which I do not even think should be in this bill. Does that mean that we are not going to have time to get to anybody else's amendment?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it will all depend on the amount of time that we can conserve in the remaining time that has been allotted to us by the rule. We have an hour and 45 minutes remaining, and we will try to work with the minority as best we can.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to note that under this unfair rule we have, the quorum call, a totally unnecessary quorum call came out of the time for amendments. We will probably have one less amendment because for no valid parliamentary reason, we spent about 25 minutes with a quorum call so somebody could get a bigger audience. And under the crazy rule we have, a quorum call comes out of the time and the quorum call has probably eclipsed one amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, let me explain that on four occasions this evening, I attempted to arrive at unanimous consent to cut back on the debate time so we would have additional time left for other amendments.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I do not regard it as an acceptable trade-off that you cut off debate time to have a quorum call. I do not think cutting debate on important amendments is an acceptable defense of a very arbitrary and unfair rule.

CLARIFICATION SOUGHT CONCERNING DEBATE ON BOSNIA AMENDMENT

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object if the request is something other than an imploring of the chairman that someone else be allowed to offer an amendment. If the request is something other than that, I will not object.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the chairman, with the big events in Bosnia this past week, we are dealing with a very, very important foreign aid bill. I know that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has an amendment which I am sure the American people would like to see debated.

I just find it incongruous that we are being denied, for whatever reason; I am not blaming anyone, but the way it is working out, it seems that Mr. HOYER will not be allowed to put forth his amendment which would call for an end to the arms embargo. I think this is a very, very important vote on a very important amendment at a very important time.

I am wondering if I could somehow or other ask unanimous consent or ask the chairman if we can somehow get some time to debate Mr. HOYER's amendment because I think the American people want to see us debate it and it is too important to just push it to the side.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to respond to the gentleman. We all share the concern about the Bosnia situation. Tomorrow afternoon we will be having a hearing on Bosnia in the Committee on International Relations. I discussed the Bosnia amendment with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. We talked about trying to have sufficient time to properly debate that measure on a single standing bill rather than to take it up as part of this in a very short and limited period of time.

I assured Mr. HOYER that I would try to work with him in bringing that measure to the floor at an early date following the consideration of this measure.

ON BOSNIA

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee. As the Members of this House know, I, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and others, offered an amendment last year that dealt with lifting the arms embargo to allow the Bosnians to defend themselves. This situation has gone on now for almost 3 years. The largest number of refugees since the Second World War have been created as a result of this confrontation and over 100,000 deaths. Genocide is occurring.

I regret that it appears, based upon the schedule that is going forward now, that I will be precluded from offering this amendment, which I believe is critically timely today and will be critically timely tomorrow.

I would hope that we could configure the schedule tomorrow so that I would have a half an hour to offer this amendment at the end of the other amendments so that this House can address this issue. It is critical. It is on the front page of every newspaper in Europe and the United States. It is in the councils of the armed forces of every NATO nation. And it seems to me it is timely now for this Congress to speak.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–83)

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1158, a bill providing for emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions for fiscal year 1995.

This disagreement is about priorities, not deficit reduction. In fact, I want to increase the deficit reduction in this bill.

H.R. 1158 slashes needed investments for education, national service, and the environment, in order to avoid cutting wasteful projects and other unnecessary expenditures. There are billions of dollars in pork—unnecessary highway demonstration projects, courthouses, and other Federal buildings—that could have been cut instead of these critical investments. Indeed, the Senate bill made such cuts in order to maintain productive investments, but the House-Senate conference rejected those cuts.

For example, H.R. 1158 would deprive 15,000 young adults of the opportunity to serve their communities as AmeriCorps members.

It would deprive 2,000 schools in 47 States of funds to train teachers and devise comprehensive reforms to boost academic standards.

It would reduce or eliminate antiviolence and drug prevention programs serving nearly 20 million students.

It would prevent the creation and expansion of hundreds of community development banks and financial institutions that would spur job growth and leverage billions of dollars of capital in distressed communities across the country.

And it would seriously hamper the ability of States to maintain clean drinking water, thus jeopardizing the health of residents.

In the end, the Congress chose courthouses over education, pork barrel highway projects over national service, Government travel over clean water.

At my instruction, the Administration has provided alternatives to the