people. It would unacceptably restrict the President's ability to address the complex international challenges and opportunities of the post-Cold War era. It would also restrict Presidential authority needed to conduct foreign affairs and to control state secrets, thereby raising serious constitutional concerns.

First, the bill contains foreign policy provisions, particularly those involving East Asia, that are of serious concern. It would amend the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) to state that the TRA supersedes the provisions of the 1982 Joint Communiqué between the United States and China. The 1982 Communiqué has been one of the cornerstones of our bipartisan policy toward China for over 13 years. The ongoing management of our relations with China is one of the central challenges of United States foreign policy, but this bill would complicate, not facilitate that task. The bill would also sharply restrict the use of funds to further normalize relations with Vietnam, hampering the President's ability to pursue our national interests there and potentially jeopardizing further progress on POW/MIA issues. If read literally, this restriction would also raise constitutional concerns.

Second, the bill would seriously impede the President's authority to orga-

nize and administer foreign affairs agencies to best serve the Nation's interests and the Administration's foreign policy priorities. I am a strong supporter of appropriate reform and, building on bipartisan support, my Administration has already implemented significant steps to reinvent our international operations in a way that has allowed us to reduce funding significantly, eliminate positions, and close embassies, consulates, and other posts overseas. But this bill proceeds in an improvident fashion, mandating the abolition of at least one of three important foreign affairs agencies, even though each agency has a distinct and important mission that warrants a separate existence. Moreover, the inflexible, detailed mandates and artificial deadlines included in this section of the bill should not be imposed on any President.

Third, the appropriations authorizations included in the bill, for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, fall unacceptably below the levels necessary to conduct the Nation's foreign policy and to protect U.S. interests abroad. These inadequate levels would adversely affect the operation of overseas posts of the foreign affairs agencies and weaken critical U.S. efforts to promote arms control and nonproliferation, reform international organizations and peacekeeping, streamline public diplomacy, and implement sustainable development activities. These levels would cause undue reductions in force of highly skilled personnel at several foreign affairs agencies at a time when they face increasingly complex challenges.

Fourth, this bill contains a series of objectionable provisions that limit U.S. participation in international organizations, particularly the United Nations (U.N.). For example, a provision on intelligence sharing with the U.N. would unconstitutionally infringe on the President's power to conduct diplomatic relations and limit Presidential control over the use of state secrets. Other provisions contain problematic notification, withholding, and certification requirements.

These limits on participation in international organizations, particularly when combined with the low appropriation authorization levels, would undermine current U.S. diplomatic efforts—which enjoy bipartisan support—to reform the U.N. budget. The provisions included in the bill are also at odds with ongoing discussions between the Administration and the Congress aimed at achieving consensus on these issues.

Fifth, the bill fails to remedy the severe limitations placed on U.S. population assistance programs by the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104-107). That law imposes unacceptable spending restrictions pending authorization for U.S. bilateral and multilateral population assistance programs. But H.R. 1561 does not authorize these programs. Con-