United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1995 No. 103

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend David Sievert, pastor, St. Matthew's Lutheran Church, Janesville, WI, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, God of Nations, God of Peace:

We thank You for the men and women You have given our Nation in the past, leaders who ''pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor'' that we may enjoy ''life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.''

Since the care of many must ever rest on the shoulders of the few, strengthen the leaders of our land and especially of this House of Representatives. Help them work for the common good. Make them conscious of their privilege and trust. Give them wisdom, courage, and resolution. Point out to them Your way.

Let the deliberations of those serving here this day speed the cause of justice and peace in our land and throughout the world; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 189, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

YEAS—220

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Martinez
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—189

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

McCarthy	Payne (VA)	Stark
McDermott	Pelosi	Stenholm
McHale	Peterson (FL)	Stokes
McKinney	Peterson (MN)	Studds
McNulty	Pickett	Stupak
Meehan	Pombo	Tanner
Meek	Pomeroy	Tauzin
Menendez	Porter	Thompson
Mfume	Poshard	Thornton
Miller (CA)	Rahall	Thurman
Mineta	Rangel	Towns
Minge	Reed	Upton
Mink	Reynolds	Velazquez
Mollohan	Richardson	Vento
Montgomery	Rivers	Visclosky
Moran	Roemer	Volkmer
Murtha	Rose	Ward
Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Waters
Neal	Rush	Watt (NC)
Oberstar	Sabo	Waxman
Obey	Sawyer	Williams
Olver	Schroeder	Wise
Orton	Scott	Woolsey
Owens	Sisisky	Wyden
Pallone	Skaggs	Wynn
Pastor	Slaughter	Yates
Payne (NJ)	Spratt	Zimmer

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Harman

NOT VOTING—24

Ackerman	Hunter	Serrano
Chapman	Laughlin	Taylor (MS)
Chenoweth	Levin	Tejeda
Cubin	Matsui	Torres
Diaz-Balart	Moakley	Torricelli
Doolittle	Ortiz	Tucker
Fazio	Sanders	Wilson
Gordon	Schumer	Young (AK)

□ 1037

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Messrs. GILCHREST, BALDACCI, JEFFERSON, and GONZALEZ, Ms. MCCARTHY, and Messrs. FIELDS of Louisiana, BEVILL, HAMILTON, CLEMENT, COYNE, DE LA GARZA, UPTON, COSTELLO, BISHOP, PAYNE of New Jersey, and MINGE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOME TO PASTOR DAVID SIEVERT

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to thank Pastor David Sievert for opening Congress this morning with a prayer.

Pastor Sievert is from my home church—St. Matthew Evangelical Lutheran Church—in Janesville, WI.

I met Pastor Sievert about 15 years ago and quickly came to understand that his message was one of faith in God, commitment to family, and love of country.

As my family got better acquainted with the Sievert family, it became very clear that his message from the pulpit was carried out in his own daily life.

Pastor Sievert's continuous message of faith, love, and commitment has inspired me and helped me through the daily trials and tribulations while running for office and now as a Member of Congress.

I look forward to listening to his motivating words for many years to come.

Pastor Sievert, I would like to thank you for making the journey out to Washington and for your encouraging prayer to open today's session of Congress.

□ 1040

FAIRNESS IN HOUSE VOTING PROCEDURES

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, prior to making a unanimous-consent request, I have two comments to make about yesterday's vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] as amended during consideration of the legislative branch appropriations bill.

First, after viewing and reviewing the videotape of yesterday's proceedings, it is quite clear that the Chair, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER], was on solid parliamentary ground when he called the vote on the Fazio amendment. The clerk informs us that he called the vote after 17 minutes and 10 seconds. The videotape shows Mr. LINDER started to call the vote and refrained from completing the call to allow a Member on the minority side of the aisle to vote at the desk, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN]. The video then shows the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] called the vote with the well of the House empty of Members. The video then shows that after some time two Members from the minority party appeared at the desk and attempted to vote. The regular procedure of the House is that after the Chair has called the vote, it is too late for Members to cast a vote. The fact that Mr. LINDER paused to allow the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN] to vote demonstrates that his intent was not to arbitrarily shut off Members from their right to vote, nor did the Chair cut off anyone in the well from their right to vote because there were no Members in the well at the time he announced the vote.

I would further point out to the House that the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] followed two earlier series of parliamentary inquiries to the chair which were propounded to Members on the minority side. These Members asked the chair to be consistent in his respecting the 17-minute voting period. The Chair allowed that he had been, perhaps, too generous in allowing votes to stay open to accommodate Members and that he would attempt to be more rigorous in abiding by the 17-minute vote policy, and with the vote on the Fazio amendment he did just that.

I would further point out that the two Members from the minority who entered the well to vote aye after the vote had already been announced were followed in seconds by another Member from the majority who also arrived too late to vote nay. Had all three of those Members voted, the amendment would still have been defeated on a tie vote, and I might point out, as is the custom, the Speaker did not cast a vote. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the outcome would not have changed even with an extra minute of voting time.

The disposition of the vote on the Fazio amendment was entirely appropriate and conducted within the proper parliamentary procedure of this Chamber.

Having said that, it is also true that many Members, most especially Members on this side of the aisle who supported the Houghton language earlier, felt that their victory had been snatched from them. They have made that clear to the leadership on this side of the aisle. Perhaps they did not have the chance to view the videotape, as I have had. I have that videotape in my office and will make it available to any Member who wishes to see it.

However, I know all too well that once the perception of unfairness and arbitrariness has set in, it is difficult to undo regardless of the facts of the matter. It is important to this Member that fairness govern this Chamber because this Member spent over a decade attempting to do the people's business under very unfair conditions. It is important to this Member that the victories we win are honest and that the defeats we endure are equally so.

For that reason I am about to make a unanimous-consent request to revisit the vote on the Fazio amendment, and, Mr. Speaker, before I make that request, if I may just speak very personally for a moment to my colleagues.

I have not been a Member of this body long, but I can think of few things in life beyond my wife and my children for which I have a greater deal of love than I have for this institution, and this body, and us as Members. I hope that we can set straight a perception of wrongdoing, errant behavior, unfairness, with this action today, and I hope we can all take time to pause and reflect, and remember this body in my estimation is the single most precious and unique institution of democracy in the world, perhaps in the history of the world, and we should all, in each and every act of conduct, no matter how small, always put the honor and the dignity of this body ahead of the politics or even, for that matter, the political subtlety of the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can see this as an opportunity for all of us to regain a new understanding of how precious is this body, and how precious is

our privilege to be here, and how precious is our duty to always do honor to this body.

VACATION OF ROLLCALL 405 AND MAKING IN ORDER DE NOVO VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA, AS AMENDED

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings of the Committee of the Whole on rollcall No. 405 be vacated and that when the Committee of the Whole resumes consideration of H.R. 1854 pursuant to House Resolution 169, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole be directed to put the question de novo on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am reserving the right to object, but I will not object. I want to respond briefly to what the majority leader said.

Mr. Speaker, I think what the majority leader is attempting to do is right. Our version of the facts is different than his, and I would like to give that version just for the purpose of all of us understanding what was involved here and so that we can try to not have these kinds of things happen again.

As all of my colleagues know, the Speaker made a ruling early in the year that we would try to hold votes to 17 minutes. The ruling stated unless someone was in the well. Our version of the facts was that these two Members, who will speak for 5 minutes and will give their version of it in a moment, were in the Chamber, were trying very much to get into the well, but were not able to physically get there, but were, clearly understood by everybody in the Chamber, trying to vote, and in fact at some point, and there is a dispute about when they handed the card in or even handing cards in to vote, when the vote was called to an end, they were not allowed to vote. There is added suspicion because the vote was close and the majority was winning by one vote, and we had two Members coming into the Chamber, so there is added suspicion from that end of it.

Mr. Speaker, there is very strong feeling on this side. I have been here now 19 years, and I have not in my experience seen the depth of feeling that occurred on this particular issue because, as the gentleman said, the thing that we all hold most dear is our ability to represent over 500,000 people in this Chamber on every issue that is voted on. These Members were doing their best to be here on time and to vote. I think there is added feeling on this side because we seem to be into a differing standard from vote to vote. As was said on the vote just before this vote, there was a long time that the clock was held open. On the vote after, on the motion to adjourn, it again was held open for a much longer time than 17 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, what I think we must do, and I hope we will be able to do, is to have a small group meet and try to figure out some standard that everyone can know so we do not wind up with either the reality or the perception of unfairness in how votes are conducted.

There was another issue yesterday that has also been resolved that I need to bring to the attention of the Members, and that was a situation in the Committee on Science where a vote was held in the committee after the first bell had rung and maybe after the second bell had rung, and a lot of our Members left the committee thinking there would be no other votes in the committee. They came here to vote and missed a vote in the committee. The chairman of the committee rectified that this morning by having a revote in the committee so that people who had not voted in the committee could get the chance to vote, and on this issue, too, I think we need to have an understanding as to when votes will not be held in the committee after the bells have begun to ring at some point.

The final thing I would say is that the most important thing we bring here is our ability to cast a vote. All of us love this House. All of us come here with a serious purpose of representing over 500,000 people. We must never call into question, in perception or in reality, that we all are treated fairly in our ability to vote in committee and our ability to vote on this floor. This is the people's House, and, if there is ever a perception that we are not running this House in a fair manner, perception and reality, then we are in great difficulty.

The minority will work in every way possible to make sure those standards are established and that they are lived with, and I believe that the right thing was done here today, and I hope and believe the right thing will continue to be done.

I would like, as part of the request, to have the Members on our side have 5 minutes to explain their version of what went on.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am about to make, as soon as this request is over, another request.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Therefore, proceedings on rollcall No. 405 will be vacated, and, when the Committee of the Whole resumes consideration of H.R. 1854 pursuant to House Resolution 169, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole will be directed to put the question de novo on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY MEMBERS TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 5 MINUTES EACH

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] be allowed to address the House for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, before recognizing the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA], wishes to make several observations:

First of all, the Chair announced at the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the committee on trying to help with families at the beginning of the year that there would be 17-minute votes. The Chair wishes to restate that 17 minutes is a reasonable limit, that if Members are in the Chamber, that they should be recognized, but the Chair also wishes to observe that on final passage on various bills Members who were getting off the elevator on the majority side did not get to vote on the final passage of bills earlier this year. The Chair simply wishes to reassert and to remind all Members we are trying to save time, we are trying to find a way to get this House home so Members can be with their families, and, as a general principle, that is a reasonable thing to do.

Second, the Chair has asked the majority and minority leaders to work both together and with those Members they wish to appoint to resolve the question of committee voting when the House is voting, and obviously, having abolished proxy voting, things are a little more difficult than they used to be, particularly adding 17-minute votes.

Third, the Chair simply wishes to reassert what both the majority and minority leaders have said. Every Member should have the right to participate fairly. Every Member should have the right to vote. This body, as a group, should recognize that there have to be some rules.

The Chair thinks the 17-minute rule reasonably applied is the right kind of thing to do, but we will do everything we can, I hope today, in what the Chair believes is an action he does not remember was taken during the preceding years when I served in this body. The Chair hopes that today's effort will be a sign of good faith that we truly intend for every Member to have their rights protected.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for, first, giving me this opportunity to speak and, also as importantly, giving this House a right to revote the controversial issue of yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I come from the city of Philadelphia. I represent the First Congressional District, and in the heart of that district stands Independence Hall where the Constitution of the United States was written and adopted. The majority and minority leaders both spoke of matters dear to them. Let me say that the Constitution of the United States of America is also very dear to me.

The majority leader stated the facts as he knows them. However I was the subject, and I was here. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that I entered the Chamber. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] was standing toward the rear of the aisle, and, as I passed Mr. OBEY on my way to the well, Mr. OBEY yelled out to the Chairman, ''One more vote, one more vote,'' which, according to custom over the years, has always allowed that Member to cast his or her vote. Mr. Speaker, I was denied that right.

We are talking about the amount of time that was involved. The Washington Post timed the vote and found that the vote was called 15 seconds prior to the expiration of 17 minutes. I ran to the well, wrote out my card, handed it to the Clerk. The Clerk actually had the card in his hand, and I was then denied to have my vote counted.

Mr. Speaker, that Constitution of which I spoke gives us as Americans some basic inalienable rights. One of the most important, one of the most basic of those rights, is the right of every American citizen to cast his or her vote, and, as importantly, it was the right, or is the right, of every American to have his or her Congressperson vote on their behalf in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that yesterday afternoon over 1 million Americans were denied their right to have their Representative cast votes on their behalf. One million Americans were disenfranchised by, I consider, a disgraceful display of arrogant, unconstitutional abuse of power.

Mr. Speaker, we might try to determine why this occurred. As you well know, the vote would have turned had I and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] been allowed to vote. That is one of the reasons. The second reason I was not aware of until I left this Chamber is, as I left the Chamber, I walked out in front of the Capitol and there saw my colleagues from the majority side boarding buses to take them to the airport to take them to New York City for a fundraiser. Strangely enough, the New York Post, owned by one Rupert Murdoch, states in its column that the GOP went to great lengths to make sure that its Members got to the Big Apple on time. Was one of those great lengths to which the GOP went the denial of Members of the right to vote and the denial of American citizens, of over 1 million American citizens, to have their Representative cast votes on their behalf?

I appreciate the fact that we are going to have a revote, and I would hope that this incident brings home the message to every Member of this House that what we do here is an important part of the American way of life. What we do in this body is a right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and that constitutional right should remain inviolate no matter what the circumstances.

□ 1100

I would hope that after this incident, every Member will have the right to cast his or her votes on behalf of his or her constituents, the American citizens.

VOICE OF FREEDOM STILLED ON FLOOR OF HOUSE

(Under previous order of the House, Mr. HILLIARD was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the floor of this House the voice of freedom was stilled by the forces of repression. The strong arms of the Republican army flexed their mighty parliamentary weight and refused two duly elected Members of this body, myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA], the opportunity to vote before this Congress. In doing so, the Republicans crushed the very voice of democracy.

This is not Caesar's Rome, this is not Hitler's Germany, and this is definitely not Stalin's Russia. This is where the voices of freedom should reign. This is the birthplace of democracy.

This is America. We all must protect its democratic institutions, and especially its foundation, the right to vote. Our right to vote supersedes any party vote on any issue. We must preserve the integrity of the vote, and we must in this body aggressively champion the right to vote.

A revote is good. It does not show good faith. To me, being a politician for 22 years, it tells me that you are out to achieve your objective at any cost. Yesterday you could not win because there were two votes in this Chamber that would have made the difference, and there was no third vote, even though I realize that you have created one now. Because you did not have the votes yesterday, and because you have twisted arms last night and you have the votes today, you are ready to revote. To me, that is not good faith.

You, because you are the majority party, have a greater duty to preserve and protect this institution, and I suggest to you that you have failed to do that. The procedures of this institution must be protected at all costs. It should be beyond and above any objective of any party.

This morning, the Washington Post stated that you cut off the vote by 15 seconds. I heard you state that 10 seconds had elapsed. By our count, we had more than 30 seconds. By the Washington Post, which I would think would be independent of the Republican count or the Democratic count, you cut off and denied over 1 million people the right to vote by 15 seconds.

This is not democracy. In Alabama we do not even do this. Never do we openly take the rights of anyone to vote, and I would hate to think that this body is below that level. It cannot be, it should not be.

I suggest to you, because you have the votes and because you have been using the clock to manipulate that vote, you hold it open when you do not have the votes, you close it when you do, you win, the Republican Party wins. But I also suggest to you that every time you do it, democracy loses.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The Chair will accept fifteen 1-minute requests from each side.

DENYING THE RIGHT TO VOTE

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we have always known that the Republicans were willing to go to great lengths to pass their extremist agenda. I never thought that I would see the day when they would actually deny Members of this body the right to vote, but on the floor yesterday, a Democratic amendment was one vote, one vote, shy from victory. There were 15 seconds left. Two Democrats who had not voted were trying to vote, and they were cut off, denying 1 million people in this country representation.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most egregious and arrogant abuse of power that I have seen on our House floor. To top it all off, when Democrats tried to question the ruling, the Republicans adjourned early and jumped on buses. You know why? Where did they go? This poster points out where they went. They went to New York, by plane, got on a bus, took a plane, and raised $1.7 million at a fund raiser.

Now, the Republicans are willing to shut down our voices, shut down our votes, and adjourn the House early, all so they can raise $1.7 million from the special interests and the wealthy corporations. Welcome to the Gingrich revolution.

TRAMPLING DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our Republican colleagues were in a rush to get to a big bucks fundraiser up in Manhattan, and democracy was trampled in their stampede to get to those big dollars. You can look at today's New York Post. You can see what it was all about. An all-star list of corporate bigwigs was slated to attend, the same corporate bigwigs that are being benefited by the tax shift to the superrich at the expense of people who want school lunches and the protection of Medicare. It is more of the same thing.

But it is a dark day indeed for democracy in this country when the rights not just of two Members, but over 1 million Americans to have their voice heard in this House, are trampled and cut off. And, amazingly, only moments before this occurred, in the Committee on Science on which I serve, in an incredible display of arrogance, there was an attempt to force people to vote there or vote here.

This is a true setback for democracy.

ADJOURNING EARLY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, in my 13 years as a Member of Congress, I have never experienced what happened yesterday in this House. Instead of doing the people's business, this House adjourned yesterday at 3:50 in the afternoon, in the middle of a workday afternoon when most Americans are still on the job. Why? Money, and millions of dollars of it. That is right. Congress adjourned early yesterday so that Republican Members with Speaker GINGRICH at the helm could fly to New York to attend a GOP fundraiser aboard the Intrepid Sea and Air Space Museum, where wealthy givers paid $1.7 million to hobnob with Republican Members who did not work a full day yesterday, but were not docked for their pay.

During the first 2 months of this year, the Republican Campaign Committee has raised over $11 million. That is over $123,000 a day. Maybe it is time to ask ourselves who is fighting for America here in Washington, and should not those Members who left early be docked on their pay?

GOP ABUSE OF POWER

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it seems only yesterday when the Republicans rode into town promising reform, but those days are long gone. Instead of reform, the new Republican majority has curried favor with the special interests, gagged debate, and yesterday denied Members of this body the right to vote.

Why did Republicans close a vote while two Democratic Members were waiting to cast their ballots? Because they had a fundraiser to go to. Yes, the buses were idling outside waiting to squire them to the ''Salute to Newt'' fundraiser, featuring GOP poster boy Rupert Murdoch. The article in the Post today says ''the GOP went to great lengths.'' Indeed, they went to great lengths to make sure that their Members got to the Big Apple on time.

Last November, the American people were promised that Government would be returned to them. But yesterday hundreds of thousands of American people were shut out of the people's House when their Representatives were denied the right to vote on their behalf. What we are seeing in this body is an arrogance of power, one of the most egregious abuses of power in our Nation's history.

THE FACTS BE DAMNED

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. My goodness, such self-righteous indignation over those big-money interests. It is a concept that the other side of the aisle has known nothing about for 40 years. But who for the past 40 years has been the champion of PAC money and collecting special interest money? It has not been this side of the aisle. It has been the Democrats. And yet now that the Republicans dare to have a fundraiser, a concept that the Democratic Party has never thought of one time in their life, we are destroying the work of the people's House. We are subverting democracy.

Dear Lord, there were two Democrats that were going to vote yesterday, but they were shut out. Be damned with the facts. Get behind us, facts. There was a Republican in the Chamber also, and the majority leader explained this yesterday. The Democrats would have lost.

But instead of sticking to the facts, they are relying on demagoguery, talking about Rupert Murdoch and other things that have absolutely nothing to do with the facts of what happened yesterday.

How absolutely irrelevant to what has been going on yesterday and what has been going on since we got here on January 4, 1995.

MEMBERS' RIGHTS MUST BE PRESERVED

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in response to the previous statement by the gentleman who just spoke, let me say the issue is not whether the Republican Party held a fundraiser or not. That happens all the time on both sides of the aisle.

The issue, however, is whether it is in the democratic tradition, big American democratic tradition, not party, for the majority party to shut down this House and cut off an individual Member's right to vote so that they can get to a fundraiser in New York on time. The article in Mr. Murdoch's paper says the GOP ''went to great lengths to make sure its Members got to the Big Apple on time.''

This is the issue. Not whether you had a fundraiser, but whether you were so anxious to go grab the money, that you were willing to shortcircuit the democratic process in the doing. That is the issue.

CRYING LACK OF FAIR PLAY

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, in response to all this money-raising garbage, frankly, that I have been hearing this morning, how interesting it is that the President of your party tonight kicks off his fundraising. Do you want to dock his pay? One of your people just proposed you dock the pay for the time they spent. Take a look at that.

Second of all, to my colleague that was just preceding me, who talked about the cutoff of voting rights, why do you not bring the videotape up here and set up the TV camera? To my colleague, the videotape does not lie. They were in violation of the rule. They were not down here in the well. They had gone beyond the 17 minutes.

Do not cry lack of fair play. Bring up the video and show the American people the truth. Are you afraid to do that? Of course you are.

□ 1115

A BAD DAY FOR THE CONSTITUTION

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, this morning I think that we should recall the words of a great woman of many, many years ago, Barbara Jordan, during the Watergate hearings, when she intoned the Constitution.

Yesterday was a bad day for the Constitution. Yesterday was a bad day for this card that we each have that the people of our respective congressional districts graced us with, the power to speak for them, the power to represent them with our vote. The Constitution. The Constitution.

Yesterday was a good day for fundraising. Yesterday was a bad day for democracy and for the Constitution and the power that the people gave us in the House of Representatives to cast our vote and to speak for them. Shame on those that would chip away at the Constitution.

CLINTON BUDGET NOT BALANCED

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office has weighed in on President Clinton's plan to balance the budget in 10 years. Their conclusions were not too, shall we say, promising.

CBO concludes that Clinton's new budget would not even come close to balancing in the year 2005. They predict the deficit that year will be $209 billion, about what it is today.

During his first State of the Union Address, Bill Clinton sang the praises of the CBO. Now, the differences between his numbers and CBO's numbers are passed off as merely a difference of opinion between policy wonks.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton's budget is a sham. If he were serious about balancing the budget, he would get serious about the Federal Government's spending problem.

Instead of a real balanced budget, all Bill Clinton proposes is a plan to protect big government.

INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, before the House institutes instant replay, I would like to talk about the Constitution in another way. Under the Constitution, an American citizen once accused shall be considered innocent and the accuser shall be held accountable for the credibility and reliability of those accusations and shall bear the burden of proof.

It is simple. It is logical. It is fair. It is American. It is right to the point.

Tell me, Mr. Speaker, when did the Washington bureaucrats reach into the Constitution and in a tax case allow the IRS to treat the American people like indentured servants, like criminals, like noncitizens, like chattel. Unbelievable.

H.R. 390 says, any time an American taxpayer is in a court over a tax proceeding, they shall be considered innocent, and the IRS shall have the burden of proof. That is simple. That is logical. That is fair. By God, that is American.

If we want to talk about the people's business, let us pass H.R. 390.

RULE ON VOTE TIME

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Let us wait just a minute, folks, with all the screaming and wrapping of the righteous robes of indignation around your bodies about what happened here yesterday. The rule was established at the outset of this session. We are not going to do it like we did in the old days. We are not going to slop over for 30 minutes on the votes. We are going to have 15-minute votes. Those 15-minute votes, because sometimes there are unexplainable circumstances, those 15-minute votes sometimes will wait until 17 minutes. The vote yesterday was 17 minutes. But I guess some Members are slow learners and they habitually wander in here after the 17 minutes and say, one more, one more, let us vote.

We were here. Where were those two Members when everybody else had voted within the 17 minutes? Where were those two Members who feel like they were so wronged yesterday? They had the same time we did. I guess they had things that were more important to do than to be on this floor and vote within that 17-minute limit.

We are here to try to change Congress and change this country. You are just trying to change the subject.

ARROGANT ABUSE OF POWER

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this body for 22 long years and never have I seen the arrogant abuse of power that I saw here yesterday.

Now the funny thing about it, I sat here for an hour and a half this morning. Thirty minutes of that time was spent on the vote that was called to vote on the record, a 30-minute vote. Check the video. Check the clock. Check the timekeeper. You will find that is the case.

Now, 30 long minutes, yet you cannot allow a Member time to get here to vote on the floor of the House of Representatives. I say to my colleagues, money is important. Everybody likes money. I like money. The Democrats like money. Republicans like money. But not at the expense should anybody leave this body to go to a fundraiser, a fundraiser in New York when business is going on to represent the people in this country.

The House of Representatives and the millions of people that we represent deserve better than that, deserve to have their voices heard, deserve to have their votes casts by those of us they send here to cast their ballots for them.

Let me tell you something else, money is the root of all evil, and you did an evil thing yesterday when you left here and did not do the people's business.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to set the record straight. Yesterday I was in the Committee on Science when the chairman laid out the rules for the vote that was going to precede the vote that came on the floor.

What happened is the opposition to this tried to filibuster in the Committee on Science and then alleged that they missed the votes here. The chairman stayed throughout all debate. He then left the Committee on Science, came here and was able to register his vote. But still the charge is arrogance.

Today I just left the Committee on Science. I just revoted on the very same amendment. It was allowed. We were considerate and yet no apology, just a charge of arrogance. When are we going to have some reality and some consideration on the floor of this House?

I think it is time that we act like gentlewomen and gentlemen as we so profusely proclaim on the floor of this House.

THE REPUBLICANS' ARROGANCE

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, let us talk about setting the record straight. Listen to this. Listen to this, you people on the other side of the aisle who simply do not get it. This country is about the right to vote.

I was in this Chamber yesterday. I am a witness. I saw it all. There were two Members standing at the very place I stand this minute, filling out cards, attempting to vote, attempting to represent over a million Americans. A million Americans were denied their right to vote yesterday, and why? There are two simple reasons: The Republicans were losing the vote and they could not stand that in this era of lockstep, almost Nazi-esque obedience.

Second, they were going to a fundraiser. It says right here, the GOP went to great lengths to make sure its Members got to the party on time.

Let us do not forget this, my colleagues. It is about their arrogance, and they never apologized for it. They just said: We will let you vote again. That is not right.

LET US GET ON WITH THE PEOPLE'S BUSINESS

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, the beltway mentality that exists here never ceases to amaze me. The votes on this issue, had they been cast, would not have changed the result of the vote to begin with. But the real crime here is that the people in my district at least have some real concerns.

For example, I have some senior citizens in my district who are concerned about Medicare. And yet while your party decides that they want to complain and carp about a time limit on a

vote, you all suggest that we are not going to deal with the Medicare problem. The President himself has admitted that Medicare goes bankrupt in 7 years. Yet your party decides to refuse to address the issue.

Which is more important? Squabbling about these votes or getting to the business of the people and addressing issues like Medicare?

Mr. Speaker, I am tired of the partisan bickering. I seldom take part in these partisan debates; I prefer to deal with issues, issues like Medicare. Let us get on with the people's business.

WE SHOULD ALL LIVE BY THE SAME RULES

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

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I have a history. I have lived in countries that were not democracies. I want to say something about democracy. In a democracy trust is the major component. in a democracy, it is not the military who makes the rules; we make the rules. We, the people, make the rules, and we trust we will all live by them.

The Republican leadership said there will be 17-minute votes. Yet today we have a 30-minute vote. So who can we trust?

That is why, they say, they denied those two Members coming down from here into the well to vote. I was standing right here, Mr. Speaker. I pointed to those Members. I said, Mr. Speaker, there are Members. It is on the videotape.

Mr. Speaker, if we lost the trust in this institution, we lose what is best about a democracy. We all make the rules. We all live by the same rules.

METHINKS THOU DOTH PROTEST TOO MUCH

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have actually sat here this morning and listened to all of the righteous indignation being expressed. There was a perceived wrong in the House, and the majority leader, in an act of magnanimity that I have never witnessed in my 15 years here, and, believe me, when we were in the minority, there were many perceived and real acts perpetrated that were not only perceived, they were real acts of wrongdoing, procedurally. This House was never offered the means to address the perception of wrong, in those days. But now the offer has been made, and it was unanimously agreed to.

I think with what is going on here this morning, there is—I would have to refer a little bit to Shakespeare here: Methinks thou doth protest too much. For the lack of an agenda of substance, you want to quibble about a procedural issue that is, in fact, being addressed and addressed in a very reasonable, up front and correct manner.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WERE DENIED REPRESENTATION

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, a frightening thing happened yesterday. Two votes that would have changed the outcome of House action were denied. In addition to the disenfranchisement of two Members, 1 million American people were also denied representation on that vote. What does this kind of capriciousness do to our democracy? What was so important that the business of the House had to be shut down?

Was it the ''Salute to Newt'' that took place in New York last night? What does this say about the integrity of the vote under Republican rule?

Republicans want to deny potential voters with the repeal of motor-voter. Republicans want to deny real voters by invalidating election results in California and North Carolina. And how we see that they are willing to even deny elected Members the right to vote on the floor of the House if it does not fit in with their outcome.

Mr. Speaker, this bodes ill for the people of America. This is going too far. They are extremists, and they cannot be trusted.

U.S. COAST GUARD COMMENDED FOR LEADING FIGHT AGAINST ILLEGAL DRUGS AND VIOLENT DRUG CARTELS

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Coast Guard is leading the charge against a force that is now our No. 1 national security threat—illegal drugs and violent drug cartels.

Last week, as chairman of the National Security, International Affairs and Criminal Justice Subcommittee, I led a congressional delegation to the front lines in the drug war. We went to the 7th Coast Guard District. What we saw was both impressive and disturbing.

Impressive, because we saw brave men and women in the air and on the sea, putting their lives at risk, in the drug transit zone, hunting narcotraffickers. They are out there protecting our kids and our grandchildren. And they need our help.

Disturbing, because our Nation has badly underestimated the threat posed by drugs and the drug cartels. The interdiction effort needs our support. Congress and President Clinton have to lead.

In the past 2 years, drug use has skyrocketed. But the priority on drug interdiction has fallen. We flew in Falcon jets. But 4 of the region's 10 Falcons have been retired. We flew in HH–60 helicopters. But the pilots have lost radars, aerostats, and their only C–130 AWAC. Resources are at rock bottom, when they should be at the top.

We saw 5,000 pounds of drugs interdicted by the brave souls on the Coast Guard Cutter *Mellon*. But the raw truth is: The drug cartels are killing us as surely as any foreign enemy. It has got to stop.

From the frontlines, I say to my colleagues and I say to President Clinton, let us get drugs at the top of the national agenda.

To the Coast Guard I say, thank you. You are doing important and dangerous work, and we appreciate it.

CORPORATE FAT CATS

(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, let us put a little focus on what this article points out. The reason we adjourned the House early on Wednesday afternoon, what every other American thinks is a regular workday, we adjourned early afternoon so people could run to corporate jets owned by tobacco companies and insurance companies, so they could traipse off and go to New York City, where the New York fat cats were waiting to stuff their coffers with money. If they kept those fat cats waiting, they might not have stuffed so much in the pocket.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the people who, after the first 100 days, went to this dome, and some were angry for holding up a sold sign, but let me tell the Members, every day it appears to me we are selling this place out. I do not want this to become a coin-operated legislative machine.

Yes, have fundraisers, but have them at night, have them on weekends. Do not have them on Wednesday afternoon with corporate jets escorting Members back and forth, so they do not upset the fat cats, so they will give them lots of money. That is why the American people are really concerned about this sacred trust we have called democracy. It is not totally dead yet, but I will tell the Members, it is in danger, as of today.

GAMES IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, there is sanctimony dripping from the ceiling. I want to set the record straight. I see my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] standing here. I would remind the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], who just stood and talked about scheduling events on weekends and at times the House is not in session, that the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO],

chairman of the DCCC, used to come to me and say ''We are going to have an event. We would like to make certain that votes are not called during that time.'' We always obliged. I think there was always comity between the two sides of the aisle.

We held an event, that side holds events. Both sides do it. This vote had nothing to do with the scheduling of our event. It had everything to do, though, with games being played here in the House that had nothing to do with the NRCC's event last night. However, we certainly will remember that advice in the future, when it comes to scheduling events, and certainly keep an eye on that side's, also.

RECOGNITION OF THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION'S RESOLUTION, JUNE 22, 1995

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

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to stand here today to recognize the bold and courageous step the Southern Baptist Convention took during its annual convention. As many of you know, its members passed a resolution acknowledging and asking forgiveness for past acts of racism.

The Southern Baptist Convention was created in 1845 when some members split from the American Baptist Convention over the question of whether slaveowners could be missionaries.

In 1989, its members moved toward this historic resolution when they declared racism a sin.

This resolution commits its members to eradicating racism in all its forms from Southern Baptist life and ministry. I pray, Mr. Speaker, that others would follow the example of the Southern Baptist Convention so that our great Nation can be all that it can be, utilizing the full potential of all its citizens regardless of race.

A LITTLE HYPOCRISY IN COMPLAINTS

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate up in the office. I just happened to see Roll Call this morning. It concerned me that maybe we have a little bit of hypocrisy going on today.

There is an article here entitled ''Party Weekend.''

> The Democrats are holding a retreat for big donors at the notorious Greenbrier resort in White Sulfur Springs this weekend. The price of admission is $10,000 for individuals, $15,000 for PAC's. There will be some time for discussion, but most of Saturday is free time for golf, tennis, swimming, horseback riding, and visiting the spa. The Greenbrier retreat is one of six events the Democrats are holding for big donors this year.

Mr. Speaker, let us get some reality here. All this rhetoric is quite disingenuous.

AMERICA IS NOT YET A COLORBLIND SOCIETY

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, let me be the first today to welcome all of our colleagues to the new colorblind society. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker himself has said just as late as last week that we were not there yet, but we are. Let us just put down all the weapons we used to get here to the promised land of equality and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, what are the signs that we are here in this land of milk and honey? The Supreme Court last week in the Adarand decision told us, and today in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, we will put yet another nail in the coffin of inequality in fair housing and lending.

News flash, we are not there yet. By taking one of the best weapons we have away from the Attorney General to use testers, qualified minority and nonminority applicants who root out bigotry and discrimination in housing, we have taken a bad detour back to the past.

Shame on those who falsely welcome us to this color-blind America. We are not there yet, Mr. Speaker. Only last week U.S.A. Today reported that there is still discrimination in housing in this land. There is still discrimination in fair lending practices. Mr. Speaker, let us move toward a color-blind society, but we are not there yet.

HOW REPUBLICANS MAKE LAW: LET LOBBYISTS DO IT

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans promised some sweeping changes in how Congress works. In one way, they have certainly delivered.

The Democratic Study Group is today releasing a special report that describes just how this Republican Congress has turned over the reins of congressional power to special interest lobbyists.

Lobbyists have been brought in from the corridors of the Capitol and given a seat of power, where they are performing the functions that are the legal and moral responsibility of Members and staff. These paid agents of private interests are dictating the wording of legislation, conducting official staff briefings advising committee counsel during bill markups, drafting official committee reports, and even sitting on the dais during hearings.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for lobbyists to give advice and suggest bill language. It is quite another for these agents of private interests, interests with a financial stake in the outcome, to perform the core responsibilities of congressional staff and Members.

Mr. Speaker, this is the business of legislating. It is the public's business. It is to be conducted only by those who are accountable to the public.

COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Pursuant to clause 2i of rule 11 Mr. ARMEY moves that all committees and subcommittees of the House be permitted to sit for the remainder of the week while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I will not take my whole hour.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, this is a routine matter. It is a fairly normal thing we have been doing here in order to enable our committees to work while the House proceeds with business. Of course, we do this in all due consideration to all our Members, but also, of course, in due consideration of the fact that the people's work must be done.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, with the exception that I will yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and would like to be heard in opposition to this motion.

Normally, Mr. Speaker, it would be my feeling that this House should proceed in all due speed to attend to matters, certainly on the Committee on Science on which I serve. However, yesterday we had an incredible display of arrogance in that committee. It is not the first time that it has happened, unfortunately.

That is that after the bell had rung for Members of the Committee on Science to come to the floor of this house and cast their vote on behalf of the over half a million people that each of those Members represent, after that bell had rung, the chairman of the committee attempted to force the committee to vote in committee at the same time, several blocks away from where they were being asked to vote on the floor of this House.

The effect of that action is to deny that half a million Americans the opportunity to cast their vote either in the committee or on the floor, since even the Committee on Science, as advanced as its outlook might be, has not

figured out a way to have Members of Congress sit in two places at the same time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with this having happened on a prior occasion, I began talking about this in the Committee on Science in hopes that there would be an opportunity to simply have the common decency and the common courtesy to postpone the vote until immediately after the vote here, because several members of the Committee on Science, Democratic members, had already left, realizing how really critical this vote was on the floor of the House concerning, ironically, the Office of Technology Assessment, a matter that relates directly to the jurisdiction of our committee.

Those members left. They included the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan, LYNN RIVERS. Ms. RIVERS, as she told the House yesterday, has never missed a vote on the floor of this House. She has never missed a vote in any of the committees on which she served until yesterday. The only reason that she missed that vote was the vote was forced while she was trying to cast her vote on the floor of the House, the vote was forced in the Committee on Science.

Mr. Speaker, I talked for 5 minutes, asking for the opportunity to simply delay the vote until such time as all our Members could return, and that opportunity, that common courtesy, was rejected. It is for that reason that I oppose this motion, because I think that the House needs to make a statement that we will not place any Member of this House, Democratic or Republican, in the position, the dilemma, of deciding shall I vote on the floor for my constituents, shall I vote on the committee to which my expertise is called?

Mr. Speaker, none of this would have been necessary yesterday. None of this rush to justice would have occurred had it not been, as several Members have pointed out this morning, for the fact that some of our Republican colleagues just could not move fast enough to get to that big bucks fundraiser up in New York City, where all of the corporate elite was gathered to shower down benefits on them. There is nothing wrong with having a fundraiser. They do go on all the time on both sides. It is the only way this place seems to be able to operate.

However, what is wrong is when democracy is trampled in the process, and people are cut off and denied their right to vote, be it on the floor or in an important committee of this House like the Committee on Science.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I think we all recognize that immediately following the disposition of this motion by the floor leader, that we are going to be back on the legislative branch appropriation bill. The very first vote is going to be, again, on OTA. At least that is being corrected.

However, then we are going to follow with other votes about 10, 11 minutes apart. We are going to have other amendments and they each have about 10 minutes to them. Those are very important amendments. Those on the Committee on Science are going to have to stay over there and not listen to the debate.

Mr. DOGGETT. They are over there right now meeting. That is the problem. They cannot be in two places at once.

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentleman will yield further, they do not know what is going on, Mr. Chairman. They have to run over here and try to make this vote. If the chairman does like he did yesterday and calls for votes, we are back in the same pickle all over again.

Would it not be better for the Committee on Science just to say no, we will not finish up today, we will come back in next week and we will finish up, at a time when it is not going to interfere with Members trying to do two things at one time?

Mr. DOGGETT. Perhaps at a time when simple common courtesy and decency and collegiality could prevail, instead of pomposity and arrogance, which is what we have had too much of.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I might point out what happened yesterday as it relates to what occurred here on the floor. I know the gentleman is interested in the total inconsistency, because when we did rush over here, literally in a gallop from way over at the Rayburn building, to try to be two places at once, we found, or I did, in response to a parliamentary inquiry, that a phone call had been made, and that the vote had been extended far beyond 17 minutes, but that was the vote immediately before the one that was cut off a few seconds shy, and 1 million Americans' right to vote shy, of being able to be cast here.

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman and other Members of the minority had been informed by the chairman of the Committee on Science that that phone call was being made, and that there would be sufficient time for the gentleman to respond to the rollcall vote over here, he would not have had to run over here right away

□ 1145

You were not told that, were you?

Mr. DOGGETT. We heard nothing of it. It would have allowed those Members like the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS] to keep her 100-percent voting record for the people of Michigan.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I really thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership on this. I know in Judiciary, we were confronted with exactly the same thing the day before. That after the second bell I left to come here to vote because I thought the 15-minute thing was legit and I guess my mother emphasized promptness too much. I left, I came over here, went back and found out that they had a rollcall and so I had not been able to participate in the rollcall in Judiciary.

Look, during the first 100 days, I think our side cooperated when we had this 15-ring circus going on. But at this point when you have got committees that are doing markups and hearings and meanwhile having issues on the floor that the committee is also interested in at the same time, I would think what we are really saying is we are just running around here voting and people do not have any time to really focus on these tough issues. I think the people expect a little more of us. They expect us to work later than 3:30 in the afternoon and in the middle of the week, knock off to go to New York City and whatever.

I think the gentleman is making an excellent point and I would hope that everybody could get some idea of what the rules are. Are we going to have committee votes after the second bell? Are we going to have them after the third bell? Are we going to be able to hold the thing open down here if that is happening? Who has the clout to do it? Is it only people on that side of the aisle? People on this side do not have that clout? These are serious issues.

Mr. DOGGETT. They are serious issues, because democracy has to work both ways. It has to be the same rule for Democrats and Republicans and people of no party affiliation. I certainly do not object to their need to rush off to a fundraiser in Manhattan with the tobacco lobbyists and the other big corporate interests, buy why is it that the people's workday had to be cut short in the middle of the afternoon? The folks I represent down in Texas do not usually get off at 3 or 4 in the afternoon to head off to some big bucks party. They have to stay and put in at least their full 8 hours of labor. Had these folks been willing to put in their full 8 hours of labor and then catch their corporate jet to New York and enjoy the chance to be wined and dined with the big corporate lobbyists, then we would not have had this problem. We could well have permitted people to vote in due order in the Committee on Science and to vote here on the floor of the House without rancor, without any kind of interruption or disruption such as we have had, and we would be much further along on the people's business today had these nasty incidents, one here on the floor of the House, one in the Committee on Science, totally uncalled for, totally unnecessary, had those no occurred.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman is making an excellent point. That what we are talking about is by trying to compact the day into just a

few hours so it is convenient for jetsetters, or fat cats, so they don't have to be kept waiting and whatever is wrong. You do your business first and then you do the other thing. We understand that.

If people say, ''Well, we don't want to work late that night,'' that may be one thing. But 3:30 in the afternoon is not really late. I think that most people would be very surprised by that. But I think basically what Members want to know is what are the rules around here? How many times can we have votes? How late are they going to be? Are we going to have to start choosing between where our vote is recorded? And it is not our vote. It is the vote of the people we represent. I think that is the thing we have to keep focusing on. People expect their voice to be heard here and Members are now being forced to choose between where they are going to cast their vote since we do not really quite know what the new rules are. I thank the gentleman for pointing this out.

I hope people vote ''no.'' I think we have got to get a little more in order here.

Mr. DOGGETT. I think there is no doubt about the outcome of this vote on my objection than any of the other votes that we have had this time. But I would commend to the majority leader the leadership of a member of the majority of the subcommittee on which I serve on the Committee on Science, the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], because we went through a subcommittee hearing on some of the same legislation being considered in the Committee on Science. It was without disruption, it was without ill feeling, even though we disagree on some of the substance as much as with any member of the full committee. That is the way that the committees and the subcommittees of this Congress need to be operated.

The people did not ask for us to come here and get engaged in some kind of partisan tussle. They simply wanted a full exchange of ideas where every Member is accorded the dignity of a vote, to represent their constituents.

I would ask the distinguished majority leader, whatever the outcome, perhaps the predetermined outcome of this vote, to simply work with us to see that this does not happen again, to see that Members are not forced to a choice between representing their constituents within a committee and representing them on the floor of the House. That is what all this is about, so that there can be informed representation, fair representation. We ask for no special privilege on the Democratic side, only the opportunity to represent our constituents and hopefully work toward a bipartisan answer to some of the problems that this country faces.

I know that there will be times when the crush of campaign duties may draw people away. But let that not be at the expense of the normal workday. There is no reason why this body cannot work until at least 5. There will be plenty of time to fly off in the corporate jets and deal with the contributors that I know are so vital to the Republican Party. They can do that and still conduct the people's business in a fair and proper way.

I think that yesterday democracy was trampled twice, once on the floor of this House, once in the Committee on Science. Let us see in today's action that in addition to revotes, that we actually have a commitment to reform.

When I came here in Congress for the first day in January of this year, I have to admit that I was not all that happy about finding myself in the minority. But I will also admit that I was quite happy to see Republican colleagues saying they were going to shake this place up. I think business as usual needed to be shaken up in this place. If I have any disagreement with them now, it is not that they shake too much but that they did not shake enough. When things like this happen, it suggests we are right back to business as usual.

It is not enough to say, ''Well, that's the way somebody else did it 10 or 20 years ago.'' These are supposed to be revolutionaries, committed to revolutionary change in this House. It is nothing but revolting to see what happened yesterday. We do need revolutionary change in this House, and I think that assuring that every Member gets to cast their vote fully and fairly in committee and on the floor of the Congress is absolutely vital to that reform.

If we can combine with that opportunity some affirmative and immediate action, if we could have as much of a rush to true campaign finance reform, as much of a rush to a gift ban and free trips and this kind of thing, to changing our rules to deal with that as there was a rush to justice yesterday to get to that fund-raiser up in Manhattan, we would begin to reform this system so that people had not only their full 100-percent right to vote on the floor of this House and in the Committee on Science but so that our citizens were dealt with fully and fairly, so that the ties that seem to bind too many Members of this body to the lobby, the gifts, the freebies, the free trips, so that those would be ended, as my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] has been trying to do with a true gift ban limitation in our rules but which we cannot get up for a vote on the floor of this House. Maybe we could have done that after 4:00 yesterday. Likewise, so that we could move forward as there appeared to be some bipartisan support for moving forward earlier in the week but it seems to have vanished away, to do something about campaign finance reform.

That gets to the heart of real reform, to genuinely shaking this body up and giving the American people the kind of reform that they need to have a Congress that is responsible first and foremost to the people that are struggling to climb up that economic ladder instead of tilting all of the benefit to those who are sitting comfortably on top. That is what this is about.

I object and ask for a ''no'' vote on this attempt of the Committee on Science to continue to operate under the same old procedures. I ask that we assure democracy and fair play for our constituents as well as our Members and hopefully put some genuine meaning in the term ''reform.''

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have just a few more comments before I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks. I am sure we would all agree they were very entertaining.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has clearly demonstrated, I think, to the satisfaction of this entire body that he does moral outrage very well. But I must admit, he is far more entertaining when he does wide-eyed innocence, and I should hope that I will not have to experience the performance again in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

This is a 17-minute vote.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 187, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

YEAS—232

Allard	Callahan	Duncan
Archer	Calvert	Dunn
Armey	Camp	Ehlers
Bachus	Canady	Ehrlich
Baker (CA)	Castle	Emerson
Baker (LA)	Chabot	English
Ballenger	Chambliss	Ensign
Barr	Chenoweth	Everett
Barrett (NE)	Christensen	Ewing
Bartlett	Chrysler	Fawell
Barton	Clinger	Fields (TX)
Bass	Coble	Flanagan
Bateman	Coburn	Foley
Bereuter	Collins (GA)	Forbes
Bilbray	Combest	Fowler
Bilirakis	Cooley	Fox
Bliley	Cox	Franks (CT)
Blute	Crane	Franks (NJ)
Boehlert	Crapo	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Cremeans	Frisa
Bonilla	Cubin	Funderburk
Bono	Cunningham	Gallegly
Brownback	Davis	Ganske
Bryant (TN)	Deal	Gekas
Bunn	DeLay	Gilchrest
Bunning	Diaz-Balart	Gillmor
Burr	Dickey	Gilman
Burton	Doolittle	Goodlatte
Buyer	Dreier	Goodling

Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—187

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman
Browder
Chapman
Dornan
Harman
Kennedy (MA)
Laughlin
Moakley
Mollohan
Schiff
Schumer
Serrano
Torres
Waters
White

☐ 1214

Mr. METCALF changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to House Resolution 169 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1854.

☐ 1217

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 21, 1995, amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 104–146 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] had been disposed of.

DE NOVO VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA, AS AMENDED

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the Chair will now put the question de novo.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], as amended.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] be allowed to speak out of order for 2 minutes in order to underscore and explain the amendment that is about to be voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will only consent to this request if we are given equal time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACKARD. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I would amend my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request now is that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] will be given 2 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be given 2 minutes.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] will be recognized for 2 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 2 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, rather than exercising my right to speak for 2 minutes, maybe I can handle this through a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Am I right that this is a revote on the Fazio amendment, amended by me yesterday?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOUGHTON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

I would reserve the balance of my time if the gentleman has yielded it to me.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to close on this, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, under what authority would the gentleman have the right to close on a unanimous-consent request that was divided?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] is the manager of the bill.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. But this is not on the bill. Under what authority would he have the right to close? This is a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. This is additional controlled debate, permitted by unanimous consent, on an amendment to the bill.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I know we have had a lot of discussion this morning about Members

who are aggrieved by the circumstances that occurred when this was last voted yesterday, and I certainly relate to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] and their concerns, but I think there is another individual Member who has been aggrieved as well, and I think that is the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] worked very hard to bring to the floor a compromise amendment which allowed for a reduction in OTA of some $7 million, and yet under the aegis of the Library of Congress, kept this very important scientific advisory entity in existence. He worked his side of the aisle, and he found a majority; he found it once, and I believe he found it twice.

He brings the perspective of perhaps the most successful businessman in this institution to this issue. He has made clear that he believes cutting our research and evaluation capability is not the way to downsize an institution, even the Congress of the United States.

I hope when all Members choose their decision to vote now for the third time on this issue, they will affirm his position, they will vote to support his perspective and, I think, as well, will vote to confirm the fact that when you work the system right here in the Congress, no one, majority or minority, should be able to deprive you of having your day in court, the court of public opinion here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I ask for an ''aye'' vote on the Houghton-Fazio amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that will preserve OTA but transfer it to the Library of Congress.

The committee, in their bill, wants to allow the functions of OTA to be done at the Library of Congress or at other agencies that do scientific studies and reports that duplicate what now the OTA does, but the bill eliminates OTA.

This amendment will preserve OTA, but transfer it to the Library of Congress. We think that if we are going to streamline, downsize, and consolidate duplicating services, the committee bill already does that.

I must mention that the Speaker very strongly does not support this amendment and very strongly does not support gutting the Library of Congress. This amendment will take $16.5 million out of the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress would have to discontinue many of its functions in terms of its basic and core functions, in terms of cataloging. It would prevent a full quarter of the cataloging necessary for its new holdings, and it would also take away some of the services to the public. It would cut the preservation program by 15 to 20 percent.

It would also cut the infrastructure support, the automation program, personnel, and procurement processes. It would deeply hurt the Library of Congress.

I urge the Members to vote against this amendment and to defeat the amendment to preserve the OTA, and to support the Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Chair will now put the question de novo.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that he was in doubt.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 204, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

AYES—220

Abercrombie
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Cardin
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Heineman
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—204

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Packard
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman
Chapman
Harman
Laughlin
Moakley
Parker
Schumer
Serrano
Solomon
Torres

☐ 1241

Mr. SMITH of Texas changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably absent during rollcall 410

to restore funds to the Office of Technology Assessment. Had I been present I would have voted ''aye.''

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 104–146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLINGER

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLINGER: Page 20, after line 10, insert the following:

In addition, for salaries and expenses of the Congressional Budget Office necessary to carry out the provisions of title I of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1965 (Pub. L. 104–4), as authorized by section 109 of such Act, $1,100,000.

Page 26, beginning on line 12, strike ''operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library;''.

Page 26, line 19, after the first dollar figure, insert the following: ''(less $1,165,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the amendment and would request the allocation of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I say that anybody who supported the unfunded mandates legislation which we passed earlier this year and which passed by an overwhelming vote, 390 Members in favor of that legislation, should indeed support this amendment. As I said at the time we debated the unfunded mandates legislation, this could be an effective way to reorder the Federal, State, and local relationship. It could also be an effective way to relieve the burdens which we imposed on State and local governments, but only if we were able to implement the law properly, and the CBO plays a vital role in the implementation of the unfunded mandates legislation. CBO must do the estimating as to whether or not the threshold of $50 million nationwide impact is reached or not. If it is not reached, then there is not a point of order lies. If it is reached, then a point of order does lie. The whole credibility of the unfunded mandates legislation would be called into question if those estimates are not accurate. If, in fact, they can be challenged or questioned or found to be somehow ineffective, then I think we lose the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

What we have done is provide an offset of $1,100,000. That is not really sufficient to do the job CBO is charged to do under this legislation, but it will give them a good start on accomplishing that. We offset it from the Folklife Center in the Library of Congress. This is a program that is not authorized, it was not reauthorized. It is a program that receives a large amount of private sector funding, and we would encourage that to continue. It is also a program that frankly should go into the private sector for funding.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my concern is about the Folklife Center, which I know through personal experience to be a most useful entity and function of the Library of Congress. I visited with Chairman CLINGER and Chairman PACKARD about this issue, and they have assured me, and I would like to engage the gentleman from California in a brief colloquy, that this function will not be decimated, that it will simply be rearranged. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I think the American Folklife Center is important and ought to be retained. I cannot assure the gentleman from Missouri that it will be retained, because that will be a function of trying to work out this cut to the library appropriation. But certainly I would work toward that end.

Mr EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. I know his commitment to the Folklife Center, and would like, as the process moves forward, to continue to work with him, and also in the authorization process, to ensure that this most vital function is indeed retained.

I thank the gentleman for his generosity in yielding.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], a very valued member of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, why are we cutting the American Folklife Center? It is a great program, but I think the money can be raised from the private sector. It does not have to come from the governmental sector. More importantly, this money was deauthorized and is not authorized. This money is appropriated but does not have the proper authorization at this point.

Why reprogram dollars to the Congressional Budget Office? I think the answer is very simple. Without this amendment, the unfunded mandates legislation that we passed in a bipartisan manner, both Houses of Congress, signed by the President, will have no teeth, because the CBO, who does the estimating on the costs of each mandate so that we will know what they will cost States and localities and the private sector, will not be able to do it. It will be gutted completely.

Let us not undo the unfunded mandates reform that a bipartisan Congress and the President passed this spring and the President signed into law. Without this amendment, that is exactly what we are doing. So I rise in support of the Clinger amendment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I simply want to say at this point I am in a difficult position. I have been urging the chairman of this committee to provide additional funding to CBO. I do think they are going to need at least $2.5 million to take on their new responsibilities. The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. DAVIS, I think just outlined, as Chairman CLINGER has, the responsibility that we have to give CBO the resources to do what we have just asked them to do in the first 100 days of this Congress.

But I do not want to do it on the back of the Folklife Center. The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the House Committee on Oversight, tells us that they will take up the authorization of this entity in due time. But if this amendment is adopted, there is obviously insufficient support for it, and therefore he may not even take up the authorization.

I think people who believe that the Folklife Center has value, as I do, ought to vote against this amendment, and we ought to find additional 602(b) allocations to this subcommittee to help CBO when we get to conference. This is obviously a conferrable item with the Senate, a joint item we will both have to consider.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Members of the House who do not know what the American Folklife Center is, I did not either, until I came on the House a couple years ago and we had an authorization bill under suspension, and I was told at the door that this was Lawrence Welk's homestead all over again. So like a hoard of other people, I voted no, only to get back to my office and have a phone call from a constituent, who happened to be chairman of the board of the American Folklife Center.

I learned out in a hurry what it was all about. I want to say now I am a believer. I have seen it. There are about 12 full-time equivalents there. Last year they served the needs of 9,000 researchers, a wonderful repository of American folklife and folklore.

One small example of what they do: Years ago, wax cylinders were made recording Indian chiefs and Indians of western tribes, recollections of their

tribe, native music and things of this kind. These were languishing somewhere in the Library of Congress. This organization brought them forth, perfected them, made them into digitized CD–ROM's, and now we have that resource preserved. We need some organization that is committed to this. For $1.25 million, surely we can continue this kind of enterprise.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds merely to say last year the American Folklife Center raised $330,000 in private funding. It obviously does attract a great deal of private support. The other point I would make is that under our amendment, we do in no way limit the Library of Congress in the ability to apply funds to that purpose, if they so choose.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I will take a short time just to say I am not going to actively oppose this amendment, but I do have some concerns about continually raiding the Library of Congress. The last amendment that passed was $16.5 million. This is another $1.165 million. That does give me some concerns. I hope we can find a way to protect and preserve the American Folklife Center.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the motives of the gentleman. He has to find money for the unfunded mandates. But clearly the American Folklife Center is not the place to cut, and would be a devastating cut. What we are basically doing is hurting the culture, the diverse culture, of this country.

This Library of Congress Folklife Center has 1.5 million manuscripts, sound recordings, photographs, films, and periodicals. It is unique in the world. It reveals our history through collections of conservations, arts, crafts, songs, traditions of everyday Americans, our cowboy history, our native American history, our Mexican-American history.

I have had many constituents call with great concerns about what this cut would do. This is not the right thing to do. We should not go after this center that is good, that is well-managed, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the Clinger amendment because I believe there is nothing more sacred to the people of this country than our rich, diverse culture.

The American Folklife Center housed in the Library of Congress maintains 1.5 million manuscripts, sound recordings, photographs, films, and periodicals. It is unique in the world. It reveals our history through collections of conversations, arts, crafts, songs, and traditions of everyday Americans.

My State of New Mexico has a particularly diverse history. Ranchers rose every day of their lives to herd cattle and sing songs around the campfire during cattle drives and the Folklife Center provides the only recordings and conversations we have of this folk cultures.

Mexican-Americans in New Mexico settled this country long before Columbus landed on Plymouth Rock. Their rich contributions to our culture should be and are chronicled in the John Donald Robb collection of Spanish-American folksongs and similar artifacts.

New Mexico is also blessed with a rich Native American culture. The American Folklife Center documents that culture with early recordings of Zuni songs and folklore, which date back to 1890. There are also recordings from the eight Pueblos in northern New Mexico, and materials from the Mascalero and Chiricahua Apache peoples.

As a nation, we have done more to destroy native American culture than to preserve it; recent appropriation bills would kill all funding for the National Museum of American Indian that would have been built here in Washington. Let's do the right thing and preserve the American Folklife Center collection of native American culture.

The American Folklife Center brings history to life like no other museum we have. It keeps pieces of our history alive for future generations to understand. When our children want to know what songs their relatives sang, or what native American language sounded like 100 years ago, the Folklife Center can provide that information.

The center has been part of the Library of Congress since 1928—it survived the Depression and post-World War II downsizing, surely we can preserve it now.

It is internationally renowned and heavily used. It's the sort of education that we must continue to cherish and fund.

The center's budget includes not just programs but collections. Its Archive of Folk Culture contains nearly 1.5 million sound recordings, photographs, manuscripts, and other unique materials representing American and (to a smaller extent) world folk music, folklore, and folklife traditions.

The Archive has been part of the Library since 1928, surviving the 1930's, the post-WWII downsizing, and other vicissitudes. It is internationally renowned and heavily used. Users include researchers, publishing and record companies from the private sector, and members of the communities documented in the collections. Its American Indian holdings alone are unparalleled in the world; its African-American holdings are unequalled. Every State, every region, and nearly every ethnic group are likewise represented.

The collections-based portion of the center's budget amounts to approximately three-fourths of the total budget; the other one-fourth covers programs and general operations overhead.

The center in 1994 raised or leveraged funds amounting to about $350,000, or one-third again the appropriated budget. Fund-raising will continue to increase. But fund-raising for the basic collections support is difficult if not impossible. That base of public support, for the center and the Library as a whole, is what the public as well as donors expect the Congress to fund.

Some supporters of the idea of removing the center's budget cite the Western Folklife Center in Elko, NV, as an example of a folklife center succeeding on private funding. This is not true, as the artistic director of the Western Folklife Center, Hal Cannon, testifies. First, that center has benefited greatly from tax-based support—Federal, State, and local. Second, the Western Folklife Center does not have the responsibility for a unique and heavily used national archive of 1.5 million items; the personnel to support such a collection adequately—acquisitions, processing, preservation, reference services—cannot be maintained by raising private funds.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], a very valuable member of the committee, a supporter of this legislation, and a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, in March the President signed the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act into law. We all debated that issue on the floor, and we are all well aware we needed to take action that would require us under the new law to come up with money to pay for the studies that CBO had to do.

That is basically what we are doing here today, is meeting our obligation to come up with some money. It is probably not enough money. We will have to do this again. It is unfortunate we have to take the money from the American Folklife Center. I understand that and am sympathetic to this. Somebody needs to speak on behalf of local government, county government, and State government on this issue. We have to do an assessment of the mandates so that we can get an actual cost. That is basically what we are doing today. We are doing it for local and State governments, and we need to be supportive of that amendment.

In addition to that, it has been mentioned, and I will reiterate for the Members on our side, this is an activity that has the support of the private citizens, and they can raise the money and it is a way for us to go. I am just saying we can move to the private sector and we can raise some money to help this American Folklife Center, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] mentioned that we might be able to conference this and work out another solution. If we can do that, that is great.

But we have to fulfill our commitment on the unfunded mandate. The President signed the law. We in Congress need to come up with this component to make it happen. So ask all Members to vote in support of the amendment.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN], an architect of the unfunded mandates legislation and a strong supporter of this amendment.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief, by necessity. Let me say I think the Folklife Center can get a lot more in private funding. They did raise $330,000 in 1994, three times what they raised in 1990. The one in the western region does it entirely by private funds. I think that offset can be handled.

If you voted for the unfunded mandate bill, you should vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate the importance of the Folklife Center. I think we all understand we ought to fulfill our responsibility to CBO to allow them to do the workload we have just given them, and I am certainly hopeful we will do that in conference. But I would not want Members to vote for this amendment, because if they do, they will end up doing in the Folklife Center at a time when it may be impossible to resurrect it and bring it back as an authorized entity.

The American Folklife Center has been an integral part of the Library of Congress since 1977, but really 1928 as the archives of folk culture. Its budget includes not just programs, but collections; 1.5 million sound recordings, photographs, manuscripts, films, videos, periodicals, and other unique materials representing American and to some smaller degree world folk music, folk lore and folk life traditions.

This is something we ought not to be doing in for $1.5 million. This is an entity that ought to be preserved. They will be raising more and more private fund sector funds, as the library in general is, but if we do them in, they will not be in a position to do that. I urge Members defeat this amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I understand that we will be delaying votes until the end. Does the rule call for this vote to be a 15-minute vote?

The CHAIRMAN. This vote will be a 15-minute vote. Amendments 8 through 11 will then be debated and the votes held until the end.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 159, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

AYES—260

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Borski
Brewster
Brown (CA)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Everett
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Volkmer
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—159

Abercrombie
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonilla
Bonior
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Callahan
Cardin
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gordon
Graham
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCrery
McDermott
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pomeroy
Rahall
Rangel
Reynolds
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Studds
Stupak
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Torricelli
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman
Browder
Chapman
Ford
Johnson (CT)
Laughlin
Lazio
Moakley
Parker
Pelosi
Richardson
Schumer
Serrano
Stokes
Torres

□ 1314

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Lazio of New York for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Messrs. BISHOP, EWING, POMEROY, and EDWARDS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, PORTER, and LIGHTFOOT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 104–146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ORTON

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ORTON: Page 25, strike lines 14 through 20. Page 32, line 16, strike ''$16,312,000'' and insert ''$23,312,000''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I seek the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair will repeat, the request for recorded votes on the next four amendments will be postponed until completion of amendment No. 11, pursuant to House Resolution 169.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

(Mr. ORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes and 45 seconds.

Before beginning, Mr. Chairman, since the House continues to waive its own rules prohibiting committees from meeting in voting session at the same time we are in voting session on the floor, I am currently missing recorded votes in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services on a bill of which I am a cosponsor, to be here to present this amendment on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is deficit neutral. It is also simple. It shifts $7 million of increased spending on the Botanic Garden to restore $7 million of cuts in the Federal depository library program. Since 1985 the Federal depository library program has been a partnership between the Federal Government and 1,400 libraries around the Nation to provide the public with local access to Government information and documents.

There is widespread use of these libraries, Mr. Chairman. One hundred sixty-seven thousand Americans per week utilize these collections. The legislation before us would cut 50 percent of funding from these libraries. Overall, this bill cuts only 8 percent of legislative branch appropriations, and actually increases spending on the Botanic Garden by over 200 percent.

The Botanic Garden in the 1995 appropriation was $3 million. In 1996 it is $10 million. The $7 million increase is the first of a 3-year $21 million appropriation for construction on the Botanic Garden. The future of the garden is uncertain. It is listed for transfer from the Congress to the Department of Agriculture. The House is also considering proposals to privatize or move the garden.

Cutting spending is tough business. In doing so, we must set priorities. In this Member's opinion, funding 14,000 libraries is a higher priority than constructing improvements on a building with a very uncertain future. Even the Architect of the Capitol, in testifying before the committee, stated the construction improvements would be of low priority, and the Botanic Garden would be subject to consideration for privatization.

Mr. Chairman, I will refer to two letters which will be included, urging support for my amendment. One is from the American Library Association, and the other is a letter from both the American Association of Law Libraries and the Association of Research Libraries.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a sensible, deficit-neutral approach that will restore $7 million in critical funding to the Federal Depository Library Program—a true hallmark of our democratic society.

Since 1895, this community-based partnership between the public and private sectors has provided unfettered public access to Government information—access that is vital to effective citizen participation in the democratic process. The Federal Depository Library Program is a partnership between 1,400 designated depository libraries and the Federal Government—the sole purpose of which is to disseminate Government information to the public, free of charge.

To give you an idea of the widespread use of the services provided by this program, the Public Printer testified earlier this year that more than 167,000 persons utilize Federal Depository library collections nationwide each week.

The GPO's 1996 request for the Depository Library Program was $2 million less than the funding level for the previous year. The Public Printer testified that this request was sufficient to maintain program responsibilities, while also managing the transition to the appropriate use of electronic media.

But, now these facilities are being asked to accommodate a 50 percent increase in electronically formatted copies, while taking a 50 percent cut in their funding source. While overall, the fiscal year 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill only represents an 8 percent cut from last year's funding level.

The purpose of the committee's 50 percent reduction in funding is to hasten the transition to electronic publishing, by requiring that executive branch agencies reimburse the GPO for the costs of producing and distributing paper and microfiche documents to depository libraries. The reduction in funding is a disincentive for Government agencies to participate in the Federal Depository Library Program.

This will result in a drastic reduction in the number of printed documents produced by the agencies, and will ultimately hinder free public access to Government information. Also, these deep cuts will result in new costs to depository libraries, as more time and effort will have to be expended to locate and acquire Government agency information products.

The president of the American Library Association testified earlier in the year that additional equipment and support would have to be provided to the depository libraries in order to implement the overly aggressive electronic program proposed in this legislation. Furthermore, some of the smaller, rural, public libraries don't have the necessary resources or the technology that the larger, research libraries have.

But, the GPO and the depository libraries recognize the increasing need to move to an effective, electronically-based program, and they are making great strides in new technology. The GPO Access System was created to provide no-fee, online dissemination—via the Internet—of such publications as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Federal Register. Now, the public has free access to this service, either through on-site equipment at depository libraries or through off-site electronic gateways established in cooperation with the libraries.

As important as this transition to electronic dissemination of information is, one must realize that not all Government information can be distributed electronically. Since the informational needs of each community are different, it is important to maintain a variety of formats—including print and microfiche.

The distribution of electronic copies has been steadily increasing, with about 454,000 copies projected for fiscal year 1996—a 50-percent increase over fiscal year 1995.

If we are to expect our Federal depository libraries to provide free, convenient access to Government information, we must allow for a more sufficient period of transition to an electronically-based program.

My amendment restores $7 million to this vital program, asking our depository libraries to take a more reasonable cut of 22 percent from the GPO's request.

I would now like to discuss the source of this critical funding.

The fiscal year 1995 appropriation for the Botanic Garden was $3.23 million. This legislation provides an appropriation of $10.053 million for fiscal year 1996; that represents a 200-percent increase at a time when other agencies and operations are being asked to take their share of cuts.

The $7 million increase over last year has been provided for a renovation of the Botanic Garden's conservatory. This is one of three, annual $7 million expenditures to carry out this renovation. It would be nice to find the funding for this renovation, but we must set priorities for our limited resources.

During hearings before the legislative branch appropriations subcommittee, the question was raised as to whether this renovation expenditure should be reconsidered in light of suggestions to privatize the Botanic Garden. Questions were also raised as to the primary function of the Botanic Garden.

The Architect of the Capitol agreed that the Botanic Garden's function is limited, and that the only reason for housing the facility in its current place is for historical reasons.

One of the members of the subcommittee suggested that the Botanic Garden might be able to serve its function better if it were privately funded. It was also suggested that services could be obtained from local landscape and nursery contractors.

Finally, the Architect was asked the following question: ''If the committee asked the Architect's office to reduce their budget by 10, 15, 20, or 25 percent for the next budget year, would this (Botanic Garden) be a low-priority item that you would recommend spinning off to privatize?''

The Architect's response: ''It would.''

One must ask the question: Should we be spending valuable resources on renovating a facility whose ultimate fate has not been determined?

We are faced here with a question of priorities—increased funding for a limited facility in Washington, DC, or a much needed investment in the 1,400 depository libraries throughout the country.

Let us ease the transition of our depository libraries to electronic dissemination of information, and assist these facilities in carrying out their primary objective—which is to provide vital Government information to the public.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the information I referred to.

The information referred to is as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF LAW LIBRARIES,
Washington, DC, June 20, 1995.

Hon. WILLIAM ORTON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ORTON: On behalf of the American Association of Law Libraries and the Association of Research Libraries, we would like to express our gratitude to you for offering an amendment to H.R. 1854 to restore $7 million to the Government Printing Office's Salaries and Expenses (S&E) appropriations. As you know, this

fund supports the Depository Library Program which provides government information in all formats to over 1,400 Congressionally designated depository libraries.

We are very concerned that the proposed fifty percent reduction in funding for S&E, shifting the cost burden to agencies as an unfunded mandate, will drastically reduce the number of documents disseminated to the American public through depository libraries. Further, we believe that the need for a well-studied transition period Must be recognized as the government converts to an effective electronically-based environment.

Thank you again for offering this amendment to restore funding for the Depository Library Program. We are very appreciative of your efforts and grateful for your support.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. OAKLEY,
Washington Affairs Representative.
PRUDENCE S. ADLER,
Association of Research Libraries, Assistant Executive Director.

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 20, 1995.

Hon. WILLIAM ORTON,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ORTON: On behalf of the American Library Association, I write to tell you of our support for your amendment to restore $7,000,000 to the Superintendent of Documents Salaries and Expenses Appropriation as the House of Representatives considers H.R. 1854, the Legislative Branch Appropriations for FY96. The House Appropriations Committee cut this appropriation by 50 percent from the FY95 funding level, a cut far in excess of the overall 8 percent reduction in the bill for the Legislative Branch. Additionally, H.R. 1854 amends the statute governing the Depository Library Program, a procedure not appropriate on an appropriations bill.

The SuDocs Salaries and Expenses appropriation funds the Depository Library Program which provides government publications in print, microfiche and electronic formats to constituents through the nearly 1,400 Congressionally designated depository libraries. This drastic cut does not provide for the orderly transition that the government must follow to assure that its statutory requirements are fulfilled to disseminate government information to the public under Title 44, United States Code.

While intended to encourage agencies to publish electronically, this slash in the appropriation will more likely result in a great reduction in the number of printed documents made available to the public. Agencies have not budgeted in FY96 for depository copies. Agencies may well shirk their responsibilities to disseminate agency information and the number of fugitive documents—those that escape the program—may increase enormously.

Additionally, the deep cuts in appropriations for the Depository Library Program will result in an unfunded mandate for the state and local governments that support depositories, and result in additional costs to participating libraries as more time and effort will be invested to locate and acquire publications. Many libraries will not have the money to buy the equipment and paper needed to provide on-demand print service to the public.

A 1992 survey of depository libraries confirmed that participating libraries make significant contributions in personnel, equipment, facilities, and resources (including resources beyond those provided by the Government Printing Office) to carry out their part of the partnership with the government to ensure that the American people have equitable and ready access to federal information.

The likely result of the change in funding and the shift to an electronic Depository Library Program is a loss of information to the American public as the government undergoes a transition from a print-based to an electronic environment. In 1994, GPO acquired, cataloged, and distributed approximately 21 million copies of 65,000 documents to depository libraries for about $1 a copy. Of these titles, only 306 were in electronic format.

In addition, the GPO Access System now provides 24-hour no-fee public access through depository libraries and gateways to the Congressional Record, Federal Register, text of all published versions of bills introduced in Congress, the History of Bills, the U.S. Code, and Public Laws of the 104th Congress. GPO plans a gateway in every state. But that development is in jeopardy because Congress required GPO Access to be funded by cost savings from the GPO's distribution of publications. With the reduction you are being asked to vote on today, GPO will no longer be able to support and expand the resources of GPO Access.

The American Library Association is also very concerned about the Appropriations Committee's decision to publish only on CD–ROM the Serial Set and the bound Congressional Record. Everyone does not have access yet to a computer for their information needs. The elimination of the print format of these very important titles will create information have-nots. Further, these two publications are at the core of Congressional information and serve as the official record of the daily activities of Congress. The longevity and durability of the CD–ROM format remain untested. In addition, the paper format has always served as the permanent and official record.

Congress should hold hearings and study the cost effectiveness and impact of these policy changes on public access to government information.

The American Library Association deeply appreciates your willingness to offer an amendment to restore funds to the appropriations for the Depository Library Program. ALA is a nonprofit educational organization of 57,000 librarians, library trustees, and friends of libraries.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR CURLEY,
President, American Library Association.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let us make it clear to the Members of the House, we are not going to cut in this bill our commitment to the depository libraries. What we are doing in this bill is requesting that the agencies of Government, including the administration agencies in the executive branch, as they provide documents printing for depository libraries, they will have to pay for their own print on paper rather than having the GPO pay for it out of their own funds. Therefore, the work will still be done. It is just that we are transferring the costs to those that require the printing to be done.

In reference to the conservatory, this is a historic building. We all see it. It is the glass building right here close to Capitol Hill. It is falling apart. We simply have to preserve and protect it, as well as to repair it, or else it will simply not be able to be visited by people who want to visit the exhibits, because of safety reasons.

We have worked out a program where we have cut them back in their request for construction money from $28 million to $21 million. If we take this $7 million away, then we may lose the private funds that are being raised and contributed for the purpose of the National Garden, but we also undercut the entire process of renovation. We think that would be a very sad mistake.

Mr. Chairman, it is only right that the agencies that request the printing to be done pay for their own requests. That is all our bill does. This would frustrate that process. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Owens].

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Orton amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot promote the general welfare unless the citizens are informed. Our people cannot fruitfully engage in the pursuit of happiness in this complicated information age unless they are informed. For the past 100 years Congress has paid for Government publications to be sent to depository libraries located in each of our districts across the country. The depository library program ensures that ordinary citizens can have access to Government information, but H.R. 1854 reverses 100 years of precedent by having executive branch agencies reimburse the Government Printing Office for their publications. I assure the Members, no executive branch agency will have it as a priority. They will not do it.

H.R. 1854 also mandates a massive shift from print to electronic dissemination of information. However, in promoting a ''cyber government'', the bill ignores the fact that we cannot electronically reach most of our constituents through these libraries. They are not wired. They do not have the ability to receive electronic information.

Mr. Chairman, information must be produced not only in electronic formats, but also in traditional print formats, in order to accommodate the wide range of the majority of our people's needs and abilities. Many citizens are not yet ready to use Government information in an electronic format. Most libraries do not have the capacity to receive it that way.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1854 also eliminates the availability of free copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that we send to our public schools, hospitals, and nonprofit libraries, not to mention free copies of bills, reports, and other documents that we supply. These proposed changes do not take us anywhere. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the bill number is H.R. 1854. The concept driving this amendment is truly circa 1854. No one is talking about cutting off depository libraries from getting information. In fact, we want to promote it. What we do not want to encourage is a central paper printing process which then produces a bulk paper product, which is then shipped across country, and then made available at a depository library. That is what we are trying to change.

More than 90 percent of the libraries transmit, send, and receive electronic data today. What we are trying to do is tell the executive branch agencies we are not going to fund them. I have no quarrel with where the money comes from, the Botanic Garden, that is a secondary issue. It is up to those people to decide what they are going to do.

I object strenuously, that they are taking money from congressional sources and funding an executive branch agency when they do not want to spend the money themselves. We should not be forced to pay the money for the executive branch to pay for perpetuating an 1854 paper world. What we want to do is get up to speed in sending that same data electronically, and by CD ROM. If taxpayers want a hard copy at the depository library, the library will produce it there. Taxpayers do not pay for shipping wood, printed on wood, across country. That is what they did in the 19th century.

What we are trying to do is stop that. This amendment perpetuates it. It is wrong. It may be revenue neutral, but the concept is wrong. Unfortunately, I am going to ask Members to vote against the amendment of the gentleman from Utah.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] has 1¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has 1 minute remaining and the right to close.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman, I would say we do need to gear up the electronic highway, we do need to transmit information electronically. Hopefully, this will save us costs. However, the reality is costs and transition time to shift to an electronic-based program, while placing an additional burden on the libraries in the immediate future.

Demand for electronic copies is projected to increase by 50 percent in just 1 year. A 50-percent cut in funding right now will make it impossible to meet this demand.

Also, Mr. Chairman, the informational needs of each community are different. Not every community in America has an off ramp from the electronic highway. Not all Government information can be distributed electronically. It is critical to provide documents and Federal information by print, microfiche, and CD ROM. The result of a 50 percent budget cut would be significant reduction of services and elimination of some Federal depository libraries.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues postpone the $7 million capital construction to the building of uncertain future, and let us continue to fund the Federal depository libraries. I urge support for my amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the committee removed from the conservatory construction funds $7 million in this year 1995 rescission bill. We have already cut them back $7 million. To cut them back an additional $7 million would be simply gutting the renovation process.

Let me speak very briefly to the idea of access to the electronic equipment and information, Mr. Chairman. Virtually all, over 90 percent of the depository libraries, have access to electronic information through Internet and other electronic access equipment. To say that they cannot access it is simply not true. Furthermore, we ought to push them toward access. We ought to nudge them toward putting in the equipment that would give them access to electronic information and facilitate that process.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, if we move this process to the electronic age, we will save more than the $7 million that we are trying to save in paperwork that is now being printed. We will save it with the electronic age.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 104–146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 34, line 24, strike out ''3,900'' and insert in lieu thereof ''3,550''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the fine work the Committee on Appropriations has done to this point in trying to execute one of the key platforms of the Republican agenda, now that we have taken control of the House, and that is a trend toward prviatization.

This appropriations bill we have in front of us today does it when it comes to the beauty shop and barber shop here in the House, the elimination of the folding room, and we all hope the eventual sale of a powerplant that the U.S. Congress actually owns and operates.

I have to tell the Members that I think this amendment is far too timid when it comes to the matter of the Government Printing Office. Mr. Chairman, the Government Printing Office has 4,000 employees in it, which essentially serve at the will of Congress itself to print documents connected to our business here. I think we have to ask ourselves why it is in 1995 that we run a printing plant.

There are 115,000 private printers in the United States. Assuredly one of them is capable of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at much more reduced costs than what we presently pay the Government Printing Office on a regular basis. Since 1991 the GPO has lost money every year. For my colleagues here in 1994, they may remember the bizarre situation where GPO lost business and suddenly decided it had to raise rates in order to make up for the shortfall. What business in America, if they lose business, would suddenly increase their costs?

□ 1330

This amendment we have in front of us, Mr. Chairman, will reduce the Government Printing Office staffing levels. The Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations has already reduced it from 4,200 to 3,900. This amendment will reduce it by another 350 slots. In the long run, what we hope we will accomplish is a glide path to force the Government Printing Office to essentially become a procurement agency in the next several years and to close down the printing function altogether. In fact, the committee report itself directs the Public Printer to study the outsourcing of both security personnel and custodial care which account for 144 of the 350 positions that we are discussing today.

I think this amendment is absolutely crucial if we are going to be serious about privatization in this House.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman talks about a printing plant. I hope the gentleman has visited that plant. In point of fact, it is in the Internet, it is on the World Net. It, in fact, has the state of the art technology in terms of information transfer available to it. Individuals anywhere in this country can get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other Government documents in their home and can print it, presuming that they have the proper facilities, as we get it ourselves.

The fact of the matter is, in addition, 80 percent of the GPO's workload is contracted out right now to the private sector. The fact of the matter is there are certain things; namely the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other documents that we need inhouse for security reasons or other reasons.

The gentleman talks about a glide path. Approximately 5,000 employees 3 years ago, down to 4,104. This bill brings them down to 3,900. They are on a glide path, they are reinventing, they are downsizing.

This will cost 20 million additional dollars. The reason being, because it will require RIF's, 554 to be exact if they come down that fast, and there will be a tremendous cost, not a cost savings.

This is a bad amendment, it is not timely, and it will undermine the ability to get the information that this Congress needs in a timely fashion.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], who has been an absolute tireless champion on reform of the Government Printing Office and has been a mentor on this issue since I first got here in 1990.

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from Wisconsin.

As the ranking Republican Member on the House-Senate Joint Committee on Printing, I have been alarmed with the dramatic losses being incurred by the GPO. The gentleman from Maryland asked if anybody has been down to the GPO. I have, many, many times.

This year the GPO estimates its losses to be nearly $10 million. The Joint Committee has requested four different studies over the last several years to be conducted by the GAO, and Arthur Andersen, and the Public Printer's GPO 2000 study, to determine the cause and options to reduce these losses. This is $10 million.

I think it is far more sensitive to employees to really gradually try to reduce the work force, if we can, than at a future date to be forced to totally eliminate the entire agency.

The gentleman from Maryland has indicated that the argument that we are going to have RIF's here and it is going to cost money—that is false and shortsighted. We do not have to go to RIF's. The GPO can do it. It is not required to utilize RIF's. Even if the GPO chooses to do so, the amendment will still save taxpayers over $6 million.

We are talking about 350 positions. This has been a glidepath but, again, this agency has lost over $10 million. They are under orders from the Joint Committee to quit losing money, and it is not the fault of the employees. It is that the GPO is the victim of a technological revolution in regard to printing.

The gentleman's amendment is in good standing. It is the continued way to go to save money. We will await the studies and see if we can make further savings. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the Klug-Roberts amendment. The Government Printing Office has served our country for 100 years and they still have a vital role.

Just to clarify for the American people, to give them a sense of what this agency does on a daily basis, they produce 20,000 copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 32,000 copies of the Federal Register, 26,000 copies of Commerce Business Daily and process nearly 2,000 orders from the American people. All of this is being done despite a 50-percent decrease in staff since 1975.

I would submit that in fact the committee considered this issue very thoroughly. They made reductions to the tune of 200 positions that are being reduced. This amendment would add to that 350, and rest assured, you cannot do 550 positions without some additional cost. You cannot do it all through attrition. There will in fact be some cost as a result of RIF's.

But the final point I would like to make is this: They do it efficiently. They produce the overnight service, the 24-hour turnaround that is required to meet our needs. There is no plant, no facility on the east coast, in the mid-Atlantic area that has shown the capacity to deliver this work product in a timely, efficient, and most importantly consistent manner as the Government Printing Office.

I believe I would have to return to the old adage: ''If it ain't broke, don't fix it.''

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I assume I have the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], a member of the committee, has the right to close.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me respond to a couple of points, if I can, Mr. Chairman. First of all the argument that nobody on the east coast is capable of doing this work.

Somewhere in India or Bangkok today a reporter from the Wall Street Journal will file a story, it will be edited in New York, sent up on a satellite dish, and the Wall Street Journal will end up on my doorstep the next morning in Madison, WI. Assuredly somebody is capable on the east coast of publishing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD overnight.

In terms of the cost of RIF's, let's make it very clear on the arithmetic for everybody who is in this Chamber today. On the average it costs us $55,000 an employee at the Government Printing Office. The one-time cost if we have to end up paying those people a RIF is $25,000. That means at a minimum we save $30,000 a year on each single employee. It does not cost us money. It saves us $6 million.

In the long run if what we are interested in is attempting to save money and to move toward privatization, then it is clear we have got to be very aggressive on privatizing services in the Government Printing Office, and RIF'ing, and eliminating another 350 positions is exactly the way to do it.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], a former chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I would love to let the Wall Street Journal print the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if we could sell ads, but that is another day.

The point is clear: In my opinion, as for 4 years I was chairman of the House Administration Committee and either chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, the Government Printing Office is on a glide path as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] so well put. It will cost money. It will cost money if we have to reduce under this amendment as quickly as this amendment says we should.

I am in sympathy with the objects that the gentleman who authored this amendment had. But let me tell you a little story. The other night, the White House wanted something printed in color and they were a little afraid to work it through the Government Printing Office, so they went to Kinko's to get 30—however many copies they needed—Kinko's in Washington. Kinko's could not handle it as quickly as they wanted it, so they farmed it out all over town.

It wound up costing $30,000. It would have cost $5,000 if it had been procured, and that is what GPO basically is today, is a procurement shop. It would have been $5,000 if it had been procured through GPO, in color. It would have been $3,000 if it had been done in black and white. THe quick turnaround time necessary for printing the documents that we use in this institution is what keeps this work force alive and in necessary for us.

My colleagues, I beg you, let's don't speed up the glide path that the Government Printing Office is on now. You are going to pull a nose dive off that is

going to have a crash and is going to cost us a lot more than if the normal path that has already been set up for many years now is followed.

The Government Printing Office is basically a procurement shop. I do not want the Defense Department being able to go out and choose whatever printer it wants to print its business. I want the Government Printing Office to be competitively bidding those jobs out in the private sector as it has been for years. I hope that will continue. I respectfully ask my colleagues, please don't vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 104–146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHRISTENSEN

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHRISTENSEN: Page 49, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 312. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the salaries or expenses of any elevator operator in the House of Representatives office buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to seek the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

(Mr. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for Members of Congress to start pushing their own buttons. Yes, that grievous, arduous task of pushing your own elevator button. No, my amendment does not propose to eliminate elevators, nor does my amendment require the Members to take the steps from here out. All my amendment requires is that we begin pushing our own elevator button.

Last week a young woman who had been visiting my office commented to my staff that she was shocked to see that we still had elevator operators in the House office buildings. She remarked, ''I though you guys got rid of those the first week.''

Well, if we the Members of this body have heard that comment once, we have heard it too many times. My amendment very simply would eliminate funding for the 10 elevator operators in the House office buildings, not the Capitol, just the House office buildings.

Each and every day this body convenes in committees and task forces all over the Capitol to make tough choices about changing the way our Government does business. We were elected to change the way our Government does business because it is no longer acceptable to Americans for us to mortgage the future of our Nation and our children.

My amendment is not going to bring the deficit down a whole lot. It is not going to work on the debt, but it is going to save the taxpayers $263,000 this year in salary and benefits.

I understand some very well-intentioned Members may suggest that we should commission a study on this issue. A study. How anyone could suggest a study to examine how to eliminate 10 elevator operators and keep a straight face while saying it is beyond me. With a $5 trillion debt, the last thing we need is another study.

In our economy, when businesses are forced to downsize, it is the perks that go first: company cars, expense accounts, and corporate country club memberships, all cut back in the name of the bottom line. By what justification can any of us say that we must downsize Government but keep House elevator operators?

I will be the first to admit that many of the people who run the automatic elevators are good, decent people. However, we must remember that any time a company is forced to downsize, many kind and friendly people may lose their jobs as well.

It might be argued here today that the purpose of the operators is to assist Members in arriving at the floor in time for votes. But I submit that my amendment has no bearing whatsoever on the elevator operators in the Capitol Building. It only affects those in the House office buildings.

I also remind Members that there are already elevators set aside for Members only to use, the speed of which remains the same no matter who pushes the button.

In closing, I will again remind all assembled here that our Federal Government is broke. We are nearly $5 trillion in debt. At a time when we are asking Americans to tighten the belt and make do with less, surely this body can make do without elevator operators.

My colleagues, the time has come for us to begin pushing our own buttons.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend yielding, and I know he is into sacrifice.

Am I correct that the gentleman's office is on the first floor of the Longworth?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. The gentleman is correct. I am on 1020 Longworth.

Mr. HOYER. Am I correct that the gentleman does not need an elevator, therefore, because he is at street level? He just walks right out?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Reclaiming my time from my friend from Maryland, it is correct that I am on 1020 Longworth, but the issue is not whether I am on the first floor or the seventh floor or in Rayburn or in Cannon.

Mr. HOYER. You want to give it up for the rest of us.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. The issue is that it is time for us to push our own automatic elevator buttons.

Mr. HOYER. I understand.

□ 1345

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Virtually every Member that does work in the Longworth Building would not want to have the elevators made more inconvenient. There has never been a time on the floor of this House when the whole issue of being able to get here to vote on time is more graphic than it was yesterday and today.

And to even consider making it more difficult for our Members to meet the time frame of getting here to vote by virtue of eliminating elevator operators, that only operate for Members at least during the time that we have a vote call, this would not be the right time.

We have not asked for a study. We have simply asked the chief administrative officer of the entire House of Representatives, to review the process of elevators and elevator operators and give us a recommendation as to how it can be improved. That is not going to be a long study and expensive study. We expect that to come back to us. We will readdress this issue at the appropriate time in the future.

Mr. PACKARD. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I am very disappointed in the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN]. We have already cut the elevator operators from 150 a few years ago down to 22. The gentleman is not giving us any credit for that.

And I might say for the elevator operators, these are good people. They have families. They are working. And what are we doing in the U.S. Congress? I thought we were going to put our emphasis on finding ways to build self-esteem and self-worth. We cannot all be chiefs; we need a lot of Indians. And we all do different things to get the job done and accomplish the mission.

Let us give our elevator operators a break. I do not see the gentleman from Texas putting a cap on these people

making $10 million or more, yet we want to single out the elevator operators who give information, they give advice, they give directions, and they are trying to make a difference.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new issue. It is an issue that is easy to make fun of. The American public hears you have got push-button elevators. What do you need an operator for? Like all the elevators around the country, they are run by computers and the computers cannot tell, they are not as sophisticated as human beings still.

And human beings, as the chairman has pointed out, can make a difference, can make judgments, can make sure that people get up and down the 7 floors of the Longworth Building or the 6 floors or the 5 floors of the Cannon and Rayburn Buildings so that Members can get to the floor on time.

We have just had a substantial incident where a number of Members were late getting to the floor. We had a big confrontation about that and the Speaker told us, voting in a timely fashion is important. We want to limit it to 17 minutes. This facilitates that at a relatively small cost. Why? Because the computers cannot tell as well as human beings can how to accommodate the 15-minute voting patterns.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have, with all due respect, seen a lot of bonehead amendments in the years that I have been here, but this one ranks up at top.

The elevator operators on the House side work very hard. They are scared to death about this. They are scared to death about losing their jobs. And, frankly, we need them. Those of us who are in the Longworth Building, many times we run down the steps because the elevators are so difficult to get in that building. Without the elevator operators, we would probably miss half the votes.

So, I can think of nothing more that is so silly. The savings is next to nothing. All it is doing is making a lot of loyal government employees, who work hard and are not paid much, frightened to death and making it impossible for Members to vote in a timely fashion.

If there was ever a vote that did not make sense on the merits, this is it. It does not make sense from a monetary point of view. It saves us nothing. It does not make sense from an efficiency point of view.

I very, very strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to defeat this amendment. It may play great with the folks back home, saying we have cut out fat. This is not fat. This is necessary. I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. For any Member to suggest that they are going to miss votes because they cannot push their own button, but they need an elevator operator to push the button, is ludicrous. What is this country coming to when you cannot push your own automatic elevator button?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has 1 minute remaining and has the right to close.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge support of my amendment and I guess it would just be the fact that it is not about the families, because they are good people. They are very good people. But when you downsize, you have to make some cutbacks and some people have to find other work. So, I would urge support of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] is mistaken. This is not a tough vote at all. It is not tough to cut out jobs; to inconvenience the Members when we have only 17-minutes to get to a vote. It is a cheap-shot vote. It is a bad vote. It is not a tough vote.

The elevator operators here control the traffic and the flow of the crowd during the times of votes. It is very important that they do that. I would urge the Members to vote down this amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In writing this bill we have not approached it to save jobs, per se. We have tried to streamline and improve the operation of Government. And the time will come when we will reevaluate the operators after we have upgraded the elevators and made them work better for the Members. But for the time being, this is not the time to make it more difficult for the Members and to eliminate the elevator operators in this amendment. I urge a strong no vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 104–146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZIMMER

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. ZIMMER: Page 49, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 312. Any amount appropriated in this Act for ''HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Salaries and Expenses—Members' Representational Allowances'' shall be available only for fiscal year 1996. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for such fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury, to be used for deficit reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, together with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], I am proposing an amendment that addresses an issue that has caused great confusion, consternation, and rancor in this House.

Many of us have gone to great lengths not to spend the money that is available for our office expenses because we believe that frugality begins at home. We believe that we cannot credibly ask for major cuts in programs that affect our constituents unless we cut programs that affect us and reduce spending in our own offices.

I have saved more than $500,000 in my 4 years in Congress, and many of my colleagues have save more. But there has been persistent uncertainty about what happens to the money that we do not spend.

This amendment ends that uncertainty by explicitly dedicating the money we save to deficit reduction. Simply put, this amendment gives Members a real incentive to do the right thing.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak not so much in opposition as to explain the circumstances. In my opinion, this amendment simply does not do anything that is now not being done through the normal process.

There has been the mistaken idea, and I had that mistaken idea for many years when I first came here, and I think many of my colleagues had the

idea, that there was a slush fund out there that all the extra money that we did not spend in our official expense or our other office expense allowances, clerk hire and so forth, if there were surpluses at end of the year, that money would be turned back to the slush fund that the Speaker or somebody else in the House would control.

That is simply not true. The fact is that when I do not spend money out of my official accounts, it is never withdrawn from the Treasury. It is never spent from the Treasury.

Members need to know that what we do not spend, what is surplus at end of the fiscal year out of our official moneys, and that is for all three accounts, never comes out of the Treasury. That includes the mail account, that includes the official expense account, and that also includes the clerk hire account. What is not spent, there is nothing written out of the Treasury. So there is nothing to return to the Treasury as this amendment would request.

We cannot return to the Treasury money that has never been withdrawn from the Treasury. So in my judgment, this amendment has absolutely no meaning in terms of changing existing policy. It will still remain the same.

With that explanation, I oppose the amendment because I think it simply adds a layer of redundancy.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I am proud to join in cosponsoring the amendment with Mr. ZIMMER. I introduced this bill as H.R. 26 on the first day of Congress. It has 121 cosponsors, Democrats and Republicans. The idea has been endorsed by the National Taxpayers Union, the Citizens Against Government Waste, and the Concord Coalition, because it does address the deficit.

We should vote for this for two reasons, and I strongly disagree with the analysis of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD]. One is because we should lead on deficit reduction. We should take the first step. If American families are tightening their belts, Congress certainly can do the same thing. And voluntarily return money. I voluntarily returned $677,000 over the last 4 years.

Second, in response to the gentleman from California, [Mr. PACKARD], this is a truth-in-budgeting amendment. It is outrageous that somebody could say we need to appropriate less money in the appropriations process and count on the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], or the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], or the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER], or the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] to return money to pay for these other people spending more.

I thank the chairman and the sponsor of the amendment and join proudly in a bipartisan way to urge passage.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I, too, at one time introduced a bill to do exactly what the gentleman from Indiana has done, but I was wrong. I simply misunderstood the process, and I now know what the process is. The money never goes out of the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I too, do not rise in opposition or in support of this particular amendment. I would tell the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] he does not return money to the Treasury.

First of all, no money is appropriated for individual offices. There is no appropriation for the 21st District of California, for example. There is no appropriation for Members' offices. There is an appropriation to the House in support of our official duties.

Members draw down on that account. If they do not use all of the money, it means they did not draw down all of their call on that account. They do not return money to the Treasury. Having said that, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] knows that I have been working with our lawyers and others to try to figure out a way to make this happen. We are talking about even fundamentally changing the way in which we appropriate so that Members who do not draw down their account to the maximum amount available under law, can go back home and say: That amount I did not draw down is designated to go to deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is a positive. That is an incentive and it is probably a better goal than just going back into the Treasury to be churned for other expenditures.

□ 1400

So that is why I am not opposing this measure, but you have got to have an understanding, folks. Your concept of the way this place works in flat-out wrong.

What we need to do is to make sure that what you are talking about, in fact, becomes reality, and I pledge my support to continue to work on this.

And the reason I am not opposing the gentleman from New Jersey is because if, in fact, it is possible, within the context of this appropriations bill, to make some determinations without having to go to statute, at least, he says, it is to go to deficit reduction instead of the general treasury. That is a modest step forward, if we can make it happen.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

I join him in urging support of this amendment, as well as the gentleman from Indiana.

I agree with much of what the gentleman from California said. He is correct in that these funds are not office- or district-specific. However, the fact is if all of the offices collectively do not use the appropriated amount, these funds can be reprogrammed.

In the past, I would submit that that has occurred in this House, and what this amendment would do is it would change that procedure so those leftover funds are not reprogrammed.

In the beginning of this session, during the debate on the rules package, I came to the floor and requested that we have an independent audit of House operations to include an examination of where these funds go, because it has been blurred and made difficult for us to find this out.

So I would urge support of the amendment.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the sponsor of this amendment, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], and also the author of H.R. 26, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], for allowing me to speak on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Zimmer amendment.

As a new Member of Congress, I have discovered there are few clear choices when it comes to balancing the Federal budget. This amendment is a simple, commonsense proposition for Members of the House to claim they support this goal. Each year many Representatives have money left over in their office budgets. This money goes back to the general House fund for use on other projects.

The Zimmer amendment would require Representatives to apply all excess funds from their office budgets each year to the Federal debt. In essence, Members of Congress would be making their contribution to the ultimate goal of balancing the budget, a goal which many of us support.

I ask Members who came to Congress as a result of the 1994 elections to carefully consider this amendment. The American people sent us here to reduce the deficit and change the way Congress does its business. The Zimmer amendment accomplishes both goals.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, this is a familiar fight for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], and other people in my class because we actually began it back in 1990.

I understand the point of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], that it is certainly not the intention, his intention, nor the intention of his colleagues to turn around and reprogram money.

It seems to me if there is a question or if there is essentially some sense of indecision about whether or not this is binding, then we should clearly err on the side of deficit reduction. Let us remove any sense of temptation that presently exists for the Committee on Appropriations to reprogram any of this money. Let us settle it once and for all.

Like my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], I have worked very hard in my office to hold down expenses and have had the lingering suspicion over the least 4 years much of the money I saved somehow gets spent someplace else.

Let us say to the Members of Congress, if you are careful enough to hold down travel and careful enough to hold down salaries of your staff and careful enough to watch the kind of monies spent throughout your House operations, then at the very least all the incentives should be in place to save money rather than spend it.

I strongly support the Zimmer amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, and Members, I, too, join in the opposition to this amendment. I really think, after listening to the dialogue here, that the problem could be corrected by allowing Members to put out a press release saying that they returned money to the Treasury.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in my concluding remarks, I want to simply remind Members that we went to special efforts to give Members credit for not spending all of their funds. The report provides that there will be a letter that would indicate that they have not spent all of their funds; they can use it for whatever purpose that they wish.

Any amount left in the appropriations account, in this account, remains in the treasury. It is never spent out of the treasury and thus it is available for deficit reduction.

The absolute intent of this amendment is being realized in the existing process.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 8, offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON]; amendment No. 9, offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG]; amendment No. 10, offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN]; and amendment No. 11, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ORTON

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] a recorded vote on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. Those in support of the demand for a recorded vote will rise and be counted. The Chair will count all Members standing in support of the request for a recorded vote.

This is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, can the Chair advise us as to how the vote turned out on the voice vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair said in the reading of the announcement that the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has not yet been ordered.

The pending business before the committee is a request for a recorded vote.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I understand this is not necessarily a parliamentary inquiry. Was it the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON]?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

EXPRESSING CONCERN ON VOTING PROCEDURE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. The concern I have, I would say to the acting ranking member and the chairman, is that if one of our colleagues requested a vote and expected that vote to occur and is now off the floor, I think it would be somewhat unfair of us not to—here is the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. I know my colleagues were glad to hear from me.

The CHAIRMAN. Any Member may make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote on my amendment. Pending that, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count for a quorum.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the point of order and demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 104, noes 321, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

AYES—104

Abercrombie
Andrews
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bishop
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Cardin
Clyburn
Condit
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Doyle
Duncan
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Furse
Geren
Gordon
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Mascara
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Mfume
Minge
Montgomery
Nadler
Oberstar
Orton
Owens
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Rahall
Reed
Richardson
Rose
Sabo
Sawyer
Schroeder
Shays
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Stenholm
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thornton
Thurman
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waldholtz
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weller
Williams
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—321

Allard
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake

Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—9

Ackerman
Clayton
Laughlin
Moakley
Parker
Scarborough
Schumer
Serrano
Torres

☐ 1430

Mr. WISE and Mr. MARTINEZ changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. PAYNE of Virginia, BAESLER, FARR, NADLER, LEWIS of Georgia, MFUME, FOGLIETTA, CRAMER, TAYLOR of Mississippi, OBERSTAR, KLECZKA, MASCARA, SHAYS, and TOWNS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Messrs. BORSKI, TAUZIN, BACHUS, GORDON, MARKEY, SKELTON, RICHARDSON, and LUTHER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote 412. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

☐ 1430

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] for a recorded vote on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 293, noes 129, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

AYES—293

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wyden
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—129

Abercrombie
Baesler
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Davis
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Engel
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Manton
Martinez
Matsui
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meek
Mfume
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reynolds
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Scott
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Ackerman
Clayton
Condit
Dornan
Laughlin
McDade
Moakley
Parker
Schumer
Serrano
Tate
Torres

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Messrs. BERMAN, TEJEDA, and GUTIERREZ changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. DEUTSCH, EHLERS, and EVERETT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Chair announces again that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHRISTENSEN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] for a recorded vote on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 246, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

AYES—177

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bilbray
Bliley
Blute
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Danner
Deal
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Dooley
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
English
Ensign
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kim
Kingston
Klug
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
LoBiondo
Longley
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moorhead
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Norwood
Nussle
Paxon
Petri
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Ramstad
Reed
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Waldholtz
Wamp
Ward
Weller
White
Whitfield
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—246

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baesler
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Chambliss
Chapman
Clay
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Poshard
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Ackerman
Clayton
Clement
Cunningham
Dornan
Greenwood
Laughlin
Moakley
Parker
Serrano
Torres

□ 1447

Mr. HUNTER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. BROWDER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, on roll call vote No. 414, I was unavoidably detained with business before the U.S. Senate regarding Dr. Henry Foster's nomination. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on the amendment offered by Representative JON CHRISTENSEN.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZIMMER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] for a recorded vote on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 21, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

AYES—403

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—21

Abercrombie
Clay
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Dellums
Dingell
Dixon
Fazio
Gibbons
Hastings (FL)
Hoyer
Lewis (GA)
Meek
Moran
Nadler
Packard
Sabo
Stokes
Thornton
Towns
Waters

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman
Clayton
Ewing
Johnson (CT)
Laughlin
Livingston
Moakley
Parker
Serrano
Torres

☐ 1455

Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. GEJDENSON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

I strongly support the bold cuts to the level of funding provided in the bill today.

There is nothing more important than addressing the $4.8 trillion national debt, which is keeping badly needed capital out of the hands of the private sector of our economy, the engine of growth and job creation. And I believe the goal of deficit reduction will only be met if we lead by example here in Congress.

Today, we have the opportunity to prove to our constituents that we are serious about addressing the national debt by taking the lead and making cuts to our own budget. This bill appropriates $1.7 billion for the House of Representatives and other legislative branch operations—$155 million less than in fiscal year 1995. This bill contains responsible cuts, such as eliminating the Joint Committee on Printing [JCP], the Office of Technology Assessment [OTA], one House parking lot, complimentary Capitol Historical Society calendars, and volumes of the U.S. Code for members of Congress. This bill provides for privatizing the flag office, the House folding room, and other support offices, reducing the General Accounting Office budget by 15 percent, combining the allowances for Members' clerk hire, mailing and office expenses into one account and cutting House committee funding by $39 million.

At a time when the House is asking others to make significant sacrifices, we must be responsible enough to tighten our own belt. I will vote for the legislative branch appropriations bill because the House should lead by example rather than give itself special treatment.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1854, legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 1996. I also rise to applaud the efforts of the subcommittee chairman, Congressman RON PACKARD, for performing a superior job in crafting this difficult bill, making truly difficult decisions, and helping ensure that the legislative branch contributes its share to the Nation's total debt reduction.

I am particularly pleased with the committee's successful efforts to find meaningful and constructive reductions in the General Accounting Office account.

H.R. 1854 appropriates $393 million for the General Accounting Office. That is $56 million, or 12 percent, less than the fiscal year 1995 appropriation, and $80 million less than the amount requested by GAO. The bill's appropriation level will support 3,947 positions, a 15-percent cut from current staffing levels. This cut is the first of a 2-year reduction in GAO's budget, which will reach a total of about 25 percent over 2 years. If this budget is adopted, GAO will have downsized by a total of 35 percent between 1992 and 1997.

No agency can sustain this level of a reduction without seriously reevaluating the work that it performs. I am confident that Comptroller General Chuck Bowsher, Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman RON PACKARD, and I will work hard to ensure that GAO takes responsible steps to absorb these reductions while still providing useful research and assistance to the Congress.

The committee report that accompanies this bill calls on GAO to fully accomplish its core mission while absorbing the reductions in their budget both this year and next. As the chairman of GAO's authorizing committee, it is my intention over the coming months to work with the GAO staff to ensure that the mission of GAO is achieved. In my mind, some of the most important functions of the GAO is to perform financial management and performance audits. The enactment of the Chief Financial Officers Act placed a great burden on the shoulders of GAO to help executive branch agencies design and publish annual financial reports. Also, the development of a District of Columbia financial control board will also result in a strain on GAO's resources. They should continue their hard work in these areas.

At the same time, GAO should continue to support the activities of congressional committees. I am confident that they will continue to do just that in the same professional manner that we have seen in the past. GAO has performed yeomen's service for the Government Reform and Oversight Committee during the past several months and I look forward to continuing that relationship with them.

Again, I applaud the efforts of Chairman PACKARD and encourage the adoption of this bill.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer the Clinger-Portman-Condit-Davis amendment to the legislative branch appropriations bill. Our amendment is fiscally responsible and is vital to the mission of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. In fact, our amendment is endorsed by many of the same groups that supported the unfunded mandates bill earlier this year, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Governors' Association, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Association of Counties, and the National League of Cities. The amendment would add $1.1 million to CBO's budget, the funding it needs to comply with S. 1, the unfunded mandates bill that was signed into law in March. As you know, the House approved this Contract With America bill by a strong vote of 394–28, and the Senate did as well, 91–9.

The amendment's appropriation of $1.1 million to the CBO is far below the $4.5 million the House authorized earlier this year in S. 1. In fact, it is only 26 percent of the amount we've already authorized for CBO by the unfunded mandates law.

As you may remember, under the unfunded mandates bill, CBO has a number of critical and new responsibilities starting January 1, 1996. First, CBO is required to analyze all new reported legislation containing Federal mandates and to prepare cost estimates for bills that impose mandates on State and local governments costing more than $50 million in any year. CBO has to perform a similar analysis for bills that impose mandates on the private sector costing more than $100 million. Although CBO does analyze intergovernmental mandates costing more than $200 million now, the new law has greatly increased its workload. These are complicated analyses, requiring CBO to perform a number of complex new tasks.

CBO has identified a number of new challenges it will be facing as it calculates the costs of mandates. Specifically, Dr. June O'Neill, Director of the CBO, has identified that: First, legislation often lacks the detailed information needed to project future impacts at the time a bill is considered; second, the effects of legislation may vary greatly among localities, making it difficult to quantify nationwide costs; third, obtaining accurate information from State, local, and tribal officials will be difficult and time consuming; fourth, obtaining information from private-sector parties will be difficult and time consuming since the information may not be readily available and is often considered to be confidential.

To make accurate cost estimates, CBO needs these additional resources to address these problems. Specifically, these resources will need to be focused on covering the costs of: First, consulting extensively with the relevant Federal agency to define the range of alternatives that are likely to be considered in issuing regulations; second, collecting information early in the legislative process from a broad sample of State, localities, and tribes, as well as from the private sector and individuals; third, consulting with experts to identify techniques that will improve CBO's ability to provide accurate estimates of nationwide costs based on a limited sample of States, localities, tribes, businesses, and individuals; fourth, consulting directly with as many States, local, and tribal officials as possible, as well as representatives from business and citizen groups.

CBO estimates that it needs 25 new full-time employees to conduct the cost analyses required by the unfunded mandates bill. The office intends to create a new intergovernmental mandate unit in the Budget Analysis Division that will prepare cost statements and studies of intergovernmental mandates, as well as work with committees and State and local governments—15 people would be assigned to the program divisions for preparing private-sector mandate cost estimates and studies.

In addition to new analytic difficulties, the quantity of estimates required by CBO will likely be burdensome. Dr. O'Neill estimates that the private sector analyses—a provision in the law that is strongly supported by many Members of Congress—alone could require CBO to analyze approximately 10 to 15 percent of all reported bills. I expect the number of analyses required for State and local governmental mandates will be even higher. The bottom line is that S. 1 increased significantly CBO's volume of work.

CBO has identified another issue that justifies this additional appropriation to its budget. In the case of both intergovernmental and private sector mandates, CBO has determined that it will take nearly as much analysis to estimate whether or not a bill exceeds the threshold as it does to provide a full cost analysis when the threshold is exceeded. A statement by Dr. O'Neill reinforces this point: ". . . all bills that are deemed to have a mandate will exert considerable pressure on CBO's resources, even when the analysis does not result in a detailed cost statement."

If CBO fails to complete these analyses, the consequences to the legislative process could be severe. Because the unfunded mandates law establishes a new point of order against the consideration of legislation for which a CBO cost estimate is not printed in the committee report or in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, points of order could potentially be raised against scores of bills. This could significantly complicate and slow down the legislative process.

In addition, a provision in the bill allows for a waiver of CBO's requirement if an analysis is not feasible, although a point of order would remain in effect. Without the CBO analysis, the unfunded mandates law would be meaningless. I view the new cost information as the linchpin to the improved accountability the legislation is intended to establish. Without the CBO analysis, Members would be voting on legislation in the dark, without any clear knowledge of the burdens they are imposing on State and local governments or the private sector. Those 394 Members of the House agreed that we should end the practice of mandating blindly. Providing CBO the tools it needs will help to eliminate this problem, by giving Members the information we all must have to legislate responsibly. Also, because S. 1 obligates committees to identify sources of funding to cover the costs of intergovernmental mandates, committees will need the CBO information to do their jobs. Last year alone, it is estimated that we sent billions of dollars worth of mandates to State and local governments. Spending $1.1 million up front to curb the practice makes sense. To do otherwise would be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

I understand that the Appropriations Committee expresses concerns about the additional duties given to CBO by the unfunded mandates law, but it suggested that DBO shift its resources to cover the new responsibilities. Having talked to CBO and looked at these new responsibilities, I believe that a mere shifting of CBO priorities will not free up enough money to cover the costs of these analyses. We should not place an unfunded mandate on the very agency helping us to end this practice.

This amendment is a modest and responsible request for funding that CBO needs. The $1.1 million is fully paid for by offsetting cuts in the legislative branch appropriations bill. The offset is to a part of the Library of Congress budget, specifically targeted to eliminate funding for the American Folklife Center, which was not authorized. We believe this is a reasonable cut. The Appropriations Committee report on this item cites that "there is ample precedence for the Library to raise private funding for the American Folklife Center."

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment. It will allow for the successful implementation of the unfunded mandates bill. CBO analyses of mandates on State and local governments, as well as the private sector, are the heart of the unfunded mandates bill—a law that is designed to ensure Congress has cost information, has a separate debate on whether and how to fund mandates and is accountable before it ever mandates again. Without providing the additional appropriation, we will also be sending the message that we are not serious about giving our State and local partners the relief they need. Let's keep our promise and support this amendment. If you supported the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 and believe in it, you should vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mr. CASTLE's proposal to cut our official mail allowances by $4.6 million. I ran for Congress with the promise that I would work to reform the franked mail system, and I intend to vote accordingly.

Consider these facts: First, Members of Congress sent about 267 million pieces of mail in 1994, that's six times more mail than was received; second, during the last election cycle, House incumbents spent more on franked mail than House challengers raised; and third, spending on franked mail doubles in election years.

I do believe that it is important for Members to keep in touch with their constituents. Members of Congress must make the attempt to listen and seek the input of constituents on important pending issues. I also believe that it is important for Members to let their constituents know about town meetings, listening sessions, and other opportunities to contact their Members of Congress. However, I do not believe that Members should be using the franked mail as a campaign advantage. A limited frank budget will result in responsible communications from Members to their constituents.

The Castle proposal freezes the franking allowance at 1994 levels by cutting $4.6 million from Members' representational allowances. That represents a reduction of 13 percent in addition to the roughly 30-percent cut of earlier this year.

The Castle proposal enjoys bipartisan support.

Those Members who are firmly committed to reforming Congress and reducing the budget deficit will vote ''yes'' on this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. Under this rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAMP) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 169, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA WITH INSTRUCTIONS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit with instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill in its present form?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1854 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 49, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 312. None of the funds made available in this Act may be provided for any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that such Member, officer, or employee has accepted a gift, knowing that such gift is provided directly or indirectly by a paid lobbyist, a lobbyist firm, or an agent of a foreign principal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

□ 1500

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this motion to recommit is to send this bill back to committee with instructions for the purposes of reporting the bill back to the floor with a gift ban, to make sure we would finally end the practice of gifts from lobbyists, lobbying firms, and others involved in legislation, to Members of Congress.

We have amended the rules of this House extensively, and we have done it on three different occasions. Each time we have been denied the opportunity to offer an amendment to end the practice of gifts by lobbyists to Members of Congress.

This is an effort to do that through the legislative appropriations bill by denying those appropriations to those offices where Members have continued to accept gifts which they knowingly have been provided, directly or indirectly, by a paid lobbyist or a lobbying firm.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope Members of this House, on a bipartisan basis, would vote to support the recommittal motion, so once and for all we can put an end to a practice that is unacceptable to the public, it is unacceptable in the conduct of the public's business, and it should be unacceptable in this House. That is ending the giving of gifts by lobbyists and lobbying firms to Members of this House while they have legislation under consideration.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, it was very thoughtful of the Committee on Rules to put some of the really critical issues of the Nation before us in the amendments that they permitted us to consider. We got to consider flowers, we got to consider whether there would be elevator operators, we got to consider a number of other matters of similar import, and yet, on the critical issue of whether the ties that bind legislators to gifts would be approved, we were denied the opportunity to even present it for a vote on the floor of this Congress. Mr. Speaker, that goes to the core of the problem in this Congress of business as usual.

Mr. Speaker, there is a need for us to be able to present the American people with a clear choice of whether we are going to end gifts, freebies, free trips, or we are not going to end them. This motion is one way to do that. It is an up-or-down vote. If Members believe in continuing the gifts, if they believe in continuing the freebies, then vote against the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

However, if Members think we ought to do something to clean up this House, this is the opportunity to do it. Some of us have taken a voluntary gift ban agreement and have signed off, and we return these gifts and these freebies, and deny these tickets and special benefits. However, this is a way to write it into law. That is the whole purpose of this amendment.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, do Members know what is so frustrating? What is so frustrating is to hear these cries of ''vote,'' when they are not saying vote on a gift ban, are they? They are not going to allow us a vote on a gift ban. We have asked again and again and again.

If we are going to reform this Congress, let us have an up-or-down vote on a gift ban. That is all we are asking for today.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, finally, I would just say we have considered many amendments to this legislation. Many of those amendments have been about how we conduct our offices and how we pay for those offices and how we approach and hold ourselves out to the public.

However, what we did not consider in this legislation was the question of gift giving by lobbyists to Members of this legislative body. It is a practice that must be ended. The leadership on that side had said they are going to end it. The question is when, because every time we have an opportunity to do it within the rules of the House, somehow we cannot find the will to do it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a practice that must end. It must end now. If Members support the motion to recommit, it can be done away with today. I would urge all the Members to support the motion to recommit.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Does the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] have a point of order?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a point of order against the motion to recommit with instructions because it includes a limitation and is not in order under clause 2 of rule XXI. Under the precedents of the House, it is not ''competent'' for the House to amend the bill in the manner proposed because it is not in order for the House to instruct the Committee to do what the House itself could not do.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from precedents of the House of Representatives: ''It is not in order to do indirectly by a motion to commit with instructions what may not be done directly by way of amendment.''

Also, Mr. Speaker, a point of order was sustained on a motion, a very like motion, to recommit with instructions on August 1, 1989, under a different Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's motion to instruct includes a limitation not specifically contained or authorized in existing law, and not considered in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to clause 2(d) of rule XXI, and therefore I ask for a ruling by the Chair on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] wish to address the point of order?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the language offered in this motion to recommit is in fact valid under the House rules. It is constructed to meet all requirements for a valid

limitation under clause 2 of rule XXI. It does not impose ''substantial additional duties.''

While it is true such an amendment could have been blocked under section (d) of clause 2 by the motion to rise had such a motion been offered in the Committee of the Whole, in fact no such motion was offered. The Committee rose under the direct terms of the rule, House Resolution 169, rather than as a result of the motion of the majority leader or the manager.

The House rules clearly permit a valid limitation to be offered when the manager or the majority chooses not to offer the motion to rise or if they fail to do so in a timely fashion. For this reason, a motion to recommit with instruction to include a simple valid limitation is in fact in order, and therefore the motion to recommit requiring a gift ban be reported back to the House is in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order. Consistent with the precedents of August 1 and 3, 1989, which are recorded in section 835 of the House Rules and Manual, the point of order is sustained and the motion is held out of order.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill, H.R. 1854, to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1854, to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, if I can, I would like to be heard on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not debatable. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit with instructions.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. GEJDENSON. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLER of California. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, why was that motion not debatable, but the previous motion was debatable?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The difference is between a motion that includes instructions, which is debatable, and one that does not.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the Chair.

Mr. PACKARD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state it.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I have been told and informed that we expect this final passage vote to be the last vote of the day. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advised the gentleman that the vote is on recommital.

Mr. PACKARD. After final passage, I am talking about, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is about to announce a 15 vote on recommital and then a 5——

Mr. PACKARD. After final passage, is that to be the last vote of the day, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would tell the gentlemen yes, that is the Chair's understanding.

Mr. OBEY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to point out that if this motion is adopted, the committee would attempt to incorporate the gift ban when it comes back from committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5(b)(3) of rule XV, the Chair may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for any recorded vote that may be ordered on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 240, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No 416]

AYES—186

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Montgomery
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Poshard
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—240

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas

Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Ackerman
Clayton
Laughlin
Moakley
Parker
Pomeroy
Serrano
Torres

☐ 1528

Mr. SAXTON changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELAY was allowed to proceed out of order.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I only take this 1 minute to clarify a statement that was made earlier.

Mr. Speaker, we do expect, in fact it is automatic on appropriations bills, a vote on final passage. The other side has assured us, and we are assuring Members that there is no plan to vote on the rule on the Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point, because that is no longer correct. Will the gentleman yield for a clarification?

Mr. DELAY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, there are two aspects of the rule which have just come to my attention, which mean that this gentleman at least would be asked for a vote on the rule. I do not know what the wish of the majority is in terms of proceeding, but I do not believe that Members should be given assurances that if the rule is going to be voted on tonight, that there will not be a rollcall vote, because with my new understanding of what the Committee on Rules has done, I intend to ask for a vote on the rule.

☐ 1530

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I change my earlier statement. There will be a vote on final passage, a rollcall vote on final passage, and Members should expect a vote on the rule in an hour after that vote is concluded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The question is on passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 337, nays 87, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

YEAS—337

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—87

Abercrombie
Andrews
Becerra
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Browder
Brown (CA)
Bryant (TX)
Chapman
Clay
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
DeFazio
Dellums
Dingell
Durbin
Engel
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gordon
Green
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnston
Kanjorski
Klink
LaFalce
Lewis (GA)
Martinez
McDermott
McKinney
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Rangel
Reynolds
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanders
Sanford
Schroeder
Scott
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Thompson
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wyden
Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman
Clayton
Dicks
Houghton
Laughlin
McHugh
Moakley
Parker
Serrano
Torres

☐ 1539

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1854, the bill just passed, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material and charts.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1905, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. QUILLEN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–154), on the resolution (H. Res. 171) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 170 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 170

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered by title rather than by paragraph. Each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2, 5(b), or 6 of rule XXI are waived. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution in the order printed. Each of those amendments may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in part 1 of the report are waived. After disposition of the amendments printed in part 1 of the report, the provisions of the bill as then perfected shall be considered as original text. Points of order against amendments printed in part of the report under clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. An amendment printed in part 2 of the report shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. During further consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to include extraneous material in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO OFFER AMENDMENTS IN MODIFIED FORM

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] be permitted to offer either of his amendments numbered 1 or 2 in House Report 104–147 which accompanies House Resolution 170, to the bill H.R. 1868 in the modified form which Representative HALL has placed at the desk.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I would like to explain this request.

The unanimous consent will simply correct a technical and clerical error that occurred at the Legislative Counsel's office in the drafting of my amendments, which appear as amendments number 1 and number 2. An incorrect number was picked up from line 14, page 22, of H.R. 1868. As a result, the corrected numbers in the Hall amendment are $2,326,700,000 and $2,300,000,000 respectively. This is a technical error.

□ 1545

It will not change the thrust of the amendments, and I still only intend to offer one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the technical amendment only in the Hall amendment and no other portion?

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

Mr. OBEY. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. That is the only part of the unanimous-consent request that I have presently on the floor on which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] reserved the right to object.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule to the floor today. While it is not a remarkable rule, it does share certain qualities with most of the rules of the new majority that we have reported this year.

First, it is open. It has a very limited number of specific waivers, and it is fair to both sides of the aisle.

Specifically, the rule for the foreign operations bill accomplishes several things. First, it is an open rule, allowing any Member to offer an amendment that is in order under the standing rules of the House. In fact, this rule does go a little bit beyond that, allowing for debate on four separate amendments, two Democratic amendments and two Republican amendments, that might not be allowed under a regular rule, might not, I say, because we are not entirely sure of the parliamentary rulings on all of them.

There are only three specific waivers given to the bill for unauthorized appropriations, reappropriations, and for a technical trade provision.

The first two are needed because there has not been a foreign operations authorization bill that has made it into law since 1985, as just about everybody knows. This year the House passed an authorizing bill. We have done our work, and it is worth noting the Committee on Appropriations has worked closely with the Committee on International Relations to ensure this bill is in line with the House-passed authorization.

The last technical waiver I mentioned is required because the bill contains a provision expanding the President's existing authority to impose trade sanctions to Iraq, Serbia, and Montenegro. While this provision is included in the bill for very sound foreign policy reasons, trade issues fall under the primary jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Therefore, this section needs a waiver from clause 5(b) of rule XXI.

As in previous rules this year, we have included a preprinting option, I stress the word ''option,'' for priority and recognition.

And, finally, this rule provides for a motion to recommit with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, as we discussed in the Committee on Rules hearing yesterday, it is important for this House to have a full and complete debate over the issue of foreign aid especially over the true amount of tax dollars involved and the policies that drive these expenditures. I am pleased that this rule allows for this debate, and I look forward to it.

This year's foreign aid rule is, in many ways, a tremendous improvement over previous bills. To begin with, it is $1.6 billion below last year's bill and $2.8 billion below the President's requests. Those are significant amounts of money, and, in my view, they are responsible cuts that represent the kind of spending reform that is necessary to achieve the balanced budget we set out to do.

In addition, there is much greater accountability for the funds spent under this bill. Americans have demanded that. And we make these two issues, affordability and accountability, our top priority in any foreign aid bill, and I think we have done that pretty well here.

We are now down to less than 1 percent of the budget for foreign aid, something under $12 billion.

There is one area in which I would like to see even greater accountability, however, and that is aid to the Government of Haiti. The Clinton administration has committed an enormous amount of taxpayers' dollars to Haiti, actually without much explanation or accounting so far. There is an important pair of elections scheduled for this calendar year, elections for Haiti's parliament this weekend and the Presidency in December of this year.

I plan to offer an amendment that will require that before United States dollars are sent to Haiti, those elections be conducted in a democratic and constitutional manner. This will provide greater accountability for the foreign aid dollars that are spent in Haiti and ensure that they are ulitized to enhance democracy and provide a real incentive to Haiti to stay on the road to democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the rule before us today is both fair and open. It was voted out of our committee on a voice vote, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 20, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open [2]	46	44	30	73
Modified Closed [3]	49	47	11	27
Closed [4]	9	9	0	0
Totals:	104	100	41	100

[1] This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

[2] An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be pre-printed in the Congressional Record.

[3] A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

[4] A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 12, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350–71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255–172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1.	Balanced Budget Amdt.	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229–100; A: 227–127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230–191; A: 229–188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282–144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252–175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253–165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271–151 (3/1/95)
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257–155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234–191 A: 247–181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242–190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95)
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95)
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217–211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423–1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228–204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253–172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414–4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233–176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225–191 A: 233–183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ:223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–196 A: 236–191 (6/20/95)
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague has described, House Resolution 170 is essentially an open rule. It provides 1 hour of general debate on the foreign operations appropriation bill for fiscal year 1996.

The rule does provide waivers of clause 2 of rule XXI, to allow unauthorized appropriations provisions in the bill, as well as clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting reappropriations in some provisions.

The rule does reflect an agreement between the authorizing committee and the appropriators by making in order two amendments to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

The rule also makes in order my children's amendment, which is called the Hall amendment, to transfer $108 million in funds to the new child survival fund and to include basic education activities for millions of poor children overseas.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the members of the Republicans and the Democrats on the Committee on Rules for making this in order. I appreciate that.

Other amendments allowed under the rule include one by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] on Cuba, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] on Haiti, and under the normal amending process in the House, any

other amendment which does not violate House rules will be in order under this rule.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I do support this rule, I have some misgivings about the bill as it currently stands. As I indicated during the debate on the American Overseas Interest Act, the international affairs budget represents only 1.3 percent of total Federal spending. It has already been cut by 40 percent since 1985, and under this bill the fund for Africa absorbs a 34-percent cut and another 40 percent is squeezed out of development aid. Funds in these areas go for self-0help, preventive programs which alleviate more money down the road.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the Committee on Rules was able to make the Hall amendment, which is my amendment, in order to transfer $108 million in funds to the new child survival and disease programs fund. This fund is created to take care of vital child survival and disease prevention activities that alleviate malnutrition and death among the world's poorest children.

My amendment will also allow basic education programs to be funded through this new children's account.

Disease and malnutrition and basic education are the core of self-sufficiency, and without a renewed emphasis on these kinds of programs, we cannot expect people to raise themselves out of poverty or improve their situations. For each additional year of schooling children from developing countries receive, their incomes rise as much as 10 percent.

My amendment pays for itself by transferring small amounts from other foreign aid programs that can absorb the cuts.

And finally, in the Committee on Rules hearing, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] did request an amendment know as the deficit reduction lockbox amendment. This would have allowed any savings obtained from floor votes to go into a special deficit reduction trust fund. Given the interest many of us have in deficit reduction, I believe the Committee on Rules should have made the Brewster amendment in order.

My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] did offer the lockbox measure as an amendment to the rule, but, unfortunately, it failed.

I plan to support the rule. I think it is a good rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, formerly of Okeechobee, FL.

Mr. SOLOMON. As a matter of fact, I will be down near there this weekend.

Let me say the two speakers, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], have accurately described this rule as being fair and open, and it is.

It allows Republicans and Democrats, it allows liberals, conservatives, anybody else, the right to come on this floor and work their will. That is the way it should be. I will not go into that any further.

Let me just say this appropriations bill itself represents yet another installment in our march towards a balancing of the Federal budget. That, to me, means so much. It means that the total appropriation in this bill is almost 20-percent below the administration's request, and more than that, it is almost 12-percent below the appropriated level from fiscal year 1995. And that is the only way that we are ever going to balance the budget. We have to spend less this year than we spent last year, and we have got to continue to do that year in and year out at least for 7 years. I wish it could be sooner.

The truth of the matter is we are following the Ronald Reagan philosophy. He said that instead of giving people fish and foreign aid, we ought to teach them how to fish, and that is exactly what this bill does. Otherwise, we have to keep giving them fish year in and year out. This way, let us teach them how to fish. That is what we are doing in restructuring our foreign aid programs, as well as the domestic programs.

So I commend the sponsors of this legislation on the Committee on Appropriations for a job well done, and I hope that everybody votes for this fair rule and then for the bill itself.

It will be the first appropriations bill on foreign operations that I have ever voted for, and that is because it begins to turn things around and reduce the Federal deficit.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply observe, with respect to the statement by the gentleman from New York, that the foreign aid bills for the last 10 years have reduced the level of foreign assistance. They used to be $18 billion, and in the last decade they have been brought down to $13 billion. So this is not, by any means, the first foreign assistance bill which was lower than the previous year. We have had that occur on a number of occasions during the years that I have chaired that subcommittee.

Let me say that I have opposed the authorization bill because I felt that it represents some of the most incredible micromanagement of foreign assistance in the history of the foreign assistance program, and I think that much of the micromanagement in that bill is idiotic.

But I have been intending to support the appropriation bill because despite the fact that I believe it has a poor allocation of priorities and, despite the reckless manner with which it deals with issues such as NATO and our relationship with the Soviet Union, it does, in fact, not have a lot of the micromanagement that is contained in the authorization bill.

I was informed earlier that it was the intention of the committee not to accept legislative language, save two amendments which everyone understood would be offered, one being the one by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] and the other by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. The abortion issue is so contentious that we almost always have an issue like that, and that cannot be avoided.

But there are two other legislative amendments which are now being made in order which have, in my view, no business on an appropriation bill which would tie our entire relationship with the Soviet Union to one narrow question of what happens in Cuba, and another amendment which would tie our entire aid relationship to Haiti to legislative language which I have not even yet had an opportunity to review, let alone staff out.

And so, under these circumstances, what I had thought would be a rule which would be a straight appropriation rule bill, in fact, allow for a number of policy issues which, in my view, properly ought to be debated on the authorization bill and not on the appropriations bill. And because of that, and because I believe that the amendment with respect to our relationship with the Soviet Union further adds to the recklessness with which that issue has generally been dealt with by this committee, I am sorry to say that I will have to oppose the rule and will, in fact, oppose the previous question on the rule and would ask that if the previous question is not approved, that the House support an amendment correcting the fact that there are two legislative amendments on this proposal that do not belong here.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just note in response to the gentleman's comments that one of those amendments was brought forward by a distinguished Member of the gentleman's party, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], and he was treated very fairly. It was thought to be an important amendment.

And the other amendment, the one about Haiti which was brought forward by myself, actually probably does not need protection, because it is a cutting amendment, a limitation amendment, not a legislating amendment, we are told.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART].

□ 1600

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for yielding me this time.

I think it is curious that we just heard that the issue that was made in order by virtue of the Menendez amendment having been made in order by the Committee on Rules, and I am going to try to paraphrase, is a narrow issue that will tie our relationship to

the Soviet Union to an incident or a situation in Cuba.

To call a nuclear power plant that is being built 180 miles from the United States, and that is being built of a model that after the reunification of Germany four nuclear power plants which had been built by the Soviets there of that same model were immediately closed down by the Government of Germany because of their lack of safety, to call the national interests of the United States that that kind of nuclear power plant not be completed 180 miles from our shore a narrow interest is quite a curiosity.

That is precisely, however, why the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] came before the Committee on Rules, because of the grave nature of the threat to the U.S. national security that would ensue if this nuclear power plant were completed.

That is why the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] came before the Committee on Rules and asked we make in order, and we did, his amendment which will simply say to Russia that, if they contribute to the completion of that nuclear power plant 180 miles from the United States in Cuba, that the amount that Russia contributes to that nuclear power plant's completion on a dollar-for-dollar basis will be deducted from United States taxpayer assistance to Russia.

Now that is not, Mr. Speaker, I would maintain, nor did the majority of the Committee on Rules maintain, a narrow interest. It is the national security interests of the United States being protected by this Congress in making sure that we make the strongest possible statement to Russia that we will not accept a VVER, a VVER model nuclear power plant being completed a hundred 180 miles from the soil of the United States.

Now in Europe the entire environmental movement is mobilized at this point to close down the other VVER power plants that are still in operation throughout Eastern Europe that the Soviets had constructed, and they are able to close them down. They have been able to close already all of them down in Germany, and they are making substantial progress in closing down the other ones.

This is not a narrow interest. This is something that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] I think brought forth very correctly, and I think he has to be commended for bringing it forth in this bill as an amendment. He brought it to our attention in the Committee in Rules, and we made it in order, as we made in order the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] that, if we are going to send taxpayer dollars to Haiti, that they have to have free elections.

Now I think it would be really an extreme absurdity if we were going to continue to send U.S. taxpayer dollars to Haiti if a government there, whatever the government is, proceeds to steal elections.

So that is all we are saying, and it is not a narrow interest. It is something that is in our national interest. It is something that is in our national interest, and that is why, despite the possible, the possible allegations that some points of order could conceivably, and we are not sure, be made with regard to those amendments, the Committee on Rules made them in order.

It is a good rule, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask for my colleagues' support of this fair rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear that I agree with both gentlemen on substance; I agree with the previous speaker. I do not want to see that reactor built in Cuba either. I think it is an idiotic, asinine, and stupid thing for the Soviets to do, and I think we ought to do everything possible to stop it.

The question is whether the method chosen by the gentleman is the most effective way to accomplish that end, and I do not believe it is, and that is the simple issue here.

I do not want for one moment for anyone to believe that I do not agree with both gentlemen with respect to their policy positions on either Haiti or with respect to that reactor. I say to them, ''I agree with you on both of them. I do, however, have substantial question about whether or not the method you have chosen to try to accomplish that purpose will do it.''

I, in fact, think it may have the opposite reaction, and that is one reason why I believe that on short order, on the basis of a very brief discussion in the Committee on Rules, this amendment should not have been made in order, because frankly I do not think the Congress at this point knows what it is doing on either one of these subjects.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] so he may respond to that.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for these 2 minutes. I do not think I will need 2 minutes. I just want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for his support on the substantive issue.

I say to the gentleman, ''If over and above our efforts you have further suggestions, we are more than open to receive your suggestions on how to make sure that those powerplants won't be completed in Cuba and how to make sure that democracy is continued and furthered and protected in Haiti. We happen to believe that this is not only an appropriate vehicle, but a most appropriate vehicle to put maximum pressure on both of these situations with regard to the national interests of the United States, but if over and above these efforts you have additional suggestions, we will be more than open to review them and hopefully work together with you.''

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that the original sponsor of the amendment, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], is a Democrat, and certainly the gentleman from Florida is a Republican, and so am I. But we all had interest in this because time is critical right now.

As a matter of fact, the truth of the matter is we delayed the markup of this rule in the Committee on Rules in order to go back to the Appropriations Committee, both sides of the aisle, staff on the Democrat side and Republican side, to find out if perhaps there was a better way or perhaps other suggestions. We did change it based on their recommendations.

So we have done everything we could. If the gentleman has a better way, we will consider that, too.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, he keeps indicating that one of the authors of one of the amendments was a Democrat. It is immaterial to me whether it comes from either side, which side of the aisle it comes from. The fact is our committee knows about as much about that subject as the gentleman can put in his left ear. It ought to be handled by the authorizing committee.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has been around here for 20 years. He is probably one of the most knowledgeable Members on the subject of foreign affairs, and I have praised him to the sky for many years.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, we do not want these——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] has expired.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. BEILENSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much my colleague and friend yielding so much time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in mild opposition to the rule and in strong opposition to the bill that it would make in order, the fiscal 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, what is at stake in this bill is nothing less than the future of America's leadership in the world. While we need to cut Federal spending, we ought to be extremely concerned about the potentially disastrous effects the spending cuts in this bill will have on U.S. influence abroad, on our ability to protect our national interests, and on the lives of hundreds of millions of people in the developing world.

The bill cuts foreign aid by $1.6 billion below this year's level, a level that already reflects a vastly reduced foreign aid budget compared to that of, say, 10 years ago when Ronald Reagan was President. In 1985, the United States spent $18.1 billion on foreign aid. This year we are spending just $13.5 billion, a 25 percent reduction, not adjusted for inflation. Adjusted for inflation is closer to 40 to 45 percent.

One of the great myths that has been perpetrated in the media is that the Federal Government spends a significant portion of its budget on foreign aid. Indeed, in a recent study three of four Americans said they believe the United States spends too much on foreign aid. But when asked how much they thought the Nation spends, the median response was 15 percent of the Federal budget. And when respondents were asked how much the United States should spend on foreign aid, the median response was 5 percent, with most agreeing that 3 percent would be too little.

As we all know, U.S. foreign aid is actually less than 1 percent of the Federal budget. In fact, as a percentage of the our gross national product [GNP], the United States is now the lowest aid contributor of the world's top 23 industrialized nations.

For a minuscule fraction of what we spend on defense, the prudent use of foreign aid helps us meet escalating threats to our national and to global security, including chronic poverty, rapid population growth, environmental degradation, forced migration, and in protecting against political instability in countries that cannot adequately take care of their own people. The long-term effect of the cuts in this bill will be a substantial reduction in the President's ability to conduct foreign policy, leaving him, and leaving us, with only a military option in too many circumstances.

Many people do not realize how much our modest investment in foreign assistance programs benefit U.S. businesses and citizens. When the Marshall plan was announced in 1947, only 18 percent of Americans supported that effort to rebuild Europe. But U.S. assistance helped to establish social and political stability, and created some of our best trading partners and, of course, our most staunch political allies. In the 1960's and 1970's, many criticized United States assistance to countries such as South Korea, Taiwan, Mexico, and India. But once again, U.S. assistance ushered in a period of unprecedented growth in those countries. With United States help, for example, India has seen dramatic increases in agricultural production and, as a consequence partially of our foreign aid, a politically stable India now offers a promising and growing market of more than 900 million people for United States goods.

The fastest-growing segment of the U.S. export market is in trade with developing countries. Today developing countries import almost 40 percent of U.S. exports, accounting for at least 2 million U.S. American jobs. In the past decade alone, exports to developing countries have more than doubled from $71 to $180 billion a year.

The United States is today exporting products and services to many of the nations we were giving assistance to in the 1960's and the 1970's. More than 24 countries since that time have moved from being foreign aid recipients to becoming trading partners with us.

Foreign aid has also dramatically improved the lives of hundreds of millions of people and reduced the risk of, and the occurrence of, humanitarian crises. Since 1960, development assistance has helped reduce infant mortality rates in developing countries by 50 percent, has helped increase life expectancy from 46 years to 63 years, has helped increase primary school enrollment from 48 percent to 78 percent. Foreign aid has resulted in important breakthroughs in agriculture; investments made by the United States in better seeds and agriculture techniques has helped make it possible to feed an extra billion people in the developing world.

More than 50 million couples in the developing world use family planning as a direct result of U.S. assistance for overseas family planning services. Over the past 35 years, the average number of children per family in the world has been reduced by one-third, from six children to four.

U.S. aid is largely credited with fully immunizing 80 percent of all children in developing countries, eradicating smallpox worldwide, and virtually eliminating polio in the Western hemisphere.

And, since 1980—in just the past 15 years—U.S. foreign assistance has helped three dozen nations make the transition to democratic governance. The spending reductions in this bill threaten to reverse these positive trends, especially as the number of poor around the world, currently an estimated 1.3 billion people, continues to soar.

One area of particular concern to me in this bill is the nearly 50-percent cut in funding for our efforts to stabilize global population growth, which underlies virtually every developmental, environmental, and national security problem facing the world today.

Global population is now nearly 5.7 billion people, and it is growing by almost 100 million every year—by 260,000 every 24 hours. Future prospects, moreover, are even more staggering. If effective action is not taken in the next few years—as today's 1.6 billion children in the developing world under the age of 15, reach their childbearing years—the earth's population could nearly quadruple to 20 billion people by the end of the coming century.

□ 1615

In much of the developing world, high birth rates caused largely by the lack of access of women to basic reproductive health services and information, are contributing to intractable poverty, malnutrition, widespread unemployment, urban overcrowding, and the rapid spread of disease. Population control growth is outstripping the capacity of many nations to make even modest gains in economic development, leading to political instability and negating other U.S. and other international development efforts.

So for these and many other reasons, which will be in my extended remarks, I urge our colleagues to vote against what I believe to be the unwise, counterproductive, and ultimately destructive cuts in our Nation's foreign assistance budget contained in this bill. These programs work. Combating rapid population growth, enhancing maternal health, ensuring child survival, reducing the spread of disease, providing basic education and improving agriculture and sustainable development are some of the most humane, farsighted, and economically effective efforts we can undertake. Maintaining adequate funding for these programs now will save many times its expense in future U.S. foreign assistance, will promote global peace and security, and will promote and protect U.S. foreign policy interests. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of exponential population growth, combined with unsustainable patterns of consumption, is also evident in mounting signs of stress on the world's environment. Under conditions of rapid population growth, renewable resources are being used faster than they can be replaced. Other environmental consequences of the world's burgeoning population are tropical deforestation, erosion of arable land and watersheds, extinction of plant and animal species, and pollution of air, water, and land.

For almost 30 years, population assistance has been a central component of U.S. development assistance. While much more remains to be done, population assistance has had a significant positive impact on the health of women and their children and on society as a whole in most countries. In many parts of Asia, Latin America, and Africa, fertility rates have decreased, often dramatically. Couples are succeeding in having the smaller families they want because of the greater availability of contraceptives that our assistance has made possible.

Today, approximately 55 percent of couples worldwide use modern methods of contraception, compared with 10 percent in the 1960's. Despite this impressive increase in contraceptive use, the demand for family planning services is growing, in large measure because populations are growing. Indeed, over the next 20 years, the number of women and men who wish to use contraception will almost double.

Similarly, population assistance has contributed to the significant progress that has been made in reducing infant and child mortality rates. Child survival is integrally linked to women's reproductive health, and specifically to a mother's timing, spacing and number of births. Despite substantial progress, a large proportion of children in the developing

world—particularly in sub-Saharan Africa and some Asian countries—still die in infancy.

And, while many countries in the developing world have succeeded in reducing maternal mortality rates, the incidence of maternal death and disability remains unacceptably high, constituting a serious public health problem facing most developing countries. According to the World Health Organization, an estimated 500,000 women die every year as a result of pregnancy and childbirth.

U.S. population assistance is preventive medicine on an international scale. Congress has long recognized this to be the case and over the years has reaffirmed the importance of population assistance in securing U.S. interests abroad. By addressing the basic health and educational needs of women and their families, population assistance provides building blocks for strong democratic government and sets the stage for economic growth. Furthermore, it helps prevent social and political crises, thereby averting the need for costly relief efforts.

At the International Conference on Population and Development [ICPD], held in Cairo last year, the United States was instrumental in building a broad consensus behind a comprehensive Program of Action, which was signed by almost all of the 180 countries that participate in the conference, and which will help guide the population and development programs of the United Nations and national governments into the next century. Central to this plan is the recognition that with adequate funding this decade for family planning and reproductive health services, as well as educational, economic, and social opportunities necessary to enhance the status of women, we can stabilize world population in the first half of the next century.

This bill, however, seems to abandon the goals of the ICPD and the international community. Throughout the Bush administration, and in the last two budgets, the President and Congress have seen fit to increase funding for population assistance, believing strongly that population funding is one of the most cost effective and important uses of our foreign aid dollars. In fact, I recently submitted a letter to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] with the signatures over 100 of our colleagues, urging the committee to fund population programs at the level requested by the President—$635 million.

Instead, the Appropriations Committee has recommended reducing population funding to roughly $300 million, and eliminating the population and development account all together.

These significant cuts in population programs will have devastating and irreversible consequences for the future course of fertility decline in developing countries. The effects of a 50 percent population funding reduction will be felt most immediately in the health and well-being of women and children in developing countries, but will also be felt by the larger global community. Without these funds, there will likely be an estimated 1.6 million unwanted pregnancies per year, resulting in 1.2 million unwanted births, more than 350,000 abortions, and 8,000 maternal deaths.

In addition to these sharp reductions in population assistance, related programs for maternal health, disease prevention, general education, agricultural improvement and rural development will devastated by the cuts in this bill. Although the Appropriations Committee has quite laudably attempted to place an emphasis on helping the world's children, this bill would cut many of the programs that will benefit children the most. It contains large cuts in maternal health—$50 million—in efforts to strengthen health care systems which deliver services to both children and adults—$88 million—and in water sanitation programs—$27 million.

Of these proposed cuts, one of the most startling and destructive is the reduction for maternal health. In the set of 18 countries central to USAID's goal of reducing maternal mortality, drastic reductions in the funding for delivery of safe pregnancy services will contribute to an estimated 24,000 maternal deaths annually that would have been otherwise averted. In addition to these preventable maternal deaths, an additional 336,000 stillbirths and early newborn deaths are likely to occur as a result of USAID's virtual withdrawal from this program. Finally, the delivery of safe pregnancy and related services not only averts maternal deaths, it also helps to avert long-term—chronic—disabilities that occur due to pregnancy and childbirth. In these 18 key countries, estimates of the number of pregnancy-related chronic disabilities are as high as 7 million annually.

I would also like to say a few words about the Smith amendment to this bill, which has been granted a waiver in the rule for violating the prohibition against legislating in an appropriations bill.

Aside from the fact that this waiver is strongly opposed by the chairman of the International Relations Committee, Mr. GILMAN, and should not have been granted, the Smith amendment will deny millions of women access to family planning, prenatal care, safe delivery services, maternal and infant health programs, treatments for infertility, and STD prevention services. It could result in over hundreds of thousands of abortions that could have been averted had these women had access to basic health services.

Contrary to what Mr. SMITH and other proponents of this amendment will argue, this is not about abortion—it is about family planning, and the fact that this amendment will cut population assistance funding to its lowest level in 25 years, when adjusted for inflation. The fact remains that U.S. funds do not pay for abortions. For over 20 years, under the Helms amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, Federal law has prohibited any U.S. funds from being used for abortions, or to promote abortion. H.R. 1868 retains this prohibition.

The proponents of this amendment also claim that it simply restores anti-abortion policies of the Reagan administration. But it goes further than the so-called Mexico City policy, which prohibited funding to organizations that perform abortion with private funds. It also targets the political messages of family planning providers. It would prevent organizations that receive U.S. population assistance from using their non-U.S. funds in efforts to influence their own country's abortion law, either for or against. Thus, although it is already illegal to use U.S. funds to lobby, groups on both sides of the abortion issue would be penalized for exercising their rights to express their views on abortion.

Finally, Mr. SMITH, in past debates, has misstated the role and involvement of the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA] in China. No one disagrees that the coercive Chinese population program is abhorrent, and the UNFPA in fact categorically condemns the use of coercion in any form or manner in any population program, including China. Mr. SMITH has said that the UNFPA cannot say enough good things about the Chinese program, and that China could not ask for a better front than the UNFPA. But Mr. SMITH relies on a 1989 quote from UNFPA executive director, Dr. Nafis Sadik, that was taken out of context, at a time when the Chinese seemed to be making progress towards improving the program. The fact is that no evidence has ever been presented of complicity by international agencies, including the UNFPA, in Chinese human rights abuses and, as confirmed by USAID during the Reagan administration, UNFPA does not fund abortion or support coercive practices in any country, including China.

Mr. SMITH's amendment ignores the benefits of the UNFPA's presence in China and over 140 other countries. One of the reasons the international community has information about the horrors of the Chinese program is because of the presence in China of international organizations such as the UNFPA. Moreover, many countries believe that by providing assistance to China, UNFPA is in a unique position to positively influence China's population policies and to promote human rights. UNFPA is in constant dialog with Chinese officials at every level on matters pertaining to human rights, and UNFPA's programs expose Chinese officials to international standards through international training in foreign institutions, including several United States universities. Moreover, denying funding to the UNFPA would have a drastic effect on the UNFPA's programs in the rest of the world. Nearly half of UNFPA assistance is used for family planning services and maternal and child health care in the poorest and most remote regions of the world.

Mr. Speaker, for these and other reasons, I urge our colleagues to vote against the unwise, counterproductive, and ultimately destructive cuts in our Nation's foreign assistance budget contained in this bill. These programs work. Combating rapid population growth, enhancing maternal health, insuring child survival, reducing the spread of disease, providing basic education, and improving agriculture and sustainable development are some of the most humane, farsighted and economically effective efforts we can undertake. Maintaining adequate funding for these programs now will save many times this expense in future U.S. foreign assistance, will greatly reduce human suffering, will promote global peace and security and will promote and protect U.S. foreign policy interests.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and on the bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask for an accounting on the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the yielding of time, because I

want to rise in support of the rule that is pending, largely because it will be accommodating an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] at a later point in the proceedings, which will seek to modify the behavior of the Turkish Government vis-a-vis the Kurds and the record of human rights violations that has become replete over the last few years.

I would not pay so much attention to it as an individual Member of the Congress as I normally would, except that this record, attached to the Turkish behavior with the Kurds, is only but the latest of other reported, documented, and severe human violations perpetrated by the Turkish Government previously, and next to the current government, in Cyprus, for instance. There we are in the untenable position of furnishing aid to a government which turns American weapons, as it were, on to the Cypriot population, and commits human rights violations there using American money and guns.

Now, the United Nations took note of that. The international community, even on the floor of the Congress, there was commentary after commentary and action after action taken at those particular times. But now there is just too much. We cannot tolerate this kind of behavior anymore.

The Kurds' situation allows us to begin to modify the behavior of Turkey with respect to that segment of the world. I have heard the gentleman from Florida, who wants to modify behavior in Haiti through this amendment process. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] seeks to conduct or help conduct foreign policy with respect to Haiti with the elections that are pending there. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] seeks to modify, along with the help of the gentleman from Florida, the issue of Russia and Cuba and a nuclear reactor.

I ask those individuals and all the remaining Members on the floor of the House and in their offices to pay attention to this particular vital issue on the Porter amendment, which can bring about a better future for the Kurds and to begin to curb the human rights violations perpetrated for decades now by the Government of Turkey.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk about the careful tailoring in this rule for various interests, but we have not heard a word about the vastly popular deficit reduction lockbox. This is the third appropriations bill we are considering, and the third time the Committee on Rules has not make the lockbox in order. For that reason, I rise in opposition to this rule.

The lockbox is widely popular here; 418 votes to 5 passed it as part of the rescissions bill. All members of the Committee on Rules voted for it. Most of America wants it. It is our best available tool now to make sure that money cut from these appropriations bills goes to deficit reduction.

Just yesterday we passed the military construction appropriations bill. We cut over $20 million from that bill in floor amendments. None of that money will go to deficit reduction. All of it will be reprogrammed. That is wrong.

The rule is wrong too. The lockbox should be in order. The lockbox should be in order under the rule on every appropriations bill, and should be passed, as most Members of this House wanted it to as an amendment to the budget act.

So vote ''no'' on this rule and vote for the bipartisan Brewster-Harman deficit lockbox.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly oppose the rule we are considering for the Foreign Operations bill today. I have great respect for the chairman of our Committee on rules and great respect for the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee and for the good work that he has done to try to find common ground in the bill, and I support the bill. But I cannot support a rule that will waive points of order against an amendment that is pure authorizing language and that will effectively gut our country's bilateral and multilateral population programs.

Mr. Speaker, the Smith amendment has no place in this bill. I am, frankly, very surprised it was made in order under the rule. A nearly identical Smith amendment was adopted during consideration of the foreign aid authorizing bill earlier this year. While I disagreed with the amendment then and spoke out against it, I did not question the Member's right to offer it at the time. That was the appropriate bill and the correct forum for that debate.

But now, however, the Committee on Rules has given extraordinary consideration to those who oppose voluntary family planning by making this amendment in order on a totally inappropriate bill. This is, in my judgment, not fair, since the bill as reported contains no funds whatsoever for abortion, no funds whatsoever for China. The Smith amendment confirms this, but goes further to gut the voluntary familiar family planning programs in the bill, harming millions of couples around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have the highest respect for the gentleman from New Jersey, who is my friend and colleague. And he and I and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] in fact are joining together on the amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] mentioned, the fact that we are aiding a country that is committing genocide against its Kurdish population. Mr. SMITH and Mr. WOLF and I are joining together to offer an amendment that will cut aid to Turkey, who is committing genocide against its Kurdish population, is preventing our aid from reaching our allies in Armenia, and is continuing its 21 year occupation of the Island of Cyprus and its intransigence in helping to reunite that island as a country.

So I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. But, very frankly, his amendment does not belong on this piece of legislation. For that reason, I would urge the Members to send this rule back to the Committee on Rules for rewriting, and will have to oppose the rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the majority and minority of the Committee on Rules for allowing three amendments that I will be offering on a bipartisan basis. I also wish to thank Mr. CALLAHAN and Mr. OBEY and their staffs for their assistance in helping me deal with these amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the open rule that we will be debating allows an open debate on the harsh realities that exist today in Burma. My most recent trip to that country was extremely disappointing on account of the Burmese regime's entrenchment on human rights and democratization efforts. As a result of this entrenchment I will be offering two amendments with the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] intended to further isolate this repressive regime by cutting all counternarcotics assistance and providing additional funds for the refugee crisis along both sides of the Thai-Burma border.

Burma's ruling military government has established itself as unquestionably the heavyweight champion of repressive governments by violating human rights and detaining the leader of Burma's Democrat movement, Aung San Suu Kyi, for the past 6 years. She courageously is in house arrest without any kind of prospects for being released. Recent efforts to obtain visas by the authors of this amendment have either been denied or granted only after preconditions were met. Leading opposition members of the National League for Democracy in Burma were arrested after I met with them last month.

Perhaps as the most egregious of all human rights violations, Dr. Michael Aris, Aung San Suu Kyi's husband, has been denied access to his imprisoned wife. Just last week the International

Committee for the Red Cross abandoned efforts to work with the Burmese Government because of unacceptable conditions imposed by the SLORC on the activities of the Red Cross. So, after permitting the Red Cross to come in to inspect prisons in Burma, they were thrown out.

What we have here is a case of a policy that right now is moving in the direction of dealing with the heroin crisis. That is important. But it does not mean that this administration or any administration should reward a repressive regime with counternarcotics assistance. The amendment that I will be offering with the support of many Members of the majority and minority hopefully will make sure that this does not happen.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude with a discussion of the refugee crisis from both sides of the Thai-Burma border that is worsening. The launching of an offensive against the Karen refugees this spring resulted in an outflow of an estimated additional 20,000 refugees to Thailand, bringing the population there to over 90,000.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from the State of Florida, Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman CALLAHAN, and especially Bill Englee from the chairman's staff, for their great help on this very important bill. The Menendez amendment which was granted a waiver from the Committee on Rules is a correct one and not a narrow interest amendment, because I believe that we must use all of the instruments at our disposal to pressure the Russian Government to immediately halt their intentions of aiding the Communist regime of Fidel Castro in finishing construction of the Juragua nuclear powerplant in Cienfuegos, Cuba. If completed, this nuclear plant will pose a serious threat to the safety of the United States, Central America, and the Caribbean.

Construction of the Juragua nuclear plant was halted in 1992 after the Castro regime was not able to obtain the foreign exchange necessary to finish construction. However, this past May, Russia and Cuba announced their intention to finish construction of this plant.

Completion of this nuclear powerplant could constitute the introduction of a real and permanent threat to the health and safety of our hemisphere. Numerous experts, including former technicians at the plant now living in the United States, have denounced its inadequate construction, as well as inferior equipment that was used in its construction. Moreover, the General Accounting Office reported allegations in 1992 that the Juragua nuclear plant was unsafe, and similar Soviet style plants in Eastern Europe have already suffered accidents. In fact, four such plants were shut down by the German Government after reunification of that country.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow this type of threat to the security of the United States to be present just a few hundred miles from our shores, especially in the hands of a totalitarian tyrant like Fidel Castro, who has no respect for the dignity of human life.

□ 1630

We must pressure the Government of Russia to stop helping the Castro regime in finishing construction of this nuclear plant. There are several amendments presented in this bill to accomplish this. Do our constituents want their tax dollars to build a Chernobyl-style nuclear facility just miles from the coast of the United States? Do our constituents want an unsafe nuclear reactor operated by one of the last Communist strongholds being built with U.S. funds? I think the answer clearly is ''no.''

The Committee on Rules was correct in granting the waiver, and I urge a ''yes'' vote on this rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express concern about a provision that has been included in this bill which would effectively change existing law through the appropriations process. The provision, which was put in the bill in the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, would severely weaken section 907 of the Freedom Support Act of 1992. This provision bans direct United States Government assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan until Azerbaijan lifts its blockade of neighboring Armenia. This law made good sense when it was adopted 3 years ago in the wake of the breakup of the Soviet Union. It is morally justified and in U.S. interests, It should not be gutted through the appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, the Azerbaijan blockade of Armenia has continued for 5 years, cutting off the transport of food, fuel, medicine, and other commodities. This ruthless blockade has caused a humanitarian crisis that has required the United States to send emergency assistance to Armenia. At a time when Armenia is trying to move forward with major market reforms and integrating its economy with the West, the Azerbaijan stranglehold has forced a shutdown of Armenian industry, caused massive unemployment, and obstructed rebuilding of areas damaged by the 1988 earthquake. Armenian children have had to do without schooling, and hospitals have been unable to care for the sick and the dying. There is no justification for this type of behavior. American taxpayers should not be asked to reward or appease these actions by Azerbaijan.

On the positive side, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Foreign Ops Subcommittee, and in particular the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], for the inclusion in the legislation of language incorporating the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. This provision would deny U.S. assistance to countries which block the shipment of American humanitarian aid to other countries. This has been the case with the Republic of Turkey, which has maintained its own blockade of Armenia while collecting generous amounts of United States aid. Mr. Speaker, I think common sense and decency would argue that countries that block U.S. aid to other recipients should not themselves benefit from American largesse. I commend the committee for including this language, which was also part of the American Overseas Interests Act, and would urge Members to oppose any efforts to remove this provision.

I also understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has also an amendment to limit assistance to Turkey in part linked to its blockade of Armenia. I would also urge support of this amendment.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would point out that some of the discussion has been talked about with regard to Haiti and Turkey and so forth. We are talking about cutting amendments, and we do have an open rule. So that is in the area of the spirit of things that are traditional and available to any Member under this type of legislation, as we all know, nothing really extraordinary there. And the fact that we have an open rule on an appropriations bill, I think, is very important for the deliberative process, something we promised we would do as often as possible.

With regard to the concern of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], on the Smith amendment, indeed we have not followed exactly the authorizing language because we did pass an authorizing bill and that is what we want to follow.

With regard to the concern of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], about the lockbox, she needs to know that we are dealing with that issue. We have planned debate and hearings and so forth, and she has been advised that she will be invited to participate.

So there is process in the legislative mill. It just does not happen to be ready yet for the appropriations round that we are in now. Many of us wish it were. I hope we get there soon. We are trying.

Finally, I think a very important point on this rule, I do not think anybody has really suggested this is not fair rule, but I would point out that last year the Committee on Rules, this was under the previous majority, the Committee on Rules made in order

only eight amendments on this appropriations bill, five by Republicans and three by Democrats. We thanked them for those five. The rule waived all points of order against all eight amendments. By our count, five of the eight involved violations of clause 2 of rule XXI. So if your concern is that, we are definitely making progress and doing a better job of getting our authorizers and appropriators in sync. I think that is important. I think it makes for a better product and an easier vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 178, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

YEAS—221

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—178

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—35

Ackerman
Bilbray
Burton
Chrysler
Clayton
Crane
DeFazio
Dooley
Frost
Gejdenson
Geren
Graham
Hansen
Hastert
Houghton
Istook
Jefferson
Kingston
LaFalce
LaTourette
Laughlin
Levin
McDade
McHugh
Mica
Moakley
Parker
Payne (VA)
Pryce
Rose
Seastrand
Serrano
Stupak
Tate
Torres

□ 1656

Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. VOLKMER changed their vote for ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 175, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—217

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hancock
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen

Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—175

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Rivers
Roemer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Shays
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Towns
Tucker
Velázquez
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—42

Ackerman
Barton
Bilbray
Burton
Chrysler
Clayton
Crane
DeFazio
Dooley
Dornan
Doyle
Frost
Gejdenson
Geren
Graham
Hansen
Hastert
Houghton
Istook
Jefferson
Kennedy (MA)
Kingston
Kleczka
LaFalce
Largent
LaTourette
Laughlin
Levin
McDade
McHugh
Mica
Moakley
Parker
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pryce
Rose
Seastrand
Serrano
Stupak
Tate
Torres

□ 1705

Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. NADLER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader to inquire about the schedule for next week.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 26, the House will meet in pro forma session. There will be no recorded votes on Monday.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour and 12 noon for legislative business. We plan to consider one bill under suspension of the rules, H.R. 1565, legislation extending health care to veterans who have been exposed to Agent Orange. We will then continue consideration of H.R. 1868, the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to take up House Joint Resolution 79, a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment prohibiting desecration of the U.S. flag, subject to a rule. We then plan to spend the balance of the week working on appropriations bills. We will complete the foreign operations legislation and, time permitting, consider the fiscal year 1996 energy and water, Interior, and Agriculture appropriations bills. On Thursday and Friday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

Mr. Speaker, it is our hope to have Members on their way home to their families and their districts by no later than 3 p.m. on Friday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will answer a question or two here. I wonder if the gentleman can advise Members how late he expects the House to work on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the Members should be prepared to work very late on all three of those evenings, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

I would point out that we are prepared and hopeful that we can during next week deal with a budget conference report, perhaps the Medicare select report, and hopefully we would be able to do something on a rescissions or supplemental assistance bill.

Mr. GEPHARDT. On that score, on an earlier version of the schedule provided by the majority, the rescissions bill was listed. It is not on the schedule that you just outlined. You just mentioned it. I assume that you are thinking it might come forward as well next week?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, we are still hopeful to have some continued discussions with the White House, but I believe that it is very likely that we will be able to do that next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. The Committee on Rules is scheduled to meet on Tuesday to consider a rule regarding the constitutional amendment on the flag. Could the gentleman or the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules advise Members what rule is expected for that resolution?

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would say to the minority leader that the Committee on Rules will be meeting, I believe, at 2 p.m. on Tuesday afternoon. The Interior appropriations bill has been pulled from that meeting and we will only consider the constitutional amendment that would allow States to ban the physical desecration of the American flag. It certainly will come to the floor under a rule and probably with 1 hour of debate and some time for a substitute by those that might be in opposition to the bill. We are in negotiation now as to just exactly how the rule would be brought to the floor.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

A couple of further questions. Could the gentleman advise Members as to when he expects the House to consider the budget conference report? I think he answered that and said it might be coming forward next week. I assume at this point you are not sure of that, but it could happen?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, we are optimistic and we would hope if everything comes together that we might be able to do that on Thursday. Possibly Friday morning.

However it works, we will do our utmost to maintain our commitment to the 3 p.m. departure for the district work period. But I should expect it would be Thursday or Friday morning.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Finally, at the end of the week, we begin the Fourth of July recess.

Could the gentleman advise Members whether he expects votes on Monday, July 10?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I believe we would probably need to be prepared to have votes by, say, 5 p.m. on Monday, July 10. We will try to examine that and make an announcement later next week if there is any change from that.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would just end with one statement for consideration. I know the gentleman is trying, as we said this morning, to have a family friendly situation here and that was part of the reason I assume we had problems with cutting off times on votes. We appreciate that.

I would just hope that if it can be worked out next week if there is one of the nights next week that could not be extra late, that might be helpful to

people. I realize you are trying to juggle a lot of different bills and conference reports. But to the extent we could work to make that happen, I am sure Members would appreciate that.

Mr. ARMEY. I do appreciate that. I do think the Members ought to certainly make sure they make good arrangements for Monday night next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1868, and that I be able to insert tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 170 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1868.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1714

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. BOEHNER, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considerd as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, before I address the contents of this appropriations bill, let me take a moment to thank the staff of our Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. This newly assembled little group got together only a few months ago, they are very professional. I want to tell you, it is a pleasure to work with them, particularly Charlie Flickner, Bill Inglee, John Shank, Lori Maes, and our CRS detail, Larry Nowels, and also to work with Terry Peel on the minority staff as well as Nancy Tippins on my own staff.

□ 1715

They were all very professional, and without their professional help we would not be here today with this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, each and every member of the subcommittee supported bringing this bill to the House floor and each and every one had to go along with things they did not want. This is what legislation in the Congress is all about, compromise.

I want to thank our chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], for all his help at the early stage of the process. And I appreciate the efforts of my predecessor, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and the ranking member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], for their patience, understanding, and guidance. Everything we are doing is building on the record that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], made in the last Congress, along with the former chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. Chairman, now let me simply address the contents of this bill. It is a foreign aid bill for sure, but it is more than that. It is the instrument for this President, and any future President, to work out foreign problems with more than talk but less than military force.

If Members find time to look at our committee report this weekend, I urge them to take a close look at the general introduction, beginning on page 3. Those pages express better than I can this afternoon what this bill is about and why it is necessary.

It is the instrument for American businesses and private groups to help less fortunate nations develop economically. The first items in this bill, in title I, are for export and investment assistance, and they are a priority for this committee this year. The best way to demonstrate a market economy is to do it, and that is what our businesses and investors enable others to do: learn about business by buying, selling, building, and working with American capitalists.

Because of the budget, we have had to reduce the more traditional types of development assistance, particularly when it is done through the multilateral banks. The committee does protect two categories of aid: children's programs and efforts to fight infectious diseases. In fact, we recommend a new account in the Treasury to ensure that children are protected and we continue a vigorous fight against diseases that affect both children and adults.

I am not sure that many American's are aware that our public health officials are moving towards the eradication of polio. Rotary International has been the sparkplug of this effort, and they have brought that to our attention.

In title III of the bill we have tried to go along with as much of the President's request for military assistance as we were able to afford. We have included the economic support fund and the military finance moneys that are sufficient to fulfill the Camp David accord needs. We also went along with the President's Warsaw initiative to help new democracies in Central Europe contribute to European security.

The final title, multilateral economic assistance, has had to bear the bulk of the reductions we made. That is not because our subcommittee does not appreciate what many of these banks and agencies do, but we simply had a higher priority on bilateral programs undertaken by our own Government. I would note that funding for UNICEF has been moved from title IV to the Child Survival and Disease Programs Account in title II, at the current level of $100 million.

The subcommittee has removed many of the general provisions from title V. Some of them have been picked up in the authorization bill. Others were no longer needed. Many of the amendments that have been filed will occur during consideration of the general provisions title.

Let me close by going over a few of the numbers. The dollar levels that the House provides in this bill, history indicates, will be very close to what the final, enacted numbers are.

This bill is less than $12 billion in budget authority. That is $1.5 billion less than the current year, and almost $10 billion less than the level of a decade ago. It is the lowest level in a decade.

At $11.99 billion, this bill is $2.8 billion less than the President's request, a reduction of 19 percent. that may be the largest reduction in history. We know it is the largest reduction within the last two decades.

Finally, this bill is under the congressional budget. In fact, it is over $200 million under our subcommittee allocation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. We have tried to come up with a fair bill and we worked hard to balance the priorities of the new Republican majority and our veteran Democratic Members. I think we have accomplished what we set out to do.

There will be those who will come to the floor today and next week when we continue this bill who will want to spend more money on foreign aid, but I would ask each and every one of them to recognize the message that the American people sent to us in November. They said to cut spending. They did not say to cut spending in every area that we deal in except foreign aid. They said to cut everything.

There will be those that want to increase that, but there is no money to increase that. We have given the President the latitude he needs to have an effective foreign policy. We give him in this bill all of the money that we can afford for foreign operations for the next fiscal year.

So I think we have been fair to the administration. Certainly the minority party has been fair in negotiating how we spend this limited amount of money next year. It is the best that we can do.

So those of you who that are planning to come forward next week and indicate that you want to spend more, that you want to give the President more, forget about it. We are not going to go any higher. We cannot go any higher.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD:

ROTARY INTERNATIONAL,
THE ROTARY FOUNDATION,
Evanston, IL, June 16, 1995.

Hon. SONNY CALLAHAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CALLAHAN: I join with the 1.2 million Rotarians worldwide in thanking you for your leadership on polio eradication. We were pleased to find out that the House Foreign Operation Appropriations Subcommittee included Report Language recommending up to $20,000,000 for targeted polio eradication efforts in fiscal year 1996.

We believe this direction from the Subcommittee is a critical first step in our fight to eradicate polio by the year 2000. This language is essential to focusing our humanitarian assistance programs on efforts that can be successful in providing important health benefits for the world's children, while at the same time saving money here in the United States.

We are encouraged by the Report Language in the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, which has demonstrated the broad consensus on the value of polio eradication. We look forward to celebrating the eradication of this disease in the year 2000.

Sincerely,

HERBERT A. PIGMAN,
General Secretary.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1868)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE					
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES					
Limitation of Program Activity:					
Subsidy appropriations	786,551,000	823,000,000	786,551,000	.....	-36,449,000
Administrative expenses	45,228,000	47,000,000	45,228,000	.....	-1,772,000
Negative subsidy	-49,656,000	-89,646,000	-89,646,000	-39,990,000	.....
Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States	782,123,000	780,354,000	742,133,000	-39,990,000	-38,221,000
OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION					
Operating expenses	7,933,000	16,000,000	15,500,000	+7,567,000	-500,000
Non-credit administrative expenses	16,389,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	-5,389,000	.....
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections	-151,620,000	-202,500,000	-202,500,000	-50,880,000	.....
Direct loans:					
Loan subsidy	8,214,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-4,214,000	.....
(Loan authorization)	(19,895,000)	(79,523,000)	(79,523,000)	(+59,628,000)	.....
Guaranteed loans:					
Loan subsidy	25,730,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	+49,270,000	.....
(Loan authorization)	(481,913,000)	(1,491,054,000)	(1,491,054,000)	(+1,009,141,000)	.....
Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation	-93,354,000	-96,500,000	-97,000,000	-3,646,000	-500,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Trade and Development Agency					
Trade and development agency	44,966,000	67,000,000	40,000,000	-4,966,000	-27,000,000
International Financial Institutions					
Contribution to the International Finance Corporation	68,743,028	67,556,000	67,550,000	-1,193,028	-6,000
Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund	75,000,000	100,000,000	70,000,000	-5,000,000	-30,000,000
Total, International Financial Institutions	143,743,028	167,556,000	137,550,000	-6,193,028	-30,006,000
Total, title I, Export and investment assistance	877,498,028	918,410,000	822,683,000	-54,815,028	-95,727,000
(Loan authorizations)	(501,808,000)	(1,570,577,000)	(1,570,577,000)	(+1,068,769,000)	.....
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Agency for International Development					
Child survival and disease programs fund	.....	.....	484,000,000	+484,000,000	+484,000,000
Development assistance fund	840,500,000	1,300,000,000	669,000,000	-171,500,000	-631,000,000
Population, development assistance	450,000,000	.....	.....	-450,000,000	.....
Development Fund for Africa	802,000,000	802,000,000	528,000,000	-274,000,000	-274,000,000
International disaster assistance	169,998,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	+30,002,000	.....
Debt restructuring	7,000,000	25,500,000	7,000,000	.....	-18,500,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(15,500,000)	(+15,500,000)	(+15,500,000)
Micro and Small Enterprise Development program:					
Subsidy appropriations	1,500,000	12,000,000	1,500,000	.....	-10,500,000
Administrative expenses	500,000	2,500,000	500,000	.....	-2,000,000
(Direct loan authorization)	(1,000,000)	(3,540,000)	(1,435,000)	(+435,000)	(-2,105,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(18,564,000)	(138,880,000)	(16,700,000)	(-1,864,000)	(-122,180,000)
Housing and other credit guaranty programs:					
Subsidy appropriations	19,300,000	16,760,000	.....	-19,300,000	-16,760,000
Operating expenses	6,000,000	7,240,000	7,000,000	-1,000,000	-240,000
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(137,474,000)	(141,886,000)	.....	(-137,474,000)	(-141,886,000)
Subtotal, development assistance	2,296,798,000	2,366,000,000	1,897,000,000	-401,798,000	-469,000,000
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	45,118,000	43,914,000	43,914,000	-1,204,000	.....
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development	517,500,000	529,000,000	465,750,000	-51,750,000	-63,250,000
Reform and downsizing	.....	.....	29,925,000	+29,925,000	+29,925,000
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General	39,118,000	38,118,000	35,200,000	-3,918,000	-3,918,000
Subtotal, Agency for International Development	2,900,534,000	2,976,032,000	2,471,789,000	-428,745,000	-506,243,000
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance					
Economic support fund	2,349,000,000	2,494,300,000	2,326,700,000	-22,300,000	-167,600,000
International fund for Ireland	19,600,000	.....	19,600,000	.....	+19,600,000
Assistance for Eastern Europe	359,000,000	480,000,000	324,000,000	-35,000,000	-156,000,000
Assistance for the New Independent States of the Soviet Union	842,500,000	788,000,000	595,000,000	-247,500,000	-193,000,000
Procurement: General provisions	-1,598,000	.....	.....	+1,598,000	.....
Subtotal, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance	3,568,502,000	3,762,300,000	3,265,300,000	-303,202,000	-497,000,000
Total, Agency for International Development	6,469,036,000	6,740,332,000	5,737,089,000	-731,947,000	-1,003,243,000

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATONS BILL (H.R. 1868)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Independent Agencies					
African Development Foundation					
Appropriations	16,905,000	17,405,000	10,000,000	-6,905,000	-7,405,000
Inter-American Foundation					
Appropriations	30,960,000	31,760,000	20,000,000	-10,960,000	-11,760,000
Total, Funds Appropriated to the President	6,516,901,000	6,789,497,000	5,767,089,000	-749,812,000	-1,022,408,000
Peace Corps					
Appropriations	219,745,000	234,000,000	210,000,000	-9,745,000	-24,000,000
Department of State					
International narcotics control	105,000,000	213,000,000	113,000,000	+8,000,000	-100,000,000
Migration and refugee assistance	671,000,000	671,000,000	671,000,000	.....	.....
Refugee resettlement assistance	6,000,000	.....	5,000,000	-1,000,000	+5,000,000
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	.....	.....
Anti-terrorism assistance	15,244,000	15,000,000	17,000,000	+1,756,000	+2,000,000
Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund	10,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	+10,000,000	-5,000,000
Total, Department of State	857,244,000	974,000,000	876,000,000	+18,756,000	-98,000,000
Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance	7,593,890,000	7,997,497,000	6,853,089,000	-740,801,000	-1,144,408,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(15,500,000)	(+15,500,000)	(+15,500,000)
(Loan authorizations)	(157,038,000)	(284,306,000)	(18,135,000)	(-138,903,000)	(-266,171,000)
TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Military Education and Training	25,500,000	39,781,000	39,000,000	+13,500,000	-781,000
(By transfer)	(850,000)	.....	.....	(-850,000)	.....
Military to military contact	12,000,000	.....	.....	-12,000,000	.....
Foreign Military Financing Program:					
Grants	3,151,279,000	3,262,020,000	3,211,279,000	+60,000,000	-50,741,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(22,150,000)	(24,020,000)	(24,000,000)	(+1,850,000)	(-20,000)
Direct concessional loans:					
Subsidy appropriations	47,917,000	89,888,000	64,400,000	+16,483,000	-25,488,000
(Loan authorization)	(819,850,000)	(795,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(-75,850,000)	(-221,000,000)
FMF program level	(3,770,929,000)	(4,027,020,000)	(3,755,279,000)	(-15,650,000)	(-271,741,000)
Total, Foreign military assistance	3,199,196,000	3,351,908,000	3,275,679,000	+76,483,000	-76,229,000
Special Defense Acquisition Fund: Offsetting collections	-282,000,000	-220,000,000	-220,000,000	+62,000,000	.....
Peacekeeping operations	75,000,000	100,000,000	68,300,000	-6,700,000	-31,700,000
Total, title III, Military assistance programs	3,029,896,000	3,271,689,000	3,162,979,000	+133,283,000	-108,710,000
(By transfer)	(850,000)	.....	.....	(-850,000)	.....
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(22,150,000)	(24,020,000)	(24,000,000)	(+1,850,000)	(-20,000)
(Loan authorization)	(819,850,000)	(795,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(-75,850,000)	(-221,000,000)
TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Financial Institutions					
World Bank Group					
Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Paid-in capital	23,009,101	28,189,963	23,009,000	-101	-5,180,963
(Limitation on callable capital)	(743,923,914)	(911,475,013)	(743,900,000)	(-23,914)	(-167,575,013)
Contribution to the Global Environment Facility	90,000,000	110,000,000	50,000,000	-40,000,000	-60,000,000
Total, contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	(856,933,015)	(1,049,664,976)	(816,909,000)	(-40,024,015)	(-232,755,976)
Contribution to the International Development Association	1,175,000,000	1,368,188,000	575,000,000	-600,000,000	-793,188,000
Total, World Bank Group	(2,031,933,015)	(2,417,832,976)	(1,391,909,000)	(-640,024,015)	(-1,025,923,976)
Budget authority	1,288,009,101	1,506,357,963	648,009,000	-640,000,101	-858,348,963
(Limitation on callable capital)	(743,923,914)	(911,475,013)	(743,900,000)	(-23,914)	(-167,575,013)
Contribution to the Inter-American Development Banic					
Inter-regional paid-in capital	28,111,959	25,952,110	25,950,000	-2,161,959	-2,110
(Limitation on callable capital)	(1,594,568,180)	(1,523,767,142)	(1,523,000,000)	(-71,568,180)	(-767,142)
Fund for special operations	21,338,000	20,835,000	.....	-21,338,000	-20,835,000
Inter-American Investment Corporation	190,000	.....	.....	-190,000	.....
Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank	(1,644,206,139)	(1,570,554,252)	(1,548,950,000)	(-95,256,139)	(-21,604,252)

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BIL (H.R. 1868)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	.....	13,221,596	13,200,000	+13,200,000	-21,596
(Limitation on callable capital)	.....	(647,656,204)	(647,000,000)	(+647,000,000)	(-656,204)
Development fund	167,960,000	304,528,525	167,960,000	.....	-136,568,525
Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank	(167,960,000)	(965,608,325)	(828,160,000)	(+660,200,000)	(-137,448,325)
Contribution to the African Development Fund	62,215,309	127,247,025	.....	-62,215,309	-127,247,025
Contribution to the African Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	133,000	.....	.....	-133,000	.....
(Limitation on callable capital)	(2,002,540)	.....	.....	(-2,002,540)	.....
Total, contribution to the African Development Bank	(2,135,540)	.....	.....	(-2,135,540)	.....
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Paid-in capital	69,180,353	81,916,447	69,180,000	-353	-12,736,447
(Limitation on callable capital)	(161,420,824)	(191,138,376)	(161,400,000)	(-20,824)	(-29,738,376)
Total, contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development	(230,601,177)	(273,054,823)	(230,580,000)	(-21,177)	(-42,474,823)
North American Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	.....	56,250,000	56,250,000	+56,250,000	.....
(Limitation on callable capital)	.....	(318,750,000)	(318,750,000)	(+318,750,000)	.....
International Monetary Fund					
Contribution to the enhanced structural adjustment facility	25,000,000	25,000,000	.....	-25,000,000	-25,000,000
Total, contribution to International Financial Institutions	(4,164,053,180)	(5,754,297,401)	(4,374,599,000)	(+210,545,820)	(-1,379,698,401)
Budget authority	1,662,137,722	2,161,308,666	990,549,000	-671,588,722	-1,170,759,666
(Limitation on callable capital)	(2,501,915,458)	(3,592,988,735)	(3,384,050,000)	(+882,134,542)	(-198,938,735)
International Organizations and Programs					
International organizations and programs	374,000,000	425,000,000	155,000,000	-219,000,000	-270,000,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)
Total, title IV, contribution for Multilateral Economic Assistance.	(4,538,053,180)	(6,179,297,401)	(4,529,599,000)	(-8,454,180)	(-1,649,698,401)
Budget authority	2,036,137,722	2,596,308,666	1,135,549,000	-900,588,722	-1,460,759,666
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)
(Limitation on callable capital)	(2,501,915,458)	(3,592,988,735)	(3,384,050,000)	(+882,134,542)	(-198,938,735)
Grand total, all titles:					
New budget (obligational) authority	13,537,221,750	14,773,904,666	11,974,300,000	-1,562,921,750	-2,799,604,666
(By transfer)	(850,000)	.....	(30,500,000)	(+29,650,000)	(+30,500,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(22,150,000)	(24,020,000)	(24,000,000)	(+1,850,000)	(-20,000)
(Limitation on callable capital)	(2,501,915,458)	(3,592,988,735)	(3,384,050,000)	(+882,134,542)	(-198,938,735)
(Loan authorizations)	(1,278,496,000)	(2,619,883,000)	(2,132,712,000)	(+854,216,000)	(-487,171,000)
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE					
Export Assistance Appropriations	1,078,774,028	1,210,556,000	1,114,829,000	+36,054,972	-95,727,000
Negative Subsidies and Offsetting Collections	-201,276,000	-292,146,000	-292,146,000	-90,870,000	.....
Total, Export Assistance	877,498,028	918,410,000	822,683,000	-54,815,028	-95,727,000
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
Bilateral Development Assistance	4,025,388,000	4,235,197,000	3,587,789,000	-437,599,000	-647,408,000
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance	3,568,502,000	3,762,300,000	3,265,300,000	-303,202,000	-497,000,000
Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance	7,593,890,000	7,997,497,000	6,853,089,000	-740,801,000	-1,144,408,000
TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
Foreign Military Financing Program:					
Grants	3,151,279,000	3,262,020,000	3,211,279,000	+60,000,000	-50,741,000
Direct loans, subsidy costs	47,917,000	89,888,000	64,400,000	+16,483,000	-25,488,000
(Estimated level of direct loans)	(619,850,000)	(765,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(-75,850,000)	(-221,000,000)
Subtotal, Foreign Military Financing Program:					
Budget authority	3,199,196,000	3,351,908,000	3,275,679,000	+76,483,000	-76,229,000
(Program level)	(3,770,929,000)	(4,027,020,000)	(3,755,279,000)	(-15,650,000)	(-271,741,000)
Other, Military	112,500,000	139,781,000	107,300,000	-5,200,000	-32,481,000
Special Defense Acquisition Fund	-282,000,000	-220,000,000	-220,000,000	+62,000,000	.....
Total, Military Assistance Programs	3,029,696,000	3,271,689,000	3,162,979,000	+133,283,000	-108,710,000

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATONS BILL (H.R. 1868)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
Contributions to International Financial Institutions	1,837,137,722	2,136,308,666	980,549,000	-856,588,722	-1,155,759,666
International Monetary Fund (IMF)	25,000,000	25,000,000		-25,000,000	-25,000,000
International organizations and programs	374,000,000	425,000,000	155,000,000	-219,000,000	-270,000,000
Total, contribution for Multilateral Economic Assistance	2,036,137,722	2,586,308,666	1,135,549,000	-900,588,722	-1,450,759,666
Grand total, all titles	13,537,221,750	14,773,904,666	11,974,300,000	-1,562,921,750	-2,799,604,666

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the passage of the foreign operations bill.

Although I hope that some funding adjustments can be made as the bill moves through the legislative process, I think the bill should be supported vigorously in its current form.

As the chairman has said, the committee has recommended a bill of $12 billion for fiscal year 1996, which is $1.5 billion, 11 percent, below last year, and more importantly, $2.8 billion below the President's request or 19 percent below the President's request. I dare say there will not be another appropriation bill presented to this House that is that much below the President's budget.

Funds are provided in the bill to meet the administration request for Camp David, and other commitments in the Middle East including Jordan and programs for the West Bank and for the Gaza Strip.

The bill also provides a significant program to help increase U.S. exports abroad, which is in my opinion one of the most important characteristics of the bill. The $822 million in export assistance in the bill will provide for more than $20 billion in guaranteed loans through the Export-Import Bank and more than $1 billion in assistance through the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

I would like to say at this point that regarding OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, that that is one of the very few agencies in the U.S. Government that pays more back into the Treasury, that remits more to the Treasury of the United States, than is appropriated for its operation.

So, it not only pays more back than we appropriate, but it also significantly affects in a positive way the balance of payments of the United States, as well as creating jobs and exports in every State in the Union.

The bill also helps meet our humanitarian commitment abroad by providing the amount requested by the administration for both refugee assistance and international disaster assistance.

The bill also, at the initiative of the chairman, sets aside significant funds for child survival and funds to meet our international commitment to fighting worldwide diseases.

I would also say, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is the result of very strenuous and vigorous negotiation and compromise on the part of all of the members of the committee and particularly of the chairman of the subcommittee, the chairman of the full committee, and the ranking member of the full committee.

The bill is truly bipartisan in nature and truly enjoys at this point bipartisan support. I can only express my hope that damaging amendments are not added to the bill which will upset the bipartisan balance that we have achieved.

I want to compliment the chairman again. I want to compliment the chairman of the full committee. I certainly want to compliment the ranking member, because everyone stretched their tolerance to the limit to reach a truly, truly, bipartisan compromise. I urge Members to stay with the bill as reported in the House and not to make changes that will endanger this bipartisan support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] for his comments and I would like to say that I omitted to recognize the gentleman's very able staff person, Kathleen Murphy, who did an outstanding job as well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], my good friend, the able chairman of the subcommittee, and rise in support of the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations bill.

First, let me pay special tribute to the great gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. The gentleman has displayed not only great leadership, but diplomatic skills worthy of Henry Kissinger in shepherding this bill through the committee.

My friends, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member, also deserve special praise for their hard work and willingness to develop a bipartisan consensus on what could have been a very difficult bill, but has not been because of their tremendous assistance and cooperation.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the chairman worked with all of the members of the subcommittee, many members of the authorizing committee, and the administration to allocate the shrinking foreign assistance dollars in the fairest and most balanced manner possible. Due to the gentleman's inclusive leadership, we are able to present a bill with bipartisan support which we hope to pass.

I want to echo the comments of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] that I hope also that it can be done with a minimum of amendments.

We are continuing the downward trend in foreign aid spending that has occurred in the last decade. We spent $18.3 billion on foreign operations appropriations in fiscal year 1985, which is $25 billion in today's dollars. Since today's bill is less than $12 billion, we have basically cut foreign aid in half over these last 11 years.

This bill makes the tough choices to cut $1.5 billion from last years's level and $2.8 billion from the President's request.

Despite the difficult cuts, we have protected the most vulnerable of those who rely on us, the young children and the victims of disease and disaster.

Therefore, I strongly support the decision of the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] to create a new account called the child survival and disease program fund. At $484 million, it slightly increases the spending for protection of young children worldwide and it encourages the administration to fund programs to eradicate polio and reduce other infectious diseases, including AIDS.

While maintaining support for children and refugees, this bill reduces the old-style government-to-government foreign aid in favor of market-oriented, private-sector-driven economic growth. Genuine and sustainable development will be promoted far faster by investment by real entrepreneurs and expanded trade and capital formation by U.S. companies in emerging private sectors around the globe.

We have invested in programs that allow private companies to work with export assistance agencies to make broad-based economic growth a reality in developing free markets. The bill contains no earmarks, instead providing the President with maximum flexibility possible to develop foreign policy without micromanagement.

We could have used this bill to score political points against the President's foreign policy, or raised flowery rhetoric on controversial issues. We avoided pejorative political statements and instead provided the President with resources to conduct a global foreign policy letting the numbers speak for themselves.

We have accepted the reorganization savings made by the authorizing committee and kept the funding levels generally in line with the levels provided in H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interest Act. If you voted for the authorization bill, you should support this appropriations bill.

We have maintained the funding levels to meet our Camp David commitments for Egypt and Israel. We have made children a priority and moved our aid program in the direction of promoting trade and free markets instead of government-to-government handouts.

Mr. Chairman, this is a responsible and balanced bill, and I urge all of our Members to cooperate with us and try to keep their amendments to the minimum, and I urge their support for the good work of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the good work of all of the members of the subcommittee.

□ 1730

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me, first of all, congratulate both the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] for the work they have done in putting together a bipartisan approach to this bill and to say that I feel that for a long time, regardless of partisan differences on many other issues, I believe this subcommittee has always served as an example of the way the Congress ought to work, putting policy ahead of party and putting the country ahead of personal considerations.

I do not think in the time that Mickey Edwards from Oklahoma was the ranking member or in the time that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] was ranking member, and I chaired the subcommittee, that you could tell who was a Democrat and who was a Republican when we were addressing issues on this bill. There were no partisan scenes, and I think that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has made every effort, as has the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], now that the Republicans are in control of this institution, to see to it that that tradition remains, and I congratulate them for it because that is the only way this country can function on foreign policy.

That does not mean we are going to agree on everything, because, as Will Rogers said, when two people agree on everything, one of them is unnecessary.

But the fact is that we have many times stood in the well in the last 10 years defending the positions and the prerogatives of the President of the United States, whether that President was a Republican or a Democrat, and I think it is essential on this bill that that tradition continue.

Having said that, I also feel an obligation to point out the priorities in this bill are not necessarily my priorities. I would prefer that military aid not be as high as it is in the bill, and I would prefer that some of the economic accounts be somewhat higher.

I also have very great doubts about both the administration's position and the subcommittee's position with respect to NATO. I would urge everyone to read the article by Mr. Hoagland in the Washington Post today if they want to understand what I mean.

And I am concerned very much about what I feel to be an insufficient appreciation for the delicate situation that exists in the Soviet Union, and I think that this Congress runs a very major risk of not dealing with that relationship in the most constructive way possible. I think there are significant defects in this bill with respect to that issue.

But having said that, I still intend at this moment to support this bill because it does represent a reasonable bipartisan effort to hold this institution together. It does not try, as the authorization bill sometimes does, to incredibly micromanage the Nation's foreign affairs. It does state clear policy preferences, but it does not try to micromanage, and I think that is a crucial difference.

I would simply concur in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas who indicated that this bill is very delicately put together and it will remain a bipartisan bill so long as it stands in roughly this shape.

The House has two choices it can make. It can choose, if it wants, to pass a partisan bill with nominal but not very enthusiastic support on this side of the aisle, in which case that bill may make a lot of people feel good temporarily. But it will in the end go nowhere because the President in the end has the veto pen, and I have no doubt he will use it if this bill is not consistent with his vision of the national interest.

But the other choice it can make is to try to do what we have tried to do many times in this country's history, which is to produce a bipartisan product which meets the needs of the United States without regard to ideological preference, and while this bill certainly has a strong philosophical bent in the direction of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], that is to be expected because they have the votes for the time being, and I think what we need right now on both sides of the aisle is a determination that we will try to keep this bill as bipartisan as possible because in foreign affairs, and this is much more crucial than any other area of governance, although it would be useful in both, in foreign affairs it is crucial that we have continuity of policy so that we do not confuse our friends and that we do not confuse our adversaries.

I think this bill tries to do that to a significant degree, and that is why, at least at this moment, I support the legislation with all of my doubts about some of the edges.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin and say that philosophically I agree with your statement that, with respect to the administration, I think the Constitution gives the responsibility and the authority to handle foreign affairs to the administration, and I think Congress has been too involved.

But we are here today, talking about money under today's circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], a member of our subcommittee.

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama for making the best of a very difficult budgetary situation. The bill is nearly $2 billion smaller than last year's, which represents a large cut in a relatively small bill, yet Mr. CALLAHAN worked tirelessly to ensure that the concerns and priorities of all the members of the subcommittee and committee were taken into account.

This is not to say that this bill is perfect—or could be in my view given the constraints the subcommittee is working under. But I believe the United States has not only an opportunity, but a responsibility, to take a leadership role in the world and promote our values of human rights, rule of law, democracy and free markets to the far corners of the globe. I am concerned that the cuts to the development assistance account—40 percent—gravely weaken our development programs, including voluntary family planning, environment, education, and microenterprise.

I strongly oppose any effort that may be made to further cut the development assistance account on the floor today or that will inhibit AID from undertaking much needed streamlining.

Perhaps the most important item in this bill in my view is the funding to the government of Turkey. Together with FRANK WOLF and CHRIS SMITH, I will be offering an amendment to cut some of these funds in order to send a clear message to Turkey that their ongoing genocide of the Kurds and that their treatment of their neighbors—Armenia and Cyprus—is absolutely unacceptable. This bill provides $320 million in loans to Turkey to allow it to purchase weapons and $46 weapons and $46 million in economic aid in the form of cash transfers to the Turkish Government. It is hypocritical, it seems to me, that our Nation, the freest ever, should be helping to prop-up and arm a government that the State Department has repeatedly cited for gross and worsening violations of human rights. As I said, at the appropriate time I will be offering an amendment to cut aid to Turkey.

I am very pleased, however, that the report to this bill makes clear that the committee continues to strongly support funds to bring together the two communities in Cyprus, which have been separated for over 20 years following the Turkish invasion of the island.

Another grave concern I have with this bill is the retreat on funding for voluntary family planning programs. To understand this concern, I would like to ask one question, ''Do you think the quality of life for people on Earth, including Americans, will be better or worse when the global population is double what it is today?''

If we do not take action to provide couples with the means to plan the number and spacing of pregnancies, the world's population will double by 2050. This will put huge pressures on food and energy supplies and the environment, not to mention the political instability that will be created by huge numbers of young people in the developing world. Adequate funding for bilateral and multilateral voluntary family planning programs today helps

to ensure that our children and grandchildren will live in a safer more prosperous world. I encourage Members to keep that in mind when an amendment is offered later by Rep. SMITH of New Jersey to effectively eliminate our multilateral population program and hamstring our bilateral program so the most effective family planning providers cannot receive U.S. funds.

This bill addresses, as best it can given the budget squeeze, the need to help other nations conserve and protect their environments. AID has for a number of years, been focusing resources on protecting the biodiversity in areas like South America, central Africa, and Papua New Guinea. I strongly support this ongoing effort.

I am also very supportive of the continuing work of the Global Environmental Facility—the GEF—which is the environmental lending program, of the World Bank. I think the best way to describe the GEF is that it is a fund that helps developing nations help themselves in ways that help us. The GEF lends funds to developing nations for environmental projects that address the loss of forests and species, ozone depletion, and pollution of international waters. Although the bill cuts the U.S. contributions to the GEF nearly in half, this level of U.S. participation is essential to ensure that other donors continue to participate. In the next 4 years, Japan has pledged $500 million and Germany has pledged $240 million. I strongly support our contribution and oppose any effort to cut it further on the floor.

This bill also puts at a high priority the democratization and development of free markets in nations of the former Soviet Union, particularly Armenia. Armenia has a young, but fully functioning democracy that is far ahead of its neighbors in privatization. This bill provides funds for both humanitarian assistance for Armenia and for long-term development that will, coupled with an end to the blockades imposed by its neighbors, ultimately make Armenia a self-sufficient country. The State Department plans to end assistance to the NIS countries before the end of the century. Assistance, like that to Armenia, is essential to set them on the right track and ensure that they will develop sufficiently to be able to stand on their own in the near future.

I am also very pleased that this bill continues to meet our Nation's commitment to the Camp David accords. Both Israel and Egypt are fully funded in this bill, as they should be. This bill helps fulfill our commitment to Israel's keeping a qualitative military edge over its neighbors as well as rewarding those who are willing to take reasonable risks to pursue peace.

Finally, I would like to commend the staff of the subcommittee for their excellent and tireless work with Members and their staffs to find common ground on what are often very difficult issues and to bring this bill to the floor today. Thanks to Charlie Flickner, the new clerk who the chairman was fortunate enough to lure away from the other body, and to John Shank and Bill Inglee of the subcommittee staff, and to Nancy Tippines, the chairman's very able associate staffer. And special thanks to Lori Maes, who is the institutional memory on the subcommittee and a real professional.

Also thanks to Terry Peel the minority staff whose knowledge of this bill was essential to our getting to this point today. I also want to commend the associate staff of the members of the subcommittee including Tripp Funderburk, Bill Deere, Ann Campbell, Chris Peace, Martha Harrison, Jim Doran, Jerome Hartl, Kathleen Murphy, Rep WILSON's very able and accommodating staffer, Steve Marchese, who grew up in Arlington Heights which is in my district, Carolyn Bartholomew, and Nancy Alcalde.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CALLAHAN and urge Members to support this bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], another distinguished member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I have the distinct pleasure and privilege of serving on this subcommittee with the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], and I find that they have crafted a very, very good bill, and I would like to recognize them for that effort.

I also recognize the staff and all of their hard work that they have done, as well.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill. This bill cuts 11 percent or $1.5 billion from fiscal year 1995 levels. It represents a $2.8 billion cut from the President's request. And more importantly, this bill continues the Republican transformation and downsizing of Government that we in Congress promised back in November.

Mr. Chairman, this bill maintains many of our traditional foreign aid priorities such as humanitarian assistance and foreign military financing. In addition, this bill moves our foreign assistance program away from traditional bilateral aid which is ineffective and bureaucratic, and toward a more market oriented development which uses the private sector to promote economic growth.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill includes no earmarks. This is a clean bill, it is one that puts this country on the right track toward a deficit-free future.

Once again, I wish to commend the chairman and the ranking minority member for their excellent work in crafting this very good and bipartisan bill, and I recommend all Members support it in final passage.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], a member of our panel.

(Mr. LIGHTFOOT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Let me begin by commending the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] for their hard work on this legislation.

A foreign aid bill is neither an easy nor popular bill to bring to the floor of the House for a vote. But Mr. CALLAHAN and Mr. WILSON have worked in the bipartisan tradition of the committee to develop a bill we should all support.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by discussing the administration's attitude throughout this year's foreign aid debate. The administration's budget proposal did not reflect the fact foreign assistance spending must also contribute toward our goal of a balanced Federal budget. Further, the administration, as well as a number of special interest groups, have convinced themselves that if the American people just understood the foreign aid program, they would support increased foreign aid. This is a dangerously misguided view.

That misguided belief apparently is fostered by a University of Maryland poll on American attitudes toward foreign assistance. As someone who has read and interpreted polls from time to time, I suspect the University of Maryland's poll conclusions would change dramatically if, for example, specific domestic programs were offered up as the funding source for increased foreign aid.

In addition, a number of ambassadors have visited with me this year and expressed concern that Republican foreign policy means a return to isolationism. In light of Anthony Lake's speech equating a reduction in foreign aid with back door isolationism and Ambassador Albright's equating opposition to increasing the number of peacekeeping operations with membership in the ''Flat Earth Society,'' it is clear the administration has deliberately orchestrated this climate in order to draw attention away from its own pathetic foreign policy record.

Now let me turn to this year's bill. Despite the bipartisan work of the committee, I believe the bill does reflect the priorities of the new majority. The emphasis of the bill is on export promotion activities, a continued commitment to supporting Israel, and a leaner more efficient agency for international development.

There are two aspects of the bill which I would like to briefly discuss. The first concerns our continued support for export promotion programs.

I believe the export assistance agencies fulfill a very important role in advancing American foreign policy. They

are not corporate welfare. As you know, our three export assistance agencies support projects in parts of the world where commercial institutions are reluctant to participate. They also help level the playing field for American business in the global market.

Neither Chairman CALLAHAN nor I believe in corporate welfare. In fact, I do not believe we believe in any kind of welfare. But it is clear that foreign governments help their businesses compete in developing markets. In a perfect world it would be nice to reduce this type of funding. However, if we cut this funding we only succeed in harming American business abroad.

Second, I think we are getting to the point where we need to think seriously about the future of bilateral aid programs. This bill and the budget resolution clearly indicate that future spending on foreign aid will continue to drop. We need to think about the most effective way to best spend those diminishing dollars.

I think the best way may be to shift from bilateral programs to using the leveraging power we have with the multilateral development banks.

Secretary Rubin and his staff have once again done an excellent job in demonstrating the utility of our funding the MDB's. As you know, the funds we appropriate as part of our previously negotiated share of MDB financing results in exports many times larger than our annual contribution.

Every dollar of our MDB contribution leverages into $22 in total MDB lending. Additionally, we must continue to contribute to the MDB's if we are to continue to play a leadership role in the management of the individual multilateral banks.

In closing, let me again commend Chairman CALLAHAN and Mr. WILSON for bringing to the floor a good bill. I also want to acknowledge the fine work of the staff in getting us here.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1745

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding this time to me, and I rise in support of the legislation and to commend Chairman CALLAHAN and the gentleman from Texas for the fine job they have done under very trying circumstances. I also rise to express my strong support for maintaining the integrity of section 907 of the Freedom Support Act which sanctions Azerbaijan for its blockade of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh. I am extremely concerned about one provision—in this bill which would gut section 907. The purpose of section 907 is specifically to prohibit direct United States Government assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan until Azerbaijan ceases its blockade of Armenia.

I want to be clear about this: Section 907 prohibits direct government to government aid. It does not deny United States humanitarian aid to Azerbaijan, as the bill's language would lead us to believe. As a matter of fact, as of March 31, 1995, Azerbaijan has received $61.8 million in incountry, United States humanitarian assistance through nongovernment organizations and private volunteer organizations.

Section 907 states:

> United States Assistance under this or any other act (other than assistance under Title V of this act) may not be provided to the government of Azerbaijan until the President determines, and so reports to Congress, that the government of Azerbaijan is taking demonstrable steps to cease all blockades and other offensive uses of force against Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh.

To date I am not aware that the President has filed a report with the Congress indicating that the blockade is being lifted.

The Azerbaijan blockade against Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh is now in its 5th year and it has made Armenia the poorest of the 15 former Soviet Republics.

According to United States AID's 1995 country profile of Azerbaijan, Azerbaijan continues to enforce a complete rail, road, and fuel blockade of Armenia throughout its territory, effectively cutting off fuel supplies and humanitarian supplies.

As a result, the blockade has forced a shut-down of almost all Armenian industries.

In fact, as many as one-third of Armenia's 3.6 million people have fled the country because the winters are unbearable and the factories stand idle.

Lifting the ban now would only encourage Azerbaijan to resist a peaceful solution to the Karabagh conflict and keep their blockade in place. The effort in the bill to weaken United States law that restricts United States aid to Azerbaijan represents a retreat from the principal position adopted by this body in 1992 that Azerbaijan must make progress towards peace by lifting its blockade. Congress would send the wrong message now by moving to weaken this restriction when the Azerbaijan Government in more than 2 years has failed to act on the United States demands.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] a member of the subcommittee.

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for this bill which reflects the subcommittee's careful crafting and compromise. I particularly wanted to salute the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], and of course the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] who has been a strong advocate for bringing together this compromise. It deserves bipartisan support. It is not a Republican idea, it is not a Democratic idea, it is an American idea.

H.R. 1868 recognizes the fiscal situation we face and reduces the amount of money that we spend on foreign assistance. But H.R. 1868 also reflects our continued belief in the importance of maintaining our role as a leader in global events.

This bill does not blindly slash foreign aid. We make some serious cuts that reflect careful consideration and the review of every program. We have eliminated and reduced funding to those programs that have failed to justify continued support.

Foreign aid is a crucial component of our foreign policy. With the end of the cold war, there exists a sentiment in our country to place foreign affairs on the back burner and focus on domestic problems, and I admit we cannot ignore the domestic problems of crime, health care, education, and the economy, but I believe that recent events in the former Soviet Union, North Korea, and Bosnia illustrate that America must not insulate itself from the international community.

Faced with a national debt that is strangling our economy, Congress is operating under severe pressure to reduce spending and rightfully so. But we must work toward these goals as the world's only superpower and the sole proprietor of democracy. We have reduced foreign aid in this bill but we have not eliminated our ability to participate in the world.

Foreign aid, which makes up less than 1 percent of our Federal budget, is a good investment and has benefited our interests around the globe by furthering the development of economic and political stability in the international community.

H.R. 1868 allows us to continue to remain active in world event while it reflects our budgetary constraints.

I support this bill very strongly, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on three issues that will come up in the context of the fiscal year 1996 foreign aid appropriations bill. First is the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. This is a provision in the bill that would bar U.S. assistance to countries that bar the delivery of U.S. humanitarian aid to another country. The Republic of Turkey, a major recipient of United States assistance, has maintained a blockade on its neighbor Armenia. Asking our allies to allow American humanitarian assistance to reach its intended recipients is a reasonable condition for U.S. aid, and any country that fails to abide by this basic condition is undeserving of our aid. This provision was approved by the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, and

was part of the foreign aid authorization bill which has already passed the House. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has also adopted this provision. Any attempt to remove the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act from the bill must be opposed.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I support conditional aid to Turkey on compliance with human rights. Our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] a member of the Foreign Ops Subcommittee and the cochairman of the Armenian issues caucus, is planning to introduce an amendment that would cut assistance to Turkey until that country makes substantial improvements in its human rights record. The Porter amendment is intended to draw attention to Turkey's immoral and illegal blockade of Armenia, the Cyprus issue, the rights of the Kurdish people, and the restrictions on free expression in Turkey. I strongly support the Porter amendment.

Third, I would urge the House to maintain the economic sanctions on Azerbaijan until it lifts its blockade of Armenia. Language was inserted into the foreign aid appropriations bill which severely weakens section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which became law in 1992. This provision prohibits government-to-government assistance between the United States and Azerbaijan until that country lifts its devastating blockade of Armenia. Given that the Azerbaijani Government has not made any progress toward lifting its blockade, as was previously stated by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY], there is no basis for changing the law, and Azerbaijan should not be rewarded for its intransigence. Indeed, the law has not prevented humanitarian aid disbursed by nongovernmental and private voluntary organizations from getting to Azerbaijani refugees. Our colleague PETER VISCLOSKY of Indiana, a member of the Appropriations Committee and also the Armenian issues caucus, may offer an amendment to strike this provision or to explicitly forbid direct governmental assistance to Azerbaijan. The Visclosky amendment would prevent the gutting of the existing law, and I urge support for that amendment.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, Armenia has made tremendous strides toward democracy and a market economy since the breakup of the Soviet Union despite the relentless hostility of its neighbors, Turkey and Azerbaijan. Turkey and Azerbaijan, in my opinion, continue this blockade illegally. The United States should support countries that share America's values and not give encouragement to those countries that oppose our principles so flagrantly.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES], one of the hardest working new Members of this Congress that has come in this year to join us. We are blessed that he was also put on our subcommittee, and he has been a valuable contributor, a man who works hard, a man who understands this bill as much as anybody in this Congress.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those wonderful words.

I rise in support today of the foreign operations bill, and I compliment the ranking minority leader of this great committee and my distinguished chairman for all their hard work.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that this document is a responsible document, to say the least. There are many across the country who question this Nation's commitment to foreign operations and foreign assistance, and I have to say to those people who think that we should be spending more around the globe that they will be disappointed because this document is a responsible document that blends a responsible approach for this Nation as a leader in making sure that we help children, that we make sure that those who are so dedicated to freedom and democracy around the world have appropriate assistance, but it does not allow us to move around and perhaps be the world's policemen.

So I compliment the committee and the committee staff particularly for their help in crafting what I would say is a most responsible document. It calls for $11.9 billion. It is a responsible document that results in the lowest spending in foreign operations in 20 years. It is in line with this Nation's ability to move toward a balanced budget. It is $200 million below the budget authority. It is $400 million below the authorizers' document, and, as I said, it is a very responsible spending plan that is in line with this Nation's responsibilities to its allies and to the preservation of democracy and freedom around the world. This document preserves funding for peace, strategic allies like Israel and Egypt, and helps to move forward on the Middle East agreements, and addresses new priorities for this Nation in counterterrorism and drug interdiction.

By zeroing out or severely reducing funding for soft loan windows at the multilateral banks, we are moving away from the statist model of development in favor of a more free market approach. On the other hand, the bill creates a new child survival account, as I have referenced, and ensuring that nearly half a billion dollars will be spent on basic needs for children rather than the nebulous and often wasteful, quote, development assistance account. It maintains and even increases funding for export assistance, something that is vital to this Nation's economy and where the small business sector looks for new opportunities. It enhances U.S. competitiveness abroad and certainly will result in the creation of jobs here at home.

The bill maintains enough funding for the United States to carry out what I said is its proper foreign policy obligations and ensures that national security functions as the world's leader continue. It brings us back from the brink of becoming the world's policemen and nanny to a more responsible place for this Nation as the guardians of peace, freedom, and democracy around the world.

□ 1800

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee and its chairman for rejecting any attempt to close down the Overseas Private Investment Corporation [OPIC]. I support downsizing Government more than anyone, but abolishing OPIC will not further either of these goals.

OPIC is not some foreign boondoggle program, as some have charged. OPIC provides loans and political risk insurance to American companies doing business abroad. It does not do this for free. It charges market rate for its services, which is how it makes money. For example, recently OPIC charged an 11.9-percent financing rate for a company that is constructing a powerplant overseas. If it was not for OPIC, that company would have had to purchase $500 million worth of goods from Japan, rather than from the United States.

Unlike almost every other Federal agency, OPIC actually takes in more than it spends. In fact, it showed a net income of $167 million last year, and it writes a check at the end of each year returning most of its profits to the Government. Since 1971, OPIC has contributed almost $2 billion back to the Federal Government to reduce the debt.

OPIC is a successful business because it negotiates on a government-to-government basis. Its services are simply not available in the private sector. OPIC does not cost the taxpayers anything, and it actually makes money for the Government, so its elimination would actually increase the deficit, not reduce it. In my opinion, OPIC is an example of how a Federal agency should be run. Its elimination would hurt U.S. interests and result in higher deficits.

I want to thank the committee and its chairman for fighting to keep it, and also I look forward to working with the chairman to make sure we stem the tide of any elimination as this process goes on.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to ask a question of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN]. I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska to reiterate what he said. I think many Members of this body do not understand that OPIC actually returns more money to the Treasury than we appropriate for it.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. WILSON. As well as creating jobs, as well as positively affecting the balance of payments, as well as creating more taxpayers.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. It does the things that the private sector cannot do, because the private sector does not have an arm where it will take political risks. OPIC takes that risk for the American enterprise, for the entrepreneur, for the corporation, loaning out at market rates and returning back to the Federal Government the cost.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in my absence a lot has been said about the amendment that I have offered and which the Committee on Rules made in order, which I want to publicly thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] who, in his wisdom, along with the members of the Committee on Rules, agreed to have this amendment made in order, particularly in view of the serious nature and the timing of what is involved.

For someone to say that it is a rather narrow focus about the issue of the nuclear power plant in Cuba, they should have seen the 60 Minutes program 2 weeks ago. It is not a narrow focus.

If we look at the September 1992, GAO report, for those of us who have been following this for quite some time, we know this is a very serious issue, and not just to those who follow Cuba policy vis-a-vis the United States and Cuba.

This is what this report said about the nuclear power plant. It said that reports by a former technician from Cuba examining with x rays weld sites believed to be part of the auxiliary plumbing system found 10 to 15 percent of those were defective; that the operation of this reactor would be criminal. In fact, it says, for those of you who are Members from Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and Washington, DC, according to a study by the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, that summer winds could carry radioactive pollutants from a nuclear accident at that powerplant throughout all of Florida and parts of the States on the gulf coast as far as Texas, and northern winds could carry it as far northeast as Virginia and Washington, DC. That affects the lives of hundreds of millions of Americans and in fact it makes it so imperative that we consider this amendment and move forward on it. We do not need to be supplying money to countries who want to permit another Chernobyl-like accident 90 miles away from the United States. That is why I appreciate the amendment being considered.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to take a second to respond to the comments of the gentleman who just spoke. I very much admire the way the gentleman attends to the needs of his district and his constituents and his substantive concerns. But I want to make clear something which I said earlier with respect to that nuclear power plant in Cuba, since he was referring to me in his comments.

As I said earlier in my exchange with the gentleman from Florida, I very much agree with people on the substance of the question of the nuclear power plant in Cuba. I think it should not be built. I think it is very bad business. I think the Russians should not be financing it in any way, shape, or form. There is no disagreement whatsoever on substance.

I would simply point out that the GAO report to which the gentleman referred was a 1992 report. My understanding is that that nuclear operation has been mothballed since 1993, and it is quite clear that the administration shares the gentleman's concerns about that plant and is trying to find the best way to see to it that it does not proceed and is not ever put in place. The only question before us is what the best way is to discourage that. The only question is how do you prevent it from actually happening. That is what is in dispute here.

So, with all due respect to people's concerns about it, which are legitimate, I would simply suggest that it is occasionally possible to be correct in terms of one's goal, while being very mistaken in terms of the means that one chooses to get to that goal. Sometimes you have a law of unintended consequences, which means that what you start out to try to stop, you in fact create because of inadvertence. I do not want that to happen here, which is why I am concerned that this amendment is considered on this bill, when I think it ought to be considered by another committee that knows a whole lot more about it than this committee does.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman that I agree wholeheartedly with you. We would not want to mislead anybody in this House or this country that we are in support of Russia affording this opportunity to Cuba. We think his destination is right, he is just on the wrong bus to get to that destination.

I agree with you, the gentleman should have done it in the authorization bill, not in this bill. So I agree with you, but I want everybody to know that I do not disagree with the destination. We do not want that plant in Cuba under any circumstances, and we do not want Russia contributing to that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, none of us do. It could be a significant threat to the security of the United States. Everybody recognizes that. The question is, what is the best way to see to it that it never happens, and I think to achieve that we all need to work together on another vehicle.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, does the ranking member agree with me that as a matter of national pride and national dignity and probably of politics in Moscow, that if the United States tells Russia they cannot do it, then they have to do it?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I know how we would react as Americans. If somebody tells America, ''You cannot do something or we are going to do X to you,'' that is when the Americans have the fur on the back of their neck go up and they say, ''Tough, buddy, we are going to do it.'' That is human nature. So the question is how do you handle this in a way that people do not do dumb things because they are following emotion rather than logic.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this committee's proposal, and I am especially grateful for the work that Chairman CALLAHAN and Chairman LIVINGSTON have done to establish a new child survival account. Since I have been in Congress, since the early 1980's, there has been a bipartisan effort to preserve and fence off money for immunizations and for oral rehydration money, which has literally saved millions of children because of that very modest investment.

I have witnessed during the 1980's two mass vaccination days in Central America and saw thousands of kids vaccinated against preventable diseases like diphtheria, tetanus, and other preventable diseases. Yet we find that millions of kids still die. We have still not brought the blessings of the child survival revolution to all those to whom we could bring it, and this account will go very, very far in trying to advance that, especially in times of budget austerity.

I would just remind Members that when we consider the authorizing bill, I had offered language that was accepted by the committee to fence off money, to earmark money, that would be used for child survival activities. It passed in a bipartisan way in committee, and a soft earmark has been retained on the floor of the House.

Let me just say why I think that is so important. When Brian Atwood testified before our committee 2 days before our markup, he said that a 30 percent cut in USAID's child survival program, and there was no cutting in the program, it was a cut in DA, would

mean that more than 4 million children will likely not be vaccinated, greatly heightening their risk of death from severe illness.

He went on to say if there was a cut across the board in DA, development authority, that that would automatically translate into a cut for child survival. It is a matter of who manages the cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for us to say we do not want to see any of these cuts. But if cuts have to be, children should come first.

I again want to salute the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] for making sure that children do indeed come first and are protected from cuts.

Mr. Chairman, foreign aid has its share of critics, and perhaps more than its share. This fact was reflected in our recently enacted foreign relations bill, which made significant cuts in foreign aid and was nonetheless subject to criticism in some quarters that it did not cut deeply enough. To some extent, the voters' distrust of foreign aid is warranted. In far too many cases, foreign aid has proved to be the ticket to the high life for corrupt bureaucrats in developing nations, while their people remain mired in poverty.

But let us be clear about what it is that people object to when they object to foreign aid. Everyone objects to corruption in the system. Many object to spending money on infrastructure projects in developing countries while money is running out for similar projects here at home. And many object to funding abortion and heavy-handed population control tactics. But what virtually no one objects to is the aid that goes directly to saving lives.

People are not skeptical about foreign aid because they believe that foreign aid has vaccinated too many children, fed too many starving people, or turned too many swords into plowshares. They are skeptical because they believe that foreign aid has paid for too many unnecessary government offices and limousines, or has been siphoned off by yet another corrupt politician. So the best political solution is also the best policy: accept the reality that resources are limited, cut the limousines, and save the food and medicine.

The intent of Congress in preserving child survival funds in an era of budget austerity is emphatically to save the funds for medicine, micronutrients, and vaccine. We intend to keep such funds from being siphoned off, either to luxurious perks, or to forms of foreign aid that lack a measurable positive impact on child morbidity.

Even in this age of advanced medical progress, this world still witnesses the preventable deaths of millions of children. We still have:

More than a million deaths per year due to measles, according to UNICEF.

Still over 100,000 cases per year of polio, despite large strides toward eradicating it, according to Dr. Jong Wook Lee of the World Health Organization.

Half of all child deaths are caused by either diarrhea or pneumonia, according to UNICEF. Yet these deaths are highly preventable: by early detection and antibiotics, in the case of pneumonia, and by oral rehydration therapy, in the case of diarrhea.

Furthermore, the World Health Organization reports:

Over a million child deaths per year from malaria; 17 million cases of river blindness and elephantiasis; 25,000 new cases per year of African sleeping sickness; 10–12 million case worldwide of leprosy, or Hansen's Disease.

Unfortunately, when Congress does not speak clearly enough on how the funds it appropriates for child survival are to be spent, they are sometimes spent in ways that do not put child survival first. In a hearing before the International Relations Committee earlier this year, Brian Atwood, Administrator of AID, told us that funds designated for child survival had been drawn down for emergency relief, while population funds had not been similarly touched. The operating assumption seems to be: population means population, but child survival means a general humanitarian fund.

Congress must state clearly that child survival means child survival—not population control or anything else. Whatever the proper place of family planning in U.S. foreign aid, it should not operate at the expense of child survival. Family planning implicates fundamental disagreements about morality, family life, and, in the case of abortion, about life itself. But child survival is something that all of us, on both sides of the population and abortion issues, can support. Child survival can and should bring us together, whatever battles we may need to fight over other issues.

Unfortunatly, the Clinton administration is conspicuously absent from this broad coalition in favor of putting children first. At a recent hearing, Mr. Atwood explained how he would manage the one-third cut in Development Assistance funding:

A 30-percent cut in USAID's child survival program would mean that more than 4 million children will likely not be vaccinated, greatly heightening their risk of death or severe illness from such preventable diseases as measles, whooping cough, and diphtheria.

But there is one fact that puts Mr. Atwood's remarks in an alarming light. Our bill does not cut child survival. It cuts foreign aid overall, while attempting to protect child survival. Mr. Atwood, it seems, was not expressing a fear—he was issuing a threat. He was saying, if you cut Development Assistance, we will take that cut out of child survival.

Mr. Atwood continued:

Oral Rehydration Therapy [ORT] prevents an estimated 1 million deaths a year due to acute diarrhea. Usage rates for ORT in all areas of the world have risen to 40–65 percent. Despite the steady growth in ORT use, 3 million children still die from diarrheal disease annually. A cut of 30 percent in child survival resources would likely mean at least 100,000 children's lives would be lost each year for lack of this cheap and simple treatment.

Chilling facts indeed—especially when you consider that such consequences could easily be avoided if USAID were to concentrate its Development Assistance cuts on something other than child survival.

This is why Congress must not send up language that gives USAID any leeway on child survival.

The Child Survival Account that the Appropriations Committee's bill would establish is a step in the direction of broadly supported humanitarian foreign aid. These funds will go, for instance:

Toward oral rehydration therapy, which saves more than a million lives a year;

Toward vaccination, so that the effective extinction of polio and measles can be brought about, as has already been done with smallpox;

Toward eliminating Vitamin A and iodine deficiencies, thereby preventing blindness, illness, and death for untold numbers of children in the developing world; and

To UNICEF, which has a long record of saving children's lives.

UNICEF's research shows us how far we have come—and how far we still have to go—in fighting childhood diseases and improving childhood nutrition. Consider the case of polio.

Worldwide estimates of polio cases have fallen from 400,000 in 1980 to just over 100,000 in 1993. But at the same time, there are still 68 countries where the polio virus is crippling children. Carrying out a vaccination program in places where outbreaks are still occurring can be expensive. Furthermore, the perception that polio is almost extinct makes it hard to generate the political will to make those expenditures, especially when other diseases seem to pose a much graver threat. Yet if the final extermination of polio is not achieved, the disease could mount a mighty comeback when a generation of unvaccinated children starts to grow up. Funds for UNICEF can help prevent this vicious circle from becoming a reality.

Consider measles. Not as terrifying as polio, perhaps—yet UNICEF estimates that it causes 1 to 2 million child deaths each year, and often leaves even its survivors with severe malnutrition. Like polio, measles can be eliminated—provided the funding for vaccination continues even after the disease becomes rare. In 1994, Indonesia held a national immunization day targeted at both polio and measles, but health authorities there had to scale it back to polio alone due to inadequate funds. Indonesia is therefore at greater risk of a resurgence of measles.

Consider child nutrition. Vitamin A is increasingly recognized as a low-cost way to reduce child mortality by between a quarter and a third in many developing nations. UNICEF calls vitamin A the most cost-effective of all interventions for children. One study showed that malnourished children with adequate vitamin A were less likely to die than well-nourished children who were deficient in vitamin A. Consequently, UNICEF is undertaking a campaign to promote the fortification of common foods with vitamin A, and to make vitamin capsules available in areas of acute need.

I have both high hopes and great fears about UNICEF. High hopes that it will continue as a pathbreaker in child survival projects, as it has done for decades. And great fears that it will veer from its core mission into areas such as family planning, which are dealt with by other U.N. agencies, and which tend to fracture the coalition that supports UNICEF.

Over the years, liberals and conservatives alike have bought UNICEF greeting cards, encouraged their children to trick or treat for UNICEF, and even supported larger and larger contributions over the years by the United States. Continuation of this unusual consensus is most unlikely if UNICEF ventures into the most morally landmined field in all of foreign aid.

The Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, which I chair, will be holding oversight hearings on UNICEF. We hope and expect to find through these hearings that UNICEF has remained faithful to its

core mission of fighting child morbidity and promoting child health. In that regard, I welcome the declaration on family planning that UNICEF makes in its 1995 report called The Progress of Nations. That declaration makes clear that under the division of labor that characterizes U.N. agencies, UNICEF's mission of improving the well-being of children and women is different from that of the agencies that promote family planning.

The core mission of UNICEF, and other important child survival activities, will be helped greatly by the child survival and disease program fund set up by this bill. This fund is foreign aid as it was meant to be. This Congress is making cuts, but it is not making them blindly or callously. It is cutting waste and extravagance, while preserving the heart of foreign aid. I commend the appropriators for their work, and I urge a ''yes'' vote on the foreign operations appropriations bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to the gentleman from New Jersey, and give him a lot of credit, because he, along with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] came and suggested that we do something to ensure that as we dramatically downsize foreign aid, that we do not preclude the ability of the administration to have a sufficient amount of money to feed starving children, and to provide the immunizations programs that will help eradicate polio. So I compliment the gentleman.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the foreign operations funding bill.

I do so with the view that this is not a perfect bill. In many respects, it represents a step backward in U.S. commitment to promoting development and democracy around the world.

I am concerned about the 34-percent cut in African aid. This is bad public policy on humanitarian grounds. These cuts also make no fiscal sense. Investing a small amount in African development today will save many more tax dollars in emergency intervention in the future.

I am also concerned that the bill contains language allowing for continued United States aid to Azerbaijan, despite that nation's unconscionable blockade of Armenia. Allowing our allies to block U.S. humanitarian assistance represents a complete undermining of our foreign policy objectives.

Despite these problems, the bill contains many important provisions, and I want to thank Chairman CALLAHAN and my good friend DAVE OBEY for their work.

I strongly support the inclusion of $3 billion in economic and military assistance for Israel. As our only democratic ally in the Middle East continues to travel down the historic—and often dangerous—road toward peace, it is imperative that our country ensure Israel's economic viability and military advantage in the region.

I am pleased that the bill maintains $15 million for Cyprus. It has been two decades since the brutal Turkish invasion of this beautiful island nation. This relatively small amount of money goes a long way toward helping the Cypriot people with critical economic development and peace-enhancing activities.

I also want to convey my strong support for the funding for the International Fund for Ireland. President Clinton and the Congress have much to be proud of with respect to the profound and peaceful changes in Ireland. We therefore must renew our commitment to the heroic Irish people.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill. It is not perfection, but it is very important nevertheless.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, this legislation poses a dilemma. Some of its provisions, such as the funding for export-related functions, are vitally necessary for our economic growth and job creation.

The bill continues current levels of funding of the Export-Import Bank, which helps finance U.S. exports.

The bill also provides $100 million for the Exim Warchest, which is used to counteract unfair trade practices by foreign governments. This, too, is essential for our competitive position in global markets. Further, the bill provides a substantial increase in the operating levels for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation [OPIC].

This is consistent with our authorizing bill last year, in which we tripled OPIC's authorizing levels to $9.5 billion. Let me point out that OPIC does not use any taxpayer funds—it pays for itself and even makes money for the Government—last year earning $167 million. OPIC also maintains reserves to cover its liabilities, with $2.3 billion currently on deposit in the Treasury.

None of these funds come from the taxpayer. Everything was earned through OPIC's business activities. The truth is, this appropriations bill simply allows OPIC to use the money that it has already earned on its own.

The bill also provides funds for the Trade and Development Agency, which generates U.S. exports by funding the engineering and feasibility studies for major construction projects overseas.

Our subcommittee's oversight hearings have shown that TDA generates $25 in exports for every $1 it spends. That is an excellent return on our investment. Therefore, I am concerned that this bill cuts TDA by $5 million. I hope this provision can be revisited later.

The importance of each of these export programs is underscored by the latest trade data, which came out yesterday. The overall deficit in April was $11 billion, the worst month in 3 years. The deficit in goods was $16 billion. That is $1.7 billion worse than in March.

In April, our exports actually went down by nearly a billion dollars, while imports went up by $700 million.

In other words, our trade deficit, which last year was the worst in our history, is getting even worse. The bottom line is, if our exports do not recover, we will certainly fall into a recession.

In recent years, exports have provided most of our economic growth, as much as 80 percent. Clearly, we need the export programs in this bill.

Therefore, I commend the Gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for these vital job-creating provisions. Unfortunately, other parts of the bill represent business as usual in doling out foreign aid.

The bill makes some cuts in foreign aid, but not enough, in my judgment. AID still gets $5.7 billion, including $530 million in operating expenses. Why does it cost a half a billion dollars to run a $5 billion program? Over the past 10 years, AID's programs have gone down 23 percent, but its operating costs have gone up 40 percent.

It makes no sense that operating costs go up when the overall program is going down. In particular, I oppose the $29 million which is provided for AID downsizing. What sense does it make to appropriate more money to shut down missions and reduce the Agency? That represents the triumph of bureaucratic thinking over common sense.

Yes, we absolutely should cut down AID, but let us not give the bureaucrats even more money to carry this out. Many amendments will be offered to this bill.

Some will propose further reductions in foreign aid. Some will propose ill-considered reductions in support for our exporters. And some would actually increase foreign aid spending. The fate of this bill hangs in the outcome of these amendments.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the export-related provisions and in making further reductions in foreign aid.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MCKEON] having assumed the Chair, Mr. BOEHNER, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 1868), making appropriations for foreign operations export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 483, MEDICARE SELECT POLICIES

Mr. BILIRAKIS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 483) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104–157)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 483), to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. PERMITTING MEDICARE SELECT POLICIES TO BE OFFERED IN ALL STATES FOR AN EXTENDED PERIOD.

Section 4358(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended by section 172(a) of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1994, is amended to read as follows:

''(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) The amendments made by this section shall only apply—

''(A) in 15 States (as determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services) and such other States as elect such amendments to apply to them, and

''(B) subject to paragraph (2), during the 6½-year period beginning with 1992.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'State' has the meaning given such term by section 210(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 410(h)).

''(2)(A) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study that compares the health care costs, quality of care, and access to services under medicare select policies with that under other medicare supplemental policies. The study shall be based on surveys of appropriate age-adjusted sample populations. The study shall be completed by June 30, 1997.

''(B) Not later than December 31, 1997, the Secretary shall determine, based on the results of the study under subparagraph (A), if any of the following findings are true:

''(i) The amendments made by this section have not resulted in savings of premium costs to those enrolled in medicare select policies (in comparison to their enrollment in medicare supplemental policies that are not medicare select policies and that provide comparable coverage).

''(ii) There have been significant additional expenditures under the medicare program as a result of such amendments.

''(iii) Access to and quality of care has been significantly diminished as a result of such amendments.

''(C) The amendments made by this section shall remain in effect beyond the 6½-year period described in paragraph (1)(B) unless the Secretary determines that any of the findings described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (B) are true.

''(3) The Comptroller General shall conduct a study to determine the extent to which individuals who are continuously covered under a medicare supplemental policy are subject to medical underwriting if they change the policy under which they are covered, and to identify options, if necessary, for modifying the medicare supplemental insurance market to make sure that continuously insured beneficiaries are able to switch plans without medical underwriting. By not later than June 30, 1996, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress as report on the study. The report shall include a description of the potential impact on the cost and availability of medicare supplemental policies of each option identified in the study.''.

And the Senate agree to the same.

TOM BLILEY,
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS,
DENNIS HASTERT,
BILL ARCHER,
WILLIAM THOMAS,
NANCY L. JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BOB PACKWOOD,
BOB DOLE,
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 483) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment that is a substitute for the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clerical changes.

EXTEND MEDICARE SELECT TO ALL STATES FOR THREE YEARS

PRESENT LAW

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990 (P.L. 101–508) established a demonstration project called Medicare Select under which insurers can market Medicare supplemental policies (called ''Medigap'' policies) that are the same as other Medigap policies except that supplemental benefits are paid only if services are provided through designated providers. The demonstration was limited to 15 states and expired December 31, 1994. The demonstration was extended to June 30, 1995, in the Social Security Act Amendments of 1994 (P.L. 103–432).

HOUSE BILL

Medicare Select authority is extended to all states which wish to participate until June 30, 2000. The Secretary of Health and Human Services is to conduct a study of Medicare Select prior to 1998 to study cost, quality and access for Medicare Select compared to other Medigap policies. Medicare Select remains in effect unless the Secretary finds that Medicare Select has: (1) not resulted in savings of premium costs to beneficiaries compared to non-select Medigap policies; (2) resulted in significant additional expenditures for the Medicare program; or (3) resulted in diminished access and quality of care.

SENATE AMENDMENT

Same as the House bill except the extension is until December 31, 1996. The Secretary is to complete the study by June 30, 1996. The General Accounting Office (GAO) is to conduct a study on Medigap insurance and report to Congress by June 10, 1996. The report is to include: (1) an analysis of whether there are problems in the current Medigap system for beneficiaries who wish to switch Medigap policies without medical underwriting or pre-existing condition exclusions; (2) options for modifying the Medigap market to address any problems identified; and (3) an analysis of the impact of each option on the cost and availability of Medigap insurance, with particular reference to problems with Medicare Select policies.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

The conference agreement adopts the Senate amendment with the following changes: (1) Medicare Select is extended to all States for three years (until June 30, 1998); and (2) the GAO study is clarified to require analysis of all types of Medigap insurance by removing specific reference to Medicare Select. Reference to pre-existing condition exclusions is also removed as they are already prohibited under current law for Medigap replacement policies.

TOM BLILEY,
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS,
DENNIS HASTERT,
BILL ARCHER,
WILLIAM THOMAS,
NANCY L. JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BOB PACKWOOD,
BOB DOLE,
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 26, 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1815

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, June 26, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 27, 1995, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

SIGNS OF A RECESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the front page of the New York Times reported that some members of the Federal Reserve Board ''have publicly expressed concern that the economy is now in considerably worse shape than they had expected.''

Two days ago, Washington Post columnist James K. Glassman wrote: ''Don't look now, but the recession may already have started.''

Mr. Glassman wrote that the White House is going to try to convince voters that this is a Gingrich recession, but then he says this:

> Such a charge, of course, is nonsense, and it's hypocritical coming from a President whose budget plan isn't so different from that of his adversaries.

Are we in a recession now? Well, the economy lost 101,000 jobs in May. Single family housing starts are at a 2-year low. Unsold inventories have, in the words of the New York Times, risen sharply.

According to Bridgewater Associates, a respected Connecticut firm that measures the economy, retail sales are wretched and second quarter GDP growth is about minus 0.5 percent.

I have spoken at least twice on this Floor about our tremendous problem of underemployment.

If you talk to any of these college graduates who can only find work in fast food outlets or restaurants, if they can find jobs at all, then you would know what I mean. I am sure they would say we are in a recession.

Like all recessions, though, the average consumer will not notice the full effects of this one until several months after it starts.

Thus most people will not notice this one, according to most economists, until very late this year, but really more probably a few months into 1996.

What is the cause of this new recession, or if not a recession, at least this severe slowdown?

Well, I think most people would agree that our obscene national debt of almost $5 trillion and our continuing deficits, or losses, of almost $1 billion a day, are the main problems.

Congressman ARMEY, a PhD economist, says the fault lies with the huge tax increase passed by President Clinton and the Democratic Congress in 1993.

Lending credence to this view is John Mueller, chief economist for Lehrman Bell Mueller Cannon, Inc. The columnist Glassman says Mueller believes there is a lag time of 2 years between actions of the Federal Reserve Board and their effects.

There is also a similar lag time with most major legislation passed by the Congress, too.

Anyone who blames a recession or economic slowdown in the next year or so on Republicans in Congress is either forgetting or ignoring the obvious.

First, most of the real changes passed by the House have not been passed by the Senate or have not been signed by the President. Most of the actions by the House have not even yet taken effect or actually gone into law.

Second, despite all the publicity about so-called spending cuts, none of these will go into effect until the next fiscal year begins in October.

Even then, the cuts do not exceed the growth in some programs, and thus overall Federal spending continues to go up and will do so every year under the most conservative budget that has been proposed.

Obviously our economy is on thin ice. So, what should we do?

First, we need to drastically reduce the Federal regulatory burden. The most conservative estimates are that Federal regulations now cost our economy approximately $500 billion each year.

Second, we need to bring Federal spending under control, cut our losses completely, and even start paying off our national debt is the only way to really help the economy, and that is with uninflated dollars.

It is ridiculous that we cannot even balance our budget until seven years from now, at the least. If we balanced the budget right now, we would still be spending over $1½ trillion by just our Federal Government this year. We would not have a lean government, we would still have a fat, sassy government. A strong, active, vibrant government is what we should have for that kind of spending.

Third, we need to overhaul, and greatly simplify and reform our federal tax code. We should greatly downsize and decrease the power and cost of the IRS.

It is just crazy that our Federal tax laws are so complicated and convoluted. I am told that we waste at least $200 billion a year in time lost and expense incurred in IRS compliance costs, keeping records, filling out forms, and so forth.

Finally, we need to lower taxes at all levels. The average person—not the wealthy, but the average—pays about half of his or her income in taxes of all types, Federal, State, and local, sales, property, income, excise, Social Security, and so forth.

The least efficient, least economical way to spend money is to have Government do it, because there is no real incentive or pressure on Government employees to work hard and/or save money, as there is in the private sector.

Money left in the private sector creates 2 to 2½ times as many jobs as does money turned over to Government.

Times are good now for some people. But they could and should be good for everyone.

Our country could be booming beyond belief—people could be doing two or three times as good as they are—if we would do the four things I just mentioned: first, deregulate our economy; second, balance our budget and start paying off the national debt; third, greatly simplify our tax code and basically eliminate the IRS; and fourth, lower the tax burden on our people, at all levels, so they can spend their own money wisely instead of having bureaucrats do it wastefully.

We could be booming, Mr. Speaker, but because real change has not yet taken place, there are many signs that we are headed into a recession that has been produced by our own Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. KENNELLY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HISTORY OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we will soon consider a farm bill that warrants an examination of the history of agriculture and a study of the lessons learned. There is linkage

between the modern American farmer and ancient Sumerian who worked the land between the Tigris and the Euphrates. Both were responsible, indeed farmers throughout history have been responsible, for their countries and the progress of civilization.

It has been said that in the last reckoning, all things are purchased with food. This was true in the cradle of civilization, and it holds true now.

Today American agriculture is this country's largest industry. Agriculture accounts for a full 16 percent of our current gross domestic product; 355 billion dollars' worth of food and fiber were produced this past year. That is more than any other industry.

And so it is especially important that we learn the lessons taught by the successes and failures of the past. History is awash with the remains of societies that failed to maintain their soil, who let it succumb to erosion, who let the channels that fed it get chocked with silt. The ancient city of Babylon, 2,600 years ago developed a productive agriculture. It allowed their civilization to grow to 17 million people and a remarkably diversified society. King Nebuchadnezzar even boasted that because he developed a great productive agriculture the rest of his society excelled. But eventually agriculture and farmers became a lesser priority in that country, and it ultimately failed. Farmers abandoned the farms and eventually the city collapsed.

Another example is the Promised Land of the Sinai Peninsula. Moses called it ''the land of milk and honey.'' Farm production and conservation were neglected and eventually only dregs of fertile soil remain at the bottom of narrow valleys.

But there are also successes. Societies with plans promoting farmers and farming survived and flourished. For the last 1,000 years, farmers in the French Alps with an eye toward conservation have terraced hillsides in a dramatic effort to prevent soil loss, resulting in continuously fertile soil, fertile agriculture, and abundant production.

□ 1830

In this country the Dust Bowl of the 1930's affected over 150,000 square miles of fields in areas of New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Colorado. For 6 years, drought and blinding dust storms were constant. The fertile ground of much of the Great Plains was stripped and deposited in drifts over millions of acres. Farms were buried and families fled. The counties of the Dust Bowl lost nearly 60 percent of their population through migration.

The cause of this ecological disaster was largely the result of an overuse of the land. Following World War I, high grain prices enticed farmers to head for the Plains. But those high prices didn't last. As the wheat prices fell, the farmers became financially stressed and looked for short-term gain by planting more wheat. The long-term advantages of strip cropping, summer fallow and other conservation measures were abandoned. In fact, by 1930 farmers had planted three times as much wheat as they had in 1920. To a large degree, the extra planting was an act of desperation to survive. Soil conservation suffered.

The drought began in 1933; the overuse made the land vulnerable to the winds that followed in 1934. Farmers continued to harvest what little of their crops they could, often driving their tractors in conditions so blinding that they couldn't see their radiator caps, much less the fields they worked as the fertile topsoil blew away. When wheat prices hit bottom during the Great Depression, more and more farmers abandoned their farms.

In 1933 President Roosevelt started a Federal program to limit production in order to help keep farm prices stable and encourage special farming techniques like contour plowing, crop rotation, and terracing that kept soil on the farm and kept it fertile. However, prices stayed low and poor farmers continued to leave the land. In 1936 the Agriculture Adjustment Administration was created to promote soil conservation by issuing checks to farmers who adopted acreage reductions and wind controls on their farms.

In the United States Congress we're now engaged in a great agricultural debate. We're deciding what proper Federal agricultural policy should be. It is important that the American people understand that agricultural programs had been designed to encourage a continuous but slight over-production. A hidden goal has been to keep enough farmers and ranchers producing so that an abundant supply would result in not only lower food and fiber prices in this country, but exports of low-priced commodities to assist in our balance of trade. Huge stores of grain were held by Government to be sold when farm prices went ''too high.''

Since the time of the first Dust Bowl we have enticed farmers to become more and more dependent on Government subsidy programs. As we move to a more market-oriented farm policy, it is important that we phase out subsidies smartly. Research and technology is needed to conserve water and topsoil, increase the efficiency of pesticides and fertilizers, and maximize yields. Farmers must ultimately make a profit if they are to continue to produce for today's needs and preserve productive land for tomorrow.

American consumers now spend 9.5 percent of their take-home dollars for food. With that 9.5 percent, they are able to buy the best quality, lowest-priced food in the world. In our haste, we cannot undermine the agricultural base that made our country strong. We must not forget our own history. New Federal farm policy needs to help assure a strong agricultural industry.

REPUBLICANS CARE MORE ABOUT MILITARY CONTRACTORS THAN THOSE WITH THE AIDS VIRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCKEON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last week my best friend's son died. He was 33 years old, HIV positive, and died from cancer—considered an opportunistic disease related to HIV.

Also last week, this House voted to invest $9 billion more than the President and the Secretary of Defense wanted, for bombers, missiles, and star wars.

I wonder how my best friend's son would have felt about that if he were still alive today. I wonder how he would have felt had he known that the new Republican majority were going to take money away from AIDS research and put it into wasteful military pork.

Mr. Speaker, what are the values of this body? Where are our priorities? The cold war is over, but we are spending billions of dollars on additional B–2 bombers and Trident D–5 missiles.

The war rages on for AIDS patients and their families, but we are taking their weapons away. Congress has placed an arms embargo on the most vulnerable people in this Nation, all because the Republican leadership cares more about military contractors than those who have contracted the AIDS virus.

FEEDING THE HUNGRY OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL, AND REDUCING THE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to talk about an issue of feeding the hungry in our Nation's Capital. I would like to thank my colleagues for the overwhelming response to our Dear Colleague letter, for the donations of sweet potatoes that were distributed to their office.

I would like to especially thank the gentlemen from Louisiana, CLEO FIELDS and RICHARD BAKER, for their work with the Sweet Potato Council of the United States, who gave each Member of Congress two cans of whole sweet potatoes. Mr. FIELDS and Mr. BAKER generously donated three cases of sweet potatoes for the hungry. The sweet potatoes will be given to D.C. Central Kitchens, a local not-for-profit organization that provides 2,500 meals a day to men, women and children in area shelters and feeding programs.

Over 100 offices of the Members of Congress have donated so far. It has been so successful that we hope to repeat this again. Several offices have donated additional items. Every item is much appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my staffer, Jennifer DelVecchio,

who came up with this idea. Many times people come by our offices and bring us small tokens or some products from back home. When we get such abundant products, some of which sit on our shelves and go to waste, she thought it only appropriate that we reach out and help those in our Nation's Capital, that the food really go to use for those who truly need our help.

Again, I would like to congratulate my colleagues in Congress for supporting this very, very worthwhile project.

Mr. Speaker, let me speak for a moment on something that I think really needs reform in the United States Congress. Yesterday in the Committee on Science I had the good fortune of striking what I considered wasteful spending in Congress. Twenty-five thousand dollars was allocated to gas-cooled nuclear technology, which has been underway for over 30 years. The Department of Science, the Department of Energy, all conclude that this proposal is going nowhere, that commercial application of this gas-cooled technology is going nowhere.

The President's budget for three times has consistently voted against it. The Senate turned it down in 1993. However, somehow the $25 million has shown up in House appropriations. I won an amendment 25 to 15 to strike this $25 million from the budget.

Today in the committee, however, Mr. Speaker, one of the Members decided $25 million is too much to pass up, and offered an amendment which was successful, to transfer that $25 million to another program.

There is a problem here in Washington, and the problem is people in Congress cannot get their hands out of the wallet, out of the checkbook of our Nation's taxpayers; that every dollar that is on the table, any dollar that is missed by an appropriator, any dollar that is offered up as sacrifice for deficit reduction, is instantly claimed as found money, so they say ''Let us get every cent of that $25 million and find something else to spend it on.''

Mr. Speaker, I can only reach in my pocket so deeply to find the very few dollars that are in it. Every dollar I come out with is my dollar. However, in this institution, the dollars are somebody else's. The card that we vote with is the world's most expensive credit card. We stick this in the machine and we can spend billions of dollars without any consequence.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat appalled when this Congress cannot come up with a mechanism that when a Member offers a deficit reducing formula to save the taxpayers money, that saves money from wasteful spending, that we cannot take that money and earmark it and lockbox it away to bring down the Nation's deficit. It is clearly one of our greatest problems. It clearly is driving up the cost of credit for consumers.

Clearly, the cost of credit for buying a home today, a 30-year mortgage, 7½ to 8 percent, would be brought down over 2 points if we get the Federal Government's appetite for credit to be minimized, and the private sector would then see relief for the average consumer.

However, no, not in this body. I see money, I spend money. I see money they do not want, I will spend it over here. Mr. Speaker, I say to the Members who are listening to this, they need to clearly reflect on what our priorities are. I think we should be in a race to see who can save the most money.

The prior speaker suggested that the Republicans are only interested in voting for bombers and missiles and are not concerned with AIDS and other issues. This Member of Congress voted against the B–2 bomber. This Member of Congress does indeed support increased funding for AIDS research, because I think the cost to the taxpayers will be exacerbated by the cost of AIDS in our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is not fair to characterize all Republicans as mean-spirited, only interested in defense and not interested in social services.

RESCISSIONS, BUDGET, AUTHORIZATIONS, APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas, [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, rescissions, budget authorization, appropriation. Mr. Speaker, I imagine the American people are wondering what holds up in the U.S. Congress, what is the job and the tasks of those that would represent us.

We have heard these words: rescission, budget, authorization, and appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to an issue of great importance, not only to the people of my Houston district, the 18th Congressional District, but to the entire country. It is interesting, Members will hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle chastise, criticize, and disjoint the pleas of the American people. What they will claim is that this particular Congress is filled with nothing but special interests, special interests here, special interests there, special interests over there.

I would simply say that this Nation is not filled with special interests, it is filled with special aspirations. We want to be inspired and challenged. We want to dream. We want a Nation that is not on the brink of a recession. We want economic enhancement and development.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say, as we begin to look at this process—rescissions, budget authorization and appropriation—why do we not understand what the special aspirations are of Americans?

I would simply say that this young lady, possibly an honors graduate, simply wants an opportunity for higher education; or would you say that she does not deserve it? I would venture to say if she is typical, she has about 70 percent student loans that have to be paid back, and we understand that we must make sure and ensure that we have a system that ensures that recommitment back to the student loan program, and maybe only 30 percent scholarship. She is typical of the student in America today: hardworking.

Many campuses that I go and visit in my district alone, which is only an example, whether they are the Houston Community College, whether it is a 4-year college in Chicago, IL, or maybe a private college in Atlanta, GA, there are hardworking students there. All they simply want is an opportunity and a chance.

What do we have out of this process of rescissions, budget, authorization, and appropriations? Cutting student loans, not for fiscal responsibility, which I have standing to be here, because I voted for a balanced budget, but we do not have our interests and our goals and our focus right.

When we go to the House floor and begin to talk about deadbeats in America, does that include those citizens who have fallen upon tragic hard times in Oklahoma City? Does it include those who have faced tragedy and loss in Florida, with the weather and hurricanes? Does it include those individuals and citizens in California suffering in the recent earthquake just about a year ago or so?

America is a country of people. It is people with aspirations. Yes, we should balance the budget, but what are we doing? During the rescissions process, which is taking back money, it seemed that we could find nowhere else to cut but summer jobs. That seems like someone would be able to stand up and talk about ''Oh, another handout.'' I argue vigorously not, for summer jobs, which must include the partnership of corporate America, give young people the opportunity to work. It gives them the culture of work. It allows them to have an understanding of what work is all about.

Although these particular youngsters are not necessarily real, they do symbolize what is good about America, the fact that we have children who have an opportunity to grow up strong, hopefully healthy, like many of the babies and young people and elementary school youngsters that I see in Wesley Elementary School or Turner Elementary School or Peck Elementary School or Pleasantville Elementary School, located in the 18th district, along with the wonderful elementary schools in the North Forest Independent School District, and Ailine, and parts of Ailey.

□ 1845

It simply exhibits that we have as a responsibility in this Nation to be fiscally responsible but to take care of our children.

Do you think it makes sense, then, to cut a program called WIC, women and infant children, that not only provides nourishment and nutrition for children but in fact it provides opportunity for young mothers to get their children immunized? What is the ultimate impact of that? It means that we will have less of those be subject to disease, and lower health costs, and all of us would like to see that.

What we have had happen is rescission, so the first part of this half a year has been taking back money. It seems that the knife-cutting has been on the aspirations of young people and children, clearly taking away hope, and not playing the role that the government should, not in charge, not dominating but actually being a partner. That is what we should be.

We have heard your cry from America, and we know there are those who may be a little misguided. I read an errant writer who wrote to a local paper,

> Don't ask me to feel guilty for the innocent children of someone who is too lazy to provide for them. Sorry, it just does not work anymore. When you can find several generations of welfare recipients living in public housing, who live off of others from birth until death, something is wrong and it's just not my fault.

An easy statement to make. In fact, as my children would say, that's the ''in'' thing. ''That's fresh. That's cool.'' That is what everybody is saying. That is what the polls say is something good and cool and receptive to say: ''Get rid of the deadbeats. I don't want to support them.''

But when you actually probe who is on welfare, it happens to be many people who want to get off. Should we provide an incentive to get off? Of course. Should we purge those who have been on and not seeking employment? Of course. But to blanket and to label all of those folks as individuals who are not my problem, somebody else's problem, is misguided, is not an example of the true spirit of America, which is to challenge people to be better and to give people a better opportunity.

As the Committee on Appropriations marks up the various bills for fiscal year 1996, I am concerned that many programs such as education and housing and job training will not receive adequate funding. They equal investment in America.

We can fight articulately and well for programs like defense and space and research, vital programs. But you cannot tell me you cannot imagine the value of matching that, creating the scientist through education that will then be at NASA, the technologist who will then be at the Defense Department who will help us be militarily ready. Why would we want to counter this young woman's opportunity and my wonderful dolls who are symbolic of all the children in America?

Have you listened to some of our children talk about their hopes and dreams? Some youngsters today talk about their feet of living past a certain age, many in the inner city, some in our rural communities, because they are exposed, if you will, to more than we have ever been exposed to with respect to violence and threats against their lives. They are feeling that maybe they will not be able to get to come up to this young lady's stage in life, happy, graduating from high school, looking for a dream.

I understand that it is the ''in'' thing to talk about the other fellow. The Republican majority has produced a document they call Cutting Government. There is not a one of us who would not sit down to the table of reason and talk about downsizing, talk about making government efficient.

You know what the real dream is and the real focus? You should have a plan behind cutting, not a mishmash of scissors, going here and going there. I believe in a lock box. If we save some dollars, there is an opportunity to put it in a lock box for deficit reduction. But let us not lose our dream, our path, the hope that we give to these young people.

The document proposes to eliminate three Cabinet departments, this Cutting Government document, 284 programs and 69 commissions and 13 agencies, some of which we can get along without, many of which have made it through their time period of survival or purpose.

But yet if we look seriously and honestly about where we want to go in this Nation in the 21st century, we would be appalled at the cost cutting in vocational job training. We would be literally appalled at the programs for Goals 2000. We would be literally overly overwhelmed, if you will, by the proposals that would undermine the role of Government, giving hope to those who would seek hope.

These proposals do not represent budgetary surgery with intelligent scalpel-like precision. Instead, Mr. Speaker, these goals are tantamount to crafting a fiscal policy with a meat cleaver.

Some people would say, well, these only impact on these soft programs. But when you cut housing, when you cut veterans' benefits, when you go into the infrastructure and cut transportation dollars, you are literally turning the clock back.

You might have heard some years ago the commitment of this Government to rebuild America. Many of you may have read in your local newspapers about the pending or the possibility of a recession. That is why I am hopeful, with the President's budget, that it is another opportunity for discussion of the best way to go.

It does not take us away from a balanced budget. It simply provides a reason and rationale for moving forward a little slowly in a 10-year period. I would simply say to you that it is important that we rebuild the highways of America, the bridges of America, the infrastructure work of America.

We are finding out that, as we have come under the Clean Water Act, and the Clean Air Act as well but particularly the Clean Water Act, many of our local communities find themselves with impure water, bad sewer conditions, and not able to enjoy the quality of life we would like for Americans.

Did you read recently the report from the Center for Communicable Diseases told most Americans, ''Boil your water before you drink it''? Someone would say, ''Are you sure you didn't see that in the paper back in the 1800's?'' No, we saw that today.

It is extremely important that we not take short shrift to the role Government can play. Let me simply share with you as we begin to look at how we can be more successful in focusing in a more reasoned manner in dealing with some of these issues.

I am a strong supporter of the defense of this Nation and of course, as I said, military readiness. That is a theme that everyone likes to promote and I think it is important. We want our young men and women, our enlisted men and women, to be secure and protected and prepared.

However, I am also concerned about families, children and the elderly. They, too, need our help as a partner. Let us not take the ugly way out, the castigating, the throwing stones, ''It's not my fault,'' ''I don't care about innocent children if the bums want to be on welfare.''

Yes, I am reiterating this because I think it is tragic, because Americans have always been individuals that have risen to the challenge. But as we look at this budget chart, we show the budget allocations for 1996, and I ask you to pay particular attention to the deep reductions in Transportation, Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, VA, and HUD appropriations.

Do you know what some of those HUD appropriations are all about? Well, it takes some of the folk that many of you see under the bridges, some who can be redeemed, some of the homeless folk under the McKinney Act we were providing and going at full steam ahead to house individuals and begin to turn them away from the mindset of homelessness.

I know it well, for when I served in the city of Houston on its local city council, I began to craft for that city a formula for working with its city's homeless, maybe about 10,000. There were many naysayers: ''You can't do anything with them. They like living under the bridges.'' But when we began to look, they were families, some of whom were living from paycheck to paycheck and because of some tragedy in the household, they were made homeless.

Let me tell you, we have turned that problem around. We have got folk housed in what we call transitional housing. We have got the private sector working with us. We have a downtown corporate community actively engaged in helping the homeless, and we are getting folk off of the homeless rolls, back into housing and being able to work as much as they want to work.

It is my challenge that we cannot abide by such draconian cuts and a withdrawal from investment in the future. We must be considerate and thoughtful.

When we look at these cuts and we see that it has been reduced, as I have said, by $9.8 billion, look very carefully at what we are going after. We are hurting cities. Cities are in fact the bastion, if you will, the heart and soul of civilization. Rome likes to think that, but cities are in fact where people are energized.

Let me include rural America, as well, because as I talk to my colleagues from rural America, they assure me that many of the ills that confront us in cities are there in rural America, and they need help with AIDS, they need help with housing for the homeless, they need help with health reform and health care, for I sat on a committee in the State of Texas, and it appalled me to see the number of rural hospitals closing because of the inability to fund indigent patients in rural America.

Can we stand for that? We can stand for more fiscally responsible health reform. We can be assured that we do the right thing and don't have people abusing the system. But can we have hospitals closing because we are in the budget-cutting business?

Mr. Speaker, what this evidences is the fact that we have forgotten our direction. We have forgotten the future of America.

I see my colleague from Illinois and I know how hard he has worked on many of these issues. In fact, he comes from a district that has called upon him to be of great service in this battle, and he has fought not for his single issues but he has fought for Americans.

I am very proud to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for taking this special order. I was back in my office going through my mail and I listened to her, and I said I want to come by and join my friend from Texas, because her message is my message. When you told the story about the college student loans, that touches me very, very deeply.

I was a recipient of Federal college student loans. My father passed away when I was a sophomore in high school. My mother was a payroll clerk for a railroad. We literally did not have the savings or resources to take care of my college education.

My mother and father had made it through the eighth grade. That was the extent of their education. They of course hoped I would do better, as every parent does. But when the time came to pay for those college expenses, I took a job, as every student would, and worked during the school year and during the summer months, and it just was not enough.

I got a little scholarship assistance here and there, but frankly had to turn to the U.S. Federal Government and something called the National Defense Education Act, that loaned me the money necessary to complete college and law school. It came to a grand total back in the 1960's of $7,500, which I thought was a mountain of debt I would never get out from under. Yet my wife and I worked and paid it off as we promised we would, so that younger kids behind us could have their opportunity.

When I listen to the proposals for budget deficit reduction from many of our friends among the Gingrich Republicans that suggest that we need to cut back on college student loans, that suggest we need to make the expense of a college education that much more for kids from working families, I think many of them have forgotten where they came from. They have forgotten that at a time in their life, this Government, this Nation, reached out a helping hand to them and was paid back in a great measure because for each of them who got that helping hand, there was an education, an opportunity, and I guess an opportunity to contribute to America, not only as a Member of Congress but in business and in so many different areas.

It seems to me so shortsighted for us to be cutting back on college student loans. I sincerely hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will remember how significant this is.

If I might mention one other point along these lines, 75 percent of the young people who graduate from high school are not going to end up graduating from college. They are going to go out in the work force looking for good-paying jobs. They will need other types of assistance, job training, to make sure that they are qualified for good-paying jobs.

I worry, too, as the gentlewoman points out the cutbacks that we are making in training and employment programs. She and I will be the first in line to suggest we need to modernize those programs, make them better.

I would commend to my friend from Texas, if she has not read it, a book by Hedrick Smith entitled ''Rethinking America,'' where he basically compares the educational systems in Germany, in Japan, and in the United States, and shows some real deficiencies in our system that need to be corrected. But we also have to understand that in those countries that are successful in taking kids right out of high school, putting them into good-paying jobs, career jobs, they have made a massive investment in training and education that is important to them.

Last week we had a debate here on a defense authorization bill, a question about building multibillion-dollar bombers.

□ 1900

Let me tell you, I think a few less bombers and a few more dollars spent on education and training would go a long way for a much more secure America in the future. The gentlewoman is right on track here, and I thank her for her leadership in this special order, and I will continue to stay here and join in, if I can, as she raises issues of mutual concern.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I thank the gentleman for his very, very kind comments but as well very, very pointed comments. He has taken me back for a moment. If I may have the gentleman indulge me just a moment, sometimes when you come to share, you are so busy focusing on numbers that you do not put the face on who may be impacted, and he took me back to my early years, and I think it is important because, let us be very frank, we are somewhat different. I think that is the face of America. It is important to realize that as the gentleman's history was, so was my history. I remember being the first to go to college in my family. Hardworking parents, their main goal was to make sure their children had a better opportunity and the time came for college and, of course, was I even then going to college, much less did we have funding to do so. Lo and behold came this opportunity for financial aid through and by a scholarship and grant and loan. The gentleman is right. The numbers seemed enormous at that time because I had them in college as he did and fortunately was able to go forth out of college and then decided, being inspired and really viewing America as a place that is a place of special aspirations, as I have mentioned, to go on to law school. Those numbers seemed enormous, but I think as the gentleman has said we can count those who have made good on those student loans and the broad brush of the problems with these programs that the Government involves itself in is not the way that we should go.

I know the gentleman spent many of his days in his district in May and June at graduations and he actually got to talk to students I would imagine, as I did. Each of them I think had stars in their eyes, holding that diploma, being able to look for an opportunity. There was not a dry eye in the place. I had to talk to those parents, many of whom had spent their life savings and were in trouble, but they were there clutching that purse, clutching that diploma, and hugging that child to say we can work with you to make sure you go, and I know that there will be a little bit of change here and a little bit of change there, but these are hardworking people. Should I come to the U.S. Congress and take that dream away from them?

The gentleman is right. What year is this: 1995 going into 1996. In 4 years almost we will be in the 21st century. Do we want to be any less of a nation than Japan, and as you mentioned England and Germany and France and Italy, in terms of any focus they may have on work, job creation, and the training of our young people?

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentlewoman will yield, I would like to also comment we spend so much time on this floor talking about statistics and numbers and percentages and budget outlays, and all sorts of things which I am sure most of the viewers back home say, what in the world is that all about.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. That is why I started out with budgets appropriations, authorizations.

Mr. DURBIN. I am so glad the gentlewoman did, and I think what we have to do too is try to translate some of the debate here on the floor to the real lives, to the people we represent.

If I can use an example, I went to a community college in my homeland, Lincoln Land Community College, to talk about the increased costs of college student loans from the Gingrich Republican proposals, and I asked the students what impact this would have on them when the average student will see an increase of $5,000 in the cost of their college education because of Gingrich Republican proposals, and a number of students said: This is tough, Congressman, it is tough enough now. We want to get out of school and get to work. We stretch out our education because it is so expensive, and now you tell me it is going to be more expensive.

So we broke up the meeting as I started to leave and a young lady came up to me, an African-American lady. She said: I was a little too embarrassed to raise my hand, but let me tell you my story. I am a welfare mother, I have two children. I am coming out to this community college and I have a college student loan. I said, ''What are you studying to be?'' ''I want to be a chef. I am trying to get the courses and training so I can be a chef and make a good living and get off welfare,'' she says. ''Now you tell me it is going to cost me more for this college student loan.'' She looked me in the eye and said, ''What am I doing wrong? Why are you making it tougher.''

We talk about welfare around here as if it is an easy thing for a person to get off. In many cases it might be, but sometimes it takes hard work. She was putting in hard work, finding somebody to watch the kids, going on out to school, taking the courses borrowing money to pay a college student loan, and community college tuition is pretty low, but she did not have it and had to borrow it, and now we are telling her it is going to be more expensive for her to try to get off welfare and go to work and have some personal responsibility. I think we have to remember some people like her around this country who are behind these statistics and standing behind these budgetary names. I think you have pointed it out here, and there are so many other areas too that we ought to be addressing.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. You tell her she need not be ashamed because I confronted her sister, who happened to be a white woman in Houston with two children who came up to me, how ironic, and said the very same thing and looked almost panicked because she was trying to grapple with and understand was I telling her tomorrow she would not have a student loan, but certainly expressing a fear because she too was leaping into the arena of independence.

The gentleman remembers how vigorously we worked as Democrats for real welfare reform. He remembers how vigorously we argued against welfare punishment and what was the deal? Work was the cornerstone of that proposal. It was again an investment back into America and Americans so that we would take less people into the 21st century on welfare. How proud we could be as a nation to be able to go into the 21st century and look back on real welfare reform that had welfare, job training, child care and health care, and a work element to it. How proud we would have been. How much we could have pointed to what the Government would have been able to say, not that it dominated, not that it took over, not that it spent too much, but it partnershiped with the States and local government to get masses of people off of welfare and to be working Americans in the 21st Century.

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentlewoman would yield, I think what we determined during the course of that debate on welfare, we analyzed on the Democratic side and the Republicans did it on their side, and I think frankly we understood the parameters of welfare. Certainly there are people on welfare as there are people in business and in other walks of life who are going to try to take advantage of the system and game the system and stay on as long as they can. But I am impressed by how many people we meet who want to get off this welfare tangle. They really want to do something with their lives, and we have to decide whether as a nation we will invest in them and their future. And that investment is training, it is education, it is transportation, it is day care, it is some health care assistance for them during this period of time.

But think about it, if we do not do it, if we just leave that person in the depths of despair, stuck on welfare, hopeless, they are not only a drain on society, they have lost their own self-worth, and they really do not have a chance to succeed. So what we tried to do on the Democratic side was say all right, we will draw the line. You cannot be on welfare forever, but for goodness' sakes let us have a goal for each person. Let us move from welfare to work. Let us make people productive citizens in America today. That is an investment that will pay off for a long time to come. It is one we made after World War II.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Clearly did.

Mr. DURBIN. We said to the returning veterans, we really invested in you as soldiers and sailors and airmen, and now we are going to invest in you as American citizens and your families, and boy, did it pay off.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. What a boom in the fifties, was it not?

Mr. DURBIN. The greatest growth in the size of America's middle class in our history. We may never rival it again. I hope we do some day. But the country said as a nation our biggest and most important resource is our people, and these veterans and their families are an investment we are going to hold very dearly when it comes to their education and housing and businesses.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. The gentleman raises, if I can move to two other issues that he reminded me of, and goes to the issue of investment and partnership. I think what we did when the veterans came back was actually the Government being affirmative, but it was a partnership. It was to give those returning veterans a leg up, and they got their leg up. They made good on their investment in terms of having served time. If they got some loans or some other governmental help, they became working Americans. They built all of the kind of tract houses throughout this Nation, but they became homeowners, taxpayers, and they raised their families.

The gentleman talked about how he had to work his way through, and most of us did, with that summer job or some kind of job. Interestingly enough many of us rose to the floor of the House to fight vigorously against cutting our kids, cutting them off from summer work.

Somebody made a lot of loose jokes about this baby-sitting camp, they are standing around. I made it my business to go back home and to reintroduce myself, if you will, because I have had youngsters work in my office in summer jobs, and I can tell you I did not see anyone being baby sat, if you will.

I tell you one personal story of a youngster, I will never forget her, came from a different background, was a recent immigrant of some years, family is now naturalized, Vietnamese, and called back one day after she was hired and said, ''Ma'am, I think I won't be able to come.'' We kind of calmed her down a little bit and prodded a little bit, and she said, ''I don't have the right clothes.'' We said whatever you have, we kind of tried to make it light, said if you have a paper bag, come on to our office. But that young lady was concerned she did not even have the clothes to come sit in an office. She worked harder than any other young intern during that summer. She learned something as well. I have heard great things about her since, graduating from college.

This is not a baby-sitting program. If we have got some, we will fix it. No one has said not to fix those programs that are not working, but I can go to the city of Houston and find youngsters getting good skills, getting an incentive to finish high school and go on to

college because they have been exposed to a workplace relationship. I would not deny any corporate American to participate with us in this program. I do not think any of us said that that was not possible. But the Government steps in to give incentive and to provide and to invest dollars in a worthy manner.

Let me add another point for your thought about this. You come from an urban area. What would we do without transportation? We can all debate on whether your urban transportation is mass transportation, train, rail, or someone else's bus or someone else's highway or bridge, but what would this Nation be? Our forefathers left the 13 Colonies and found a way to go west, go west, young man, young woman, to explore, and they got there through transportation, and of course the way they got there was a four-legged animal. We now today are prepared to make massive cuts. That is taking away from the opportunity for people to grow.

I see people up here, tourists who have visited this Capitol, many of whom have come by the transportation that includes the highways and the bridges of America. We are glad that they are here. We are glad they have the opportunity to freely flow throughout this Nation in freedom. What would they think if they got to the end of one bridge having traveled halfway across the country and it was nothing but an open pit because it had collapsed because it was in such disrepair? Is that a focus on what is good for Americans? Is that the cleaver mentality of the Republican majority? Yes, it is, the meat-cleaver approach. It does not invest capital in Americans, in jobs, in businesses, that help us design and build these infrastructures that are needed for us to be the kind of 21st-century nation.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. What we should recall too is there is nothing partisan about what the gentlewoman has just said. Possibly the greatest investment in modern times in America's infrastructure was made under a Republican President, President Eisenhower, who decided in the fifties that the United States would embark on an Interstate Highway System. It was unheard of. He was going to link up every corner of America through a modern highway system. In my part of the world, my hometown, Springfield, IL, is on old Route 66. It used to be the subject of a lot of songs and a lot of Americana. But Route 66 was replaced by Interstate 55, and so many other interstate systems. At the same time the middle class is growing after World War II with our GI bill and our investment, America made an investment in infrastructure that has paid off so handsomely for us. It is the greatest thing in the world when one of my communities, Quincy, IL, was recently designated as being on an interstate highway. All of a sudden now they have a chance to brag and say not only have we got a great highway, it is interstate standard. So you think about what this means to a community. If we do not keep up that investment in not only our highways and our bridges and our airports and ports, but in the people who build them, then frankly we will pay dearly in the future.

I watch some of these cuts that are coming down the line here.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. $1.1 billion in transportation, by the way.

Mr. DURBIN. $1.1 billion, and it not only affects what I have just described, but it also affects mass transit. In the city of Chicago, for example, so many working families get on that mass transit every day to get down to their workplace. It is their only way to do it. They cannot afford to drive and park. They have to take mass transit. Now we are seeing massive cuts in operating assistance. So these communities will see the fare box go up in cost, which means that families struggling now to get by, husbands and wives both working hard trying to make ends meet, have a new added expense because of this decision to cut back on operating assistance. It really raises a question about whether we are helping the right people.

I worry as much as the gentlewoman does that we have to help all of America, but I am particularly concerned about those who are struggling down at the bottom, those forgotten families at the bottom of the economic pyramid, who pay their taxes, play by the rules, and keep falling behind. When we see cuts in operating assistance for mass transit, we are not making it any easier for them to get to work.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. If the gentleman would yield, I am glad he said that we are here for all Americans, because if I can get just a little bit feisty for a moment, I am darn mad about the accusation. I do not know about the gentleman. He has got Springfield and parts of Chicago. I know he has a corporate community, and I know he has worked with them, because I have worked with the corporate community in Houston.

□ 1915

Because I have worked with the corporate community in Houston and we have worked along the lines of making their needs come before the United States Congress and insure the activity for a climate that will create jobs and a good business climate. No one, I guess, is against that.

But I think that we fail and do not reach the mark. We do not get to the finish line if we do not do what is good for people.

We take that $1.1 billion away from transportation, including mass transportation, and Mr. and Mrs. Smith, who do not have a car or cannot afford the gasoline that will take them downtown on a regular basis, are then kept, and that is a lot of dollars, the transportation costs of going back and forth and maybe the youngsters are going to school on public transportation. It adds up, and every penny is counted in some families in America. You know, 14 million of the families in America earn under $10,000 a year, and so what we have is a situation where we are turning around and slicing ourselves in the wrong place because we are not investing in Americans and giving them the opportunity to go to that workplace and be part of the system.

And so I do not take very lightly any suggestions that the climate for business has not been good when Democrats have been in, because I think we have not come this far for them to be able to achieve in the best Nation in the world for the kinds of corporations that we have. They have enjoyed the bounty of this Nation.

And yet we now come to a point where we may undermine that very structure that they have, the talent, and the trained employees that I have had corporate executives tell me they depend on. They wonder where the trained workers will come from for the 21st century. We are cutting transportation for them to get there, and we are aimed, for cutting, if you will, the training for them, but yet I think, you know, this issue, we still have a billionaire tax loophole. We allow those folks to enjoy the bounty of this Nation. That means that they enjoy the green lands, the wonderful capital. I heard one colleague tell me what the percentage of what we are invested in America, what each of us owns. We are millionaires, to be certain, about what we own in this Government, and yet those individuals will enjoy the bounty, all of this goodness, and then have to abdicate their citizenship and live somewhere else where they will not pay taxes. They are billionaires, and we are losing about $3.5 billion a year.

Mr. DURBIN. The gentlewoman makes an important point. Most people may have missed it. There was a television special about folks who became so rich that in order to avoid paying Federal taxes, they renounced their citizenship, and by renouncing their citizenship and becoming citizens of some other country, they avoided their Federal tax liability, so they used our Nation, they used our resources, they used our people, they filled up their bank account, and then they skipped town, and what we have been trying to do, actually skipped the country, what we have been trying to do here is to change that and to say that is all over. If you owe the Federal Government of the United States taxes and you have made a profit in doing it simply by renouncing your citizenship, we are not letting you off the hook. I am sorry we could not get our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us in this effort.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Repeatedly we have tried, have we not?

Mr. DURBIN. We tried it several times. It strikes me as eminently sensible if a person earned his or her fortune in this country, they should not be able to get off the hook and escape the tax liability. These families getting on the mass transit every day in your hometown and the city of Chicago, they are paying their taxes. It is coming right out of their paycheck. They never think about renouncing their citizenship. They are proud of their country.

I am sure they get a little catch in their throat at the ''Star Spangled Banner'' and watching the flag.

Here we are protecting these folks who would walk away from America. That does not make any sense whatsoever.

I sincerely hope we can address this in the near term because it is really a loophole in the Tax Code that must be changed.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Let me just draw you, as we begin to conclude on where we are trying to take this Nation, because I believe what has been misunderstood, as I have understood it, I have worked hard to be a part of the process, is that we have solutions. We did not totally ignore a tax cut. We had a reasoned tax cut for citizens making under $75,000.

There are solutions that can be bipartisan. We, as Democrats, looked at whether or not any citizen making over $200,000 need a tax cut. I have had them tell me they do not need it.

And so the tax cut that was offered, a fair one, I might add, really spoke to the issue of getting to those working families.

Mr. DURBIN. I just will ask the gentlewoman to yield so it is clear the tax cut package the Democrats support was for families making $75,000 a year and less.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. That is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. The tax break package supported under the Gingrich Republican contract actually gives tax breaks to families making $200,000 a year and more. A family could be making $4,000 a week and qualify for the Gingrich Republican contract tax break, and I think the gentlewoman makes an important point here. We ought to focus on helping people who ready need it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. We had a plan. I think that is what is important.

The other difficulty that I have is that many of the rescissions, remember I started out saying rescissions, budget, authorizations, appropriations but many of the rescissions, taking away money, was not even to place it with a focus, to help us move into the 21st century, maybe giving some more money to education. Those cuts they were doing was to give these people making over $200,000 more money, and not really focus on transportation, on military construction, or dealing with the training program or having a real welfare reform package. That is the exasperation.

That is what I think the American people need to understand. There is not a lot of talk here without action. We worked on real packages that, if accepted, would have been a fair bipartisan approach to this whole idea of, one, reducing the deficit, having a balanced budget over a period of years, which I think many of us may agree with, but we want to have focus and direction and we want to protect the working families of America.

We could not strike that chord, that unifying chord. What we actually had were pages and pages of cuts going to the very heart of veterans, like our good friend who is not a veteran but certainly our hero we had in Bosnia. He came back. We all praised him. Why were we praising him? Because he had the training, the training to know what to do. He saved himself, and he made us proud of America.

All through here are cuts that would impact on some aspects of what happened with that young man, who is a hero, aspects on his early education, training, secondary education, high school, college, impact on housing on those who are trying to get job training, all of these, a myriad of cuts.

I do not think anybody paid any attention to what they were impacting. They just got lists.

Mr. DURBIN. That point is an important one. The question is whether or not we have to make cuts to balance the budget. The answer is ''yes.'' The question is: Should we make more cuts in order to give a tax break to wealthy people and to profitable corporations?

What the Republicans proposed in their Contract on America was a package of about $350 billion in tax breaks. That meant, in order to move toward a balanced budget, we had to cut another $350 billion in spending on other programs, and we are down to the point now, there is still waste we can find, we are also finding they are proposing cuts in education and health care and things so critically essential to our Nation.

So does it make sense to cut a college student loan in order to give a tax break to somebody making $200,000 a year? That is upside down.

If we have limited resources, focus it on the people who need it.

What we said in our tax cut package was let us focus it, for example, on families that want to deduct the cost of college education for their kid. That is sensible. That says let them put together a little account for their kids' college education and get some favorable tax treatment as a result of it. That is a good investment all around, families doing the right thing for their son or daughter, the son or daughter gets a chance of an education, and the tax code is basically giving them incentive instead of for the person making $4,000 a week, handing them a tax break which they will never even notice.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I have had many say this is not the time for that income level to receive one. I have had them actually say that. I appreciate the employer or a constituent who would say they are concerned about the deficit, they do want to ensure they have got the kind of youngsters trained and other adults who need retraining, by the way.

Let me speak just a moment to something that is somewhat unpopular. That is what we are going to be facing as foreign aid. I know many of our citizens claim a great opposition to that.

What is the direction of the Republican Party, to cut aid to developing nations, that they want to get off, if you will, the dependence that they have on this Nation? And I support that.

And so some of the programs that help independence, humanitarian aid; I do not want to call any particular countries, but in particular to Africa where you are able to ensure that these individuals can stop coming to the United States, and that is where we all want to be. We want to see a world that is standing on its own two feet, that has people working, that has a country that stands up for helping their economic development.

We do not know how that vote is going to come out, but what I have seen to date, it seems that they have taken the ax again, or the cleaver, to programs that would allow those small countries to be independent, and I think we do the wrong thing when we think taking dollars away, because we do not know if those countries will fall then to some misguided political philosophy, because they have not had the opportunity, not to get a fish from us, but for us to teach them how to fish and to be able to go ongoing into the 21st century to be independent.

Mr. DURBIN. Foreign aid is not popular in any quarter in America. People are very upset about it. Many do not understand it. Sometimes it is humanitarian in nature.

We have seen these heart-rending pictures of people who are literally starving to death, mothers holding their children as they starve to death in their arms, and we sense as Americans a feeling of compassion and caring to come and provide our extra bounty so that they do not die literally in the dust covered with flies. That is what America has always been about, we have always stood for.

I will tell you an area of foreign aid the gentlewoman would agree with me on, and we really ought to take a look, and I am afraid we have not. That is military foreign aid. When it comes to sending our millions and often billions of dollars overseas to protect Germany and Japan, this Member has a real problem. Here we are, 50 years after World War II, and we are still defending Japan? For goodness sakes, these folks are cleaning our clock when it comes to the trade account. They ship all of their products here. They have a trade surplus with the United States, and we are sending millions of dollars

overseas for troops and ships and planes to protect Japan?

The same thing is true in Europe. For goodness sakes, now, the Berlin Wall is down. The cold war is over, and we still defend Europe 50 years later, while the Germans are investing and uniting their country and educating their work force, making better products, a higher, I might say, standard of living, unfortunately, than the United States, in many areas. That is military foreign aid which we tried to address on this floor in the name of burdensharing, saying to our allies, ''It is about time you share this burden that we have carried for 50 years in this country.''

But many of our friends who are the first to say they hate foreign aid would not even consider touching this military foreign aid which costs us so dearly.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. That is why I wanted to spend some time on solutions, because what comes out of the media and what trickles down to constituents is what are the solutions. We have had solutions.

What you have just talked about, yes, I join you on that. It made perfect sense, reasoned, logical planning of what we want this Nation to look like in the 21st century.

We all applauded the 50th-year celebration this past spring that we had celebrating the great coming together and the great victories we had in Europe in World War II. We celebrated, we embraced it, we went back to salute the heroes, they saluted us. We are in sync. We are committed to each other, Europe and Japan.

But the question is, the question becomes a very commonsense proposal that do we want to continue to pay for military, and it leads very well, as we move to July 4, what we are doing to our veterans.

It makes sense. We sit down to the bargaining table, we work out a process, we say if you get in jeopardy, we come to the table, we come and rise to the occasion.

But during peacetime, to continue to pay, time after time after time after time, over and over again, dollars to a peacetime relationship, it seems to me that you are not investing your money right. You are not making the right decision. It is not saying that we are isolationists or moving away from the international role that we need to have, because I support that.

I think America needs to be strong. I think we need to be there for our allies, but it makes no sense, to me, cutting veterans' benefits, having seniors come to me who are veterans saying that they are losing their benefits in health care, as someone has told them, because they have got to cut costs. These are people giving almost the extent of their life, and we are grateful they did not lose it, to this country, and yet we are cutting the very benefits of those who are in need.

We do not know what we may face in Desert Storm or what we may continue to face with Agent Orange with Vietnam veterans and others, and we need to ensure that we pay both our respects, like we like to do on these holidays, of which I join my veterans on Memorial Day, but we must show them, as we celebrate July 4, the founding of this Nation, and what we stand for, that we respect and appreciate them.

Why are we still taking care of the military overseas for other nations?

Mr. DURBIN. One of the things that I think is significant, and most Americans are not aware of this fact, is that we will spend about $270 billion in the next fiscal year on our military. I often ask in my town meetings if anybody in the audience knows which country in the world is No. 2 in military spending and how much they spend.

Well, most do not know, and it is almost a tie between Great Britain and France. Each of them spend about $45 billion a year, one-sixth of the amount that the United States spends, and yet despite all of this expenditure, $270 billion, six times more than any other nation in the world, we still have soldiers and sailors on food stamps.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. They are not being paid enough in the service not to qualify for food stamps; still, their income is too low.

So the quality of life for men and women in the service is being sacrificed at a time when they are our most important investment. We put money into these weapons, billions and billions of dollars, and overlook the most important weapons system, the men and women giving their lives and their time to serve in our American military.

□ 1930

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. As exhibited by the captain that was so heroic in this last month in terms of his coming out of Bosnia.

Mr. DURBIN. Lieutenant O'Grady.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I like him a lot. I think all of America fell for this fellow, because he came out and it does us proud to have fellow who has come through such terrible ordeal and who says, ''Don't give me credit. Give the credit to the rescuers. I was acting like a bunny, hiding in the bushes.'' But when he tells his story, we know it took a lot of guts and bravery for him to make it through that.

There are many more like him in the service, and thank God there are. They deserve first-class treatment. And instead of building these weapons system that cost so much money like star wars, we have put $40 billion in star wars, this Ronald Reagan concept that is going to protect the United States. We have little or nothing to show for it. And now our friends on the Republican side say, let us spend another $30 billion and see what we can find.

I say put the money in defending this country and making sure that the people who serve in the service are treated with respect and dignity.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. If the gentleman will yield, I tried to elevate the young man to captain, but maybe because I was so impressed with his demeanor and how he presented himself to the American people.

Which reminds me of one of my invitations to visit 6,000 men and women on one of our nuclear submarines. And, really, the most impressive part of it was the young men and women. Particularly the young men; I think this was a ship that did not yet have young women on the ship.

In any event, in addition to seeing the expertise that they had, I got some personal stories as well. And I think you realize that those who are on submarine duty are out 6 months or so at a time and they leave their families back home.

And one in particular came up to me and mentioned that he was a single father with two girls who were living with the grandmother. And he pleaded with me about the need for a higher salary, because his youngsters were probably on food stamps with his mother who was taking care of them. He did not see them on a regular basis and he was struggling to make ends meet. But he was trying to be a good father and a good parent.

That breaks your heart when you hear those kinds of stories, because you know when we call upon him, if anything was to happen and he had to risk his life for us, for Americans, he would be right there to do it. I would hesitate to have him have on his mind the needs of his children. And they do.

The same thing with housing for our enlisted men and women. I again will bring up veterans. The same thing with facilities for veterans. Why would we want to put them through that? Where is the focus? Where is us capturing the aspirations of Americans?

Let me add one other thing. I am wearing this little patch because I was today with the physically challenged. And they are out supporting the Americans with Disabilities Act, which will be impacted by many of these cuts, because as you realize, the act requires modification.

And these folks were not here asking for handouts. They were not here whining about their condition. They were here in full force. They came from across the country; many of them in different challenged conditions, but yet they got here saying, We just want a chance.

I promised them today in front of the U.S. Capitol that I will give them a chance and that is what we are missing out here. We are not giving Americans a chance.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentlewoman will yield, I had a presentation last Monday in my hometown of Springfield, IL, at the Land of Lincoln Goodwill Industries. They have been accredited for their rehabilitation activity and they take a lot of people facing

physical and mental challenges and them to work in good jobs. They pay them a modest amount of income, but really turn their lives around.

I visited a license plate factory in Decatur, IL, several years ago and the administrator told me a story. She pointed to a young woman who was working on the assembly line for these license plates and said, ''When she first came to this facility we literally carried her in. She was considered to be an impossible case; never capable of doing a thing. We trained her and stuck with her. You know what the problem is now, Congressman? When we have a big snowstorm and I want to close down this factory, I know she is going to show up anyway. She feels so dedicated to the job.''

Many people with these challenges and disabilities just need a chance. And the Government comes through with that chance, giving them a helping hand so they can be productive and have real lives.

Your commitment is one I share. And I really fear that the disabled will be the first casualties of these budget cuts and it would be sad for the future of our country if that occurs.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I think your fears are well founded. They indicated they felt concern about the education act that related particularly to the mentally and physically challenged, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the SSI, and Medicare and Medicaid which they depend upon.

And what I started out saying, sometimes we think it is in to talk about folk like that. Articles in newspapers or letters to the editor saying, Sorry, I am not going to feel guilty. These people are deadbeats that are on welfare.

But let me tell you that out of that session I had today in front of U.S. Capitol came a young woman who said, ''I was an architect, but after a tragic car accident and brain injury I am here today to say I just need a chance.''

We had a good time out there. A few tears were shed. Because I think Americans need to realize that people who find themselves in these conditions, physically challenged, mentally challenged, are not just the other guy that you might see that unfortunately was born that way, but many of us in life's journey may come upon these hard times, whether it is a tragic accident, but we live, and we thank God for that, but it may be leaving us in a condition where we need the kind of support that this training program could give or SSI could give.

And I have heard some really, I think, thoughtless comments that some mothers are misrepresenting on forms so that a child could be listed as autistic. I do not know if anyone has seen an autistic child. I do not think that any parent would go to that length to be able to label the child autistic, just to be on SSI.

I have seen real life cases. And we need to really invest in the American people and the cases that we have seen before us for the future of this Nation.

Mr. DURBIN. I noticed, too, in my own district, a young lady who was a single mother with two children and one suffered from a severe learning disability. She was able to continue to go to work, and continue to make money to help raise her family, because of the assistance she received from the Government.

And they asked her in this interview, What are you going to do if you do not receive that assistance? And she said, ''It is hopeless for me. I would have to stay home and take care of my child. I would not be able to work.''

At a time when we are trying to reduce welfare dependency, she is doing the right thing. She is facing a challenge that many of us would wither under and doing the right thing. And we are giving her a helping hand for that purpose.

I would hate to see us turn that hand and slap her and say, No, now you're on your own. Show us how you can do it personally without our help, because we know that just a little bit of help has made a significant difference in her family's future.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I don't know what the answer would be for that young woman, and that is why I am trying to get this clear message that we need a focus and a direction; that none of us are apart on the fact that we want the Nation to be strong with a strong bottom line, moving toward deficit reduction.

But where is the focus? Today I happen to have voted against the congressional appropriations bill. I did that because I would almost imagine we could cut a little bit more. But I will say the direction was wrong.

Here they were, as I see tourists coming to this Nation and this Capital represents so much good. The Botanical Gardens, which needed some enhancement, we get someone on the other side of the aisle, a Republican, who wants to cut the flowers out from Americans.

That is the kind of misguided direction. It does not mean we cannot come to some conclusion about cutting the budget. But I would think that if you asked an average American if they enjoy a botanical garden where flowers grow and enhance the beauty of this Capital, whether or not the few pennies that were going to be saved, and I can tell them it was a few pennies that would be saved, or whether or not that was worth it.

What happened? No focus. Just a haphazard approach. Everybody with a meat cleaver. Me, me, me. I want to be the one that cuts. So, I think it is very important that we place the American people first. That we ensure that we understand what the Constitution says, but more importantly what the Declaration of Independence said; we are all created equal with certain inalienable rights. And that equality is a promise to Americans and a promise of job opportunity.

And I might add just a note, it is a promise to those of us who came from different locales and look differently. And that is why I think affirmative action is something that Americans need to understand. It is not a negative; it is an even playing field.

What we should say to Americans is: Understand that Democrats have solutions. We have solutions. Your Member has a solution. I have a solution for the 18th Congressional District. I do not want the State of Texas to lose $1.1 billion in rescissions and not go back to any deficit reduction, but go to tax cuts for those making over $200,000.

What I want is a plan; a plan to invest in America. Those investments would count for infrastructure, for education, for housing, for energy development, for space development for some of us who are interested in making sure we are at the high technological cutting edge for the 21st century. It has to be, I believe, an investment.

TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION OF ISSUANCE OF LICENSES FOR EXPORT OF MUNITIONS LIST ARTICLES TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–87)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 902(b)(2) of the foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–246) (''the Act''), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to the Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to terminate the suspension under subsection 902(a)(3) of the Act with respect to the issuance of licenses for the export to the People's Republic of China of U.S. Munitions List articles, insofar as such suspension pertains to export license requests for cryptographic items covered by Category XIII on the U.S. Munitions List.

License requirements remain in place for these exports and require review and approval on a case-by-case basis. The Department of State, in consultation with the Department of Defense and other relevant agencies, will review each request, including each proposed use and end-user, and will approve only those requests determined to be consistent with U.S. foreign policy and national security.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 22, 1995.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TORRES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for June 21 and today, on account of personal business.

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. SERRANO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MCHUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), after 3:15 p.m. today, on account of official business.

Mr. LAZIO of New York (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), between noon and 2 p.m. today on account of attending the Women's Veterans Memorial groundbreaking ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery.

Mr. LATOURETTE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), after 4:30 p.m. today, on account of personal 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. WILSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. KENNELLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. CLINGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes each day on June 27 and 29.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes each day, today and on June 28.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes each day on June 28 and 29.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

Mr. TOWNS in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. FILNER.

Mr. RAHALL.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida in two instances.

Mr. CLYBURN.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. GORDON

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. SKAGGS.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. BARCIA in two instances.

Mrs. MALONEY.

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

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. STUPAK.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. WAXMAN in two instances.

Mr. HINCHEY.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mr. POMEROY.

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

Mr. SOLOMON in three instances.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. PORTMAN in three instances.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. HORN.

Mr. DORNAN.

Mr. BAKER of California.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee.

Mrs. CHENOWETH.

Mr. COBLE.

Mr. DOOLITTLE.

Mr. RIGGS.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. STUMP in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. JONES.

Mr. COYNE.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Mr. CAMP.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 26, 1995, 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:

1075. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Norway (Transmittal No. DTC–33–95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1076. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1077. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–63, ''Rental Housing Conversion and Sale Act of 1980 Reenactment and Amendment Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1078. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–64, ''Arena Tax Payment Temporary Amendment Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1079. A letter from the Federal Co-Chairman, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1994, through March 31, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1080. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the activities of the Department's Office of Inspector General for the 6-month period ending March 31, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1081. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting proposed new FEC Form 3P for use by authorized committees of Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(d); to the Committee on House Oversight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1062. A bill to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial service providers; with an amendment (Rept. 104–127 Pt. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 79. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States (Rept. 104–151). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. H.R. 1617. A bill to consolidate and reform workforce development and literacy programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104–152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. H.R. 1720. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the cessation of Federal sponsorship of two Government sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104–153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. QUILLEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 171. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–154). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1077. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Land Management, with an amendment; (Rept. 104–155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CLINGER: Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. A Citizen's Guide on

Using the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act of 1974 to Request Government Records (Rept. 104–156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 483. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–157). Ordered to be printed.

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. STARK:

H.R. 1912. A bill to deter and penalize health care fraud and abuse and to simplify the administration of health benefit plans; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, 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.

By Mr. BAKER of Louisiana:

H.R. 1913. A bill to reform and improve the rural electrification loan programs under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COYNE (for himself and Mr. STARR, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1914. A bill to require the mandatory reporting of deaths resulting from the prescribing, dispensing, and administration of drugs, to allow the continuation of voluntary reporting programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, 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.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. BYRANT of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BONO, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CANADY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARR, Mr. BAKER of California Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):

H.R. 1915. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing Border Patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on National Security, Economic and Educational Opportunities, Government Reform and Oversight, Ways and Means, Commerce, Agriculture, and Banking and Financial Services, 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.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 1916. A bill to reform certain statutes regarding civil asset forfeiture; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 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.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. YATES, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FILNER, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. FURSE, Mr. REED, Mr. TORRES, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 1917. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide special funding to States for implementation of national estuary conservation and management plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1918. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the exclusion of gain on certain small business stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 1919. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of certain personal care services under the unemployment tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOLINARI (for herself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KING, and Mr. PAXON):

H.R. 1920. A bill to protect victims of domestic violence from health insurance discrimination; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 1921. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Francis Albert Sinatra; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SKAGGS (for himself and Mr. MCINNIS):

H.R. 1922. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain lands in Gilpin County, CO; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. NEUMANN, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 1923. A bill to balance the budget of the U.S. Government by restructuring Government, reducing Federal spending, eliminating the deficit, limiting bureaucracy, and restoring federalism; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on National Security, Banking and Financial Services, International Relations, Science, Commerce, Resources, Rules, Transportation and Infrastructure, Agriculture, Small Business, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Budget, Veterans' Affairs, House Oversight, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH (for herself and Mr. ENSIGN):

H.R. 1924. A bill to designate a site for the interim storage of spent nuclear fuel; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.J. Res. 97. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the Congress to limit expenditures in elections for Federal office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS:

H. Res. 172. Resolution supporting the National Railroad Hall of Fame, Inc., of Galesburg, IL, in its endeavor to erect a monument known as the National Railroad Hall of Fame; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

MEMORIALS

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

116. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to Federal supported sugar programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

117. Also memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to memorializing Congress to support the George C. Marshall Commemorative Coin; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

118. Also memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose a constitutional amendment to authorize a prohibition against flag desecration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

119. Also memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend the Maine territorial sea limits from 3 miles to 12 miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

120. Also memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to claiming sovereignty for Indiana with regard to all powers not granted by the U.S. Constitution to the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

121. Also memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to repealing the imposition of a 4.3 cents per gallon tax on jet fuel which will otherwise become effective on October 1, 1995; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. PETRI introduced a bill (H.R. 1925) for the relief of Thomas McDermott, Sr.; which was referred to the Committee on Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 53: Mr. FAZIO of California and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 54: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 104: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 218: Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee.
H.R. 248: Mr. MINETA and Mr. STUDDS.
H.R. 371: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 373: Mr. HERGER and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 470: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 491: Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 530: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 580: Mr. KLUG and Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 703: Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 752: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. WISE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 789: Mr. WALSH and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 820: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. FRISA, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 863: Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 882: Mr. YATES, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 945: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. QUINN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. Young of Alaska, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 989: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 997: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 1005: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.
H.R. 1021: Mr. BALDACCI.
H.R. 1023: Mr. EVANS, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. LEACH.
H.R. 1100: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. POSHARD.
H.R. 1143: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. DORNAN.
H.R. 1144: Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. DORNAN.
H.R. 1145: Mr. DORNAN and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
H.R. 1176: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 1229: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1242: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.
H.R. 1274: Mr. HOKE and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1279: Mr. COOLEY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1299: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.
H.R. 1362: Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. STUMP, and Mrs. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1381: Mr. BONIOR Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. DELLUMS.
H.R. 1496: Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.
H.R. 1499: Mr. WELLER and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 1500: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 1544: Mr. MORAN, Mr. THOMPSON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 1580: Mr. SCHAEFER.
H.R. 1594: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.
H.R. 1595: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. FROST, Mr. STUMP, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FORBES, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MICA, Mr. LINDER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BLUTE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1610: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1614: Mr. REYNOLDS and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1660: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TORRES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.
H.R. 1680: Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 1700: Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1715: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BURR, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H.R. 1735: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1744: Mr. KLECZKA and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 1753: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. BLILEY.
H.R. 1764: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 1774: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.
H.R. 1775: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1791: Mr. BURR, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 1821: Mr. BAKER of California and Mr. TORKILDSEN.
H.R. 1876: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1893: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia and Mr. LAFALCE.
H.R. 1897: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.J. Res. 79: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.J. Res. 89: Mr. DAVIS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KIM, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Con. Res. 12: Ms. PELOSI.
H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. MARTINI, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. PALLONE.
H. Con. Res. 63: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. SALMON.
H. Con. Res. 76: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VENTO, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R.

(Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1996)

OFFERED BY: MR. CUNNINGHAM

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior—

(1) to conduct a lease sale or issue a lease for oil or gas under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in the Southern California, Central California, of Northern California Planning Areas; or

(2) to approve any exploration plan, development and production plan, or application for permit to drill, or permit any drilling, for oil or gas under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act on any lands of the Outer Continental Shelf in the Southern California, Central California, or Northern California Planning Areas.

H.R.

(Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1996)

OFFERED BY: MR. UNDERWOOD

AMENDMENT NO. 2: In title I of the bill, decrease the amount appropriated for technical assistance and maintenance assistance under the heading ''Territorial and International Affairs'', by $2,580,000 and $2,000,000, respectively.

In title I of the bill, appropriate $4,580,000 to Guam for impact aid under Public Law 99–239 (relating to the Compact of Free Association).

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. BROWNBACK

AMENDMENT NO. 64: Page 12, line 8, strike ''$7,000,000'' and insert ''$3,000,000''.

Page 13, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 14, line 11.

Page 16, line 24, strike ''$595,000,000'' and insert ''$619,000,000''.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON of Indiana

AMENDMENT NO. 65: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

SEC. 564. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance Fund'' may be made available to the Government of India or non-governmental organizations and private voluntary organizations operating within India.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. ENGEL

AMENDMENT NO. 66: Page 63, after line 4, insert the following new section:

SEC. 540A. RESTRICTIONS ON THE TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS AGAINST SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO.

(a) RESTRICTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no sanction, prohibition, or requirement described in section 1511 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160), with respect to Serbia or Montenegro, may cease to be effective, unless—

(1) the President first submits to the Congress a certification described in subsection (b); and

(2) the requirements of section 1511 of that Act are met.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this subsection is a certification that—

(1) there is substantial progress toward—

(A) the realization of a separate identity for Kosova and the right of the people of Kosova to govern themselves; or

(B) the creation of an international protectorate for Kosova;

(2) there is substantial improvement in the human rights situation in Kosova;

(3) international human rights observers are allowed to return to Kosova; and

(4) the elected government of Kosova is permitted to meet and carry out its legitimate mandate as elected representatives of the people of Kosova.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. ENGEL

AMENDMENT NO. 67: Page 63, after line 4, insert the following new section:

SEC. 540A. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO RESTRICTIONS ON THE TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS AGAINST SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO.

(a) RESTRICTIONS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no sanction, prohibition, or requirement described in section 1511 of the

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160), with respect to Serbia or Montenegro, should cease to be effective, unless—

(1) the President first submits to the Congress a certification described in subsection (b); and

(2) the requirements of section 1511 of that Act are met.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this subsection is a certification that—

(1) there is substantial progress toward—

(A) the realization of a separate identity for Kosova and the right of the people of Kosova to govern themselves; or

(B) the creation of an international protectorate for Kosova;

(2) there is substantial improvement in the human rights situation in Kosova;

(3) international human rights observers are allowed to return to Kosova; and

(4) the elected government of Kosova is permitted to meet and carry out its legitimate mandate as elected representatives of the people of Kosova.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSS

AMENDMENT NO. 68: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR HAITI

SEC. 564. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be made available to the Government of Haiti when it is made known to the President that such Government is controlled by a regime holding power through means other than the democratic elections scheduled for calendar year 1995 and held pursuant to the requirements of the 1987 Constitution of Haiti.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. MENENDEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 69: Page 78, after line 6, add the following:

WITHHOLDING OF ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES SUPPORTING NUCLEAR PLANT IN CUBA

SEC. 564. The President shall withhold from assistance made available with funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act an amount equal to the sum of assistance and credits, if any, provided on or after the date of the enactment of this Act by that country, or any entity in that country, in support of the completion of the Cuban nuclear facility at Juragua, near Cienfuegos, Cuba.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 70: Page 16, line 24, strike $595,000,000'' and insert ''$565,000,000''.

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. BARRETT OF WISCONSIN

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 16, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(less $5,000,000)''.

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. BARRETT OF WISCONSIN

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 505. Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities'', not more than $10,000,000 shall be available for hydrogen research.

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. BREWSTER

AMENDMENT NO. 5. At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE —DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCKBOX

DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND; DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS

SEC. . (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the ''Deficit Reduction Trust Fund'' (in this title referred to as the ''Fund'').

(b) CONTENTS.—The Fund shall consist only of amounts transferred to the Fund under subsection (c).

(c) TRANSFERS OF MONEYS TO FUND.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Fund an amount equal to the allocations under section 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations with jurisdiction over this Act minus the aggregate level of new budget authority and outlays resulting from the enactment of this Act, as calculated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(d) USE OF MONEYS IN FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amounts in the Fund shall not be available, in any fiscal year, for appropriation, obligation, expenditure, or transfer.

(2) USE OF AMOUNTS FOR REDUCTION OF PUBLIC DEBT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall use the amounts in the Fund to redeem, or buy before maturity, obligations of the Federal Government that are included in the public debt. Any obligation of the Federal Government that is paid, redeemed, or bought with money from the Fund shall be canceled and retired and may not be reissued.

(e) DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—Upon the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall make downward adjustments in the adjusted discretionary spending limits (new budget authority and outlays) as set forth in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 by the aggregate amount of estimated reductions in new budget authority and outlays transferred to the Fund under subsection (c) for such fiscal year, as calculated by the Director.

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. KLUG

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 16, line 2, insert before the period the following:

: *Provided*, That, of such amount, not less than $74,129,000 shall be available for photovoltaic energy systems, not less than $25,329,000 shall be available for solar thermal energy systems, not less than $40,000,000 shall be available for wind energy systems, not less than $28,115,000 shall be available for geothermal, and not more than $323,628,000 shall be available for materials sciences: *Provided further*, That within such $323,628,000, not more than $113,954,000 shall be available for non-research, including (but not limited to) facilities and operations.

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. KLUG

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 16, line 1 strike ''$2,596,700,000'' and insert ''$2,576,700,000''.

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. KLUG

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 25, line 6, strike ''$142,000,000'' and insert ''$0''.

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. KLUG

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 29, line 1, strike ''$103,339,000'' and insert ''$0''.