United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 21, 1995 No. 119

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mrs. MORELLA].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 21, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable CONSTANCE A. MORELLA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We have heard it said of old that there abides faith and hope and love and the greatest of these is love. And now we pray that in all the moments of our lives the reality and dynamic of this greatest of all Your gifts, will be meaningful in our daily lives and have a profound effect on our attitudes toward others. We know too, O God, that the reality of love is greater than our ability to imagine or comprehend, so may our hearts and minds be alert to all the opportunities to experience this gift and to embrace it with joy and thanksgiving. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 10 1-minute speeches on each side.

SET-ASIDE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

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

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I have been assured by you and the House Republican leadership that I will be able to offer an amendment that would eliminate race- and gender-based set-aside programs for the awarding of Federal contracts, and I intend to do so. We have agreed to utilize the DOD appropriations bill as our means.

I say this to give Members due notice. Prior to the vote, I intend to hold hearing-like meetings on my amendment. On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week, I will hold these sessions for Republicans and Democrats to discuss this proposal. Notices will be going to every Member's office denoting the time and the location.

Communication, openness, and input from all interested Members prior to the vote is desired, because we all would like to offer every American an equal opportunity to succeed in this great country.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD T. GREENE

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a patriarch of American banking and finance. In New York City and across the Nation, his name and his professional legacy command respect and admiration. Richard T. Greene, the chairman of the board of directors of Carver Federal Savings Bank, the Nation's largest African-American financial institution, has maintained a life-long commitment to the success of America's financial services industry and the well-being of his community. Today, we join a host of other organizations and institutions that have already recognized his enduring contribution to mankind.

Richard Greene has been with Carver for 35 years and has served as its president and CEO for 25 of those years. Carver, founded in 1949, has more than $368 million in total assets and eight offices in New York City and Long Island. His leadership has been recognized by numerous newspapers, journals, and periodicals. Fortune, the Daily News, American Banker, Black Enterprise, and Newsday have featured the growth and success experienced by Carver under Greene's stewardship.

Carver continues to fulfill its founding philosophy of operating in the best interests of the people in the communities it serves. Since 1986, the bank has awarded 401 scholarships totaling $312,970 to children of its customers through its Scholarship Awards Program.

Greene served two terms as a member of the board of directors of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, second district, which services thrift

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

institutions in New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. He also serves as board member of the Thrift Associations Services Corp., Harlem Urban Development Corp., New York City Housing Partnership, American Savings and Loan League, and the Apollo Theater Foundation.

Born and raised in Charleston, SC, and a graduate of Hampton University in Virginia, Greene studied business administration at New York University and the University of Pennsylvania Wharton School of Banking and Finance. During Greene's service in the Army, he received the Army Commendation Medal for exceptional service. He was discharged with the rank of captain and is now a major in the Army Reserves. He received an honorary doctor of commercial science degree from St. John's University, Jamaica, NY, on May 24, 1992.

Greene is an active member of the communities in which he lives and works—as an elder in the Westminster Presbyterian Church in Jamaica, NY; as a member of the New York Hampton Unviersity Alumni Association, the Omega Psi Phi fraternity, One Hundred Black Men, Inc., and of the President's Council of the Museum of the city of New York. He has received numerous honors and awards from fraternity, religious, social, service, business, and educational groups.

In addition to his stellar professional experience, Greene takes tremendous pride in his family. He is married to the lovely M. Virginia Lea. This dynamic couple is blessed with two children, Cheryll and Richard, Jr., and three grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, Richard Greene is an exceptional man and worthy of this body's recognition.

REPUBLICANS ARE NOT CUTTING MEDICARE

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I was a teacher for 24 years. These is a prescription for success in teaching. It is summarized, ''Repetition is the soul of learning,'' and it works even better if you say the same thing in different ways. It works wonders in our schools. Perhaps it will work here. Listen up on the other side of the aisle.

Republicans are not cutting Medicare. The average recipient receives $4,800 now. In 2002 they will receive $6,700. Where is the cut?

Republicans are not cutting Medicare—$6,700 is greater than $4,800; $4,800 is smaller than $6,700. Pay to the average recipient of Medicare will grow from $4,800 to $6,700—$6,700 is larger than $4,800. Republicans are not cutting Medicare.

This repetition works wonders in our schools. I hope it will work here. Republicans are not cutting Medicare. It will grow from $4,800 to $6,700—$6,700 is larger than $4,800.

STILL NO REPUBLICAN MEDICARE REFORM PLAN

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman is not cutting Medicare, why could he not get his plan out here? I learned yesterday that it will be at least another 2 months, until September 22, before we get the details of the Republican plan. They can put charts up. They had wavy graphs yesterday to try to confuse the American people. But the bottom line is that they are going to reach in the pockets of American seniors and they are going to pull out $1 for every $4 that would be paid under existing law with reference to Medicare.

That means that the Republicans think our seniors are not having to pay enough for their health care at the present time, because the second part of their plan, as revealed not by them but by the newspapers this week, is that they think seniors should be discouraged from getting Medigap insurance; that they are not having to pay enough; that they do not have enough incentive to not make use of health care under existing law.

Yes, they are MediScared. They are MediScared to tell the American people the truth about their changes, and that is why we are not getting the plan today. That is why we have to wait 2 months, because they are MediScared to tell the American seniors that it is their pocket that is going to be picked.

TOUGH DECISIONS NEEDED TO STRENGTHEN MEDICARE

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, my good friend from Texas can be answered with another question: Where is your plan? Have the courage to come forward and accept what the trustees of the Medicare trust fund have told us, what three Cabinet-level officials in President Clinton's own Cabinet have told us, that Medicare goes broke in 7 years if we fail to do anything.

Friends, we are not out to scare the American people, unlike my friend from Texas. We are here to make tough decisions, to strengthen and save Medicare.

So, yes, we do have to work out the details. We invite our friends to join us. But, once again, instead of joining us and stepping up to the plate and helping us govern, they would rather whine and complain and try to scare the American people.

That old formula no longer works. It is time for bold new leadership to save Medicare, and this majority is committed to finding the answer.

TAKING EXCEPTION TO PLAN TO SAVE MEDICARE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today, and I am glad my colleague from Arizona talked about it, to take exception with the Republican plan to save Medicare. Only in Washington can they say that they are going to save Medicare and cut $270 billion, and then give a $245 billion tax cut. They are telling the American people they are saving the system.

Well, that does not play in Houston, TX. Maybe it plays in Arizona. We are smarter than that. I have a letter from a senior citizen in my district. She had an ear infection and went to an HMO, which is what they want to force senior citizens to go to. She had to wait 2 months before she could see a doctor for an ear infection. That is a long time to have your ear hurt.

I think the Republicans are moving too fast when they talk about even waiting until September to change senior citizen health care to managed care. Still they want to give that $245 billion tax cut and cut $270 billion in growth in Medicare.

Only in Washington can somebody get away with saying we are saving the system, but we are cutting $270 billion.

PORKER OF THE WEEK AWARD

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to tell you about the National Institutes of Health and its multimillion-dollar grant to the University of Colorado. This multimillion-dollar grant is not for cancer research, as one might expect, or for AIDS research, or aid to children in developing countries, or for juvenile diabetes, or any of the things you might think this kind of money would go for. But what it is for is to study why people get fat.

Now, it does not take this kind of money, it does not take any money, to figure out what will result from too many trips to the refrigerator. In fact, you could spend a fortune just buying the magazines and books that contain the already countless studies on this subject. Thousands of them have been done.

Sure, it does appear that there is a certain medical explanation for some obesity, but most of the studies seem to indicate that the way you eat and the way you exercise explains most of the problem.

It is ironic that this study is being done in Colorado, which has the lowest percentage of overweight people in the Nation.

So the National Institutes of Health gets my porker of the week award this week.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL POWER OF IRS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, only the IRS can conduct an audit of your financial records without a warrant. Only the IRS can levy penalties without a court order. Only the IRS can seize your bank account without a judgment. Only the IRS can actually take your home, take your home, without due process.

Now, if that is not enough to tax your 1040, check this out: When you decide to fight this pack of bullies, you go to court, Tax Court, with the IRS; you are considered guilty and have to prove yourself innocent.

Beam me up. Ladies and gentlemen, there is only one reason for the unconstitutional power of the Internal Revenue Service: The Congress of the United States of America. Think about it. I yield back the balance of these taxes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind people in the gallery they should not express approval or disapproval during the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT DOES NOT NEED ANOTHER NEW BUILDING

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

Mr. SANFORD. Madam Speaker, late last night we had the debate on an amendment that I proposed to prevent the construction of yet another Washington office building, this one being $40 million and in size 350,000 square feet. For those of my colleagues who were wisely asleep at the hour, I would say it still makes a lot of sense for a couple reasons.

First, GSA already controls 644 million square feet of office space in the United States. That is the equivalent of all the office space in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Houston combined. Do we need another office building?

Second, even if it is the right thing to do, now is not the right time to do it. That is why the National Capital Planning Commission said ''No, don't do it, wait until after the farm bill.''

Third, it is what the budget asks for.

Fourth, it is what National Taxpayers Union and Citizens for a Sound Economy think to be a good idea.

CONGRESS SHOULD BE MORE FAMILY FRIENDLY

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

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Speaker, last night we worked here in the House of Representatives well past midnight, and last night is no different from any other night from January 4, when we went into session. Fifty-four percent of the time we have adjourned after 9 o'clock at night since January 4.

Now, for the first 3 months we expected that. We knew working on the contract we would have late nights. But Speaker GINGRICH said on his first day here on the floor, right behind me, ''We are going to set schedules we stick to so families can count on time together.''

Now, Madam Speaker, the only time we see our families is when we take a picture of them out of our wallets and look at the frayed pictures.

I think that we need predictable schedules. We want to work hard. We have been in more than 300 hours over last year at this time. We need predictability. Let us have one night a week that we are out by 6 p.m. and have it predictable. Let us roll votes, and let us make sure we come in and start work at 8 o'clock in the morning for 1 minutes. I think that is the hour that America starts to work.

THE ISTOOK, MCINTOSH, AND ERHLICH AMENDMENT

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of efforts to reform our grant-making process—specifically, the Istook, McIntosh, and Ehrlich legislation.

I join my colleagues in believing that we engage in a dangerous enterprise when Government selectively subsidizes particular interests and lobbying organizations. It raises a question about the fundamental integrity and impartiality of Government.

What this legislation addresses is the fact that certain groups have simultaneously enjoyed the advantages of exemption from tax payments and the statutory right to spend an unlimited amount on lobbying Congress. This is wrong and has led to a mistrust of Government by the American people.

Ordinary citizens do not enjoy all of these benefits simultaneously and this kind of preferential treatment can only serve to maximize the influence and power of certain privileged lobbying groups at the expense of the people we were elected to serve. In my view, organizations should have to choose between being tax-exempt, self-interested lobbying organizations or administrators of Federal grants.

TRICKLE-DOWN ALREADY PROVEN UNWORKABLE

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

Mr. KLINK. Madam Speaker, back in the 1980's Republican Ronald Reagan told us decrease taxes for the wealthy, investment will go up, wealth will trickle down, America will prosper.

The wealthy did keep more. They invested it overseas and our jobs followed. Industrial America began to disappear.

Just over a decade later, they are at it again, saying decrease taxes for the wealthy, $245 billion, pay for it by cutting Medicare $270 billion, by cutting Medicaid $170 billion; let's cut back school lunches, student loans, WIC, Head Start.

Madam Speaker, fool America once, shame on you. Fool us twice, shame on America. Only in Washington, DC, could people on the other side of the aisle say they are saving Medicare by cutting $270 billion out of it.

It reminds me again of the officer in Vietnam who said we saved the village by burning it to the ground. The Republicans are going to save Medicare and Medicaid by burning that to the ground, and our senior citizens are going to be the victims.

PRIVATIZATION SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my fellow Nebraskans to call and write often. I listen to what they have to say, and I am often persuaded by what they write.

Last week I received this postcard, which perhaps is the most persuasive that I have ever received. In this bag, Madam Speaker, is a note from a constituent regarding the privatization of the post office. This note was saying why we should not privatize the post office. But you see, this note came in what the post office calls as body bag. It comes with discarded mail, and they put it in here and say ''We care.''

Well, it is quite ironic that this kind of mail would come in this form and fashion, and the message in it would be not to privatize the post office.

Madam Speaker, in light of this, I want to encourage the continued privatization ideas that are coming forth in the 104th Congress. I want to continue to expand and look beyond at how we can make this a more efficient, a more better run Government.

□ 1020

MEDISCARE

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, the other side of the aisle keeps standing up and talking about MediScare, MediScare. The Democrats are scaring people. Well, the Democrats are not scaring people, it is their side of the aisle that scares people.

Luckily the American people have two ears and a brain. When they hear the other side of the aisle constantly saying the Medicare trust fund is in trouble, the Medicare trust fund is in trouble, so we are going to cut it $274 billion, would that not scare you? Whoever said that you are going to help a trust fund by gutting a trust fund? Then they get angry when they find that the reason they are gutting the trust fund, the reason they are taking money out of their trust fund is to plug holes in the budget caused by the huge tax breaks for the fat cats that funded their campaign. That would scare me. That should scare you.

I think the American people are right on. When they have 1.4 percent taken out of their check every single paycheck and their employer adding the same thing to the trust fund, they want that trust fund to deal with future needs of seniors, not to help fat cats be able to bail out of the tax system.

PRESERVE MEDICARE

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

Mr. HOKE. Madam Speaker, where is the credibility on this issue? Let us go back to 1993, the last time we had any votes on Social Security. My friends on the other side of the aisle cut Social Security by $2 billion, $2 billion that they took out of the paychecks of Social Security recipients.

What have we done on this side of the aisle since the beginning of the 104th Congress with respect to seniors' issues? We have done two very important things. No. 1 is we, in fact, restored that $25 billion cut to Social Security recipients, and we also lifted the earnings test on the limitation for earned income for senior citizens.

We have the credibility on this issue. The trustees of the President have made it clear that the Medicare trust fund cannot sustain the system. We do not have enough money on it. It is going broke. If we do not do something to strengthen, improve, save, preserve Medicare, we will not have a Medicare. Heavenly days, is it not our responsibility, is it not your responsibility to join in this effort to preserve Medicare.

DODGING THE FACTS ABOUT MEDICARE CUTS

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

Mr. OLVER. Madam Speaker, Republicans are dodging the facts about their Medicare cuts. Let me give some of those fact.

Fact No. 1, the Republicans will cut Medicare by $270 billion. No. 2, Republicans cut that Medicare to give $245 billion in tax breaks, mostly to people who do not need them, people making over $100,000 a year, and you guessed it, all Members of Congress are in that category. Fact No. 3, drastic cuts in Medicare will make health care too expensive for many seniors.

Madam Speaker, we are not talking about just a little increase in out-of-pocket costs, we are talking about double the deductibles, double the premiums, and huge new copayments for services like home care. If seniors cannot afford to pay that much more, they must ration their health care or simply go without needed care.

The last fact, Madam Speaker, the Republican plan is that simple and it is that real.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, this is a report released by the Medicare board of trustees. By the way, three of these trustees are from President Clinton's own Cabinet. The report is shocking. I found out that the Medicare trust fund would be bankrupt in 7 years.

Second, I found out from this report that there is tremendous waste and fraud in this Medicare Program that we Republicans recognize this Medicare crisis with. We have rolled up our sleeves and are working on a 7-year plan to save Medicare from bankruptcy.

Even our own President Clinton recognized the crisis. He has offered a 10-year program to save Medicare from bankruptcy.

It amazes me that they keep attacking us saying that we are cutting. There is nothing to cut. We are not cutting anything, we are trying to eliminate waste and fraud.

So I got hold of their copy, what kind of a plan they are offering. Here it is, the Democrat plan to save Medicare. Nothing. Blank. They have no idea, they have no plan to save Medicare from bankruptcy, except attacking, attacking, and bashing. I think it is a shame.

REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL TO PRIVATIZE MEDICARE

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, the Republican leadership has misled Americans with their proposal to reform Medicare. ''Reform'' means to ''make something better'' not ''make it worse.''

The Republicans' idea of reform is to dismantle Medicare and limit choice by herding seniors into private managed care, requiring seniors to pay more in out-of-pocket expenses, while receiving less in vital health care services.

Seniors have more health needs.

It is very unlikely HMO's will enroll seniors without raising premiums or restricting hospital stays, medical testing, and prescriptions.

Paying more to receive less services is not making the system better.

Also, instead of using the Medicare savings to improve the health care system, the Republican reformers will take $270 billion from Medicare to pay for a $245 billion tax cut for the wealthy.

The goal of the Republican Medicare plan is clear: Raid Medicare and put our Nation's seniors at risk to pay for tax breaks that make the wealthy more healthy.

ECONOMICALLY TARGETED INVESTMENTS

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

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, because President Clinton knows that he will never have the support of the Republican Congress to raise taxes, in order to fund his social projects and handouts, he is dipping into the $3.5 trillion in private pension funds. The Clinton administration and his Department of Labor are encouraging pension fund managers all over the country to invest in economically targeted investments, or ETI's. ETI's are the administration's new scheme for harnessing private pension funds for social investment projects.

The American people should be able to sleep at night knowing that their retirement money is invested to give them the safest and most lucrative return possible. Their retirement money should not be improperly risked in ETI's. Madam Speaker, we must keep the Clinton administration's hands off America's pensions.

TRIBUTE TO LENORE DONNELLY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, today I rise to say thank you and pay tribute to the historic career of Mrs. Lenore Donnelly, originally of Worcester, MA, now of Virginia, who, for the last 10 years, has served this House with distinction, vivacity, good humor, and professionalism as Chief of Pages on the Democratic side of the aisle. Today is her last official day in this capacity as she retires to pursue family and personal interests.

Lenny came to Washington to work for Senator John F. Kennedy in the Presidential campaign in 1959 and later became a member of his White House staff. She served in helping to arrange

private and congressional tours of the White House and worked on arrangements for the President's trips within the United States and abroad, often traveling on such trips, including the famous trip to Ireland.

After the President's tragic assassination, she continued under President Johnson to serve at the White House during that administration. She worked in Senator Robert F. Kennedy's campaign for President, and after that Senator's tragic assassination, worked out of the New York office on his funeral arrangements at St. Patrick's Cathedral and the historic train ride bringing the Senator's body back to Washington.

Later she became Deputy Chief of the U.S. Capitol Guide Service, responsible for the orientation, supervision, and direction of all Capitol guides and tours. In 1985 she was appointed as Chief of Democratic Pages by Speaker O'Neill and has worked with over 2,000 young American Pages from all over the United States, responsible for their training, orientation, guidance, counseling, and familiarization with House procedures and conduct in this Chamber.

We wish her Godspeed, along with her husband, Ray Donnelly, who has been active in planning the Korean War Veterans Memorial being dedicated on July 27 on the Mall.

America could have had no finer daughter in service to this Nation. She has served millions and millions of our citizens as well as visitors from throughout the world.

Thank you, Mrs. Donnelly.

LENNY DONNELLY

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

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a fine lady and great friend, who is a shining example and reminder to us all, of the tremendous good a single person can perform in a career of public service.

Lenny Donnelly has served this country with distinction in a career that has spanned 36 years. Early in her career she worked on President Kennedy's White House staff, where one of her duties was scheduling all VIP and congressional tours of the White House. There are still a few left in this Chamber, including myself, who will always be indebted to Lenny for her help in graciously accommodating our scheduling needs.

Lenny has been Chief of Democratic Pages for 10 years and in that time she has become a friend to us all. She has trained, guided, counseled, and cared for over 2,000 pages from all over the United States. Lenny has helped equip a wonderful group of young people with the tools to become part of the next generation of American leaders. Perhaps we will best come to understand her contribution to this institution when in the future, a public leader is asked to name a major influence, and they respond, their time spent as a page under the tutelage of Lenny Donnelly.

Lenny has left her unmistakable mark of expertise on the Page program and she will be sorely missed. She has set a standard of excellence in the field of public service that we should all strive to meet. I wish Lenny the best in all of her future endeavors and am confident she will continue to positively influence the lives of many people in the future. On this, her last working day before retiring, I wish to give Lenny my profound thanks, gratitude, and respect for a job well done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). This entire body joins the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] in thanking Mrs. Donnelly for the service she has performed. It is very special when you meet somebody who gives such a warm reception, sense of humor, sense of perspective, and sense of propriety, and we wish her well.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

Mr. DOGGETT. Reserving the right to object, Madam Speaker, the Democratic leadership of each of those committees has been consulted, and we have no objection.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2002, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 194 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 194

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. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 3 of rule XIII or section 401(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. 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 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with the colon on page 4, line 17, through ''transportation'' on page 6, line 2; beginning with ''operations'' on page 11, line 23, through the comma on line 25; beginning with the figure on page 20, line 12, through the comma before ''and'' on line 13; beginning with the colon on page 20, line 14, through the citation on line 19; page 27, lines 22 through 25; page 28, lines 3 through 8; page 28, lines 21 through 24; page 29, lines 3 and 4; page 29, lines 7 through 10; page 29, lines 15 and 16; page 29, line 23, through page 30, line 6; page 48, lines 5 through 7; page 51, lines 14 through 22; page 53, lines 1 through 13; page 54, lines 3 through 24; and page 55, line 1, through page 63, line 6. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. During 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. It shall be in order at any time to consider the amendment printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, and 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 the amendment printed in part 2 of the report are waived. 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 gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], 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.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 194 is an open rule, providing for consideration of H.R. 2002, the Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996 with 1 hour of general debate.

I will be offering an amendment to the rule that resolves concerns between the Transportation Committee and the Appropriations Committee. The

amendments is being offered because the appropriators and the authorizers were able to come to further agreement after the rule was passed out of our committee.

This rule provides for fair and open consideration of the Transportation appropriations bill while providing the necessary protections we need to be able to bring the bill up for consideration by the full House.

The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized and legislative provisions on an appropriations bill, except for provisions in the bill relating to the Safe Communities Program and the central artery project. The rule also provides that upon adoption of the resolution, appropriations for the national driver register and certain new start transit projects, as described in the rule, will be made available subject to House passage of an authorization bill. This provision preserves the working protocol that has applied for all appropriation bills this session calling for agreement between the authorization and the appropriation before including unauthorized expenditures in an appropriations bill.

Accordingly the rule ensures that funds would not be made available until the House deliberates and votes on whether or not to fund these new start transit projects and the national driver register as part of the normal authorizing process.

Further, the rule waives section 401(a) of the Budget Act that prohibits contract authority spending in excess of levels already authorized; waives clause 6 of rule XXI prohibiting reappropriations; waives clause 3 of rule XIII requiring that a committee bill report contain the text of a statute being repealed within that bill; and provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule makes in order an amendment consisting of the complete text of H.R. 2, the line-item veto bill as passed by the House on February 6, 1995. This gives us an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to passage of a line-item veto.

□ 1040

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we are very concerned about this rule that provides for the consideration of H.R. 2002, the fiscal year 1996 Transportation appropriations bill. We regret that we must oppose it.

We supported the resolution as it was reported from the Committee on Rules, although we were aware of some problems with the original rule. For example, many of us were concerned that the majority on the Committee on Rules gave the line item veto provision protection under the rule. While we all agree that reducing the Federal deficit is one of the most important tasks facing us in the Congress, and the President must have tools to help accomplish that task, the text of H.R. 2002, which the rule makes in order, should not be part of this debate today.

It is yet another example of protection for a controversial and major change in law, and one that the House and the other body have already had the opportunity to work their will on. The process is working, Madam Speaker, even if it is a little slower than some Members would like.

Nonetheless, Madam Speaker, we felt that, overall, the rule as it was reported on Wednesday was proper and was fair. We have generally been supportive of the majority's stated intention to provide open, unrestricted rules for as many of the appropriations bills as possible, and for its policy of providing waivers of House rules only when the authorizing committees agree to those waivers.

This rule was in compliance with those goals. Unfortunately, whether because of oversights and errors or because of the opposition from some in the majority party to the rule as it was reported, or perhaps some combination of these reasons, we are now being asked to consider a controversial amendment that changes entirely the nature of the rule as reported. We do not believe that this is the fair or right thing to do, Madam Speaker.

We are especially concerned that the amendment to the rule will provide a waiver of rule 212 for a provision in H.R. 2002 that repeals section 13(c) of the Federal Transit Action Act, that section of law that provides labor protections for transit workers. Under section 13(c), the Department of Labor reviews all Federal grants to transit agencies to ensure that the Federal money would not be used to the detriment of transit employees.

As the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] testified in the Committee on Rules, when Congress passed the Urban Mass Transportation Act, we entered into a contract with transit employees. Congress said that the use of Federal funds to be used to acquire private transit companies should not worsen the transit employees' position. Section 13(c) is thus, in effect, a contract made with the concurrence of the transit industry with transit employees.

Madam Speaker, in a show of bipartisan unity that is somewhat rare these days, the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], all asked that the Committee on Rules not protect that section of the bill which includes the provision to repeal section 13(c), and to abrogate existing collective bargaining agreements.

We feel strongly that the bipartisan request of these Members, including those who represent the committee with legislative jurisdiction over the section, should have been honored.

Madam Speaker, whether or not one supports section 13(c) is not the point of our objection. The point is that we should not even be debating the complex issues presented by this section as an add-on to an appropriations bill. In fact, we should not consider the repeal of any major provision of any law in the context of an annual appropriations bill; but certainly we should not be asked to protect such a provision from a point of view when the leadership of the authorizing committees disagree unanimously with including the provision in an appropriations bill, and strenuously object to our doing so, as in fact they do.

This sweeping legislative change will have an enormous effect on transit workers and their families in many of our Nation's cities. An issue of this magnitude should go through the normal legislative process, with hearings, markup, and consideration on the floor that is handled by the authorizing committee. That is how Members should decide on the validity of section 13(c). Its repeal should not be part of an appropriation bill.

Madam Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, we have other concerns about the rule, but we have generally been supportive, as I have said, of the attempts by the majority on the Committee on Rules to report most of the appropriations bills with basically open rules.

We have, however, been critical of the committee's decisions to provide waivers of standing House rules for provisions in the bills as reported by the Committee on Appropriations when waivers have not been provided for amendments that Members are seeking to offer. We thought in this rule as reported that we had reached a fairly good balance in that respect, and we very much regret that objections to the rule as reported mean that the provision repealing section 13(c) will be protected from the rule by a point of order, while several Members were denied similar protection for amendments that they sought to offer to the bill.

In particular, Madam Speaker, we object to this waiver if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] is not accorded the same protection for his amendment to reform, rather than to repeal, section 13(c), and we believe that serious oversight should be corrected.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2002 is a very important piece of legislation, affecting, as it does, the transportation and

infrastructure decisions our communities will be making in the years to come. The bill affects all Americans. Many of us regret that the bill slights funding for mass transit and that it slights funding for central transportation safety programs. Many of us who support strong fuel economy standards, the corporate average fuel economy standards, so-called, for automobiles, are concerned that they are frozen in the bill. Nonetheless, we had hoped to be able to consider the bill and our objections to it under a fair and open rule.

We regret that apparently will not be the case. The only fair way to deal with this situation would be to allow the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] to offer his amendment that proposes reform of section 13(c). If the previous question is defeated, that is the amendment, in fact, that we will offer.

We cannot express strongly enough our opposition to the amendment to the rule, especially when the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] to be given waivers to protect his amendment was denied. Again, Madam Speaker, we oppose the amendment to the rule. If we must be required to address the repeal of a major law in an appropriations bill, both sides should have the opportunity to present their case and Members should be permitted to consider a reasonable alternative to the repeal of that law.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me address the concerns that have been raised by the gentleman from California. First, with regard to the line-item veto, I want to stress that the inclusion of the language in this particular bill regarding line-item veto is designed to simply allow us an opportunity to reaffirm what this body has already done.

On February 6 of this year, this House passed the line-item veto provision. The language that is included in this rule is identical to the language that was previously passed on February 6, so we are not asking for the House to change its previous action. We simply included this as a means to reemphasize the commitment that this House has to a line-item veto. We chose to include it in an appropriations bill because there is nothing that the line-item veto is more pertinent to than appropriations.

The whole point of a line-item veto in the hands of the President is to allow the President the opportunity to veto specific line items included in appropriations bills passed by this House. We felt that it was appropriate in light of the delay that we feel is happening between trying to bring together the versions passed in the House and Senate that at this time in the appropriations process, we wanted to allow the House the opportunity to reemphasize its support for this measure that passed overwhelmingly earlier this year.

Let me also address the particular rule amendment that I will be offering at the close of this debate. Once again, Madam Speaker, I want to emphasize that these changes were made in accordance with the protocol that has been followed by the Committee on Rules and by the authorizers and the appropriators throughout this appropriations process in that these changes are made as a result of agreement between the chairman of the authorizing committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the gentleman from the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

There were some concerns between these gentleman that had not been resolved as of the time the Committee on Rules considered and passed out this rule. After the rule was passed by our committee, they were able to resolve some of these differences, and the amendment that we are presenting today reflects the agreement that they were able to reach. There is absolutely nothing inconsistent with this procedure that we have followed with what we have done in previous appropriations bills. Once again, what is being included is a result of agreement worked out between the appropriators and the authorizers. We have had similar waivers for every other appropriations bill that has come before this House so far this year.

Let me say one other word. That is about the 13(c) provision. What we are attempting to do is simply allowing the House the opportunity to discuss this measure. We believe it is important that the House discuss this measure now, as the outcome of the debate on 13(c) will have a definite impact on funding requirements for transportation throughout our Nation. The waiver in the rule protects language in the bill that repeals section 13(c) of the Federal Transit Act regarding labor issues. Under this open rule, Members are allowed to offer amendments affecting the provision, allowing for consideration by this House and for vote by the entire membership.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the substitute rule being offered today. I had gone to the Committee on Rules and requested that several items that are legislative in nature and therefore would be violations of rule XXI, that they not be protected from points of order. The original rule acceded to my request on these items. Since that point we have had several discussions with the leadership on some of the items of concern and have reached an accommodation.

I am pleased to say in the report that I will be allowed to raise points of order against two legislative provisions, and I intend to do so: the central artery language, and appropriations for the Safe Communities Program, which is unauthorized.

In addition, unauthorized transit projects, as well as the national driver register, will be made subject to an authorization in a House-passed bill. This is essentially what I have been requesting, and this protects the integrity of the House rules, as well as the prerogatives and jurisdiction of the authorizing committee.

In addition, we have been able to reach accommodation on legislative language relating to the Hot Springs Airport. The substitute rule does not grant my request to leave unprotected the repeal of section 13(c) of the Federal Transit Act, as well as a related provision concerning arbitration of disputes in the National Capital region. I understand that these are leadership initiatives, and I support the leadership on protecting these provisions.

Madam Speaker, therefore, I urge support for the substitute rule.

Mr. BEILENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, let me say at the outset, and I should say also to my colleague from Pennsylvania, we have problems certainly on this side of the aisle with this particular amendment to the rule being brought to the floor of the House. It is a break with tradition, certainly. Let me just say, I was handed 2 minutes ago this Waldholtz amendment. We have had days to go before the Committee on Rules, yet they cut some kind of deal behind closed doors.

I do not understand why we wanted the public not to take a part in the rules process. What happened in the negotiations? Who was in them? I do not know. Who said what? We do not know. I was told just a minute ago by the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the authorizing committee, that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was involved in negotiations. That is interesting. The public does not know that, do they, unless we just take their word for it? We do not know what was said in there. I think this is a terrible way to do business.

On their side of the aisle they started out this session of Congress by clamoring for openness, telling us how we are going to change all these kinds of things, and yet here we are, breaking with the tradition of the House and amending a rule on the floor. They could go back to the Committee on Rules in open public debate and discuss what they are doing, but they do not want to do that.

Last week we amended the Interior appropriations bill to limit debate. I

think there might have been some ability on the part of everyone to understand that process, but to do this this way is ridiculous. Let me tell the Members some of the things they protected and did not protect. That is why this rule ought to be defeated. Let me tell Members what this new amendment to the rule protects.

As Members may or may not know, there are 13 transit projects that we determined in our Subcommittee on Transportation, 13 transit projects that had not been authorized by the authorizing committee. Yet, the chairman, a Republican, the gentleman from Virginia, FRANK WOLF, decided nonetheless we should fund these. Our side of the aisle agreed that yes, many of these are ongoing, many of these are planned, and we should fund them, but in order to fund them, you have to protect them under the rule.

The chairman of the authorizing committee went to the Committee on Rules and said, ''Do not protect unauthorized legislation,'' we will get an authorization for these that we think are valid and ought to be authorized. Sure enough, the Committee on Rules, in open public debate, agreed. They said, ''You are right, we should not appropriate these unauthorized projects.'' We all accepted that.

Let me say to the Members, there were 15 or 20 Members of Congress that did not like that, but it was probably the right thing to do. I congratulate the Committee on Rules for doing it. However, hold the phone, wait a minute, we now have an amendment here on the floor that I got to see 2 minutes ago, not in front of the Committee on rules, not open to public debate, not written about, permitted to be written about by the media. Here it is, right here. I got to see it just 2 minutes ago. Wait a minute, have we had a public debate on the Committee on Rules on this issue? No.

Let me tell the Members what they do. Let me tell Members about these 13 projects. These are just an example of what they did. Let me tell about these 13 unauthorized projects, as we were told. They protected Canton-Akron-Cleveland Commuter, $6.5 million. We cannot strike it on a point of order. Wait a minute, we have got to go to the authorizing committee on DART North Central, DART Dallas-Fort Worth RAILTRAN, Miami-North 27th Avenue, Memphis Regional Rail, New Orleans Canal Street, Orange County Transit Way.

Hold it, wait a minute. We are going to protect St. Louis—St. Clair extension. No, the Puerto Rico issue is going to have to be authorized again. Tampa to Lakeland Whitehall Ferry Terminal, Wisconsin Central Commuter; hold it, we are going to protect Pittsburgh Airport, phase 1, $22.630 million.

We are picking and choosing in this amendment, already picking and choosing? Let us not make any mistake about it, when we vote, when we vote today in a few minutes, or whenever it is that the determination is made to vote on the previous question, a motion can be made by the author, the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], when we have the opportunity to vote on this particular motion, what happens is that we self-enact these.

Madam Speaker, it is my understanding that the Republicans are going to break with the tradition of this House and substantially amend a rule on the floor. I say it is my understanding, and not that I know, because I have not been consulted on this issue. It is not that I haven't been available. We were all here late into the night. I spent most of yesterday and this morning in committee with my colleagues on the other side. My staff has reached out to theirs and still not even a word to advise or counsel. That does not make for a family friendly schedule either for myself or my staff.

Last week, we amended the rule governing debate on the Interior appropriations bill to limit debate. This was done with the consultation of the ranking Democrat of the Appropriations Committee. I have consulted with many Members with more tenure than I and all agree that amending a rule is without precedent in modern times. Because it was for the good of the consideration of that bill and was limited to time restrictions, Democrats agreed.

I understand the frustration those on the other side must feel on the slow process of open rules. I too am frustrated. Long did Members across the aisle object when the Democratic majority wrote rules on appropriations bills limiting debate and in those instances where we felt an immediate need, protecting certain provisions from points of order. I do not wish to mislead anyone. When we were in charge, we tried to cultivate rules which allowed a reasonable amount of time for debate, but yet provided guidelines so that the appropriations process moved along at an efficient pace. However, the amendment that the majority is going to offer today does not limit debate. It substantially changes the rule. This is a dangerous precedent and frankly I am surprised that a leadership that prides itself on open rules and open debate would go behind closed doors after the legislative process had worked in the open, then cut a deal significantly changing the rule. You could have returned to the Rules Committee, pleaded your case again, and asked for a second rule, but that would have required a 1-day layover on the rule and we couldn't wait 1 day—even though it would serve to preserve the integrity of the House and of the legislative process. Also it would have been open to the public.

The frustration over the pace of the appropriations bill on the floor is no reason to set new precedent in this Chamber and move to substantially amend a rule on the floor, because a few, albeit influential members, did not get their way in the Rules Committee. The reason we have the Rules Committee is so that the competing interests of all Members may be heard when setting the parameters of debate. That is what we did on this bill. All the Members interested in shaping the rule went to the committee and pleaded its case.

No one got everything they asked for and a few Members were unhappy with the rule. So what did the leadership do? It went behind closed doors to draft an amendment changing the rule. In this case, the leadership not only blocks the constructive input of the minority, it suffocates the will of a significant portion of majority Members.

I am disappointed that the majority has chosen to do this on the transportation appropriations bill. This is one of the few appropriations bills both sides agreed would move through with little rancor. While not completely enamored with the bill, I had conceded several times in testimony and in conversation to Members that Chairman WOLF had dealt with the bill in a fairly evenhanded manner—until now.

What does the Republican amendment do? Well, that's a good question and until just a few minutes ago I didn't know for sure. This amendment that Republicans will offer at some unknown point, will reverse the decision of the Rules Committee and rewrite major labor laws. It does not strike the ability to attach the line-item veto to this bill—legislation which has already passed this House and which we are supposed to go to conference with the Senate on who does not agree with our approach. Again, that is why we have the deliberative process. The leadership has said that it did not want to bog down the appropriations process with authorizing legislation. That is what allowing this provision to remain does.

Adhering to the procedures of the House, I testified before the Rules Committee and asked that three legislative items not be protected in the rule. Two of those items repeal labor protection provisions—section 13(c) collective-bargaining rights and arbitration standards for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, a matter never discussed in our subcommittee. I also asked the Rules Committee to make in order my amendment to reform instead of repeal one of the provisions, section 13(c) if they protected its repeal. The Rules Committee, which is comprised of nine Republicans and four Democrats, did not protect the two labor provisions as requested by the chairman of the subcommittee, allowing opponents to strike these ill-advised provisions. This amendment—crafted behind closed doors and without precedence on the House floor—reverses that decision.

We all agree that section 13(c) needs to be reformed. However, as demonstrated by the close 23-to-25 vote my reform amendment experienced in the Appropriations Committee, there is no consensus on this issue. I believe this issue is better left to the authorizing committees and the Department of Labor. Repealing section 13(c) is an attack on the collective-bargaining rights or our Nation's 200,000 transit workers. I understand that the chairman believes that repeal of section 13(c) will somehow help to compensate for the disproportionate reduction in funds that transit took in this bill.

Section 13(c) is intended to assure that the distribution of Federal grants to local transit systems does not harm transit workers and that employee issues arising out of Federal transit grants are properly addressed through collective bargaining. In its 30-year history, 13(c) has provided a remarkable measure of labor-management stability in an industry that has experienced unprecedented growth and change. In urban, suburban, and rural communities alike, 13(c) has provided an effective system for transit systems to manage significant changes without harming employees.

For those of us who are genuinely concerned about the delays attributed to the 13(c) program, striking the repeal or allowing my

amendment would have allowed the Department of Labor a reasonable amount of time to process the 13(c) applications. The Department of Labor has moved to address concerns about the time it takes to certify some labor agreements. On June 29, the Department published in the Federal Register substantive revisions to the 1978 guidelines which will leave in place the important employee protections, but will establish strict timeframes for the certification of protections in a more expeditious and predictable manner. Under these proposed rules, DOL certification permitting the release of funds will occur within 60 days.

I have heard from literally thousands of the transit workers who will be effected by this repeal. Workers from Dallas, TX; Orange County, NJ; La Mesa, CA, and elsewhere. They all share the same sentiment ''please don't take away the assurance of collective bargaining.'' Collective bargaining was created so that disruptions in labor caused by Federal grants could be dealt with in a manner fair for management and labor. This amendment to the rule protects the repeal of section 13(c) making it impossible for me to offer a reform amendment.

The third provision I requested not be protected, but the Rules Committee did protect from a point of order is a section in the bill forcing DOT employees receiving workers compensation who are eligible to retire should retire. Sounds good on the face of it. However, what the bill and report don't tell you is that substantial numbers of these retirees are disabled. They have been receiving workers compensation for several years. When you receive workers compensation, no money is credited toward the retirement system. Therefore, if you were an Air Traffic Controller who had 5 years of Federal service before becoming totally disabled for work in 1976, you would be eligible for the minimum retirement annuity—$130 month. This is drastically less than wage-loss benefit under the present system. How do you expect a disabled Federal employee to live on $130 a month?

Unfortunately when the doors were closed and member's projects were being protected, the disabled Federal employee was not.

We will probably not have a lot of time before the vote against the previous question. As demonstrated by the fact that we just received the amendment, the majority does not want these substantive changes to the amendment aired on the floor of the House. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can restore reason and fairness to the process.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, I just entered the Chamber. Did I hear the gentleman say that the list of projects that he was holding are unauthorized?

Did I understand correctly that that list that the gentleman is holding is of unauthorized projects, projects that this House or Senate have never authorized?

Mr. COLEMAN. That is right. The Republican Party said at the outset, the day we were swearing in our new Speaker, that we were not going to do those kinds of things.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will yield further, will the House have the opportunity to vote to accept these projects separately or collectively? Will we have a separate vote?

Mr. COLEMAN. Absolutely not. They have protected these projects. There is nothing Members can do about it, even if they are unauthorized. They made exceptions very specifically for certain of the projects that they wanted to accept. I just think this is doing something we should not do.

There is nothing wrong, let me say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they know this, we know this, there is nothing wrong with going to the Committee on Rules and getting a rule they want, but can we not at least have a debate on these as a matter of fact? We do not have that. I do not understand all the rationale for the ones Members protected and did not protect. Is the public not entitled to know? It is taxpayer money, is it not? Of course it is. Do not tell us you cannot do that.

Madam Speaker, I think it is time that we understand what this amendment does, so I say to the Members, be careful when you vote. I am going to ask Members on both sides of the aisle to be absolutely careful when they vote on making the decision on making the previous question. The correct vote will be ''no.''

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is important that we let the public know exactly what happened and how this rule came about. On Wednesday, the Committee on Rules passed out a rule that failed to protect, deliberately, by design, a list of projects that are unauthorized, because the appropriators and the authorizers had been unable to agree that they should be included. Accordingly, these projects that the gentleman has referred to were not included for protection in the rule, meaning that they would be subject to a point of order on the floor; that therefore, it would be not in order to allow them to be discussed, and that Members of this House would not be able to have a vote.

□ 1100

On Thursday, Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and others met and were able to reach further agreement. They agreed that these projects should be allowed to be discussed on the floor of the House. Amendments to knock these projects out are certainly in order, and such amendments have already been prefiled, but they agreed that the Members of this body ought to have the opportunity to discuss them.

Once again, Madam Speaker, let me stress that unauthorized projects have been included for discussion in every appropriations bill that we have considered this year. But it has only been done where there has been agreement between the authorizers and the appropriators, and such agreement was reached on these projects yesterday.

There has been some intimation that somehow this was a secret. In fact, Madam Speaker, I explained this rule in great detail to the Legislative Digest late yesterday afternoon. I explained to them exactly what we had done on these mass transit projects. I explained to them exactly what we had done on the 13(c) requirement. There is nothing that has been kept secret in any way here.

This has been discussed with the news media. I assume they published their reports. If not, that is something over which we have no control.

Again, let me stress at the time the rule was passed out of the committee there was disagreement between the authorizers and the appropriators as to whether they should be considered. After the rule was passed out, they were able to come to an additional agreement.

It is interesting, I think, to note that the two projects about which the gentleman has raised the most objection are included for Members on his side of the aisle. The St. Louis metrolink project is a project in the district of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]. The Pittsburgh Airport phase 1 is in the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MASCARA].

We are not picking and choosing, Madam Speaker. We are not favoring one party over another or members of one committee over members of another. We are treating all similarly situated projects the same.

The projects on this list have not been authorized. There was disagreement. The agreement was reached that we could consider them, but, as this rule reflects, these projects will be subject to authorization by the House.

We have two opportunities to review these projects, one in the appropriations process and one in the authorization process. We are not picking and choosing, Madam Speaker. We are allowing the Members of this House the opportunity to discuss these items, to make amendments to determine whether we want to fund them or not, all in accordance with the protocol that has been followed throughout this appropriations process.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman is talking about last Thursday. That was last night. We were in session last night until about 11. The amendment I have got is dated July 21, 10 a.m. That is today. That is about an hour ago. I think that that is not the way we ought to legislate.

She says it is not done in secret. I guess not. America has had 62 minutes to find out what is in your amendment.

Let me just also say to the gentlewoman that last week, in dealing with another amendment to a rule, we did it for limiting debate. This is different. I hope the Members will recognize that

it is different in casting their vote today.

Adhering to the procedures of the House, I testified as a Member of the minority before the Committee on Rules and asked that three legislative items not be protected in the rule. Two of those repeal labor protection provisions, section 13(c) of the collective bargaining rights and arbitration standards for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, a matter never discussed in our subcommittee.

I also asked the Committee on Rules to make in order an amendment if they decided, like your amendment has decided this, to not protect the repeal of 13(c) since it is legislation. Your decision is, no, no, you are not going to be able to reform it.

I asked the Committee on Rules, please, if you are going to protect it, at least let me have an amendment that would reform it and not completely repeal it. But your amendment does not allow me to do that because you are not the Committee on Rules.

I hope you understand that what you are doing with this amendment is cutting off our rights in the minority. A lot of us think that that is not the way that we ought to be legislating.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman and I have been here for a number of years. I have been here for 17 years. I have listened during all of those years to a Republican marketing effort to try to convince the American people that the former Democratic leadership, whether it was Tip O'Neill, Tom Foley, Jim Wright, or whoever was corrupt, corrupt in part because they would not allow Republicans an up-and-down vote on major issues. They constantly repeated the misrepresentation that we had gag rules. Since I have been here, not one time, count them, not once have the Democrats used this kind of a stealth process to protect pork. Not once.

Mr. COLEMAN. Reclaiming my time, if I might, just in closing, I would urge all Members to understand that on the motion to recommit that is going to be made by the gentlewoman from Utah, we need to be together, those of us who believe on both sides of the aisle that this procedure and this procedure is wrong, we should vote no. Let us permit the Committee on Rules to write a rule that the Committee on Rules is charged with writing.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me simply point out that, under the rules, the gentleman will have an opportunity to move to strike the provision on 13(c). So the gentleman will get an up-or-down vote on whether or not to repeal this particular provision. If the motion to strike is successful, then we will go back and be able to review this for the authorizing process. So there is an opportunity for the gentleman to strike this provision under the rules.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Utah for yielding me this time. I want to commend her for the excellent job she is doing handling this rule. As a veteran on the Committee on Rules with some very good battle scars of my own from managing the transportation appropriations bill the last couple of years, I very well know the challenges posed by this particular bill and the difficulty coming up with a fair formula that keeps everybody happy and addresses every Member's concern. It is a virtual impossibility.

Traditionally, this bill, perhaps more than others, has highlighted the tension that exists between the appropriators and the authorizers; and, frankly, that is what we are seeing played out here, some of that tension, and I know it is a frustrating process.

The budget process is supposed to work so that the authorizers set the policy decisions which are supposed to be agreed upon by the Congress before the money is spent. That makes sense.

The reality is that we seldom complete our authorizing work before the appropriations cycle begins and, as a result, we end up with spending bills that are filled with programs that have not been authorized and legislative provisions that in a perfect world probably should not be there but nevertheless are important in the Nation's business, which seems to have a higher priority, I think, and most do, than the exactness of our rules as long as our rules are free and fair, which is what we are trying to do.

Let me be clear. This is not the fault of any one committee or any one chairman. This is the fault of a budget process that has gotten, in my view, much too complex, somewhat unworkable and probably not up to the task in our current fiscal and political environment that we have.

The Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process of the Committee on Rules, working with our counterpart, the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House, both these subcommittees together have begun holding hearings on the larger question of reforming the budget process. Of course, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Government Resources and the Committee on the Budget are involved in this as well.

Perhaps next time we have a transportation appropriations rule on the floor we will actually have some of these systemic problems resolved and reduce some of the tensions.

With regard to this specific rule, I think the gentlewoman from Utah has spoken terribly well to the issues that are out there and what has happened. I think we are up to date, and I think she is absolutely right. There will be a fair chance to deal with these issues.

I think the Committee on Rules has tried to develop a fair product that respects the wishes of the authorizers to the greatest extent possible, which is a guiding principle because of the situation between the appropriations cycle and the authorizing cycle. But we also want to assure that the hard work that the Committee on Appropriations has done in making the very tough spending decisions they have got to make as we get on the balanced budget glide path, we have got to preserve that work, too.

This is an attempt to balance that, and I think it does pretty well. It contains necessary waivers in order to allow the process to move forward to the point it has been negotiated as we get to this part of our calendar.

Madam Speaker, to my colleagues still concerned about our commitment to bringing forward a deficit lockbox that works, and I mention this because there has been a great deal of interest in it specifically, I remind the folks that are interested in a deficit lockbox that works that our Rules Committee in fact yesterday marked up a bill and we are hoping to keep it on track and bring it up to the floor for next week.

We think we have got a pretty good device that is going to work pretty well. It is simple and it is flexible.

Finally, I think this particular rule is written to send a strong signal to the other body that we are serious about our version of the line-item veto which we think very much is the version that will work.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of the rule. Once again, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Utah for her professional way of handling this. She has described it exactly correctly, and there is ample opportunity for everybody to get a vote on these issues as we go through the total cycle.

Mr. BEILENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

Mr. ORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for the reasons stated, that it is protecting many pork projects.

This simply shows the additional need for the line-item veto. I am concerned, however, that the Speaker has stated ''line-item veto bites the dust,'' or ''we won't get to it this year,'' as quoted in the Washington Times. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is even quoted in the Times saying, ''Perhaps the best thing is to wait until fall when the budget is finished. There's no sense in going through with it now.''

I rise to commend the Committee on Rules for allowing either the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] or the gentleman for Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] to offer what is in effect my amendment, to attach the line-item veto to the transportation appropriation bill.

On Wednesday the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and I came before the House Committee on Rules with an amendment to apply the provisions of H.R. 2 to this bill. H.R. 2 was the line-item veto bill which passed the House in February with an overwhelming margin of 294 to 134.

I also announced my intention to offer an amendment to apply the line-item veto to each and every appropriation bill remaining.

I am both pleased and amused to see that the Committee on Rules in direct response to my proposal has taken my idea and adopted it as their own. After all, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

During debate on this bill, I will be supporting the Solomon-Clinger line-item veto amendment, which is in reality the Orton-Spratt amendment. However, pride of authorship is not what is important here. Getting line-item veto back on track is the issue.

Enactment of this amendment is not an empty exercise. We have embarked on this campaign because I am disturbed by the previous statements of the Speaker reported in the press. Some have speculated the demise of line-item veto is due to a reluctance of the Republican Congress to give this power to a Democrat President. Others ascribe this to an honest disagreement between the House and Senate.

Either way, it is my strong belief that there is no reason not to apply line-item veto to additional spending bills this year.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support the line-item veto. Last year I led the fight to get this bill on the floor. This year I voted for it. It is my belief the taxpayers should not suffer from congressional inaction on this issue. Every bill we pass that is not subject to line-item veto means millions and potentially billions of dollars of unnecessary spending that we will not cut.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution for the reasons stated by my colleague from California. This rule protects specific pork barrel projects from points of order. These are spending projects which have not been considered, debated, or authorized by the Transportation Committee and this body will not have the opportunity to eliminate them from this appropriation bill.

Does it seem hypocritical to anyone to adopt a rule which protects specific pork barrel projects and in the same rule allow an amendment to provide the President with line-item veto authority to veto those same pork barrel projects? Where is the reponsibility in such a rule? Wo unto the credibility of the Congress if we adopt this rule to protect our pork and then rely on the President to make us responsible by vetoing line items of pork from this legislation.

While I oppose this rule, I do support the amendment to apply line-item veto to this legislation. In past weeks I have become very concerned over the delay in adoption of the line-item veto. On June 7, 1995, in a Washington Times article entitled ''GOP Puts Line-Item Veto on Slow Track,'' Chairman SOLOMON is quoted as saying, ''Perhaps the best thing is to wait until fall when the budget is finished. There is no sense in going through with it now.'' Then on July 13, 1995, in the Washington Times article entitled, ''Line Item Veto, Product Liability Issues Bite the Dust:'' Speaker GINGRICH is quoted as saying, ''My sense is that we won't get to it this year.''

Madam Speaker, I commend the Rules Committee for allowing either Representative SOLOMON or CLINGER to offer what is in effect my amendment to attach line-item veto to the Transportation appropriations bill, H.R. 2002.

On Wednesday, Representative JOHN SPRATT and I came before the House Rules Committee with an amendment to apply the provisions of H.R. 2 to this bill. H.R. 2 was the line-item veto bill which passed the House in February by an overwhelming vote of 294 to 134. I also announced my intention to offer an amendment to apply line-item veto to each and every appropriations bill remaining for consideration this fiscal year.

I am both pleased and amused to see that the Rules Committee, in direct response to my proposal has taken my idea and adopted it as its own. After all, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. During debate on this bill, I will be supporting the Solomon-Clinger line-item veto amendment, which is in reality the Orton-Spratt amendment. However, pride of authorship is not what is important here, getting line-item veto back on track is the issue.

The enactment of this amendment is not an empty exercise. I have embarked on this campaign because I am very disturbed by recent statements by the Speaker and others reported in the press that line-item veto may be dead for this year. Some have speculated that the demise of line-item veto is due to a reluctance of a Republican Congress to give this power to a Democrat President. Others ascribe this to an honest disagreement between the House and Senate. Either way, it is my strong belief that there is no reason not to apply line-item veto to individual spending bills this year.

Madam Speaker, I am a strong support of line-item veto. Last year, I led the fight to get this bill to the floor of the House. This year, I voted for final passage. It is my belief that the American taxpayer should not suffer from congressional inaction on this issue. Every bill we pass that is not subject to line-item veto means millions and potentially even billions of dollars of unnecessary spending that will not be cut.

Finally, while I am pleased that the Solomon-Clinger amendment has been made in order, I hope that this will not be merely a one-time symbolic effort to express the importance of line-item veto.

While Speaker GINGRICH and Majority Leader DOLE may have given up, I have not. And this House cannot abandon our strong bipartisan effort to enact line-item veto for the President of the United States, regardless of his or her party affiliation.

If we are to succeed in that effort, we must put maximum pressure on both Houses of Congress to come to agreement. We should apply line-item veto individually to each and every bill we send over to the other House. I pledge to continue the struggle to do so, and ask for the support of every Member of the House in this effort.

Mr. BEILENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], the ranking member of the authorizing committee.

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

Mr. MINETA. Madam Speaker, I rise in very, very, very strong opposition to this rule and urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question.

There are two reasons for my opposition. First is the substance of the legislation that we are dealing with. Second, because of the process.

□ 1115

Now, there are many areas of concern in this rule and in this legislation. One of the areas I would like to point out is the area of my concern about section 13(c) of the Federal Transit Act.

As Members know, at the request of the authorizers, the Committee on Rules reported out a rule that did not, did not, protect points of order with respect to the repeal of section 13(c) in the Department of Transportation appropriations bill.

As part of that request, we had also asked that if the section 13(c) repealer were protected, that the rule make in order an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] on 13(c).

What we have in this rule is the worst of both worlds; the 13(c) repealer is protected from a point of order and a reform amendment is not made in order.

Madam Speaker, this rule is not fair. As Members know, a repeal of section 13(c) could adversely affect the jobs and lives of hundreds of thousands of transit workers across the country.

As the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with jurisdiction over this issue, I am particularly opposed to the use of an appropriations bill to make such sweeping legislative changes affecting so many transit employees and their families in so many cities.

An issue of this magnitude should move through the normal legislative process with hearing, markup, and consequent floor action spearheaded by the authorizing committee and not tucked away in the deep recesses of an appropriations bill.

This problem is further compounded by failing to make in order a reform amendment that could have been offered and should have been offered by my colleague from Texas, Mr. COLEMAN, relative to 13(c).

Mr. COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, that is just the one point I wanted to

make. When the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] stood up and said they can offer a motion to strike it, there are a lot of Members on both sides of the aisle that think there is a middle ground, that we do not have to do an either/or; we either have the 13(c) or we do not.

A lot of us, including the Secretary of Labor, including, by the way, the promulgation of rules that was announced on June 30th, agree that there ought to be a middle ground by which we can get reform of 13(c); not an either/or, take-it-or-leave-it like the gentlewoman's amendment to the rule causes us to do.

Madam Speaker, I am just going to say, the amendment of the gentlewoman from Utah precludes us from that middle ground. We cannot offer it.

Mr. MINETA. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is only fair that if a provision repealing a program is protected, that we be given an opportunity to offer an amendment which would reform the program, as our colleague from Texas has just indicated, and make its repeal unnecessary, especially when such a reform amendment almost prevailed, almost prevailed, at the Committee on Appropriations by a 2-vote margin.

Now, the second reason I am in opposition, the process is outrageous, because what we have is the ability to file a rule, let it lay overnight so that Members are able to see what the rule is. But in this instance, they filed a rule and now by stealth have an amendment coming to us to amend the rules.

Now, which amendment are we going to talk about? The 1 a.m. Waldholtz amendment of July 21, or are we talking about the 10 a.m. July 21 amendment? To me, this is outrageous that this kind of process is taking place with the use of the Committee on Rules to abrogate the legislative process.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me respond to the concerns expressed first on the line-item veto amendment. When the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] came to the Committee on Rules, we agreed that this was an appropriate time for this House to reaffirm publicly its support of the line-item veto that was passed by this House on February 6.

But I need to point out that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] was not the same text as passed by the House on February 6. The Orton amendment did not include authority for the President to veto targeted tax benefits. Those are special tax provisions intended to benefit 100 people or less.

The amendment in order under the bill, however, consisting of the text of H.R. 2 itself, was already agreed upon and voted on and supported by this House in February. Making the amendment in order under the rule allows the House the opportunity to once again express our support, with the identical text, including line-item veto for these targeted tax benefits.

Addressing once again the 13(c), let me stress, Madam Speaker, that the way the rule is now constructed allows us to vote on repeal of 13(c) and allows those who want to continue this program to move to strike. We will have an opportunity to vote on whether or not this program should continue. If there is sufficient sentiment in this House that this program should continue, then we can go through a process of debate and consideration of necessary reforms through the authorization process. But we believe it is appropriate first to find out whether there is enough support in this House for the continuation of this program.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] for yielding, especially since she knows I rise in opposition to this rule.

The reason I am opposed is because once again the lockbox is not included. However, I would like to say to the gentlewoman, and to the other Republican and Democratic members of the Committee on Rules, how pleased I was that yesterday, finally, a lockbox bill was reported with bipartisan support. Now the question is when will the House consider it?

This is the lockbox. It is still empty. We have disposed of five appropriations bills. We will dispose of the agriculture bill later today. That is six. Now we are considering a rule for the transportation bill that excludes a lockbox amendment.

We have made over $200 million in cuts so far this year; cuts which will not go to deficit reduction. I know the gentlewoman from Utah joins me, as do many of our other colleagues, in feeling that it is far past time to have the lockbox enacted into law. Let us do it quickly and let us get on with reducing the deficit, which the American people demand.

Mr. BEILENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the Democratic whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, let me if I could put this debate, as it revolves around 13(c), into some perspective. The radical, extreme leadership on the Republican side of the aisle has decided, once again, that it will engage in class warfare against working people in this country.

Since 1979, 98 percent of all new income in America was generated by the top 20 percent of America. The other 80 percent stayed even or fell below what they were receiving. The largest employer in America today is not IBM or GM; it is temporary manpower services. The difference between what the average CEO in America makes and the average worker is 150 times more in salary; the average CEO makes 150 times more.

What we have here in this rule is an attempt to shut out literally tens of thousands of transit workers across this country from engaging in collective bargaining, a further erosion of the right of working people in this country to bargain for a fair day's work.

Madam Speaker, we may think that we are in a third wave. I think we have missed a wave, quite frankly, Madam Speaker. But the work of this country is still done by people who pack a lunch, who punch a clock, and who pour their heart and soul into work every single day and these transit workers are a part of what makes America go and work.

We, on our side of the aisle, feel aggrieved by the fact that we are not getting a chance to engage in this debate. I encourage my colleagues, in conclusion, Madam Speaker, to vote against the previous question so we could have a chance for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] to offer his reforms and we can protect working people in this country.

Mr. BEILENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL], the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], a member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise to urge a ''no'' vote when the previous question is ordered.

On Wednesday, correctly recognizing that it is not appropriate under House rules to allow legislation on an appropriations bill, the Rules Committee issued a rule to govern the Transportation appropriations bill that would not have protected from a point-of-order a provision repealing section 13(c) of the Transit Act.

This provision of law basically insures the collective bargaining rights of over 200,000 transit workers in this country.

On Thursday, however, the same Rules Committee issued an amendment to that rule, an amendment which now protects the section 13(c) repeal language from a point of order.

Now, Madam Speaker, this business of issuing amendments to rules is a relatively new tactic under which all kinds of mischief can be employed. Indeed, even now, most Members probably have only an inkling as to what this amendment includes.

Be that as it may, today I am urging a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that we will be in the position to offer an alternative rule that would make in order a compromise on the section 13(c) issue.

Indeed, during the Rules Committee hearing, RON COLEMAN, NORM MINETA, and I urged that the section 13(c) repealer not be protected from a point of order. Short of that, however, in the event the rule protected this provision, we asked that a compromise amendment to be offered by RON COLEMAN be made in order.

As I already noted, the original rule accommodated our initial request. The subsequent amendment completely closes us out.

And so, it is only by defeating the previous question that we will have a chance to offer our amendment.

Make no mistake about it. This is an extremely important matter, both substantively and procedurally.

Substantively, the provision repealing section 13(c) included in the bill would sell transit workers across this Nation into slavery.

In one fell swoop, this provision not only repeals a major item in transit law, but runs roughshod over existing collective bargaining agreements.

And this should not be allowed to happen as an amendment to an appropriation bill.

Procedurally, the issue involves fairness, and whether we are now going to allow debate governing major legislation to be dictated by amendments to rules issued in the middle of the night.

Again, vote ''no'' on the previous question.

Mr. BEILENSON. Madam Speaker, 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. MENDENDEZ. Madam Speaker, it is said the devil is in the details and the Transportation appropriations bill has the handiwork of the devil all over it. Today we see the majority's vision for America in its devilish detail. It has a single theme, take from the needy and give to the greedy.

This is a singularly bad bill. The Rules Committee knows this, but the majority leadership is so intent on union busting that they have to amend their own rules. Talk to the Parliamentarians. See how rarely this procedure has been done in the last 60 years. The legislating on this appropriations bill cannot withstand the scrutiny of the normal legislative process so the Republican leadership has to resort to stunts to pass their hidden agendas.

Why are the Republicans so afraid to step forward and say what they intend to do? Tell America the Republicans want to break up unions and drive down wages. Level with the American people that labor is not as important as capital to the Republican Party. That the contributions from road builders and developers are more important for Republicans than the average Joe being able to take the bus or subway to work in the morning. This is a bad bill. Reject the stunts to stifle debate. Vote no on moving the previous question on the rule. Send this horrible bill back and tell the Rules Committee to start over.

Vote against the previous question on the Transportation appropriation bill, and return control of the rule to those who would:

First, allow the Department of Labor and the authorizing committees to determine major labor laws—this includes section 13(c) collective bargaining rights.

Second, as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, preserve mass transit projects in Ohio, Kentucky, Texas, Florida, Tennessee, Louisiana, California, Missouri, Puerto Rico, New York, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania.

Third, preserve the integrity of the deliberative process of the House of Representatives.

Vote against the previous question on H.R. 2002.

□ 1130

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I am not an expert on drafting rules. Frankly, if I were on the Committee on Rules, I would have limited every amendment to 10 minutes on each side.

I think the schedule of this place is totally and completely out of control. All of us are going to be successful in the House, and we are going to fail in our own homes. So I have problems with the Committee on Rules. I think you all are too lenient and you ought to get control of the process so men and women who serve in this body can go home.

Let me talk about the two issues, though, that have come up. The last gentleman spoke. He talked about, and I see him sitting back here, about there is antilabor. It really is not antilabor.

I come from a labor background. My dad helped start the Fraternal Order of Police in Philadelphia. I come from blue-collar background. It is not that way.

Let me tell what we are trying to do—13(c) has basically driven up the cost of transit riding. We are trying to get control.

Let me give you an example for Washington, DC. I hope everyone will listen to this. In Washington, DC, the bus drivers make $46,000 a year after 3 years. They make more money than the teachers in the inner city. My daughter, Virginia, taught in the District of Columbia and made about $26,000 a year teaching and as you drive up those costs, what you fundamentally do is you make riding to work more expensive.

Let me give you another example here in the Washington metro area. A single parent living in Vienna drives his or her car to Vienna, pays $2-something to park, had to drop their children at a day care center, then spends $3.25 to come into this inner city, $3.25 to go out. That is $8 or $9 a day. A single parent just cannot do that.

And so this is a protransit rider thing, and I have told the bus drivers in my area, many of whom I represent, that I want to save their jobs because what has actually happened in 7 years, if something like this is not done, there will not be any Metro bus drivers in the Washington, DC, area because in Virginia and Maryland, where the gentlewoman chairing this and I come from, they are doing away with Metro drivers. They are going to DART and Ride On. You have buses crossing in the morning, one making $27,000, $28,000, $29,000, $30,000, the other making $46,000.

We also have bus drivers that are making in the range of $50,000 and $60,000.

So I want moms and dads and people to be able to use mass transit.

Second, I say to gentleman, I am pro mass transit. I want to keep the operating subsidies up. I do not necessarily agree with everybody in my party. I hope over the years we can keep operating subsidies up.

Third, what we did, and nobody has talked about it, I was in the committee and we were voting, is we allow for the first time under this for transits to be using their operating subsidy, their capital subsidies, to have bus overhauls.

Who is for this 13(c) repeal? Everybody can get up and offer an amendment. What was going to happen, it was going to be basically cheap grace. It could have been knocked out on a point of order.

Now we can have a battle. We may lose or we may win, but who are the people that are for the repeal? The Birmingham Metro Express, the Little Rock, AR, Central Transit, Los Angeles County Metro Transportation Authority, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the Oceanside North County transit district, the Orange County Transportation Authority, there are more, Greater Bridgeport Transit District, Greater New Haven Transit District, Metro in Washington, DC, in Clearwater, Sun Coast Transit Authority, in Illinois the Chicago Regional Transit Authority, in Indianapolis, the city of Indianapolis, South Bend Public Transit Authority, in Nevada, the Regional Transportation Commission, in New Jersey, the Department of Transportation, in Newark, New Jersey Transit, in New York City, the Department of Transportation, in New York City, the Metropolitan Transit Protection Authority, in Buffalo, Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority, in Ohio, the Department of Transportation, in Pennsylvania, Lehigh and Northampton Transportation Authority, Pennsylvania Association of Municipal Transportation, and SEPTA, where I come from, SEPTA in Philadelphia, I used to ride

the 36 trolley car in the old PTC to work every day.

This is honest to goodness, and I know there are differences, but this is honestly a protransit vote, and I am not out to hurt the other issue.

When the two things were not protected, the one for the two transits, I would have like to have seen them treated the same way as the other transits. I would have felt, quite frankly, guilty on the floor except for the fact one is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], and the other is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MASCARA].

Since they are both Democratic Members, I do not feel so bad. We try to do something for a Republican Member: Had it been a Republican Member, quite frankly, I would have felt guilty about the rule.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, will he yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Let me just say in some respects we are together, in some respects we are apart. My point is simply this: I say the reform of 13(c), and I think even the transit unions recognize that the way to do it is not through this process. It is through the authorizing committee. I think that is where the determination should be made, not unilaterally striking down the rights of collective bargaining for these people.

Second, I believe the gentleman when he says he is protransit, and I want to have a transit vote, too, very important to my district, but we are cutting already $310 million for mass transit subsidies. That is not protransit.

Mr. WOLF. We have done others. I have told transit people, go see Senator HATFIELD. I will be glad to work; if you get more in the Senate, I will be very, very sympathetic.

Third, you have a chance to go to your committee. This is what APTA said about the reform bill; APTA said on July 29, after the Department of Labor issued the first proposed rule in more than a decade. The DOL guidelines have now been reviewed by APTA's working group with lawyers who regularly deal with 13(c) issues on behalf of transits. They have concluded the Department of Labor's proposal would bring no substantive changes to the existing 13(c) process. Proposed procedural changes have significant loopholes as to render them meaningless.

I would hope, after we do this, the authorizers would take it and go reform it or repeal it. This is their chance. This is their chance, honestly, I believe, to have a vote on this. There will be a vote for lower transit costs for working people and anyone else who uses transit.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and I certainly thank the folks in the Committee on Rules for giving me a little time.

This is a commonsense approach I think we ought to take. There are reasons why we try make these changes.

Let me relate to you a conversation I had with the mayor of Chicago. The mayor of Chicago, a large city, very much dependent on mass transit, was telling me that the city created an industrial park in the middle of the city. They have cleared out some of the old industrial buildings, built new-type industrial buildings that would fit the needs of the city, but the only thing is the shift change comes in at 2 o'clock in the morning. Now, all of a sudden, there are 40, 50, 60 people that need a ride at 2 o'clock in the morning. The contract with the union bus system says, as to the drivers, they have to keep those drivers on a set schedule all night long. They could not afford to do it, but they were prohibited from going out and contracting with a bus company to pick those people up and take them home at 2 o'clock in the morning.

Now, there are some neighborhoods in Chicago I would not want to be stranded in at 2 o'clock in the morning, but yet because of the rigidity of this piece of legislation, there is no way out. There is no flexibility.

What we are doing, whether it is the authorizing committee or here in the Committee on Appropriations, is trying to find a solution to a problem that exists, a commonsense solution. It is time to do it, and I would ask for the support of the rule and the support of the amendment.

Mr. BEILENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this particular rule, because it is not reform. It is not. They are repealing instead of reforming. I am opposed.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule.

This effort to repeal the 13(c) labor protection program is being sold as a reform, but it is not reform in any sense.

It is—plain and simple—an all-out attack: an attack on collective bargaining—the most basic right of working men and women; an attack on this Nation's 200,000 transit workers, without whom our cities would be gridlocked; and an attack on the procedures of Congress itself.

This deal is an attempt to manipulate and to twist the rules of the House to sneak this change, though the House, under cover and without public input.

Why are they doing this?

They say they are doing it to save money and increase efficiency.

The fact is, the people pushing this amendment are listening to only one side: big transit authorities. The committee listened only to transit managers. They did not even bother to consider the views of transit workers.

Madam Speaker, transit workers are dedicated to their jobs and to the service of the public. They serve people in our society who have few transportation options—poor people who don't have cars and who need public transportation to get to work.

Madam Speaker, the 13(c) program has worked well for over 30 years. It has protected the collective bargaining and job rights for middle-class working people. Under 13(c), the transit industry has greatly expanded and improved efficiency and service. We should support this Nation's transit workers. We should protect collective bargaining rights. We should reform, not repeal section 13(c).

Mr. BEILENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of our time.

Let me say there was a nice discussion of 13(c) by the gentleman from Virginia. I am afraid it is indicative of what seems to happen to appropriation chairmen around this place. These legislative issues are supposed to be debated and decided by the legislative committees and not by the appropriations committees. They are not supposed to be stuck in the middle of appropriations bills, as this particular one has.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, we will offer an amendment to the rule which self-executes the Coleman amendment regarding section 13(c) of the Federal Transit Act.

Defeating the previous question will allow us to protect certain provisions of the bill but also allow full and fair debate of the provision protecting the collective bargaining rights of transit workers. That is the only fair and proper thing to do.

Madam Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD the amendment which we shall offer. The amendment referred to follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEILENSON TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. WALDHOLTZ OF UTAH TO H. RES. 194

At the end of the amendment add the following new instruction:

At the end of the resolution, as proposed to be amended, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. (a) The amendment printed in subsection (b) shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole and shall be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions thereby inserted in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived.

Page 53, strike line 1 through 13 and insert the following:

SEC. 343. Subsection (b) of section 5333 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) The Secretary of Labor shall undertake all actions necessary to certify promptly employee protective arrangements under this section for the purpose of expediting the release of Federal assistance under this

chapter. The Secretary of Labor, working with the Secretary of Transportation, is directed to issue in final form by September 30, 1995, guidelines which ensure that protective arrangements with respect to a qualified application for Federal assistance under this chapter are certified within 60 days after receipt of such application from the Department of Transportation''.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

(Mrs. WALDHOLTZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Madam Speaker, to close this debate, let me simply say the Committee on Rules has tried very hard to open up the amendment process for all Members regardless of party affiliation in this Congress.

Madam Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a chart that will show in this Congress as of this date 72 percent of the rules that have been offered were open or modified open rules, whereas in the last Congress as of this date only 44 percent of the rules were open or modified.

Madam Speaker, we are trying to keep this amendment process open, and this rule accomplishes that. The Committee on Rules is trying to facilitate discussion of as many issues on the floor of this House as possible, and so this rule reflects the use of the guideline that provides customary necessary waivers where agreement has been reached between the responsible authorizers and appropriators.

This rule is no different in that regard. This rule does not guarantee the outcome of any particular process in this bill, but it does guarantee discussion on items that, without these waivers, would not be able to be brought to the floor of this House.

On 13(c), there is a motion to strike in order, and so if those who want to reform rather than repeal the program have sufficient strength to carry the day on this particular item, then we can go through the reform process in the authorizing process.

The point is, Madam Speaker, this is a rule that will allow us to consider critical funding issues for the transportation and infrastructure needs of our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 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	36	72
Modified Closed [3]	49	47	12	24
Closed [4]	9	9	2	4
Totals:	104	100	50	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 preprinted 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 July 20, 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 (3/2/95)
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
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 (4/6/95)
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 (5/11/95)	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	PQ: 221–178 A: 217–175 (6/22/95)
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95)
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258–170 A: 271–152 (6/28/95)
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PQ: 236–194 A: 234–192 (6/29/95)
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235–193 D: 192–238 (7/12/95)
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230–194 A: 229–195 (7/13/95)
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242–185 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–192 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95)
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleague in opposing the rule which protects a provision of the bill that repeals 13(c). For over 30 years, 13(c) has guaranteed collective bargaining rights to over 200,000 transit employees throughout the Nation. Changing course now would simply paralyze collective bargaining in transit. What that means in real terms is that bus drivers, trolley operators, and other transit workers face cuts in their wages and diminished job security. If you listened to opponents of 13(c) you would think we were talking about Donald Trump's wage and benefit demands. We are not. We are talking about a bus driver who may make $30,000 a year. Or a trolley operator fighting for a full package of health benefits.

These workers should have the protection of the collective bargaining process.

The Department of Labor, transit labor unions, and the Department of Transportation are taking real steps to address the issues. The administrative burdens and the costs of 13(c). They are working to reform 13(c). Let's let that process continue. I can report to you that the back and forth lobbying about this very issue has soured labor relations in Philadelphia which had been positive and productive. Let's defeat this rule.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MRS. WALDHOLTZ

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Madam Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mrs. WALDHOLTZ:

Strike all after ''Resolved,'' and insert the following:

''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. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 3 of rule XIII or section 401(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. 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 amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amendment, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and 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 or 6 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with the colon on page 20, line 14, through the citation on line 19; and page 54, lines 3 through 24. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. During 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. It shall be in order at any time to consider the amendment printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by a Member designated in the report. That amendment shall be considered as read, 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. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes. 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.

Sec. 2. The amendment considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole is as follows:

Page 20, line 13, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the first comma.

Page 27, line 23, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the semicolon.

Page 27, line 25, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the semicolon.

Page 28, line 4, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the semicolon.

Page 28, line 6, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the semicolon.

Page 28, line 8, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the semicolon.

Page 28, line 22, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the semicolon.

Page 28, line 24, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the semicolon.

Page 29, line 4, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the semicolon.

Page 29, line 8, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the semicolon.

Page 29, line 24, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the semicolon.

Page 30, line 2, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the semicolon.

Page 30, line 4, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'' before the semicolon.

Page 30, line 6, insert ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amount provided therein)'' before the period.

Page 48, strike lines 5 through 7.

Page 51, strike line 14 and all that follows through line 22, and insert the following:

''Sec. 339. None of the funds in this Act may be used to enforce the requirement that airport charges make the airport as self-sustaining as possible or the prohibition against revenue diversion in the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 USC 47107) against Hot Springs Memorial Field in Hot Springs, Arkansas on the grounds of such airport's failure to collect fair market rental value for the facilities known as Kimery Park and Family Park: Provided, That any fees collected by any person for the use of such parks above those required for the operation and maintenance of such parks shall be remitted to such airport: Provided Further, That the Federal Aviation Administration does not find that any use of, or structures on, Kimery Park and Family Park are in compatible with the safe and efficient use of the airport.''.

☐ 1145

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Madam 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 she 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 passage of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 202, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

YEAS—217

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

Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
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
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
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
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
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—202

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
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)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
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
King
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
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
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—15

Bateman
Brown (CA)
Collins (MI)
Cox
Crane
Dreier
Dunn
Gallegly
Goodling
Jefferson
Moakley
Reynolds
Torricelli
Volkmer
Watts (OK)

☐ 1211

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Dreier for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. MCNULTY and Mr. MCHUGH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

☐ 1215

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 70, EXPORTS OF ALASKAN NORTH SLOPE OIL

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, from the Committee on Rules submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–198) on the resolution (H. Res. 197) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 70) to permit exports of certain domestically produced crude oil, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and that I may be permitted to include tables, charts, and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193 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. 2002.

☐ 1217

IN THE COMMITTED 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. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. BEREUTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentle from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] had made an excellent suggestion where, by using the whole hour, we limit it to half an hours, 15 minutes on each side.

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

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

Mr. COLEMAN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. WOLF. We will do that and Members can get home earlier.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I will summarize very quickly. The transportation bill we bring to the floor is a good bill. It is balanced. I thank all the members of the committee, and I will not mention their names but they know who they are.

Let me take a few minutes to summarize the bill. It is within the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation in domestic budget authority and outlays. In total, the bill provides $12.6 billion in budget authority and $36.9 billion in outlays.

I would add at this point the budget authority is reduced from fiscal year 1995 levels by $1 billion, and it is fair and balanced.

In order to meet the 602(b) allocation, we have to cut a number of programs. We set priorities. One was in the area of safety and, therefore, we made a special effort there.

After safety, the committee's second priority was to provide continued investment in the Nation's highways and bridges and transit systems, Amtrak, and airports. The bill provides $18 billion for the Federal aid highway program, the highest level in the history of the Nation, and permits the expenditure of all 99 percent of the tax receipts collected by the highway trust fund this year.

For the first time in countless years, the bill contains no special earmarked funds for highway demonstration projects. Rather, the committee has provided an increase of $840 million in the Federal aid highway program which will allow every State to receive additional funds for highway construction than they received.

I would hope then the Governors of these States, since they are getting this extra money, will then take it and apply to it many of the projects that Members of the body were interested in.

Aviation has been funded at $8.343 billion; within that amount is the airport improvement program at $1.6, an increase of 10 percent. The Coast Guard program has been helped at $3.653, and also the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], in the defense authorization has also granted us $44 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to kind of just summarize and kind of end on that. There are a number of other things. One, we repealed section 13(c), which has driven up the cost of transit riders. That will be an issue we will talk about.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee brings to the floor today the fiscal year 1996 transportation appropriations bill. This bill has been crafted after a great deal of hard work and hearings and meetings with Members of the House and with the assistance and cooperation of all members of the subcommittee. We have consulted with the Department of Transportation and the administration as well as other interested parties. Where possible, the subcommittee has included provisions or language to address concerns expressed by these individuals.

I want to thank our Members, Mr. DELAY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. SABO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. FOGLIETTA. Each Member and his staff has worked diligently and hard and the product is as much theirs as it is anyone's.

Let me just take a few minutes to summarize the bill we bring before you today. The bill is within the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation in domestic budget authority and outlays. In total, the bill provides $12.6 billion in budget authority and $36.9 billion in outlays. I would add at this point that budget authority is reduced from fiscal year 1995 levels by $1.0 billion. And most importantly, this bill is fair and balanced.

In order to meet the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation, the subcommittee had to set priorities, and our first priority was to protect programs and initiatives related to transportation safety. This is the primary reason for the Department of Transportation, and it is the Federal Government's responsibility in the transportation area. We must ensure that funding is available to promote and provide for safe transportation systems. This bill does just that.

The committee's second priority was to provide continued investments in the Nation's highways, bridges, transit systems, Amtrak, and airports. The bill provides $18 billion for the Federal aid highway program, the highest level in the history of the Nation; and permits the expenditure of almost 99 percent of the tax receipts collected by the highway trust fund this year. The bill provides the full amount authorized for transit expenditures from the transit account of the highway trust fund, and the bill spends $90 million more than collected this year for aviation programs financed from the aviation trust fund.

For the first time in countless years, the bill contains no special earmarked funds for highway demonstration projects. Rather, the committee has provided an increase of $840 million in the Federal aid highway program which will allow every State to receive additional funds for highway construction than they received last year. This decision represents less Federal intrusion in what should be State decisionmaking and provides a fairer process for the distribution of Federal dollars.

The bill provides $3.653 billion for the Coast Guard which is to be supplemented by an additional $44 million that is included in the defense bill to fund defense-related Coast Guard activities.

Aviation accounts are funded at $8.343 billion. Within that amount, the airport improvement program is funded at $1.6 billion, an increase of 10 percent. After a year where aviation fatalities were the highest in a decade, funds have been maintained or ever added for aviation security and safety-related systems.

Funding for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is recommended at levels slightly above last year, recognizing the need for continued funding to address alcohol-impaired driving and occupant protection.

Funding for Amtrak's capital program is funded at the level requested by the administration, $230 million, and operating expenses have been reduced by nearly $140 million. All appropriations for Amtrak are contingent upon authorizing legislation that reforms the National Rail Passenger Corporation.

But, as I mentioned earlier, difficult choices had to be made and for each increase over last year, reductions in other areas had to found. Funding for operations of several important agencies and grants for Amtrak and transit operating assistance have been reduced in order to stretch our transportation dollars as far as possible.

A number of programs have been eliminated, including local rail freight assistance, highway demonstration projects, Penn Station Redevelopment, and various smaller Coast Guard, FAA, and highway programs. The Interstate Commerce Commission is terminated on January 1, 1996.

Fifteen million provided for essential air service through a new Federal-State-local partnership that requires a 50–50 match by the State or local entity. This level represents a reduction of 55 percent.

Funding for administrative functions of the Department of Transportation have been reduced from last year's level in many cases. A reorganization of the Department's extensive field structure is directed, saving $25 million this year.

And transit operating has been reduced from $710 million to $400 million, $100 million below what the administration requested. To mitigate these reductions, however, the bill contains two provisions that will allow transit agencies the flexibility to reduce their costs and accommodate reductions in Federal operating assistance without reducing services or increasing fares. First, the bill repeals section 13(C) of the Federal Transit Act. Many transit agencies have informed the committee that the labor protections provided under section 13(c) are costly, outdated, burdensome, and impede innovation, efficiency, and growth of transit services. Second, the bill includes language, requested by the administration, that permits bus overhauls to be funded from transit capital funds.

The bill includes $29.9 million for pipeline safety, a reduction of $12.5 million below last year's level. This level is necessary not to compromise program operations or pipeline safety.

And lastly, the bill contains a provision that prohibits training that personally offends or seeks to change the personal, religious values, or the lifestyle of an individual. This provision stems from extensive hearings that the committee conducted regarding training at the Department of Transportation.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, this is a balanced bill, developed in a very difficult budget year. It provides for essential transportation needs of this country, it places a high priority on safety and trust fund financed programs and infrastructure investments. We have worked in a bipartisan fashion with the minority members of the subcommittee and throughout the Congress. I believe the bill deserves the committee's support, and I recommend it for approval.

As usual, Mr. Chairman, the committee report accompanying the bill spells out in detail the funding recommendations. For additional information or specific funding levels, I would refer my colleagues to that document.

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

FY 1996 TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2002)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses	58,094,000	62,164,000	55,011,500	-3,082,500	-7,152,500
Immediate Office of the Secretary	(1,220,000)			(-1,220,000)	
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	(563,000)			(-563,000)	
Office of the General Counsel	(7,878,000)			(-7,878,000)	
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy	(2,309,000)			(-2,309,000)	
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs	(7,887,000)			(-7,887,000)	
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	(4,400,000)			(-4,400,000)	
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	(2,260,000)			(-2,260,000)	
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	(22,425,000)			(-22,425,000)	
Office of Public Affairs	(1,360,000)			(-1,360,000)	
Executive Secretariat	(932,000)			(-932,000)	
Contract Appeals Board	(930,000)			(-930,000)	
Office of Civil Rights	(1,779,000)			(-1,779,000)	
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	(936,000)			(-936,000)	
Minority Business Resource Center	(4,000,000)			(-4,000,000)	
Office of Intelligence and Security	(800,000)			(-800,000)	
Office of Intermodalism	(1,000,000)			(-1,000,000)	
Undistributed	(-2,313,000)			(+2,313,000)	
Office of civil rights		12,793,000	6,554,000	+6,554,000	-6,239,000
Transportation planning, research, and development	8,293,000	15,710,000	3,309,000	-4,984,000	-12,401,000
Office of Commercial Space Transportation: Operations and Research	8,080,000			-8,080,000	
Working capital fund	(93,000,000)	(104,364,000)	(102,231,000)	(+9,231,000)	(-2,133,000)
Payments to air carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(33,423,000)		(15,000,000)	(-18,423,000)	(+15,000,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(33,423,000)		(15,000,000)	(-18,423,000)	(+15,000,000)
Rescission of contract authority	(-4,000,000)	(-38,800,000)	(-23,800,000)	(-19,800,000)	(+15,000,000)
Rescission		(-8,788,971)	(-8,788,971)	(-8,788,971)	
Rental payments	144,419,000	143,438,000	130,803,000	-13,616,000	-12,633,000
Headquarters facilities		331,000,000			-331,000,000
Minority business resource center program	1,800,000	1,900,000	1,900,000		
(Limitation on direct loans)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)		
Minority business outreach		2,900,000	2,900,000	+2,900,000	
Total, Office of the Secretary	218,788,000	569,903,000	200,477,500	-18,288,500	-369,425,500
(Limitations on obligations)	(33,423,000)		(15,000,000)	(-18,423,000)	(+15,000,000)
Total budgetary resources	(252,189,000)	(569,903,000)	(215,477,500)	(-36,711,500)	(-354,425,500)
Coast Guard					
Operating expenses	2,598,000,000	2,618,316,000	2,566,000,000	-32,000,000	-52,316,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements:					
Vessels	187,900,000	203,700,000	191,200,000	+3,300,000	-12,500,000
Aircraft	11,800,000	19,500,000	16,500,000	+4,700,000	-3,000,000
Other equipment	29,700,000	56,300,000	42,200,000	+12,500,000	-14,100,000
Shore facilities and aids to navigation	89,350,000	99,800,000	92,275,000	-7,075,000	-17,525,000
Personnel and related support	44,200,000	48,900,000	43,000,000	-1,200,000	-5,900,000
Subtotal, A C and I	362,950,000	428,200,000	375,175,000	+12,225,000	-53,025,000
Environmental compliance and restoration	23,500,000	25,000,000	21,000,000	-2,500,000	-4,000,000
Alteration of bridges		2,000,000	16,000,000	+16,000,000	+14,000,000
Retired pay	562,585,000	562,022,000	562,022,000	+19,437,000	
Reserve training	64,981,000	64,859,000	61,859,000	-3,122,000	-3,000,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation	20,310,000	22,500,000	18,500,000	-1,810,000	-4,000,000
Boat safety (Aquatic Resources Trust Fund)	25,000,000		20,000,000	-5,000,000	+20,000,000
Emergency Fund (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund) (limitation of permanent appropriation)			(3,000,000)	(+3,000,000)	(+3,000,000)
Total, Coast Guard	3,657,326,000	3,742,897,000	3,660,556,000	+3,230,000	-82,341,000
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations	4,395,394,000	4,704,000,000	4,600,000,000	+4,606,000	-104,000,000
Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	2,067,489,000	1,907,847,000	2,000,000,000	-67,489,000	+92,153,000
Rescission	(-35,000,000)		(-60,000,000)	(-25,000,000)	(-60,000,000)
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	259,192,000	267,861,000	143,000,000	-116,192,000	-124,861,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)		
(Limitation on obligations)	(1,450,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,600,000,000)	(+150,000,000)	(+100,000,000)
Aircraft purchase loan guarantee program	148,000	50,000	50,000	-98,000	
(Limitation on borrowing authority)	(9,970,000)	(1,600,000)	(1,600,000)	(-8,370,000)	
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	6,942,223,000	6,879,558,000	6,743,050,000	-199,173,000	-136,508,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(1,450,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,600,000,000)	(+150,000,000)	(+100,000,000)
Total budgetary resources	(8,392,223,000)	(8,379,558,000)	(8,343,050,000)	(-49,173,000)	(-36,508,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure investment program (limitation on obligations)		(-1,500,000,000)			(+1,500,000,000)
Total budgetary resources	(8,392,223,000)	(8,879,558,000)	(8,343,050,000)	(-49,173,000)	(+1,463,492,000)

FY 1996 TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2002)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on general operating expenses	(625,341,000)	(599,496,000)	(495,361,000)	(-29,980,000)	(-104,135,000)
Highway-related safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(10,800,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(-800,000)	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(10,800,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(-800,000)	.....
Rescission of contract authority	(-20,000,000)	.....	.....	(+20,000,000)	.....
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Limitation on obligations)	(17,160,000,000)	(20,254,255,000)	(18,000,000,000)	(+840,000,000)	(-2,254,255,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(2,267,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,932,000)	(+44,231,000)	(+2,231,932,000)
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(17,000,000,000)	(19,200,000,000)	(19,200,000,000)	(+2,200,000,000)	.....
Right-of-way revolving fund (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on direct loans)	(42,500,000)	.....	.....	(-42,500,000)	.....
Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(73,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(68,000,000)	(-5,000,000)	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(74,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(79,150,000)	(+5,150,000)	(-5,850,000)
Surface transportation projects	362,055,000	.....	.....	-362,055,000	.....
Rescission	(-12,004,000)	.....	.....	(+12,004,000)	.....
High priority corridor (sec. 314A)	8,000,000	.....	.....	-8,000,000	.....
Orange County, CA toll road project (sec. 339a)	8,000,000	.....	.....	-8,000,000	.....
Total, Federal Highway Administration	362,055,000	.....	.....	-362,055,000	.....
(Limitations on obligations)	(17,344,850,000)	(20,348,255,000)	(18,089,150,000)	(+844,350,000)	(-2,260,105,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(2,267,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,932,000)	(+44,231,000)	(+2,231,932,000)
Total budgetary resources	(19,878,556,000)	(20,428,255,000)	(20,401,082,000)	(+522,526,000)	(-26,173,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure investment program (limitation on obligations)	.....	(-20,134,255,000)	.....	.....	(+20,134,255,000)
Total budgetary resources	(19,878,556,000)	(295,000,000)	(20,401,082,000)	(+522,526,000)	(+20,106,082,000)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and research	79,556,000	84,586,000	73,316,570	-6,239,430	-11,281,430
Rescissions	.....	.....	(-4,547,185)	(-4,547,185)	(-4,547,185)
Operations and research (Highway Trust Fund)	46,997,000	59,744,000	52,011,930	+5,014,930	-7,732,070
Subtotal, Operations and research	126,553,000	144,342,000	125,328,500	-1,224,500	-19,013,500
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(151,000,000)	(180,000,000)	(153,400,000)	(+2,400,000)	(-26,600,000)
State and community highway safety grants (Sec. 402) (limitation on obligations)	(123,000,000)	(166,600,000)	(126,000,000)	(+3,000,000)	(-42,600,000)
National Driver Register (Sec. 403) (limitation on obligations)	(3,400,000)	(2,400,000)	(2,400,000)	(-1,000,000)	.....
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures programs (Sec. 410) (limitation on obligations)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	.....	.....
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	126,553,000	144,342,000	125,328,500	-1,224,500	-19,013,500
(Limitations on obligations)	(151,400,000)	(196,000,000)	(153,400,000)	(+2,000,000)	(-42,600,000)
Total budgetary resources	(277,953,000)	(340,342,000)	(278,728,500)	(+775,500)	(-61,613,500)
Federal Railroad Administration					
Office of the Administrator	13,090,000	17,370,000	14,000,000	+910,000	-3,370,000
Local rail freight assistance	17,000,000	.....	.....	-17,000,000	.....
Rescission	(-6,583,000)	.....	.....	(+6,583,000)	.....
Railroad safety	47,729,000	51,104,000	49,940,660	+2,211,660	-1,163,340
Railroad research and development	20,500,000	48,947,000	21,000,000	+500,000	-27,947,000
Northeast corridor improvement program	200,000,000	236,000,000	100,000,000	-100,000,000	-135,000,000
Next generation high speed rail	20,000,000	30,000,000	10,000,000	-10,000,000	-20,000,000
Trust fund share of next generation high speed rail (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(3,400,000)	(7,118,000)	(5,000,000)	(+1,600,000)	(-2,118,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	.....	.....
Rhode Island Rail Development	5,000,000	10,000,000	.....	-5,000,000	-10,000,000
Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation:					
Operations	542,000,000	420,000,000	336,000,000	-206,000,000	-84,000,000
Transition costs	.....	.....	62,000,000	+62,000,000	+62,000,000
Capital	251,500,000	230,000,000	230,000,000	-21,500,000	.....
Long-term restructuring transition	.....	100,000,000	.....	.....	-100,000,000
Pennsylvania station redevelopment project	40,000,000	50,000,000	.....	-40,000,000	-50,000,000
Rescission	(-40,000,000)	.....	.....	(+40,000,000)	.....
Total, Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corp	833,500,000	800,000,000	628,000,000	-205,500,000	-172,000,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	1,166,819,000	1,192,421,000	822,940,660	-333,878,340	-369,480,340
(Limitations on obligations)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	.....	.....
Total budgetary resources	(1,161,819,000)	(1,197,421,000)	(827,940,660)	(-333,878,340)	(-369,480,340)
Unified transportation infrastructure invest program	.....	-1,045,000,000	.....	.....	+1,045,000,000
Total budgetary resources	(1,161,819,000)	(152,421,000)	(827,940,660)	(-333,878,340)	(+675,519,660)

FY 1996 TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2002)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative expenses	43,080,000	44,292,000	39,280,000	-3,800,000	-4,942,000
Formula grants	640,000,000	1,244,200,000	490,000,000	-150,000,000	-754,200,000
Operating assistance grants	710,000,000	500,000,000	400,000,000	-310,000,000	-100,000,000
Formula grants (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on obligations)	(1,150,000,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,110,000,000)	(-40,000,000)	(-10,850,000)
University transportation centers	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	.....	.....
Transit planning and research	92,259,000	109,027,000	82,259,000	-10,000,000	-17,777,000
Metropolitan planning program	.....	(41,512,500)	(39,436,250)	(+39,436,250)	(-2,076,250)
Rural transit assistance program	.....	(4,612,500)	(4,381,250)	(+4,381,250)	(-231,250)
Transit cooperative research program	.....	(8,475,000)	(8,051,250)	(+8,051,250)	(-423,750)
National TPR program	.....	(33,882,000)	(19,460,000)	(+19,460,000)	(-14,472,000)
State TPR program	.....	(8,475,000)	(8,051,250)	(+8,051,250)	(-423,750)
National transit institute	.....	(3,000,000)	(2,850,000)	(+2,850,000)	(-150,000)
Subtotal, Transit planning and research	(92,259,000)	(100,027,000)	(82,259,000)	(-10,000,000)	(-17,777,000)
Trust fund share of expenses (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(1,150,000,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(-29,150,000)	.....
Discretionary grants	.....	58,944,000	.....	.....	-58,944,000
Discretionary grants (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on obligations):					
Fixed guideway modernization	(725,000,000)	(724,976,000)	(666,000,000)	(-59,000,000)	(-58,976,000)
Bus and bus-related facilities	(353,330,000)	(274,882,000)	(333,000,000)	(-20,330,000)	(+58,008,000)
New starts	(646,670,000)	(724,976,000)	(666,000,000)	(+19,330,000)	(-58,976,000)
Subtotal, Discretionary grants	(1,725,000,000)	(1,724,944,000)	(1,665,000,000)	(-60,000,000)	(-59,944,000)
Mass transit capital fund (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(+500,000,000)	(+300,000,000)
Interstate transfer grants - transit	48,030,000	.....	.....	-48,030,000	.....
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	.....	.....
Violent crime reduction program (Violent Crime Trust Fund)	.....	5,000,000	.....	.....	-5,000,000
Total, Federal Transit Administration	1,738,340,000	2,159,373,000	1,217,510,000	-521,830,000	-941,863,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(2,875,000,000)	(2,845,794,000)	(2,775,000,000)	(-100,000,000)	(-70,794,000)
Total budgetary resources	(4,614,340,000)	(5,005,167,000)	(3,992,510,000)	(-621,830,000)	(-1,012,657,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure invest program	.....	-2,154,373,000	.....	.....	+2,154,373,000
(Limitation on obligations)	.....	(-2,785,850,000)	.....	.....	(+2,785,850,000)
Total budgetary resources	(4,614,340,000)	(64,944,000)	(3,992,510,000)	(-621,830,000)	(+3,927,566,000)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	10,251,000	10,243,000	10,190,500	-60,500	-52,500
Research and Special Programs Administration					
Research and special programs	28,238,000	31,862,000	28,030,000	-208,000	-5,832,000
Hazardous materials safety	(12,887,000)	(12,782,000)	(12,600,000)	(-287,000)	(-182,000)
Aviation information management	(2,453,000)	(2,282,000)	(2,322,000)	(-131,000)	(+40,000)
Emergency transportation	(1,328,000)	(1,301,000)	(1,088,000)	(-240,000)	(-215,000)
Research and technology	(2,530,000)	(7,604,000)	(3,209,000)	(+679,000)	(-4,395,000)
Program and administrative support	(7,032,000)	(7,893,000)	(7,394,000)	(+362,000)	(-499,000)
Accountwide adjustment	.....	.....	(-561,000)	(-561,000)	(-561,000)
Subtotal, research and special programs	(28,238,000)	(31,862,000)	(28,030,000)	(-208,000)	(-5,832,000)
Pipeline safety (Pipeline Safety Fund)	34,991,500	39,720,000	27,243,500	-7,748,500	-12,477,000
Pipeline safety (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund)	2,432,500	2,696,000	2,696,000	+265,500	.....
Subtotal, Pipeline safety	37,424,000	42,416,000	29,941,000	-7,483,000	-12,477,000
Alaska Pipeline task Force (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund) (reec)	(-544,000)	.....	.....	(+544,000)	.....
Emergency preparedness grants:					
(Emergency preparedness fund)	400,000	400,000	400,000	.....	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(10,800,000)	(11,338,000)	(8,890,000)	(-1,910,000)	(-2,448,000)
Total, Research and Special Programs Administration	64,082,000	74,480,000	58,371,000	-7,691,000	-16,109,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(10,800,000)	(11,338,000)	(8,890,000)	(-1,910,000)	(-2,448,000)
Total budgetary resources	(74,882,000)	(85,818,000)	(65,261,000)	(-9,601,000)	(-20,557,000)
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses	40,000,000	40,238,000	40,238,000	+238,000	.....
General Provisions					
Administrative provision: Procurement (sec. 323a)	-65,120,000	.....	.....	+65,120,000	.....
Bureau of Transportation Statistics (transfer from Federal-aid Highways)	(15,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	.....
Federal railroad transfer (sec. 341)	3,000,000	.....	.....	-3,000,000	.....
Federal-aid highways (sec. 318 (a))	.....	-574,341,000	.....	.....	+574,341,000
Working capital fund reduction (sec. 327)	-7,000,000	.....	-10,000,000	-3,000,000	-10,000,000
DOT field office consolidation (sec. 338)	.....	.....	-25,000,000	-25,000,000	-25,000,000
ICC transition (sec. 344)	.....	.....	8,421,000	+8,421,000	+8,421,000

FY 1996 TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2002)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Total, title I, Dept of Transportation (net)	14,134,164,000	14,199,787,000	12,755,149,004	-1,378,014,996	-1,438,578,025
Appropriations	(14,252,275,000)	(14,259,114,000)	(12,690,093,160)	(-1,402,181,840)	(-1,368,020,840)
Rescissions	(-118,111,000)	(-45,368,871)	(-64,934,156)	(+23,176,844)	(-19,547,185)
(Limitations on obligations)	(21,770,483,000)	(24,937,267,000)	(22,948,440,000)	(+678,017,000)	(-2,288,847,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(2,267,701,000)	(60,000,000)	(2,311,932,000)	(+44,231,000)	(+2,251,932,000)
Total budgetary resources including (limitations on obligations) and (exempt obligations)	(36,172,266,000)	(39,161,114,000)	(37,713,521,004)	(-458,766,996)	(-1,447,593,025)
Adjustments made for unified program	.....	-3,199,373,000	.....	.....	+3,199,373,000
(Limitation on obligations)	.....	(-24,420,105,000)	.....	.....	(+24,420,105,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure invest program	.....	24,392,976,000	.....	.....	-24,392,976,000
Total budgetary resources	(36,172,266,000)	(39,153,885,000)	(37,713,521,004)	(-458,766,996)	(-1,440,464,025)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES					
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board					
Salaries and expenses	3,350,000	3,656,000	3,656,000	+306,000	.....
National Transportation Safety Board					
Salaries and expenses	37,392,000	38,774,000	38,774,000	+1,382,000	.....
Emergency fund	.....	360,802	160,802	+160,802	-200,000
Total, National Transportation Safety Board	37,392,000	39,134,802	38,934,802	+1,542,802	-200,000
Interstate Commerce Commission					
Salaries and expenses	30,302,000	28,844,000	13,379,000	-16,923,000	-15,465,000
Payments for directed rail service (limitation on obligations)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	.....	.....
Total, Interstate Commerce Commission	(30,777,000)	(28,319,000)	(13,854,000)	(-16,923,000)	(-15,465,000)
Panama Canal Commission					
Panama Canal Revolving Fund:					
(Administrative expenses)	(50,030,000)	(50,741,000)	(50,741,000)	(+711,000)	.....
(Limitation on operating and capital expenses)	(540,000,000)	.....	.....	(-540,000,000)	.....
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority					
Interest payments and repayments of principal	9,193,000	.....	.....	-9,193,000	.....
Total, title II, Related Agencies	80,237,000	71,634,802	55,969,802	-24,267,198	-15,665,000
(Limitation on obligations)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	.....	.....
Total budgetary resources	(80,712,000)	(72,109,802)	(56,444,802)	(-24,267,198)	(-15,665,000)
Total appropriations (net)	14,214,401,000	35,456,994,831	12,811,118,806	-1,403,282,194	-22,647,876,025
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Offsets	-20,048,000	.....	.....	+20,048,000	.....
Emergency preparedness grants limitation	-5,554,000	-2,249,000	-4,887,000	+3,667,000	-2,448,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Tolls (loss of receipts)	9,570,000	.....	.....	-9,570,000	.....
FHA: Federal-aid highways (H.R. 1944)	.....	382,190,000	382,190,000	+382,190,000	.....
DOT retirement provisions	.....	.....	-14,950,000	-14,950,000	-14,950,000
General provision: Bonuses and awards	-4,650,000	.....	.....	+4,650,000	.....
(Portion derived from Trust Funds)	(-940,000)	.....	.....	(+940,000)	.....
ICC termination pay	2,900,000	.....	.....	-2,900,000	.....
Pipeline safety	.....	-4,037,000	8,440,000	+8,440,000	+12,477,000
Railroad Safety inspection fees (leg required)	.....	-893,000	.....	.....	+893,000
Total, adjustments	-20,880,000	375,011,000	370,883,000	+391,883,000	-4,028,000
Grand total (net)	14,193,521,000	35,833,975,831	13,182,101,806	-1,011,419,194	-22,651,874,025
Appropriations	(14,311,632,000)	(35,878,382,802)	(13,277,035,966)	(-1,034,596,034)	(-22,602,328,840)
Rescissions	(-118,111,000)	(-45,368,871)	(-64,934,156)	(+23,176,844)	(-19,547,185)
(Limitations on obligations)	(21,770,483,000)	(487,757,000)	(22,948,915,000)	(+678,017,000)	(+22,158,158,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(2,267,701,000)	(60,000,000)	(2,311,932,000)	(+44,231,000)	(+2,251,932,000)
Grand total budgetary resources including (limitations on obligations) and (exempt obligations)	(36,232,120,000)	(36,401,732,831)	(36,140,948,806)	(-91,171,194)	(+1,739,215,975)
Total mandatory and discretionary	14,193,521,000	35,833,975,831	13,182,101,806	-1,011,419,194	-22,651,874,025
Mandatory	571,926,000	582,072,000	582,072,000	+10,146,000	.....
Discretionary:					
Crime trust fund	.....	5,000,000	.....	.....	-5,000,000
General purposes	13,621,595,000	35,246,903,831	12,600,029,806	-1,021,565,194	-22,646,874,025
Total, Discretionary	13,621,595,000	35,251,903,831	12,600,029,806	-1,021,565,194	-22,651,874,025

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would seek an understanding from the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

In other to respect the rule established, does each gentleman intend to yield back 15 minutes of their time?

Mr. WOLF. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, that would be my intention. Let me only put the caveat on there, as some Members are asking for more time, I will advise the gentleman, we are not over that amount yet. I will certainly advise the chairman of the subcommittee, should that occur. My intention is for us to limit the debate to an even shorter time than the rule allowed.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be the order. Each gentleman yields back 15 minutes of their time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

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

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], on some of the good features of the bill. Certainly funding for the basic Federal highway construction and maintenance programs have been increased, a 5-percent increase in fact, over this year.

The funds are needed to address our deteriorating roads and crumbling bridges across the country. He was steadfast in his determination to free up funding for the basic highway formula program which benefits all States by not funding highway demonstration projects.

I will say to my colleagues, however, Mr. Chairman, that the statement of administration policy submitted by the White House on this bill states very clearly, and I quote, ''The committee bill would make it difficult to continue today's high level of transportation safety.''

I share the administration's concerns. Particularly with regard to the recommended cuts in the Federal Aviation Administration budget, funding for FAA operations is maintained in the bill at about this year's level, but the $4.6 billion recommended is $104 million less than the FAA requested to maintain the air traffic control system and address safety needs. I think that should be of concern to all Americans.

I think what is important to note, of course, too, is that this transportation bill affects the lives of every American in one way or another. We all know that when you drive to work, when you take your children to school, whatever method you use, in some way this bill affects whether or not we are able to do that in an effective and safe manner, hopefully, also in an efficient and rapid manner as necessary.

Let me say to you that cutting the research and technology that this bill cuts would speed the transfer of transportation technologies and boost commercial transportation applications. Had we not made those cuts, there is 40 percent less in this bill for high-speed rail activities in the bill and for the intelligent transportation systems program which will now be severely constrained.

In the rail area, neither freight railroads nor passenger rail service escaped this budget ax.

Assistance to freight railroads is terminated in the bill. Amtrak funding is severely reduced. Amtrak funding in this bill is $305 million or 30 percent less than it was in fiscal year 1995. It is less than the amounts assumed even in the House budget resolution.

Moving to the transit area, I and other Members of this body have deeply held differences of opinion with the chairman on priorities or transit funding and on transit policy. Federal support for community transit and bus operations take a real major cut in this bill, when the need for a major Federal role in transit continues unabated. Some 35 million Americans ride buses or some form of commuter rail service every day. They are working Americans. They are the elderly. They are the disabled. These are the people who will be affected by the 44 percent reduction in mass transit operating subsidies and the 20 percent reduction in transit formula grants in this bill.

I also want to reiterate my strong objections to the bill's provisions that have now been contained in this rule that are now part of the legislation, which does not permit us to reform 13(c). We cannot reform it. Sorry. Sorry. We passed a rule. We insisted that the Committee on Rules was wrong, so we passed an amendment by the gentlewoman from Utah now which saw to it that we are not able any longer to simply reform section 13(c).

I think that is a major mistake. Not only are the repeal of provisions and the rewriting of labor law in this legislation bad policy, I think it is especially bad when we do not even hold hearings on it. We did not hear from the transit workers. We did not hear from the transit property owners, those who own transit properties, to tell us about the effects on them specifically of 13(c) or any collective bargaining agreement.

Some of us, some of us who understand a little bit about the labor laws of this country recognize that at least we should have had hearings, but that did not occur.

I will say to my colleagues that it is not a money issue. No one can point to any credible evidence that repealing a lot of those provisions will save money. There is certainly no empirical evidence, and none in the testimony from any expert in our subcommittee. A lot of us think that is the reason that you should leave these matters to the authorizing committee.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, let me only close by saying to my colleagues that while I have grave concerns about the bill's prohibition that limits certain types of training conducted by the Department of Transportation, I also recognize that we must move on, if we are about the responsible business of running the government.

I do hope that we can achieve a better balance in the bill as we go through the process, when we meet with the Senate in conference, when we deal with amendments today and next week, perhaps. I look forward to working with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia toward that end.

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

□ 1230

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2002, the Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. This bill deserves the support of every Member of Congress. The Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, under the very able leadership of Chairman FRANK WOLF, has produced a bill that will create jobs, build our Nation's infrastructure, and ensure the safety of our traveling public.

I want to take a moment here to congratulate Chairman FRANK WOLF. As you all know this is his first year as the chairman of the subcommittee. Well, I can tell you he hit a home run with his first effort.

This subcommittee held numerous hearings trying to identify the needs that exist across the Nation. This bill addresses them. I wish every Member of Congress had been able to sit through our hearings. If they had, I am certain that they would support this bill without hesitation.

This is a unique bill. With this bill this Congress builds America. We build the highways, transit systems and airports. We provide a network of transportation that moves America—its people, its products, its services. Across town or across the Nation this bill provides the necessary funding to make our citizens mobile and allow our goods and services to get to market.

This bill does other things as well. It funds the Coast Guard to protect our citizens that use our water ways. We fund other safety programs that keep our travelers safe.

This bill also repeals unnecessary regulations like 13(c). Section 13(c) is an arcane, outdated regulation whose primary purpose is to pit one Cabinet level Department—the Department of Labor against the Department of Transportation and against the Congress. Imagine if you can, Congress and the Department of Transportation providing much-needed transit funding for

your transit agency so that your constituents can get to and from work—but just as the grant from the Department of Transportation, and approved by Congress is ready to be released guess what happens? The Department of Labor steps in an overrules Congress and DOT and says no. Your transit agency cannot have those already approved funds. I urge your support for repeal.

Before my time runs out I want to take this opportunity to once again congratulate Chairman WOLF. He is a tireless worker and a principled man who listened to the concerns and interests that not only I had but of every Member who had an interest in this bill. He always extended the utmost courtesy and cooperation and his word is his bond. I want to thank him for working with me and for developing this bill—a bill that I am proud to support. I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate the very able gentleman from Texas and the ranking member on the subcommittee, RON COLEMAN.

I also want to a take a moment to recognize the staff of the committee—John, Rich, Stephanie, Linda, Cheryl, Kristi, and Deborah and all the others who worked on this bill on many late nights and weekends and who always worked with to answer questions I had or offer any assistance that I needed.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] for a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman of the subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Virginia is prepared to answer questions. Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee regarding an important project at Toledo Express Airport.

The air traffic control facility at the Toledo Express Airport has experienced several equipment and structural problems during the last few years. There have been several near misses. The tower is now nearly 50 years old and at 57 feet, it is 43 feet shorter than towers at similar airports. Visibility is inadequate and the facility needs relocation.

Rather than waiting for the FAA to address this problem, the Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority has taken the initiative and proposed to construct a tower meeting FAA specifications. Construction would be financed by bonds issued by the Port Authority, and the FAA would move into the tower under a leaseback arrangement. This proposal would cut 3 years off of the time it would take the FAA to construct a tower under its normal procedures and save significant interest costs.

We have discussed this proposal. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], as well as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], have been most gracious and helpful.

It is my understanding that the gentleman supports the Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority proposal for the construction and leaseback of a Toledo Express Airport tower, is that correct?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Yes, I believe it is a sound proposal, Mr. Chairman. In fact, I believe it is a very very, very sound proposal. It should not only be given strong consideration by the FAA, but frankly, I just hope they do it.

Ms. KAPTUR. It is my further understanding that the gentleman does encourage the FAA to do all it can to facilitate and expedite the project?

Mr. WOLF. That is correct. I will be glad to have a meeting in my office with the gentlewoman and the FAA so we can work the problem out.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the chairman, all my pilots, people that work near the airport, all that work in the control towers, and I thank the gentleman for his interest and assistance in this matter.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I would seek to engage the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in a coloquy, if he would be so amendable.

Mr. Chairman, as we know, the administration requested $10 billion for the Rhode Island Freight Rail Development initiative in the fiscal year 1996, to be matched dollar for dollar by the State of Rhode Island. This funding was to be combined with $5 million in fiscal year 1995 funds. Regrettably, the bill does not contain this request.

Is this correct, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee?

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

Mr. REED. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Yes, as the committee reported in its report: ''Language in the 1995 Transportation Appropriations Act requires that the project have matching State funds.'' As of June 1, 1995, the State has not been able to match the Federal appropriated money.

Mr. REED. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, recently the Governor of Rhode Island announced that he has all of the matching funds and that the State expects to commence preliminary work prior to the end of fiscal year 1995. In addition, the Governor has requested a Federal contribution of $1 million in fiscal year 1996 to continue this work. It is my understanding that the subcommittee continues to believe that this project is worthy of Federal support.

Is this also the chairman's understanding?

Mr. WOLF. If the gentleman will continue to yield, yes. As the committee report states: ''The committee is willing to reconsider funding for this project in fiscal year 1997 if the available funds are obligated.''

Mr. REED. In light of the expected obligation of fiscal year 1995 funds and the Governor's request, does the chairman believe this is an issue that may be considered during conference with other body provided that Chamber endorses the Governor's recent request?

Mr. WOLF. Yes; if the State is able to match and obligate the 1995 Federal funding and the Senate appropriates the funds for fiscal year 1996, the committee will certainly reconsider further funds for initiative.

Mr. REED. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and his staff for his assistance and consideration. I would also like to extend my appreciation to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] and his staff for their attention to this matter.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PETRI], a member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2002, the fiscal year 1996 DOT Appropriation Act.

I want to thank Chairman WOLF, Chairman LIVINGSTON, and ranking members OBEY and COLEMAN for their hard work in producing this legislation.

This bill sets high trust fund spending levels in the highway and transit programs. It recognizes the importance of infrastructure to our Nation, even in difficult budgetary times.

Unfortunately, some difficult choices needed to be made. However, I applaud the decision to make trust fund infrastructure spending a priority.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman of the subcommittee, and also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], the ranking member, for the work they have done in this bill to maintain the pipeline safety program in the country. Pipeline safety is extremely important for my constituents, because just over a year ago a natural gas pipeline explosion occurred in Edison, NJ, in my district, and leveled the Durham Woods apartment complex, and dramatically altered the lives of thousands of my constituents.

I have learned in the last year that in order to maintain pipeline safety in this country, we need a competent Federal program with the knowledge and manpower to get the job done. The

only way we get that is to adequately fund the Federal program.

Last year, in the wake of the Edison accident, Congress appropriated some $37 million for the Office of Pipeline Safety. We finally gave this consistently underfunded program some teeth. This year, the President recommended $42 million for pipeline safety in his budget, an amount I think would go a long way toward improving the Federal program and enhancing State programs through Federal grants.

Although I fully support the President's request, I understand that the pipeline operators, whose user fees fund the program, do not want to pay that much. I do not agree with these operators, because I think the President's request does not place an undue financial burden on them, because I know that the $20 million they favor is not enough to run a good program.

However, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] who worked very hard to take a middle ground, a compromise, that I think is very acceptable, that places about $29 million or $30 million into the Office of Pipeline Safety. It essentially reduces the burden on the pipeline operators, but gives the office enough money to do its job. I urge my colleagues to support this committee's appropriation level. I think that both the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] have done a great job in coming up with this figure. I want to commend them.

I also want to point out that the committee report highlights the importance of the one-call notification system, and provides $1 million for grants to States to implement one-call systems. A one-call notification system would help many of the problems that are responsible for nearly two-thirds of all pipeline accidents in the Nation. The language that the chairman of the subcommittee has included in this bill makes me more confident that we can move a bipartisan Federal one-call bill in this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to touch on one other subject that is very important to the lives of the people who live along our Nation's coasts. I am greatly concerned about the Coast Guard's proposal to close 23 small boat unit stations around the country. There will be an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATOURETTE] during title I that I cosponsored with others to basically transfer $6 million from the Office of the Secretary's account to the operation and maintenance account of the Coast Guard in order to provide funding for these small boat units, and to prevent their closures.

I think this is a very important amendment. The closures would come at a time when the Coast Guard has reported increases over the last 10 years in injuries and accidents. A larger burden is being placed on the Coast Guard, and closing stations is not the way to respond. I think the safety of lives is going to depend upon passing this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman WOLF, for the time, and compliment him and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. COLEMAN, on the good work that they have accomplished in this bill. I rise in strong support of H.R. 2002, the Transportation Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is important for several reasons. First, it reduces overall transportation spending by $1.2 billion from last year's level. As Chairman LIVINGSTON has said on this floor several times, the Appropriations Committee is doing its job and this bill is further proof that we are keeping our promise to balance the budget.

Second, the bill is good for the State of New Jersey, the most densely populated State in the country. This bill gives New Jersey the funding and flexibility we need to improve our transportation system.

Most important, the bill provides $75 million for the urban core project, a series of mass transit upgrades which will take cars off the road and made commuting much easier for New Jersey residents. I thank the chairman and ranking member for including this important funding.

Finally, the bill ends an outdated requirement that has held up and raised the cost of several transit projects. This 30-year-old provision, known as 13C, has stifled innovation, efficiency, and growth in transit services, and I am pleased that the committee decided to end it.

Mr. Chairman, we know we have to do more with less money, and this bill does that. Transit operating subsidies have been reduced. But this bill repeals 13C which has been nothing more than a gift to organized labor for the past 30 years. This takes away labor's veto power over transit projects and lets transit manages do what they do best—which is manage.

Mr. Chairman, I again applaud the gentleman from Virginia for this bill and urge its adoption.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, Mrs. CARRIE MEEK.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], with whom I have worked before, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], for having worked together to bring such a bill as the one we see on the floor today. However, I am very concerned, as I always am, when we do substantive legislation on an appropriations bill.

I seek today to sort of let the Congress see what happens when we repeal 13(c). In this repealing of 13(c), we are thinking primarily about transit authorities. The Congress has done an excellent job of telling the Congress how transit authorities feel, but they neglected to show how transit workers feel, and to give them a fair and equitable chance to work with the authorities when Federal grants are provided to cities and to countries.

□ 1245

I think by excluding the transit workers, one part of this continuum is left off. If we repeal 13(c), that is the effect of it. I am not saying that 13(c) is the answer for all of the problems. I think that 13(c) does need to be reformed, but it does not need to be repealed. Therefore, I call on the chairman and the members of this committee to please think this through very thoroughly in terms of the repeal, to think more of reforming. We have got about 200,000 transit workers out there that carry the people who live in my district and other districts like mine who need to get to work every day. I have women if they cannot get to Miami Beach to their jobs, they will not have a job. If they cannot get downtown to their jobs, they will not have jobs.

I am appealing to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] who is thinking about the working person and has in the past, to think of the impact, the negative impact of repealing 13(c), and instead think of making the necessary reformation and turning it over to the authorizing committee.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], a member of the committee.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman of the committee, for putting together a very difficult bill under very hard circumstances and bringing it to the floor. This is his first attempt at writing a transportation appropriations bill and I am very proud to say that I sit next to him on the committee. I am very proud of the work that he has done. I am also proud of my colleague and fellow Texan, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], the ranking member, for his hard work on this committee. Particularly I thank the staff of the committee. I do not think we can thank the staff enough for putting up with us and helping us write these bills, because it is through their knowledge and their hard work that we are able to bring a bill of this quality to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this bill. It is a good bill. I can support an appropriation bill that actually cuts spending from last year. This is $1.4 billion less than 1995 in discretionary and $22.6 million less than even the President requested. But the thing that I am most proud about this bill is an issue that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I have worked on for many, many years, and, that is, that

the bill repeals section 13(c) of the Federal Transit Act which gives transit authorities the necessary flexibility to reduce operating expenses in their transit system.

Section 13(c) was originally intended to protect the rights of transit workers employed by private transit authorities that were acquired by public agencies in States that prohibited collective bargaining. Now, 30 years later, and ironically the same jobs that 13(c) seeks to protect may be the same jobs that are lost because of it. Like Amtrak, these protective arrangements provide transit workers up to 6 years of full compensation and benefits after they lose their job. Section 13(c) is a labor protection that has become too costly and outdated. It has impeded innovation, efficiency, and growth in providing transit services across the country, including new and restructured services.

Section 13(c) has become a means to pursue broader labor objectives and will mean ultimately the loss, not the protection, of jobs in the transit industry.

The bottom line is that section 13(c) has been used by the unions as another bite at the apple to get additional concessions that they could not get through regular collective-bargaining practices.

I encourage all the Members to vote against any amendment that would strike this repeal language.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is a responsible bill, and it is one that should be supported by all the Members of this House because it does represent a well-crafted piece of legislation. We eliminate the ICC in the bill, providing only close-down costs. The bill has absolutely no highway demonstration projects, allowing the States to do their job in designing and building highway projects that are the priorities of the State. There are no new section 3 starts. The only projects that are funded are ongoing projects that need completion. With regard to Amtrak, the bill requires the authorizers to make significant reforms, including labor reforms, before funding is provided.

I encourage all the Members to support the transportation appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise the bill managers that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] has 1½ minutes remaining.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I understood that each of us had in fact not yet yielded back the 15 minutes yet. I understood we would do that at the end, provided we have the time. I just have some requests for time.

How much time did the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] have?

The CHAIRMAN. He has 1½ minutes.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do have two more speakers.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 1½ minutes, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] will be recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI].

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill places the Nation's transportation priorities in the wrong place and it deserves to be defeated.

This is a backward-looking bill that promotes the transportation solutions of the 1950's. This bill does little to move forward with advanced technologies, especially the use of so-called third-wave technologies to help solve the problems of urban congestion. This bill attempts to overturn the progress that has been made in recent years, especially through the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to promote a balanced national transportation system.

The investment numbers in this bill look good but the priorities are misplaced. I fully recognize the need to reduce spending, but I believe it is a serious mistake that will have long-term impacts on our Nation's economic growth to reduce our commitment to infrastructure investment. If we decide that infrastructure investment should be sacrificed, then all modes of transportation should share equally in the pain. Instead of continuing the trend for a balanced transportation system based on State and local flexibility, the Committee on Appropriations has decided to impose its view of a transportation system on the Nation. The committee has decided to raise highway spending by 4.5 percent and to increase the airport improvement program by 10.3 percent, while cutting the transit program by 13 percent. That includes a 43-percent cut in operating assistance, a cut that will jeopardize the very existence of many transit systems in rural areas and small cities. Cuts of that size are not fair, especially when other programs are getting more money.

These cuts are in the face of estimates by the Department of Transportation and by the transit industry that increased investment will be needed to replace aging and outdated equipment, to maintain current conditions, to complete expansions now under way, and to meet the Nation's congestion reduction and air-quality goals. It makes no sense to impose these severe cuts on transit systems that are important to so many people. It is not only the Nation's urban areas but also rural areas where there are thousands who need transit to reach their jobs, their schools and their medical care. This bill will make sure that many of these transit-dependent people will no longer be able to reach their destinations without driving.

In the Philadelphia area, the cuts in operating assistance will mean either a fare hike of 10 to 12 cents or the elimination of service to 8,000 riders every day. That would be a devastating impact on those 8,000 people and a total of 2 million annual trips.

This is a bill for the part of America that has cars and needs its airports expanded. It is not a bill for the working people of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would say to the managers of the bill that if either or both of the managers wish to reclaim their time or a portion of their time, they may do so by unanimous consent.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim 1½ minutes of the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ 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. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to alert my colleagues that later on in the debate, I will have an amendment that will reduce by .2 percent the administrative budget of the FAA management team. This is congressional relations advisers. This is administrative expenses.

It strikes me that when we are cutting food stamp funding, environmental restoration, that a bureaucracy that I will say to Members is not responsive, as somebody that has lost a number of flight service stations, cannot get radars because I am from a rural area, and a bureaucracy that does not represent the best interests of many aviation consumers, does not return telephone calls, is not responsive, that they can stand to take a cut just like everybody else does.

I wanted to alert my colleagues, and I have discussed this with the chairman and the ranking member.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. On another subject, I just want to congratulate the gentleman for the great work he has done with regard to traveling around the world and getting a number of people out. I just want to personally put that in the RECORD.

I thank the gentleman very much. Perhaps if Mr. Christopher leaves, the gentleman should be the Secretary of State.

I have no question on the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. COLEMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just also wanted to say, it seems to me the gentleman could get the Secretary of State to talk to the White House and they would probably take care of this FAA problem.

In any event, I understand the gentleman's amendment, and I am proud to have yielded him the time.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, as the House considers the Transportation appropriations legislation, I wanted to take this opportunity to mention something that is important to south Texas and the nation as a whole—I am referring to the need for improvements along U.S. Highways 291 and 77 to enhance commerce with our trade partners to the north and south.

U.S. Highways 281 and 77 are the two main north-south transportation arteries in south Texas. They are located in a region that is experiencing the fastest growth of anywhere in Texas and anywhere else in the country, for that matter. Already, the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA] has greatly increased commerce travelling these highways and the area is expected to absorb even more traffic.

Initiatives to improve and enhance U.S. Highways 281 and 77 are critical elements of a nationwide transportation system that will tie together major economic centers of our Nation with Canada and Mexico.

At this juncture when we are at the threshold of a new era in international trade, we can ill afford to allow our infrastructure to become deteriorated and congested. We must anticipate and prepare for the most efficient and safe flow of goods entering and exiting the United States. We can do so by improving and enhancing U.S. Highways 281 and 77 through south Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment printed in section 2 of House Resolution 194 is adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule by titles and each title shall be considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to a Member who has caused an amendment to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

It shall be in order at any time to consider the amendment printed in part 2 of House Report 104–195, if offered by a Member designated in the report. That amendment shall be considered read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by the resolution.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

The clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

H.R. 2002

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, $55,011,500, of which not to exceed $40,000 shall be available as the Secretary may determine for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation up to $1,000,000 in funds received in user fees established to support the electronic tariff filing system: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise made available may be used to maintain duplicate physical copies of airline tariffs that are already available for public and departmental access at no cost; to secure them against detection, alteration, or tampering; or open them to inspection by the Department.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, $6,554,000, and in addition, $809,000, to be derived from ''Federal-aid Highways'' subject to the ''Limitation on General Operating Expenses''.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning, research, systems development, and development activities, to remain available until expended, $3,309,000.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Department of Transportation Working Capital Fund associated with the provision of services to entities within the Department of Transportation, not to exceed $102,231,000 shall be paid, in accordance with law, from appropriations made available to the Department of Transportation.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, as is payable by the Department of Transportation, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund: *Provided,* That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs in excess of $15,000,000 for the Payments to Air Carriers program in fiscal year 1996: *Provided further,* That none of the funds in this Act shall be used by the Secretary of Transportation to make payment of compensation under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, in excess of the appropriation in this Act for liquidation of obligations incurred under the ''Payments to air carriers'' program: *Provided further,* That none of the funds in this Act shall be used for the payment of claims for such compensation except in accordance with this provision: *Provided further,* That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for service to communities in the forty-eight contiguous States that are located fewer than seventy highway miles from the nearest large or medium hub airport, or that require a rate of subsidy per passenger in excess of $200 unless such point is greater than two hundred and ten miles from the nearest large or medium hub airport: *Provided further,* That of funds provided for ''Small Community Air Service'' by Public Law 101–508, $23,600,000 in fiscal year 1996 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective January 1, 1996 no point in the 48 contiguous States and Hawaii eligible for compensated transportation in fiscal year 1996 under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, including 49 U.S.C. 41734(d), shall receive such transportation unless a State, local government, or other non-Federal entity agrees to pay at least fifty percent of the cost of providing such transportation, as determined by the Secretary of Transportation: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may require the entity or entities agreeing to pay such amounts to make advance payments or provide other security to ensure that timely payments are made: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, points covered by the cost-sharing provisions under this head for which no State, local government, or non-Federal entity agrees to pay at least fifty percent of the cost of providing such transportation shall receive a reduced level of service in fiscal year 1996, to be determined by the Secretary as follows: The Secretary shall subtract from the funds made available in this Act so much as is needed to provide compensation to all eligible points for which a State, local government, or other non-Federal entity agrees to pay at least fifty percent of the cost of providing such transportation, and, with remaining funds, allocate to each other point an amount reduced by the ratio of the remainder calculated above to all funds made available in this Act: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall allocate any funds that become unallocated as the year progresses to those points for which a State, local government, or other non-Federal entity does not agree to pay at least fifty percent of the cost of such transportation.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(RESCISSION)

Of the budgetary resources remaining available under this heading, $6,786,971 are rescinded.

RENTAL PAYMENTS

For necessary expenses for rental of headquarters and field space not to exceed 8,580,000 square feet and for related services assessed by the General Services Administration, $130,803,000: *Provided,* That of this

amount, $1,897,000 shall be derived from the Highway Trust Fund, $41,441,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, $836,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, and $169,000 shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund: *Provided further,* That in addition, for assessments by the General Services Administration related to the space needs of the Federal Highway Administration, $17,099,000, to be derived from ''Federal-aid Highways'', subject to the ''Limitation on General Operating Expenses''.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

For the cost of direct loans, $1,500,000, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 332: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further,* That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $15,000,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, $400,000.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

For necessary expenses of the Minority Business Resource Center outreach activities, $2,900,000, of which $2,642,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1997.

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for; purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)); and recreation and welfare; $2,566,000,000, of which $25,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund; and of which $25,000,000 shall be expended from the Boat Safety Account: *Provided,* That the number of aircraft on hand at any one time shall not exceed two hundred and eighteen, exclusive of aircraft and parts stored to meet future attrition: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be available for pay or administrative expenses in connection with shipping commissioners in the United States: *Provided further,* That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for expenses incurred for yacht documentation under 46 U.S.C. 12109, except to the extent fees are collected from yacht owners and credited to this appropriation: *Provided further,* That the Commandant shall reduce both military and civilian employment levels for the purpose of complying with Executive Order No. 12839: *Provided further,* That of the funds provided for operating expenses for fiscal year 1996, in this or any other Act, not less than $314,200,000 shall be available for drug enforcement activities.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, $375,175,000, of which $32,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund; of which $191,200,000 shall be available to acquire, repair, renovate or improve vessels, small boats and related equipment, to remain available until September 30, 2000; $16,500,000 shall be available to acquire new aircraft and increase aviation capability, to remain available until September 30, 1998; $42,200,000 shall be available for other equipment, to remain available until September 30, 1998; $82,275,000 shall be available for shore facilities and aids to navigation facilities, to remain available until September 30, 1998; and $43,000,000 shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs, to remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided,* That funds received from the sale of the VC–11A and HU–25 aircraft shall be credited to this appropriation for the purpose of acquiring new aircraft and increasing aviation capacity: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may transfer funds between projects under this head, not to exceed $50,000,000 in total for the fiscal year, thirty days after notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, solely for the purpose of providing funds for facility renovation, construction, exit costs, and other implementation costs associated with Coast Guard streamlining plans.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the Coast Guard's environmental compliance and restoration functions under chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, $21,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

For necessary expenses for alteration or removal of obstructive bridges, $16,000,000, to remain available until expended.

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations therefor otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, and payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plans, and for payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. ch. 55), $582,022,000.

RESERVE TRAINING

For all necessary expenses for the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; maintenance and operation of facilities; and supplies, equipment, and services; $61,859,000.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law, $18,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which $3,150,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources, and foreign countries, for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

BOAT SAFETY

(AQUATIC RESOURCES TRUST FUND)

For payment of necessary expenses incurred for recreational boating safety assistance under Public Law 92–75, as amended, $20,000,000, to be derived from the Boat Safety Account and to remain available until expended.

EMERGENCY FUND

(LIMITATION ON PERMANENT APPROPRIATION)

(OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND)

Except as provided in emergency supplemental appropriations provided in other appropriations Acts for fiscal year 1996, not more than $3,000,000 shall be obligated or expended in fiscal year 1996 pursuant to section 6002(b) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to carry out the provisions of section 1012(a)(4) of that Act.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including operations and research activities related to commercial space transportation, administrative expenses for research and development, establishment of air navigation facilities and the operation (including leasing) and maintenance of aircraft, and carrying out the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 471 of title 49, U.S. Code, or other provisions of law authorizing the obligation of funds for similar programs of airport and airway development or improvement, lease or purchase of four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $4,600,000,000, of which $1,871,500,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, foreign authorities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the provision of aviation services, including the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and for issuance, renewal or modification of certificates, including airman, aircraft, and repair station certificates, or for tests related thereto, or for processing major repair or alteration forms: *Provided further,* That funds may be used to enter into a grant agreement with a nonprofit standard setting organization to assist in the development of aviation safety standards: *Provided further,* That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for new applicants for the second career training program: *Provided further,* That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for paying premium pay under 5 U.S.C. 5546(a) to any Federal Aviation Administration employee unless such employee actually performed work during the time corresponding to such premium pay.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase, and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities and equipment as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, U.S. Code, including initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; engineering and service testing, including construction of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; and construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Administration stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available; and the purchase, lease, or transfer of aircraft from funds available under this head; to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, $2,000,000,000, of which $1,784,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1998, and of which $216,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment and modernization of air navigation facilities.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, $60,000,000 are rescinded.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for research, engineering, and development, as authorized under part A of

subtitle VII of title 49, U.S.C., including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, $143,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred for research, engineering, and development.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and for noise compatibility planning and programs as authorized under subchapter I of chapter 471 and subchapter I of chapter 475 of title 49, U.S. Code, and under other law authorizing such obligations, $1,500,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $1,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1996 for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and noise compatibility planning and programs, notwithstanding section 47117(h) of title 49, U.S. Code.

AVIATION INSURANCE REVOLVING FUND

The Secretary of Transportation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures and investments, within the limits of funds available pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44307, and in accordance with section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program for aviation insurance activities under chapter 443 of title 49, U.S. Code.

AIRCRAFT PURCHASE LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

None of the funds in this Act shall be available for activities under this head the obligations for which are in excess of $1,600,000 during fiscal year 1996.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Necessary expenses for administration, operation, including motor carrier safety program operations, and research of the Federal Highway Administration not to exceed $495,381,000 shall be paid in accordance with law from appropriations made available by this Act to the Federal Highway Administration together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Highway Administration: *Provided*, That $190,667,000 of the amount provided herein shall remain available until September 30, 1998.

HIGHWAY-RELATED SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 402 administered by the Federal Highway Administration, to remain available until expended, $10,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed $100,000 of the amount made available herein shall be available for ''Limitation on general operating expenses'': *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $10,000,000 in fiscal year 1996 for ''Highway-Related Safety Grants''.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $18,000,000,000 for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 1996.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are attributable to Federal-aid highways, including the National Scenic and Recreational Highway as authorized by 23 U.S.C. 148, not otherwise provided, including reimbursements for sums expended pursuant to the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 308, $19,200,000,000 or so much thereof as may be available in and derived from the Highway Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

RIGHT-OF-WAY REVOLVING FUND

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

None of the funds under this head are available for obligations for right-of-way acquisition during fiscal year 1996.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out 49 U.S.C. 31102, $68,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $79,150,000 for ''Motor Carrier Safety Grants''.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary with respect to traffic and highway safety under part C of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code, and chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, $73,316,570, of which $37,825,850 shall remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended to plan, finalize, or implement any rulemaking to add to section 575.104 of title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations any requirement pertaining to a grading standard that is different from the three grading standards (treadwear, traction, and temperature resistance) already in effect.

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary with respect to traffic and highway safety under 23 U.S.C. 403 and section 2006 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–240), to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund, $52,011,930, of which $32,770,670 shall remain available until September 30, 1998.

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the amounts made available under this heading in Public Law 103–331, Public Law 102–388, and Public Law 101–516, $4,547,185 are rescinded from the national advanced driving simulator project.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 153, 402, 408, and 410, Chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, and section 209 of Public Law 95–599, as amended, to remain available until expended, $153,400,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding subsection 2009(b) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 1996, are in excess of $153,400,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402 and 410, as amended, of which $126,000,000 shall be for ''State and community highway safety grants'', $2,400,000 shall be for the ''National Driver Register'' (subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein), and $25,000,000 shall be for section 410 ''Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures programs'': *Provided further*, That from the $126,000,000 provided under ''State and community highway safety grants'', $3,000,000 shall be made available for the ''Safe communities'' program in three States, notwithstanding the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402(c) and (g): *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used for construction, rehabilitation or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local, or private buildings or structures: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used to purchase automobiles or motorcycles for state, local, or private usage: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,153,000 of the funds made available for section 402 may be available for administering ''State and community highway safety grants'': *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 of the funds made available for section 410 ''Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures programs'' may be available for technical assistance to the States: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $890,000 of the funds made available for the ''National Driver Register'' may be available for administrative expenses.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, not otherwise provided for, $14,000,000, of which $1,508,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of a program making commitments to guarantee new loans under the Emergency Rail Services Act of 1970, as amended, and no new commitments to guarantee loans under section 211(a) or 211(h) of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, as amended, shall be made: *Provided further*, That, as part of the Washington Union Station transaction in which the Secretary assumed the first deed of trust on the property and, where the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation or any successor is obligated to make payments on such deed of trust on the Secretary's behalf, including payments on and after September 30, 1988, the Secretary is authorized to receive such payments directly from the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, credit them to the appropriation charged for the first deed of trust, and make payments on the first deed of trust with those funds: *Provided further*, That such additional sums as may be necessary for payment on the first deed of trust may be advanced by the Administrator from unobligated balances available to the Federal Railroad Administration, to be reimbursed from payments received from the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation.

RAILROAD SAFETY

For necessary expenses in connection with railroad safety, not otherwise provided for,

$49,940,660, of which $2,687,000 shall remain available until expended.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for railroad research and development, $21,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

For necessary expenses related to Northeast Corridor improvements authorized by title VII of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976, as amended (45 U.S.C. 851 et seq.) and 49 U.S.C. 24909, $100,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations pursuant to section 512 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–210), as amended, in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to pay any amounts required pursuant to the guarantee of the principal amount of obligations under sections 511 through 513 of such Act, such authority to exist as long as any such guaranteed obligation is outstanding: *Provided,* That no new loan guarantee commitments shall be made during fiscal year 1996.

NATIONAL MAGNETIC LEVITATION PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of the National Magnetic Levitation Prototype Development program as defined in subsections 1036(b) and 1036(d)(1)(A) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991.

NEXT GENERATION HIGH SPEED RAIL

For necessary expenses for Next Generation High Speed Rail technology development and demonstrations, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TRUST FUND SHARE OF NEXT GENERATION HIGH SPEED RAIL

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For grants and payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of the High Speed Ground Transportation program as defined in subsections 1036(c) and 1036(d)(1)(B) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, including planning and environmental analyses, $5,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $5,000,000.

GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation authorized by 49 U.S.C. 24104, $628,000,000, of which $336,000,000 shall be available for operating losses and for mandatory passenger rail service payments, $62,000,000 shall be for transition costs incurred by the Corporation, and $230,000,000 shall be for capital improvements: *Provided,* That none of the funds under this head shall be made available until significant reforms (including labor reforms) in authorizing legislation are enacted to restructure the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further,* That funding under this head for capital improvements shall not be made available before July 1, 1996: *Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for lease or purchase of passenger motor vehicles or for the hire of vehicle operators for any officer or employee, other than the president of the Corporation, excluding the lease of passenger motor vehicles for those officers or employees while in official travel status.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal Transit Administration's programs authorized by chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, $39,260,000.

FORMULA GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5307, 5310(a)(2), 5311, and 5336, to remain available until expended, $890,000,000: *Provided,* That no more than $2,000,000,000 of budget authority shall be available for these purposes: *Provided further,* That of the funds provided under this head for formula grants, no more than $400,000,000 may be used for operating assistance under 49 U.S.C. 5336(d).

UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION CENTERS

For necessary expenses for university transportation centers as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 5317(b), to remain available until expended, $6,000,000.

TRANSIT PLANNING AND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses for transit planning and research as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 5303, 5311, 5313, 5314, and 5315, to remain available until expended, $82,250,000 of which $39,436,250 shall be for activities under 49 U.S.C. 5303, $4,381,250 for activities under 49 U.S.C. 5311(b)(2), $8,051,250 for activities under 49 U.S.C. 5313(b), $19,480,000 for activities under 49 U.S.C. 5314, $8,051,251 for activities under 49 U.S.C. 5313(a), and $2,850,000 for activities under 49 U.S.C. 5315.

TRUST FUND SHARE OF EXPENSES

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out 49 U.S.C. 5338(a), $1,120,850,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided,* That $1,110,000,000 shall be paid from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund to the Federal Transit Administration's formula grants account.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $1,665,000,000 in fiscal year 1996 for grants under the contract authority in 49 U.S.C. 5338(b): *Provided,* That there shall be available for fixed guideway modernization, $666,000,000; there shall be available for the replacement, rehabilitation, and purchase of buses and related equipment and the construction of bus-related facilities, $333,000,000; and there shall be available for new fixed guideway systems, $666,000,000, to be available as follows:

$42,410,000 for the Atlanta-North Springs project;

$17,500,000 for the South Boston Piers (MOS–2) project;

$6,500,000 for the Canton-Akron-Cleveland commuter rail project (subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein);

$2,000,000 for the Cincinnati Northeast/Northern Kentucky rail line project (subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein);

$16,941,000 for the Dallas South Oak Cliff LRT project;

$2,500,000 for the DART North Central light rail extension project (subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein);

$5,000,000 for the Dallas-Fort Worth RAILTRAN project (subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein);

$10,000,000 for the Florida Tri-County commuter rail project (subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein);

$22,630,000 for the Houston Regional Bus project;

$12,500,000 for the Jacksonville ASE extension project;

$125,000,000 for the Los Angeles Metro Rail (MOS–3);

$10,000,000 for the Los Angeles-San Diego commuter rail project;

$10,000,000 for the MARC commuter rail project;

$3,000,000 for the Maryland Central Corridor LRT project;

$2,000,000 for the Miami-North 27th Avenue project ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'';

$2,500,000 for the Memphis, Tennessee Regional Rail Plan ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'';

$75,000,000 for the New Jersey Urban Core-Secaucus project;

$10,000,000 for the New Orleans Canal Street Corridor project ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'';

$114,989,000 for the New York Queens Connection project;

$5,000,000 for the Orange County Transitway project ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'';

$22,630,000 for the Pittsburgh Airport Phase 1 project;

$85,500,000 for the Portland Westside LRT project;

$2,000,000 for the Sacramento LRT extension project;

$10,000,000 for the St. Louis Metro Link LRT project;

$5,000,000 for the Salt Lake City light rail project: *Provided,* That such funding may be available only for related high-occupancy vehicle lane and intermodal corridor design costs;

$10,000,000 for the San Francisco BART extension to the San Francisco airport project;

$15,000,000 for the San Juan, Puerto Rico Tren Urbano project ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'';

$1,000,000 for the Tampa to Lakeland commuter rail project ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)'';

$5,000,000 for the Whitehall ferry terminal, New York, New York ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)''; and

$14,400,000 for the Wisconsin central commuter project ''(subject to passage hereafter by the House of a bill authorizing appropriations therefor, and only in amounts provided therein)''.

MASS TRANSIT CAPITAL FUND

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out 49 U.S.C. 5338(b) administered by the Federal Transit Administration, $2,000,000,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 14 of Public Law 96–184 and Public Law 101–551, $200,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to the Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Corporation's budget for the current fiscal year.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses for operation and maintenance of those portions of the Saint Lawrence Seaway operated and maintained by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, $10,190,500, to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99–662.

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Research and Special Programs Administration, $26,030,000, of which $574,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, and of which $7,606,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That $2,322,000 shall be transferred to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics for the expenses necessary to conduct activities related to Airline Statistics, and of which $272,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That up to $1,000,000 in fees collected under 49 U.S.C. 5108(g) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, for reports publication and dissemination.

PIPELINE SAFETY

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

For expenses necessary to conduct the functions of the pipeline safety program for grants-in-aid to carry out a pipeline safety program, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 60107 and the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979, as amended, and to discharge the pipeline program responsibilities of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $29,941,000, of which $2,698,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and shall remain available until September 30, 1998; and of which $27,243,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which $19,423,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That from amounts made available herein from the Pipeline Safety Fund, not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for grants to States for the development and establishment of one-call notification systems.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS

(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5127(c), $400,000 to be derived from the Emergency Preparedness Fund, to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That not more than $8,890,000 shall be made available for obligation in fiscal year 1996 from amounts made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i) and 5127(d): *Provided further*, That no such funds shall be made available for obligation by individuals other than the Secretary of Transportation, or his designees.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $40,238,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title I?

□ 1300

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order against page 20, line 14, beginning with the colon through the citation on line 19.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BEREUTER). The gentleman must state the basis for his point of order.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, this provision violates rule XXI, clause 2(a) of the rules of the House because it appropriates money for a ''safe communities'' program which is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point order is conceded and sustained.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Page 7, line 20, strike ''$2,566,000,000'' and insert ''$2,565,607,000''.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this amendment implements the original recommendation of the Coast Guard, the President's budget, and was also incorporated in the House budget resolution to phase out employees working in the Coast Guard personnel offices. There apparently was a misunderstanding on whether or not these offices would be closed.

According to the Coast Guard, whom I talked to this morning, possibly one might be closed, but the rest of the stations would be left open. This amendment strikes $393,000 out of the Coast Guard's operating and maintenance expenses used to fund unneeded employees in five civilian personnel offices.

The proposal is consistent with the administration, with the Coast Guard, with the budget resolution. Again this, proposal strikes funding for five employees that the Coast Guard recommends be phased out and personnel matters. The amendment restores the Coast Guard's proposal.

Mr. Chairman, as we rein in big government, it is very important to get the most for taxpayers' dollars. This amendment does cut Coast Guard overhead and allows the savings to be used for ships, equipment, and other more vital functions.

The amendment, according to OMB, will save $1.244 million over the 2-year consolidation period. This amendment makes fiscal sense. It has bipartisan support. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will consider supporting it.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and we will accept the amendment. I think it is a good amendment and will save money.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, the minority has no objection and would agree to the amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, I rise to question the procedure here. There are a number of us who had amendments relating to the O&M account and my question is, if this amendment is acceded to, does that preclude any further amendments to the Coast Guard O&M account?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Oregon would yield, I would say to the gentleman, no, it does not. What will happen is after this amendment is adopted, the committee will rise and the agriculture people will come back and nobody is foreclosed. When we begin on Monday or Tuesday or whenever we begin, we will start from here. No amendment will be foreclosed.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, my understanding is that there is some rule regarding revisiting an account once the number has been altered.

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

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Oregon, we reviewed, as a matter of fact, the Smith amendment in respect to what it might do to the DeFazio amendment. Our view is that it will require a rewrite of the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO]; not a changing of numbers. It will require some rewrite so that it does not violate a rule that does not allow us to revisit that same amendment twice.

So it will require a rewrite. All I can say is that I am sure that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], nor I, would in any way object to the gentleman being recognized as though he had correctly published that amendment in the RECORD.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. If the Chairman agrees, then I would certainly not object to this amendment going forward.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLF. 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. KLUG), having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, 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. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLUG). Pursuant to House Resolution 188 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill H.R. 1976.

□ 1305

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

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. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. KLUG in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1995, the bill was considered as read.

After disposition of any questions earlier postponed under the authority granted by the order of the House of July 19, 1995, and pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 20, 1995, no further amendments shall be in order except the following: The amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], 60 minutes; the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], 10 minutes; the amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], 20 minutes; and the amendment by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], 20 minutes.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order specified, by the specified proponent or a designee, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified, 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.

When proceedings resume on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], that amendment shall again be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOKE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 20, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

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

The purpose of the Hoke-Meehan amendment is very simple. What it does is reduces the appropriation for title I of Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development Assistance Act of 1954, by $113 million to the level that was requested by the President and approved in the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution that we passed in this House.

What exactly is this title I program all about? Does it develop new markets for America's farm exporters, as its proponents would have you believe? Not according to a very long series of investigations by the Congressional Research Service and the General Accounting Office. In fact, there is not one single shred of nonanecdotal evidence that it develops long-term foreign customers.

Does it provide humanitarian food aid to save starving populations in desperately poor and hungry nations? No; in fact, that is not even the purpose of title I. That is the purpose of the $875 million that has been appropriated in titles II and III for emergency humanitarian food aid relief.

However, there is substantial evidence that Public Law 480, title I, does exactly the opposite. It undermines the ability of foreign farmers to compete with much cheaper, dumped, subsidized American agricultural products. This has literally resulted in the destruction of local foreign farm economies around the world.

In Egypt, an AID study found that the volume of United States food aid has become a disincentive to Egyptian farmers to produce grain. South Korea is frequently cited by Public Law 480 proponents as the best example of a success story where a recipient has become a customer. But according to a 1995 GAO study, there is no evidence to support the existence of a direct tie between title I aid and the development of commercial markets for United States farm goods in South Korea.

In fact, because of the disruptive impact that this program has had on local farm economies, the nations of Bulgaria, Latvia, Poland, and Slovakia, among others, are no longer participating in it.

Well, if it is not about developing new markets for American farm exporters and it is not about providing humanitarian food aid for poor nations, then what is it about?

Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader, got it right and said it best when he called this, the politics of greed wrapped up in the language of love.

What this is about is clear-cut, straightforward Government subsidies to big-farm and big-shipping interests. This is a program that makes it possible for the U.S. Government to dump our products at below-market prices on foreign countries at the expense of small foreign farmers, all for the benefit of the very largest, giant agri-conglomerates in the United States; companies like Archer Daniels Midland, Bunge, Cargill, Continental Grain, and others.

Well, good for them, but not good for foreign policy, not good for the American taxpayer, and not good for building long-term relationships. This is precisely the kind of corporate welfare that our constituents want us to get rid of. Here is our opportunity to bring it down to the level requested by the President and approved by the 1996 budget resolution that we have already voted for.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to inform my colleagues that this amendment has been endorsed by Americans for Tax Reform, Citizens Against Government Waste, Citizens for a Sound Economy, and the National Taxpayers Union.

Vote ''yes'' on the Hoke-Meehan amendment.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, after last night's debate, I think what is needed is some clarity on the issue. What many of the opponents of this amendment suggested is that this amendment is adopted, and Public Law 480, title I funding is cut, that starving people around the world would not receive food assistance.

If that were the case, I certainly would have never cosponsored this amendment. An action such as this would be mean-spirited at the very least.

Title I is a market development program, not an emergency humanitarian food program. Other titles of the Public Law 480 act are responsible for these activities. Title II authorizes donations for agricultural commodities for emergency feeding programs and to carry out activities to alleviate the causes of hunger and disease and death. Title III authorizes grants of agricultural commodities to be used for food distribution programs and development of food reserves.

The distinction between these differing objectives was made clear by the Committee on Agriculture itself. The 1990 Agricultural Development and Trade Act distributed the responsibility for these programs to two different agencies with distinct missions. The management of title I activities was kept in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that Members vote for the Hoke-Meehan amendment. The administration is in favor of cutting back this appropriation.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, title I, about which we are talking, is directed toward countries that exhibit potential to become customers of U.S. agricultural commodities. It is a program that serves as a vital link between the assistance we give to severely impoverished nations and business we receive from cash-paying customers of U.S. agricultural commodities.

So, Mr. Chairman, I stand today in strong opposition to this ill-advised amendment and must refute some of the arguments that have been presented.

First of all, it was stated last evening that several countries have dropped out of the title I program. They have. They have graduated from the concessional program to become hard-cash customers of U.S. commodities. In fact, 43 of the 50 largest buyers of American farm goods are countries that used to receive food aid.

□ 1315

Examples of this include Egypt, which now purchases a half billion dollars in United States bulk grains annually, and Pakistan, which has become 1 of the top 10 importers of United States wheat.

Furthermore, both of these countries have allowed privatization of their government-managed food importing agencies, a reform which has been furthered by participation in this program.

Some have said that this program has outdated objectives. I disagree. Market development and privatization are still very much in style today. Development of our export markets is as important today, if not more so, than it has ever been.

This amendment affects specifically title I, the portion directed toward economically stronger food-deficit countries that have the potential of becoming commercial importers, but it is an important part of the entire Public Law 480 picture because it allows a transition between the assistance that we give to severely impoverished nations and business we receive from cash-paying customers of U.S. agricultural commodities.

I also want to respond briefly to the argument the title I program was deemed inadequate by the GAO and USDA. That is not true. Both agencies have offered suggestions for refining the program, and these concerns will be addressed in the farm bill.

However, using the appropriations process to limit the role of our food assistance and foreign market development efforts is neither a timely nor an appropriate manner to effect needed operational refinements. This program is a win-win situation. We provide jobs for U.S. workers both now and in the future, and we assist struggling countries to meet their food needs.

I urge my colleagues, I plead with my colleagues, to vote against this ill-advised amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me. He has been a true leader in having U.S. agriculture address the nutritional needs of countries that are in desperate shape from a food need standpoint.

This amendment comes right at the heart of a very important program we have long maintained, using our agricultural prowess to help shaky countries with serious food need shortages for their citizenry.

What have we gained from that? The benefit of world leadership, the benefit of stabilizing very unstable situations and, finally and best of all, new customers for our agricultural products.

Following the GATT Treaty, we are in a critical period of shakeout in terms of developing international markets. We must maintain the funding for Public Law 480. Please, do not succumb to the very shallow attractiveness of this amendment. Please, support the Committee on Appropriations and reject this amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. EMERSON. I yield back to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this terribly insensitive amendment and attack on our Public Law 480 program.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution also. He is a distinguished leader on the Agriculture Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SKEEN. I, too, think it is about time we quit talking about corporate welfare when we do not even know what the program is all about. I tell the gentleman that I admire him for taking this on, his support for this program. It is one of the things that helps agriculture in this country. That is exactly what we need.

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The CLERK. The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOKE: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 726. The amounts otherwise provided in this Act for under the heading ''Public Law 480 Program Accounts'' are hereby reduced by the following amounts:

(1) The amount specified in paragraph (1) under such heading, $129,802,000.

(2) The amount specified in paragraph (2) under such heading, $8,583,000.

(3) The amount specified for the cost of direct credit agreements, $104,329,000.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, the Chairman announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings, and this first vote will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 83, noes 338, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

AYES—83

Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blute
Chabot
Coburn
Davis
DeLay
Dornan
Duncan
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Fawell
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gilchrest
Gordon
Goss
Green
Hancock
Hayworth
Hefley
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Inglis
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Klug
Kolbe
Largent
LoBiondo
Longley
Luther
Manzullo
Meehan
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Myrick
Neumann
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Petri
Portman
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Torkildsen
Wamp
White
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—338

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske

Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Seastrand
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Bateman
Brown (CA)
Collins (MI)
Cox
Crane
Dreier
Ford
Gallegly
Goodling
Moakley
Reynolds
Volkmer
Watts (OK)

□ 1340

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Mr. Dreier for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Messrs. ALLARD, RUSH, BOEHLERT, and Ms. FURSE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. DAVIS, SHADEGG, HOEKSTRA, SCHUMER, GORDON, and GILCHREST changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not know if any of my colleagues were as thrilled as I was when I was driving around my district, I think on Monday, and had my radio on, and heard that one of our colleagues, a colleague from this House, was the one that had the courage and the guts to have two of our fellow Americans released by Saddam Hussein. It was not somebody from the administration; it was not somebody from the Senate. It was somebody from our House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say I have been waiting all week to bring a little civility to the House, and what better way to do it than to recognize the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON]? We are in his debt for what he has done for two Americans and for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we are in his debt, and now we are asking him to free us from this institution today.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHood] for the very generous words.

Second, I want to thank all of my colleagues for their expressions of support.

I want my colleagues to know that this was not a solitary effort. I got support from the administration and many on both sides of the aisle like the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] and many others that worked with me to secure the release of the two Americans.

I also want my colleagues to know that Saddam Hussein did reject part of the deal, that being that I stay in Baghdad for a few days.

□ 1345

But seriously, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for the nice words.

I think that there is a role for those of us, many here, with abilities in foreign policy that can serve as mediators when our executive branch perhaps does not have the flexibility to do that. There are many here in this body like the FRANK WOLFs and JOHN PORTERs and NANCY PELOSIs and TOM LANTOSes and SAM GEJDENSONs and JIM MORANs and JIM OBERSTARs, all who have talents in foreign policy, care about human rights, and could very easily have undertaken the efforts that I just did.

I think it is important that as we move ahead in relationships with countries that previously have been antagonists, like with North Korea, that eventually we utilize the talents of some of our own, like JAY KIM and many others that have direct experiences on many of these issues.

To my colleagues, I thank them for their warm words. I am thankful for the support and friendship and the jokes, the Free Willy jokes, the many others that they have undertaken, but mostly to the gentleman from Illinois and to the American people and to the families of these two good men and these two good Americans, family values, two regular guys that innocently got caught and did not get a response from their government until it was a coordinated effort between the executive branch and the Congress. I thank you.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] 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 text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. SANFORD: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

''SEC. 726. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act shall be used for the construction of a new office facility campus at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center.''.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 221, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

AYES—199

Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Camp
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Cooley
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
Doggett
Dornan
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Furse
Ganske
Geren
Goodlatte
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson

Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McNulty
Meehan
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myrick
Neumann
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Owens
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Upton
Waldholtz
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Williams
Wyden
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—221

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Bartlett
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cardin
Chapman
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cremeans
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Funderburk
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kingston
Knollenberg
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Lipinski
Livingston
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McKeon
McKinney
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moran
Morella
Myers
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Bateman
Bonilla
Brown (CA)
Collins (MI)
Cox
Crane
Dreier
Gallegly
Goodling
Hoke
Moakley
Reynolds
Volkmer
Watts (OK)

□ 1355

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Mr. Dreier for, with Mr. Moakley against.

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

Mr. CAMP and Mr. WICKER changed their votes from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OLVER

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLVER: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel to provide assistance to livestock producers under provisions of title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1949 if crop insurance protection or nonuninsured crop disaster assistance for the loss of feed produced on the farm is available to the producer under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended.

(b) CORRESPONDING INCREASE IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided in this Act for ''Rural Development Performance Partnerships'' is hereby increased by $60,000,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 248, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—169

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Armey
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Castle
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Ehlers
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Furse
Gejdenson
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Pickett
Poshard
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Thompson
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wilson
Woolsey
Wyden
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—248

Allard
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bentsen
Bilbray
Bishop
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cramer
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Leach

Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martinez
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—17

Bateman
Brown (CA)
Clay
Collins (MI)
Cox
Crane
Dreier
Gallegly
Gibbons
Goodling
Greenwood
Moakley
Reynolds
Volkmer
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Wise

□ 1403

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Dreier against.

Mr. Wise for, with Mr. Watts of Oklahoma against.

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

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZIMMER

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 29.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZIMMER:

Amendment No. 29: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 726. (a) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out a market promotion program pursuant to section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623).

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided in this Act for ''Commodity Credit Corporation Fund—Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses'' is hereby reduced by $110,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 20, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and that he be permitted to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and that he be permitted to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. To make things clear to my colleagues in the House, the proponents of the amendment control 30 minutes of the time, 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER]. The opponents control 30 minutes, 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

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, this amendment would eliminate funding for the market promotion program, the program that epitomizes corporate welfare and congressional pork at its worst. Since 1986, one and a quarter billion taxpayer dollars have been used by MPP to underwrite the overseas advertising budgets of some of America's largest and most profitable businesses like Gallo, Blue Diamond, McDonald's, Burger King, Jim Beam, Hershey's.

I am proud of what this Congress has done to get the poor off welfare. I think it is time we showed the same commitment to getting the rich off welfare. At a time when we are eliminating hundreds of Federal programs for the sake of Federal budget reduction, we can no longer afford this program.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] plans to offer an alternative amendment he says can preserve the MPP and still get rid of corporate pork. Do not be fooled by the Obey amendment. It is just pork lite. Mr. OBEY proposes to eliminate from eligibility any organization that sells more than $20 million. You heard that right, that is $20 million, not $20,000, not $200,000, not even $2 million, but $20 million.

Let me put that $20 million in perspective for you. The average American farm household income in 1993 was less than $43,000. It would take that average American farm household 466 years to earn $20 million. Most American farm producers are lucky if they gross $100,000, let alone $20 million. In fact, only 6 percent of all American farms gross more than $250,000 annually.

So who is the Obey amendment going to help? Who is he thinking of? The average farmer who earns $43,000, or the 94 percent of all American farms whose total gross annual sales are less than $250,000? I think not. Under the Obey amendment, you will be asking American taxpayers to subsidize the advertising budgets of those who do up to $20 million in business, and as high as it is, even the $20 million cap would be incredibly easy to evade.

In yesterday's debate on this bill, we heard how the current $50,000 per farm subsidy cap is a joke. The Obey amendment $20 million cap can be breached by any competent lawyer through the use of multiple bogus partnerships and dummy corporations. The Obey amendment $20 million will not get Ronald McDonald off welfare. Instead of one application for MPP money for Ronald McDonald, you get 500 from Ronald's franchises.

If you do not believe that this is welfare for the rich, then support the Obey amendment. If you really want to help small American farm producers break into overseas markets, then vote for the Zimmer amendment and scrap this program altogether. The Obey amendment, no matter where it places its cap, does not address the fundamental bias that this program has toward big business.

MPP requires a 50 percent match, and Obey will not change that. So if you are a California producer with less than $250,000 in sales and you can spare $2,000 for ads, MPP will give you $2,000. But if you are big business with $20 million in sales, and you can spare $200,000, you can get $200,000 from MPP. If you want to get rid of corporate pork and if you want to help the small producers, support the Zimmer amendment, vote to end this fatally flawed MPP program and ask the authorizing committee to create a brand-new program for you, one that has not been tainted by 10 long years of controversy and pork. You do not need to do this in this year of 1995. When the farm authorization bill comes to the floor, seize that opportunity. Vote for the Zimmer amendment, and do not settle for pork lite.

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

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

Once again, we hear the stories of 6 or 7 years ago and most of them were wrong then, and to dredge them up over and over does a disservice to this debate.

Through the efforts of this committee, we have forced the Department to redo the way it manages the Market Promotion Program, the idol of all of the great pork busters when they cannot find a pig. It now targets the small, nonbranded trade groups. The success of this program is well-known, and we

will hear story after story today to show how this program benefits American farmers and industry.

This program means jobs in the United States, and to pass this amendment means jobs in other countries. Vote ''no,'' save American jobs.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join with my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER], to end once and for all and never return to one of the most ill-conceived and wasteful programs in the annals of congressional spending, the market promotion program.

Joining us in spirit, if not in person as a cosponsor and one of the originators, is no other than the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], who has worked with me for many years to kill the MPP Program. For 10 years this program has shoveled over $1.3 billion to pay mostly, not exclusively, but mostly, huge agribusinesses to advertise their products overseas.

The program was changed so badly, three times in separate reports by the GAO, for example, that Congress borrowed a tactic from the FBI's witness protection program and changed its name from TEA to MPP to give it a new lease on life.

Well, you can run but you cannot hide. MPP still brazenly gives cash grants to the biggest corporations in the world: $70 million to Sunkist, $40 million to Blue Diamond, $20 million Sunsweet, Gallo, $16 million, Pillsbury, $10 million, and a little hamburger company called McDonald's got over $1 million.

I have nothing against McDonald's or any of the other blue chip companies that receive these grants. They are what makes America tick. They are good. But it is simply wrong for corporations that grace the pages of Fortune magazine to receive taxpayer handouts.

Some companies never even sought the grants, there is so much money in this program that is unneeded, but took the money because USDA offered it free of charge.

□ 1415

USDA called Paul Newman's salad dressing company, for example, and asked if they wanted a grant. Now, is this a government program, or is this a Publishers Clearing House contest?

My favorite story, of course, is the one about the California Raisin Advisory Board. They received $3 million to introduce raisins to Japan. After this MPP fiasco, it will be centuries before the Japanese eat a single raisin. The Raisin Board used the same singing and dancing, ''I heard it through the grapevine'' claymation raisin campaign that proved so successful in the United States, but not so in Japan. First, it turns out that these claymation raisins were not bilingual, so they only sang in their native English. The Japanese could not understand.

Second, Marvin Gaye and his hit song, ''I Heard It Through the Grapevine,'' are virtually unknown in Japan, so the Japanese target audience did not get the pun.

Third, since the Japanese were not familiar with regular raisins, they were baffled by these gargantuan vaudevillian dancing raisins. They thought they were dancing potatoes or dancing chocolates.

Finally, and worst of all, the raisin figures that they had dancing had four fingers. In Japan, this is a very bad omen. It would be similar to the Japanese marketing the Nissan as satan. Therefore, this is not the only MPP-inspired fiasco.

A California walnut ad in Israel has puzzled Israelis scratching their heads. Only 1 in 20 Israelis could figure out what the ad was about. The rest thought the walnut was, you guessed it, a potato.

As bad as this program is, as tight as our budget is, as draconian as the cuts in this bill are for child nutrition, MPP, can Members believe this, received a $25 million increase.

Our MPP amendment funds this program at the level it deserves: zero. I urge Members to support a bipartisan amendment. Look who is supporting it: Heritage Foundation, the Citizens for a Sound Economy, the National Taxpayers Union, all the way over to the Center for the Public Interest, the Teamsters, and no group less than the Doris Day League for the Protection of Animals.

With all due respect to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one final argument. I hope those of the Members, and their staffs watching on the television, please tell your Member this. If we pass this amendment and end the program, we skip the next three votes. We will be out of here much earlier this afternoon than we would otherwise. This final argument is one that even the gentleman from New Mexico, BILL RICHARDSON, could not negotiate such a good settlement. Therefore, I say to my colleagues in conclusion, do not be fooled by any substitutes. Vote against the MPP Program.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, in response to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, I realize he comes from an urban area, but those companies he is talking about are selling food. Just so he will be reminded, food does not come from the grocery store, it comes from the farmer.

Beyond that, I want Members to know I strongly oppose this amendment. Just a few weeks ago this floor rejected an amendment to abolish OPIC, and the vote was 90 to 329. I know that OPIC is not structured like MPP, but they have the same purpose: to increase American exports; OPIC for manufactured jobs, MPP for agriculture. Last month's debate showed that exports not only create jobs but also create a positive balance of payments. OPIC creates American jobs. So does MPP.

Mr. Chairman, GATT allows us to support agriculture exports for a few years. Our economic competitors are using every legal means available, and so should we. I did not support GATT because I believe in fair trade. It is not fair trade if our competitors use tools that we deny our own farmers. Just look at this chart, and it shows what we spend as compared to others.

Mr. Chairman, the agriculture-related segment of the economy upstream and downstream from the farm constitutes about 17 percent of our gross domestic product. Agriculture exports have outpaced imports by about $20 billion in recent years.

Mr. Chairman, I just would like to remind this House that 43 State delegations supported OPIC last month, and we ought to be supporting MPP.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON].

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, the Market Promotion Program is the ultimate corporate welfare—giving millions of taxpayer dollars away to many of our largest corporations. It is good business to advertise overseas, and corporations would, and do, do it on their own. Our Nation's businesses are the best in the world. They know how to advertise effectively both at home and abroad.

This amendment will not put people in the unemployment lines as its opponents say, but it will help to get people off of welfare. People like Ronald McDonald, the Keebler Elves, the Dancing Raisins, and the Pillsbury Doughboy, to name a few. In fact, in 1993, the GAO reported that they could find no correlation between the amount spent on the MPP, and the levels of U.S. agricultural exports.

We are taking great steps forward toward shrinking the Federal Government and balancing our budget. Continuing the MPP flies in the face of all that we are trying to do. We are making tough choices and setting tough priorities so that we will not burden our children with a debt that they had no part in creating. Providing seed money for multibillion-dollar corporations to advertise beer, nuts, fruit, or any other product overseas is not one of these important priorities.

In tight budgetary times, this program should not have even survived—but it was increased by 30 percent. The MPP has already cost taxpayers $1.2 billion. Let us end this corporate welfare program.

Without the MPP, the raisins will still dance, the doughboy will still giggle, and Ronald McDonald will still smile. The difference is that Mr. and Mrs. America will not be picking up the tab. Vote ''yes'' on the Zimmer-Schumer amendment.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.

Corporate welfare, they say? The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] spoke of several of America's larger corporations. How about Bekins Skiff Orchards, how about McCluskey Farms, or western New York State apple growers? This program impacts on our farmers positively.

The MPP program, just this year, opened up a great new market for New York State apples in Israel. Trade sources in Israel report the market potential is 50,000 metric tons per year. This year we sold thousands of pounds of apples from New York State, upstate New York, to Israel. This means jobs. It means real income to our farmers all over the country, not just in New York. Stop this big city assault on our family farms. Vote ''no''.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER], cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a cosponsor of this amendment to end funding for the Market Promotion Program [MPP].

The Market Promotion Program, as other speakers have mentioned, reimburses companies for advertising and promotion incurred in overseas markets. While I fully appreciate the merits of export promotion, and I respect the motives of those who support this program, I must ask why we are even considering funding a program like this when our Federal budget is completely out of balance and we are nearly $5 trillion in debt.

The MPP is a clear example of a taxpayer-provided subsidy for dozens of American's successful businesses. In fact, over the past decade, the MPP has cost American taxpayers over $1.2 billion to subsidize foreign advertising.

Like with other programs, a case can be made that this advertising is helpful in selling our products overseas, but if the program is so successful, then the private sector should—and hopefully will—continue the practice without help from American taxpayers.

In fact, to their credit, some of the companies, including at least one in my home State of Minnesota, has been candid and honest enough to say that while they benefit from this program, they understand the need to cut this subsidy along with other areas of Federal spending.

This amendment is supported by groups across the spectrum including the Concord Coalition, Citizens for a Sound Economy, and the National Taxpayers Union.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying I am surprised that we are even having to deal with an issue like this in today's environment. I thought the people of this country made it clear in last fall's election that they want change, discipline, and fiscal responsibility here in Washington. Why then does spending like this still appear in a bill on the floor of this House?

Today, after years of overspending, we have no extra money to spend and we must discipline ourselves the way the rest of the world does. We must ask ourselves, not whether there is some value in this program, but rather is it more important to provide this foreign advertisement subsidy or make future investments in our children's education, Head Start, job training, and health care for the people of this country.

And what credibility will we have in trying to hold the line in those areas if we fund this program?

I ask you to bring some discipline and common sense to our work and support this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, this week all of us were greeted when we read our morning newspaper, regardless of where we were in the country, that the United States was experiencing the largest trade deficit in history, that we had an $11.5 billion trade deficit. It is ironic that today on the floor of this House, we are considering passing an amendment that would increase that trade deficit.

Our agricultural exports are one of the few sectors of our economy to have a positive balance of trade. We are exporting over $51 billion worth of agricultural goods, creating a $20 billion surplus of trade in that sector. When we look at this, we are doing this in light of the fact that we are being grossly overspent by our competitors in the international marketplace.

If we look what the EC is spending, they are spending 10 times as much as the United States is. On wine exports alone, the EC has their subsidies of $90 billion. That is more than we spend on the entire market promotion program.

We talk about the arguments about the major corporations and cooperatives in this country, but the only way a cotton farmer in California or an apple grower in Pennsylvania or a dairy farmer in New York can market their products overseas is through some type of cooperative or some type of corporation. The MPP gives the tools to the farmers, to the cooperatives, so they can compete against the unfair international competition.

Mr. Chairman, this program is a program that works. This chart clearly demonstrates that since MPP was instituted, our trade balance has gone up with our agricultural products. It is a success. Do not listen to some of the arguments of our urban neighbors and urban colleagues. Vote for MPP.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO].

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

Mr. Chairman, we say it over and over—if we are going to balance the budget in 7 years, we must make some tough decisions. Cutting the market promotion program is not one of them. This is easy. There is no way that this program can be justified.

We must ask ourselves if it is an essential task of the Federal Government to advertise McDonald's Chicken McNuggets, Gallo Wine and Sunkist Oranges in foreign countries. The answer is no. Yet that is exactly what the market promotion program does.

The supporters of this program are going to talk about how the market promotion program is justified because it increases economic activity here in the United States.

Which means one of two things:

If the program is effective, we should eliminate funding because these multi-million-dollar corporations don't need it.

If, on the other hand, the market promotion program is not effective enough for private corporations to justify spending their money on it—then how do we justify spending more taxpayers' dollars on it?

Either way, we should eliminate funding for the market promotion program.

Since the program began in 1986, Congress has spent $1.25 billion to supplement the advertising budgets of some of the biggest corporations in the United States.

In this bill, spending on the market promotion program will increase from $85 million this year to $110 million in fiscal year 1996. This is a spending increase that we cannot tolerate.

Mr. Chairman, the American people sent us here to do what is right for the Nation. They want us to cut spending. They want us to stop putting them deeper and deeper in debt. And they want us to build a better economic future for them and their children. They want us to shrink the size of the Federal Government—to preserve those things that only government can accomplish, and get government out of those areas that should be left to the private sector.

We must make difficult decisions on spending in order to balance the budget in 7 years. The Zimmer amendment is an easy one. Vote ''yes'' on Zimmer-Schumer.

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose any of these amendments pending on the floor

today to the 1996 agricultural appropriations bill which would either eliminate or reduce funding for the market promotion program.

□ 1430

Such an action would cripple American agriculture's ability to remain competitive in the post-GATT global marketplace.

Let me be clear about one thing. The world marketplace is still characterized by unfair competition. The European Union, for example, over the past 5 years has outspent the United States by 6 to 1 in terms of export promotion, and will be able to maintain this historical advantage even under GATT. The European Union now spends $89 million just promoting wine exports, which is more than we spend promoting all of our agricultural exports abroad.

The people that would be hurt by this amendment, which again comes from Northeasterners and I think is sort of a continuation of the overall war on the West emanating from Washington, DC, would be farmers and ranchers and the 1 million Americans whose jobs depend on U.S. agricultural exports. The fact of the matter is the MPP works.

Let me tell why. Arizona State University as part of a recent study completed analysis of the impact of MPP expenditures on 7 fruit and vegetable crops. The analysis showed that for every dollar of MPP funds spent overseas promoting American table grapes, there was an increase in value of $5.04. Even more dramatic was the return from a value-added product such as American wine. In addition, the study found that the return from the MPP to apple production was $18.19. The Market Promotion Program based on this study pays for itself and then some. The funds invested in the MPP translate into increased income for farmers, more jobs in the packaging and processing industries, and more jobs on the shipping lines.

Do not be deceived by these stories about so-called corporate abuse.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year I put together my own plan to balance the budget. I had to make some difficult decisions, but I learned a valuable lesson: If we're serious about balancing the budget, Congress has to stop allocating scarce resources to pork-barrel projects.

The Market Promotion Program is a flagrant example of misallocated funds. Last year alone the Department of Agriculture spent $110 million helping market American food products abroad: $2.9 million went to Pillsbury to sell pies and muffins; $465,000 went to McDonalds to market Chicken McNuggets; $10 million went to Sunkist to sell oranges; and $1.2 million went to the American Legend to market mink coats.

Ronald McDonald and the Pillsbury doughboy shouldn't take priority over feeding young children when it comes to Government spending. Congress should end the special interest handouts before cutting programs that people rely on—like WIC, and other nutrition programs.

Let's put an end to the Market Promotion Program. Vote for the Schumer-Zimmer amendment, and start cutting corporate welfare now.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing a lot of talk about the large companies and how they benefit, but there are a couple of small Maine companies that benefit, and there are companies in the Northeast in the family farms that do benefit.

There is a family in Yarmouth, ME, Chick Orchards, which has been run by the Chick family since 1933. They have 500 acres of apple trees and about two-thirds is planted as McIntoch. Last year along they shipped 36,000 boxes of apples to supermarkets in the United Kingdom. Norman Chick chatted with me a while Wednesday and he told me how important the MPP program is to his success. Each time there is a promotion in the United Kingdom, he sees an increase in demand, an increase in sales. The Chick family has been on the orchard since 1933. That is a program that works.

This year for the first time ever funds from the Market Promotion Program are going to be used by the lobster industry in Maine, in my State. With the help of the MPP funds, a good deal of their money is going to be promoting the Sprucehead Lobster Company and the Seaview Lobster Company in Kittery, and they are going to be part of a delegation that travels to Japan and Korea.

The MPP program does work. Trade is the future. We are not going to have subsidies and price supports into the future. We have got to be able to give the small family farms the opportunities to be overseas.

It does work, it does work in the Northeast, and it works all over.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

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

You are sitting in a beautiful restaurant, a little overpriced, kind of snooty, you are handed a list. See if any of these names sound familiar to you: Gundlach Bundaschu, Iron Horse, Trefethen, Chalone, Robert Mondavi, Far Hierte, Sutter Home, Fetzer, Dry Creek, Domaine Chendon, Firestone, Sebestiani, Simi, Korbel, Pine Ridge Parducci, Kendall-Jackson.

Wonderful list. Wonderful list. Why on Earth, please? Why on Earth are we subsidizing these vineyards for advertisement abroad? It is crazy.

The thing that I really do not understand about the people that are supporting this is that we have the same folks who are the most avid free traders, pro-GATT, pro-NAFTA, antitariff, anti any kind of barrier to trade. Yet they are saying, ''Well, we've got to have the MPP Program because we've got to subsidize them from within.'' It is just another way of having unfree trade. That is what it is all about.

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

Mr. HOKE. Did I miss one of them? Who did I miss?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. What I would like to point out to the gentleman, he did tick off a rather impressive list of wineries, most of which are small family-owned wineries. I just want to point out to him, of the 101 wineries participating in the MPP, 89 are small wineries.

Mr. HOKE. And probably 100 of them are from California.

Reclaiming my time, what I would like to point out, also, is that it is an extraordinarily regional kind of subsidy and welfare scheme. It goes 10 times to California what it goes once to Ohio. Ten times. It is unfair. It is crazy. It is antifree trade.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT].

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, it is fascinating that the proponents of this amendment, all from the northeast part of the United States, do not understand what we in the West do to help them sit in that restaurant and eat the food that is produced in this country and we do it because we export it overseas. A lot of our farmers in the West are potato growers, are apple growers, pea and lentil growers, and wheat growers.

The proponents of this amendment ought to come out to Washington State and see what we export overseas because Washington exports over 1 billion dollars' worth of agriculture products and those exports generate about $3 billion in economic activity and about 30,000 jobs in this country.

We benefit New Jersey and New York by the fact that we are able to export our goods overseas. We have to compete with the European Union who subsidizes their wine growers in this country to the tune of $89 million. We have to have this kind of assistance to be fair to the jobs and the economy of the Northwest. Vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT], a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, imagine that you are a chairman or a president of a major corporation in this country, and Uncle Sam walks into your office and tells you, ''I've got a deal for you. Here's the deal. I subsidize your foreign advertising budget, while in exchange you do nothing. You just get the money.'' That is how the program works.

Also, think of every single company in your State. Not just your Congressional District. Every company in your State. Unless you are from New Jersey or unless you are from California, Gallo Wine last year received more money than every single company in your State under this program. Sunkist received more money than every single company in your State under this program. That is simply wrong. We should not have two corporations receiving more than every single company in my State or your State or anybody else's State. That is not a good distribution of resources.

The people who support this program say, well, the return on the dollar is very good. There was one person who was attacking the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] who said, ''Wait a minute, there is a 5-for-1 return on my investment here.'' If there is a 5-for-1 on your investment, you would be a knucklehead if you did not invest yourself. If you are making that much money on the program, well, then invest. You don't need Uncle Sam to do it.

We hear in Congress that the private sector can do a lot of things better than Government. One thing is for sure. Private sector can do the private sector a lot better than Government can.

There is no reason for the Government to come in and subsidize these corporations. If there is a problem and if we want to encourage exports, we should do it in another way. But we should not be doing it by giving it to corporations who make millions of dollars in this country.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, the first 20 years of my life I lived in New Jersey and New York and Massachusetts. Then the last 30 I have lived in the valleys of California. I have learned a little bit in that last 30-year time frame, but I have not forgotten how politically attractive a cutting amendment could be for the people who think they do not benefit from these programs.

Let me simply ask the gentleman who works for the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] if he would leave the well.

I think this is a very important piece of information. The Europeans are spending a tremendous amount on export promotion. They understand where it is at in agriculture. Now with the GATT round completed, those subsidies for agriculture that are off the table are going to shift even more money over to the promotion of agricultural exports in competition with our growers.

Let me tell who these people are. They are people who grow 10 acres of almonds or 50 acres of prunes or 30 acres of wine grapes. These people are the heart of agriculture. Whether they sell through a small entity or a co-op or whether they sell through a large corporation, they have to find outlets for their products. They have to find income for their families. This program works. We ask for a 50/50 cost share. Nobody gets into these programs free. They have to think long and hard before they put the money on the table. But they have proven time and time again, as the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY] showed, to increase export sales and increase farm income.

Let's face it, folks. Mistakes can be made. This program can be and has been reformed. But it works. If we turn our back on the international markets, we are killing our small farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would eliminate the Market Promotion Program.

Every year, we see these short-sighted attempts to reduce or eliminate the Market Promotion Program. Fortunately, this House has kept this important program alive in the face of such opposition, and I hope we will be smart enough to do so again this year.

American agriculture leads the world in productivity and in total production. Agriculture accounts for our greatest export dollar. Agriculture and related food and fiber industries employ more Americans by far than any other industry.

However, one area in which we are falling short—and this has been analyzed by agricultural experts, the GAO and others—is promotion for our agricultural products overseas.

In particular, we need promotion for so-called value-added agricultural products. This is an area where our competitors in the European Union and Asia are making enormous promotion investments and reaping enormous returns. It is an area where we should be doing much more.

The Market Promotion Program is the program that fills this need.

Agriculture exports, projected to exceed $50 billion this year—up from $43.5 billion for fiscal year 1994—are vital to the United States.

Agriculture exports strengthen farm income.

Agriculture exports provide jobs for nearly a million Americans.

Agriculture exports generate nearly $100 billion in related economic activity.

Agriculture exports produce a positive trade balance of nearly $20 billion.

If U.S. agriculture is to remain competitive under GATT, we must have policies and programs that remain competitive with those of our competitors abroad.

GATT did not eliminate export subsidies, it only reduced them.

The European Union spent, over the last 5 years, an average of $10.6 billion in annual export subsidies—the United States spent less than $2 billion.

The EU spends more on wine exports—$89 million—than the United States currently spends for all commodities under the market promotion program.

MPP is critical to U.S. agriculture's ability to develop, maintain and expand export markets in the new post-GATT environment, and MPP is a proven success.

Our success with the MPP in California is very instructive.

MPP has been tremendously successful in helping promote exports of California citrus, raisins, walnuts, almonds, peaches and other specialty crops.

For example,

In Japan, MPP funds helped educate consumers regarding the high quality of United States cheeses. The result: a 15-fold increase in exports.

In Eastern Europe, MPP funds were used to provide technical and educational assistance to textile spinners. The result: U.S. cotton exports to this area rose to 1,100 metric tons with a value exceeding $1.4 million.

MPP permits small producers to pool the promotion efforts for particular commodity groups.

It may allow them to pursue new markets—markets they could not have pursued otherwise.

It may leverage their promotion efforts in a particular market that are already underway.

We have to remember that an increase in agriculture exports means jobs: a 10-percent increase in agricultural exports creates over 13,000 new jobs in agriculture and related industries like manufacturing, processing, marketing, and distribution.

The measure of any government program has got to be performance.

The Market Promotion Program performs.

For every $1 we invest in MPP, we reap a $16 return in additional agriculture exports. And as I said before, more exports means more jobs for Americans.

MPP has come under some criticism in recent years, and the program has been adjusted to take these recommendations into account.

In allocating funds, MPP gives small businesses the priority—we've stopped the subsidies for big companies that don't need the help.

MPP limits participation to 5 years—that means commodity groups will not grow dependent on MPP, but will use those funds wisely to put in place long-term, industry-wide promotion efforts.

MPP requires a cost-share—participants, including farmers and ranchers, must contribute as much as 50 percent of their own resources and cannot substitute MPP funds for investments they intended to make in the first place.

MPP is accountable—independent audits and on-going reviews ensure that the program remains effective and remains true to the intent of Congress.

In short, MPP is an effective program. If anything, we should be bolstering our commitment to value-added market promotion overseas instead of constantly whittling back our efforts in the face of significant investments by our competitors.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support American agriculture, support smart marketing efforts to promote American exports, support American farmers and producers, and oppose this amendment.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 20 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Zimmer amendment to eliminate funding to the Market Promotion Program. We in the 104th Congress have been struggling to get pork out of the budget so we can balance the budget. We have talked about the evils of corporate welfare.

Believe it or not, this Market Promotion Program, I believe, is worse than pork and it is worse than corporate welfare, because at least Federal pork and corporate welfare dollars are spent in the United States. The Market Promotion Program on the other hand takes precious and scarce Federal dollars and spends them overseas to pay for advertising for very wealthy, rich American companies, like Sunkist, Gallo Wine in my State, and McDonald's.

Supporters of this foreign handout use the argument that scarce tax dollars are being spent to convince people to buy American products. Well, I do not care what American products you are talking about, it is not the job of the Federal Government to promote American products.

□ 1445

The last thing we need is for hard-working taxpayers to be actually footing the bill for paying for wealthy companies' advertising. We do not want to use scarce tax dollars to convince the French to buy ''Le Mac.'' We do not need that.

What we need is open markets and let those companies handle their own advertising and produce superior products and we will win and we will prosper.

I support the Zimmer amendment, which will allow us to balance the budget by eliminating this unnecessary spending.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], a gentleman who knows the difference between a co-op and a corporation.

(Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed, of course, to the elimination of the MPP program.

In the first place, to kill this program with an amendment to the agriculture appropriations bill is simply not the way to go.

In my opinion it is clearly an attempt to set policy on an appropriations bill and it is a decision that we should want to debate when we talk about the farm bill, not now.

Mr. Chairman, this is not to say that I do not have some concerns with the Ag Department's administration of the program, because I do. In fact, I believe that the only congressional hearings that have taken place on this issue, on trade matters, with very few exceptions, have been my subcommittee. Those hearings were conducted by the General Farm Commodities subcommittee, the point committee on the new farm bill.

I wish Members who were offering this particular amendment, and perhaps others who support it, might have come to the committee of jurisdiction before taking an end run to the floor.

Even some strong advocates for MPP realize the political problems with the branded promotion part of the program where Federal dollars actually help benefit large private companies. However, the brand promotion increases the highest value and the fastest growing U.S. agricultural exports.

But I believe the changes can be made and I believe they will be made with respect to branded promotion. My subcommittee will address these matters at the appropriate time when we start marking up the farm bill after the August recess.

The MPP is just one of the few tools that we have that have been instrumental in assisting the United States in increasing and enhancing agricultural exports.

According to the testimony by the administrator of the foreign ag service, ''market promotion is really working the best.'' He added, ''To eliminate the MPP now, I think, would be not helping to keep America competitive in the coming years.''

The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is the market promotion has been a success. It is a good example of Federal, State, and private partnership which has worked well. It may need some reform, but this is not the time nor is this the legislation to do it.

I urge a no vote. Let us do it the right way.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the elimination of all funding for the Market Promotion Program for a number of reasons.

First, to kill this program with an amendment to the agriculture appropriations bill, is clearly an attempt to set policy on an appropriation bill. A decision we should want to debate in the farm bill.

This is not to say that I don't have some concerns with the Agriculture Department's administration of the MPP program. In fact, I believe the only congressional hearing in this Congress, relating to MPP and most of the other agricultural trade programs, was conducted by the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, which I chair.

I wish the Members who are offering this amendment, and others who support the abolishing of MPP, would come to the committee on jurisdiction before taking an end-run to the floor.

Even some strong advocates for MPP, recognize the political problem with the branded promotion part of the program, where Federal dollars help benefit large private companies.

However, the brand promotion increases the highest value and the fastest growing U.S. agricultural exports. But I believe changes can and should be made to MPP with respect to branded promotion, and my subcommittee will address this when we mark up the farm bill after the August recess.

Despite some problems, there is little doubt of the overall success and efficiency of this program. Unfortunately, like many government programs, the Market Promotion Program has been much more effective than it has been given credit.

The world markets are very competitive. In 1994, world farm subsidies amounted to $175 billion. That's correct, virtually all countries support their agricultural industry, and in 1994 those subsidies totaled $175 billion.

This year the European Union alone, will be spending $9 billion on export subsidies. The EU's overall farm expenditures is $54 billion. By comparison, this is roughly 10 times what the U.S. is expected to spend on agricultural trade programs.

The MPP is just one of the few tools we have, that have been instrumental in assisting the United States in increasing and enhancing agricultural exports.

According to testimony by the Administrator of the Foreign Agriculture Service, ''market promotion is really working the best.''

He added, and I quote, ''to eliminate the MPP now, I think, would be not helping to keep America competitive in the coming years.''

The bottom line is, the Market Promotion Program has been a success. It is a good example of a Federal-State and private partnership which has worked well. It may need some reform, but this is not the time, and certainly not the legislation, with which to kill the program.

I urge a ''no'' vote. Let's do it the right way.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT]

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I have to move through this quickly, so I am going to stand and state my opposition to the Zimmer amendment, the Obey amendment, and the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I come from California, a district which is dependent heavily on agriculture and we are also dependent on agricultural trade. Trade is the driving force for our economy in the Central Valley.

Today what we are trying to do is to penalize what we believe to be large ag companies. Let me assure my colleagues, we are not penalizing large ag companies with these amendments today. What we are doing is penalizing thousands of small farmers.

Let me give my colleagues an example. In my district, the largest wineries, the five largest wineries that participate in the Market Promotion Program, purchase 90 percent of the grapes. That is hundreds and thousands of independent grape growers.

Second, this Congress has already addressed the issue of small business during the 1993 Budget Reconciliation Act by requiring small business be given the first priority for funding of MPP.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I do not have more time, but I ask my colleagues to vote against all these amendments as they come up today.

I rise today in strong support of the Market Promotion Program [MPP].

Contrary to popular belief by some Members of this body, MPP is one of the most effective trade programs at the Department of Agriculture.

By eliminating the Market Promotion Program, Congress will be sending a message to Americans and American business that we can do without $1.4 billion in exports generated by this important program.

The Market Promotion Program is designed to assist in the promotion of U.S. agricultural products.

This program promotes American food and American farm products, not individual company names.

U.S. producers often find themselves competing not with their foreign agriculture counterparts but with foreign governments.

The European Community for example, subsidizes their wine industry $89 million annually, the government of France spends $229 million on the promotion of agriculture products and the Australian Government contributes $226 million to promote agriculture products such as dairy, wine, brandy, and processed meats.

By eliminating funding for the Market promotion Program you will be sending a message to the American farmers that what is appropriate in another country may not be appropriate in this country.

Congress will be saying that you can go out on your own and compete in a world market against foreign governments and fend for yourselves.

If the United States is serious about establishing fair trade and has the political resolve to establish its position in world trade, the Market Promotion Program is the right vehicle to use.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to that high-spurring, hard-riding gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Opponents of the Market Promotion Program have portrayed this program as ''corporate welfare.'' Nothing could be further from the truth.

U.S. Agriculture continues to face rigid competition in the global marketplace against heavily subsidized countries all over the world.

By helping U.S. Agriculture compete more effectively, the Market Promotion Program contributes to economic growth, job creation, and increased tax revenue.

Even Secretary Glickman has said, and I quote—''We cannot eliminate unilaterally our export assistance efforts at a time when the competition is increasing its investments in these areas.''

In Oregon, agricultural exports total over $500 million. Such exports alone generate over $1.4 billion in economic activity and provide over 15,000 export-related jobs.

Increasing exports not only helps boost economic activity, but adds to my State's and the Nation's job base.

I urge my colleagues to protect American jobs and reject this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the Members, ''Wake up. Look what is going on around here.'' We passed GATT last year. We passed NAFTA. We told the world we want to be competitive and now my colleagues want to cut the underpinnings that allow us to be competitive?

All you urban legislators that get up and talk about cutting this program turn around and say it is all right to use taxpayers moneys to promote New York, promote Massachusetts, and promote Atlantic City. ''Bring the tourists here. We will use the taxpayers' money to do that promotion.''

But when it gets to agriculture, ''No, we don't want to use any of that money. We don't want to promote.'' You walk into a restaurant and you talk abut the fact that there are all these big wine companies. There are also Chilean wines, European wines.

Do my colleagues know that the Europeans spend more money promoting European wine than is in this entire program? I represent small farmers who try to sell their strawberries. We grow more strawberries than California and the United States can consume. We have to sell them some place else. We have to have some help doing that.

They have to put their own money into it. They have to be in small business and can only be in the program for 5 years. This is a program that works. If we are going to be competitive in the world, we have to sell our product abroad. Do not undercut the small farmers in the United States. Vote no against this amendment and all the other ones that attack this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER], as the designee for the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], is recognized.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

(Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, let us be straight about what is going on here. This program is nothing more than a corporate grab of the worst order.

We are here on the floor of the Congress of the United States cutting the most important programs about the future of this country. Whether it is student loans or whether or not it is funds to assist our senior citizens.

But what we are saying is we do not have money for things like the fuel assistance program to heat or cool our homes, but there is plenty enough to buy a shot of Jim Beam whiskey to keep people warm at night.

We say there is no money to pay for summer jobs or paying for student loans, but the Pillsbury Dough Boy is going to go to the head of the class.

We say there is no money for public housing, but we are going to give wine to the homeless. And we have cut services for the needy and the frail elderly, but they will be able to go out and buy a cup of warm Campbell's soup.

We say there is no money to pay for the senior citizen's health care in this country. We cannot buy their pills, but we can buy them a pack of M&M's.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues let us stop what is going on here in this country with a corporate grab to grab the few dollars that are available to invest in the future of this country. These corporations are not the Ma-and-Pa kinds of operations that are being described. These are the biggest corporate 500 companies in America.

Ten percent is all they have to put up. The smallest vineyards in the country put up a very small amount of money and get a very small amount of money. The biggest companies, Ernest and Julio, the brothers themselves, stand up and get $22 million over 5 years to promote their wines overseas.

Let us be realistic about who wins and who loses in this country and who wins and who loses in this bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the Market Production Program is very important to the people of my district in Marin and Sonoma County, CA. The wine and wine grapes from my district, many of them that were listed by the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. HOKE] are famous worldwide. But these vintners have to fight to enter and compete in the world market.

The Market Promotion Protection Program, on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, helps these small wine producers. It helps them in my district compete with heavily subsidized foreign producers, producers who dominate the global marketplace.

The U.S. wine industry is at a disadvantage from the start because it receives no production subsidies from the Government. I repeat, no production subsidies from the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me today in an effort to level the playing field of the global market by opposing the Schumer-Zimmer amendment. Let us help export California products, not California jobs.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS].

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the MPP has been a tremendous success in helping U.S. agriculture, including farmers and ranchers in my district and in my State, compete more effectively in the international marketplace. It has opened up markets in Eastern Europe for the sale of more United States cotton, opened markets in Japan for the sale of United States structured wood panels and beams, and opened up markets in Mexico for additional apples to be sold. We need this program.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my friends who are world and free market traders, this ought to be right down their alley. This is their opportunity to support free trade by U.S. agricultural product.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER].

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is easy to get up here and toss around the words ''pork'' and ''boondoggle.'' This is a program that is working. It is working to create jobs in the global marketplace; 24,000 alone in my home State of Mississippi, over 1 million jobs nationwide.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on the Schumer amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, it seems like all the supporters of MPP are from the West, and I am, too, West Virginia. It is about 1 hour and 15 minutes from here. We have pockets of high unemployment, but yet the county that has the lowest unemployment is an agricultural county.

When my colleagues talk about pork, I would rather talk about poultry, because the MPP is helping move poultry into the Asian market. Take Hester Industries of Hardy County. Hester Industries, with $3,500 of MPP, of which they matched half of it, began a promotional campaign in Japan. In the last 6 months they have moved 100,000 pounds of drumsticks into the Japanese market.

Or Wampler-Longacre, a bigger company, yes, but using a little amount of MPP, which they had to match, I might add, they have been able to put hundreds of people to work, both in the poultry houses as well as the poultry processing industry as they promote their products in the Far East.

A very small amount of MPP leverages a large amount of jobs for West Virginians and, yes, in revenues for this Government as well as a healthy economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you to support the Market Promotion Program.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from our Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Dan Glickman. You know who is into market promotion big time under GATT, under free trade? Not the United States, not McDonald's, not Gallo. It is the European Union. As has been stated, they are spending more for wine export promotion than we invest in all of our products.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] should introduce their bills in the British Parliament and the French Assembly and the German Bundestag.

It is easy to say the check goes to McDonald's. It does not. It goes to the United States Poultry, Egg and Potato Council, and McDonald's matches that contribution so that that customer in McDonald's in Bangkok will eat American French fries and American Egg McMuffins, representing 2,000 jobs in New Jersey, 10,000 jobs in New York, and I would tell the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], 30,000 jobs in Ohio, not Chinese products.

□ 1500

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Since 1985, we have reduced subsidies, direct subsidies, to farmers from $35 billion in 1985 and $9 billion last year, and as we have brought subsidies to farmers down, what we have done is we have moved money into export programs so that our farmers have fair access around the world.

There are a number of programs that they gain access for our farmers. The market promotion program is just one of these programs, and the special part about market promotion is that this is value-added products. It is commodities that are produced here in America, they are processed here in America with American labor, creating American jobs that we can use this program to move these products around the world. As we continue to bring down subsidies to farmers, as most every Member of this Congress wants to do, we have to ensure that our farmers are not being unfairly blocked from entry into other markets around the world, because the European Economic Union is trying to steal those markets from our small farmers. It is not fair. This is a good program. Defeat their amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair give us an accounting of the time at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be delighted to give a time summary.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] controls 4 minutes, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] 5, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], the designee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER], 3 minutes, and yourself, 4 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Does the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] have the right to close? Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico as the chairman of the committee, has the right to close debate.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM].

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman for yielding me this time.

One thing that really concerns me in this whole discussion that is forgotten is that agriculture and the small farmers are going to take their hit as far as reducing the budget and getting to a balanced budget. In the next 7 years, we have passed a budget resolution that takes away $13.4 billion from the American farmer, and it is not just that, folks.

We are talking about real jobs in this program, and I think when you look at the proportion, if you are from California, we are talking about 137,000 jobs in California directly related to agricultural exports, and you talk about what the base closings did to California.

If you are in Iowa, Iowa is the second largest State as far as export jobs with 96,000 jobs; if you are in Illinois, there are 68,000 jobs.

I see the gentleman from Minnesota up here. You go back to Minneapolis and tell them you voted to take away 50,000 jobs in Minnesota and see what they say.

Defeat this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, we are conducting this debate at a time when our trade deficits are running at a historic high. Our trading partners must be looking at us in absolute amazement.

Agriculture is one facet of our economy where we actually sell more than we buy, and the old ''hurt America first'' crowd now comes after agriculture. When will you be satisfied? When we import more agriculture, too?

In fact, in the post-GATT world, we are in a vicious competition for new markets, and the Europeans know exactly what that is all about. They have committed many times the amount of support for their export products than the United States of America.

The MPP program is a buy America program. It benefits farmers, ranchers, American workers that process and handle the product, and shippers. In fact, there are 20,000 American jobs that flow from $1 billion worth of agriculture exports.

The MPP program is a critical link. Do not pull the pin on our export program.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I for the life of me cannot understand why we attack programs that increase ag exports and decrease our trade deficit.

We continue to cut agricultural programs domestically, and we need to protect and preserve our foreign trade and our foreign markets.

We need to do more, not less.

You know, this program, if it needs reform, let us reform it. Do not kill the goose that lays the golden egg of $100 million in economic activity, thousands and thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in tax revenues. Vote against these amendments.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

I was trying to find one of the proponents of this waste-of-moneys chart, but I cannot seem to locate it right, now, so I will not use it.

Mr. Chairman and Members, if we had an extra $110 million lying around

collecting dust, maybe we could justify giving it to corporations like Ralston Purina, Pillsbury, Snapple, name brand, very profitable companies.

But, my friends, we do not have an extra $110 million laying around. So at this point in time I think it is time to say we do not have the money. We have to abolish the program.

Why? What are we doing to the citizens of this country who provide those tax revenues? For the senior citizens of this country, we are going to cut Medicare by $270 billion. Do you know where the bulk of those funds are going to come from, my friends? From your pocket. It is going to come as out-of-pocket expenses to pay for the hospital bills and the doctors you are going to need.

So, as we give $110 million to E.J. Gallo and Pillsbury, you are going to pay more. For the students, $10 billion cut in student loans, they are not going to be able to afford college.

We do not have the $110 million.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I think the thing that is important for me today is I came here to balance the budget, and we have $200 billion in excess spending.

When I went home for my townhalls, I was asked to get rid of corporate welfare, and corporate welfare being those things that American people could do for themselves.

When I look at this program, even though for a time we needed help in the marketing, I have to say now it is time we let industry do this for themselves, we let the farmers, we let the companies that market it, we let you and I, we let the big corporations. At some point we have to say no to some of this stuff. We cannot continue to say yes to everything.

It is nice, But it comes in the nonnecessary.

And yes, I have farming in my State, but everybody is going to have to sacrifice just a little bit if we are ever going to get there.

Our grandchildren have to see us do this now, or we will never get rid of the debt, and we are giving this cost to our grandchildren and our children and they just plain old should not have this charged to their account.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, it amazes me here in the House of Representatives. We are very often trying to fix things that are not broken.

Certainly, the program that we are talking about here is not broken. What we must remember is that people just do not buy soybeans and corn and wheat and cotton. They buy cooking oil and cereals and clothing products that are all processed by foreign companies also, and our competitors, our competitor nations, are certainly helping them.

The goal of branded promotion is to persuade foreign consumers to choose and develop a loyalty to brand names by U.S. companies that utilize U.S. commodities. It is also important to remember that products promoted in this program provide jobs here in the United States.

This program, which helps us assist the really very positive factor in our trade problems, agriculture, is one of the great things we have got going for us. This is the thing we want to whack.

I do not understand how this House could come to the conclusion that we want to hurt something that is helping us so very much.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would devastate the Market Promotion Program.

Through the Market Promotion Program, funds are available to conduct promotional and educational activities including trade servicing, technical assistance, and generic and branded advertising of U.S. grown agricultural commodities and products in foreign markets. A majority of the MPP efforts are focused on consumer-oriented, high-value products—the products that are found in supermarkets.

The MPP also provides that assistance may be made to private organizations for branded advertising when it is determined that such organization would significantly contribute to United States export market development. This is the aspect of the program that has generated controversy, because some view it as unfair that individual corporations receive funds.

What we must remember is that people don't buy soybeans, wheat, corn, and cotton. They buy cooking oil, cereals, and clothing—products that are also processed by foreign companies. The goal of branded promotions is to persuade consumers to choose and develop a loyalty to brands made by U.S. companies and that utilize U.S. commodities.

It is also important to remember that the products promoted in this program provide jobs in the United States. Selling value-added products overseas not only supports agricultural producers, but also creates jobs in the processing, merchandising, advertising, and transportation industries. For every $1 billion in agricultural exports, 20,000 jobs are created in the United States. Expansion assistance, the value added portion of total agricultural exports has more than tripled, reaching a record high of almost $17 billion in 1994. That growth translates to over 220,000 jobs throughout the country.

Furthermore, the cost-share requirements of the MPP require private companies selling branded products, with few exceptions, must contribute at least 50 percent of the promotional costs.

In short, the Market Promotion Program has helped boost U.S. exports, promoted economic growth, contributed to agriculture's trade positive trade balance, created additional employment opportunities, and enlarged the tax base. It has been a cost-effective method for leveraging the growth potential of the food industry.

While there is room for improving MPP, it is appropriate to make operational refinements in the farm bill rather than to dismantle now what has been a fundamentally successful program. Using the appropriations process to limit the role of our foreign market developments is neither a timely nor appropriate matter to effect needed modifications.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment and allow true reform to take place in the pending farm bill debate.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment. Mr. Chairman, in this time of burgeoning U.S. Trade deficits, why would we even consider eliminating one of our most successful export programs?

Consider, for example, what this program has done for the walnut and raisin industries in California. In 1986 the United States market share of walnuts in Japan was 30 percent. As a result of a highly successful MPP promotional program, 9 years later the California industry controls 71 percent of the market and exports nearly 12,000 metric tons of walnuts to Japan.

The raisin industry has enjoyed similar success in the United Kingdom where agricultural exports encounter stiff competition from heavily subsidized European commodities. Over the last 9 years, with the help of the MPP, California raisin shipments to the United Kingdom have increased sixfold, capturing 45 percent of the entire market. Today California raisins are known and preferred by over 54 percent of the households in England.

Mr. Chairman, let's not penalize ourselves for succeeding. I urge no vote on the Zimmer amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I think we need to be reminded here in this body of some of the facts of what we are talking about today.

We are talking about reducing this appropriation bill. The $110 million is not in the bill we are considering today. It is in the farm bill, and that is why many of us are suggesting that we ought to take a look at the farm bill for this purpose, not this amendment today.

When we talk about this, I do not take a back seat to anyone on balancing the budget. Since 1981, the Committee on Agriculture has cut $50 billion from our function of the budget. Under the budget reconciliation bill, we will have to cut another 23 percent, and not from an inflated baseline but from a real baseline.

This discretionary bill is down 3.1 percent from last year, but it is completely overlooking we cut 14 percent.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] presided over that last year when there was a different chairman and minority member.

So let us keep our facts straight when we are talking about budget cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Zimmer amendment calling for the elimination of funding in general or that would limit funding for salaries and expenses associated with the MPP program.

The United States must compete for world export markets. The new GATT trading rules are opening markets throughout the world, and U.S. agricultural producers must compete for shares of these newly opened markets. The European Union is expected in 1995 to spend over $54 billion—$6 billion more than last year—under its common agricultural policy to support its farmers, including over $9 billion for export subsidies alone.

The MPP is a value enhancing program that gives U.S. agribusinesses the added edge to be aggressive in markets that they otherwise would not. A new national food and agriculture policy project study has shown a $5 return on each $1 spent in MPP funds for certain horticultural products and products derived from them. According to USDA, every dollar spent through MPP results in an additional $16 in U.S. agricultural exports.

Currently, the United States spends less—$85.5 million—on MPP for all commodities than the European Union spends on wine exports—$89 million. The European Union, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and other major foreign competitors are aggressively working with their agricultural producers and exporters in support of market development and promotion efforts. Such expenditures total nearly $500 million more than similar efforts by the United States.

MPP is vital to U.S. agriculture's ability to develop, maintain, and expand export markets in the new post-GATT environment, especially to some 20,000 family farms, that are members of agricultural cooperatives. As members of cooperatives that benefit from MPP, these families are able to engage in international markets that would otherwise be unavailable to them.

Our agricultural industry is the most competitive in the world, but it cannot compete against foreign governments alone.

Therefore, we need to keep the Market Promotion Program as it is, and allow the authorizing committee to address the concerns and criticisms of MPP in the farm bill. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against any amendments reducing funding for the MPP.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the Zimmer-Schumer amendment is nothing short of unilateral disarmament in the world trade war. They have replaced the peace-at-any-price crowd with the Zimmer-Schumer unemployment-at-any-price, because the Zimmer-Schumer amendment is a job killer. One million Americans work in businesses which have a direct interest in ag exports, and these are generally good-paying jobs. What the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] want to do is to cut out those jobs, reduce them, make it more difficult for us to sell overseas, while every major exporting nation in the world is pumping up its export efforts.

ZIMMER and SCHUMER and all of their friends would have the United States throw in the towel. ZIMMER and SCHUMER just do not get it. They should sit down in Tokyo and Seoul and learn the realities of world trade competition.

American products can win the trade war overseas if we are willing to fight.

The Market Promotion Program is a proven success. For $110 million we leverage $50 billion in ag exports, creating jobs and farm income across America, and that is a great investment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

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

When you sit here and listen to the debate, it boils down to ideology over realty. Stop and take a look at what is taking place with this amendment.

Some of my colleagues talk about big companies. You should be so lucky to have big companies involved. First, do you know what it takes for a big company to be involved in this program? You must cite unfair trade practice in the targeted country. Second, you want MacDonald's involved, because if MacDonald's is involved, every piece of beef has to be American, every piece of bread has to be American, every piece of cheese has to be American. Everything under this program has to be American. You should be so lucky to have the big companies involved in this program.

This program is for all the small companies, like the one in Door County up in Great Lakes, where 30 people have jobs because we are selling cherries overseas in Australia and opening the market in China. This is not an ongoing program. This is a beachhead program. Exporters get a few dollars to go over to these other countries to get them to understand what good products we have here in America.

□ 1515

I do not want anyone who votes for this amendment ever to tell me they are concerned about a trade deficit or jobs here in America. This is for good-paying jobs here in America.

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

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is an essential industry in this country. Agricultural jobs are very important to us, as are jobs in food production.

But there is absolutely no proven connection between the MPP and act exports or agricultural jobs, and do not take it from me. This is what the GAO, this is what the Office of Technology Assessment, has concluded.

In all the years of the MPP program, Mr. Chairman, not one disinterested group has looked at the program and come to its defense. They all conclude there is no evidence that these large corporations would not have spent their own money, McDonald's money, on this advertising if MPP were not available, and MPP has been under fire for all these years because the lion's share of its money has gone to the biggest corporations, and change it as they might try, this is still the case.

And so, as a result, in 1994, the last available year for data, while Berry Station Confectioners in New York, a small company, got $2,000 in MPP funds, Hershey's got $265,000, Tootsie Roll got $161,000, and M&M-Mars, which by the way, Mr. FARR, is in my State, got more than $300,000. In California, Ernest and Julio Gallo last year got a whopping $2½ million. Other vintners did get some money: $2,500 for Mountain View Vintner, $4,000 went to Sunny Dune Vineyards. Now we know why Gallo sells no wine before its time. It is waiting for its subsidy check.

This is not a regional issue, my colleagues. This is an issue that involves every State and every taxpayer. My State, as I said, is the home of M&M-Mars, of Ocean Spray, of Campbell Soup. My friend, the secretary of agriculture of New Jersey, and, yes, New Jersey does have a secretary of agriculture, is very upset with me for this, but I believe that we have to have frugality begin at home because this is a program that cannot be justified. It has been changed in its features; even the proponents of the program have said in passing that it still is not a program that does not need changes.

This reminds me of a story about the great baseball player, Leo Durocher, when he was a playing coach. He had a player who was committing error after error out on the field. Leo Durocher took that player out of the game, put himself in the game instead. The first play that happened thereafter was an easy fly ball. Leo Durocher dropped it. At the end of the inning Leo Durocher stormed into the dugout, told the player he had taken out of the game, ''You screwed up that position so bad nobody can play it.''

What we have got to do is terminate this program, pull it up by its roots, and allow the authorizing committee, the Committee on Agriculture, and the 1995 farm bill to come up with a program that will help exports in a way that does not benefit the biggest, and wealthiest, and least needy corporations.

In the past years the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], has led the fight against this program, and I will close by quoting him:

> The market promotion program is a corporate handout, nothing more. I wonder about our commitment to deficit reduction if we cannot take Betty Crocker, Ronald McDonald, and the Pillsbury Doughboy off the dole.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized for 1 minute.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, 10 years ago I thought it was important to have a cooperative effort between the Government and the private sector, not through subsidies, but through a cooperative effort. That is what this program is.

My colleagues have heard this is about trade. We are at war. It is post-GATT. My colleagues heard a lot of jokes earlier about raisins and about the Japanese. I ask my colleagues, Do you know the Japanese are our third largest raisin market? My colleagues heard talk about corporations. Sun-Maid is not a corporation; it is 5,000 farmers and 50,000 workers.

What we are talking about is something that we have got to do more of. We have got to be competitive in the world marketplace. The single largest positive balance-of-trade category is horticulture-agriculture. That is what we are talking about in the MPP program. We need market share, we need a cooperative effort between our Government and our American workers, farmers, and processors.

This program is $100 million. It brings back enormous benefits. It should be $1 billion. Let us knock this ill-conceived amendment where it belongs.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises in strong opposition to this misguided amendment which would eliminate the Market Promotion Program. If the other agricultural producing nations of the world did not grossly and unfairly subsidize the production and sale of agricultural and food products, this member would be more than willing to support this amendment. Unfortunately, free and fair trade does not exist in world agricultural trade. Even with the Market Promotion Program, U.S. producers are being out-subsidized by their competitors, including the very aggressive member countries of the European Union. The United States Department of Agriculture has determined that the United States would have to increase its current funding of the MPP by approximately 500 to 600 percent in order to catch-up with the European Union in consumer food exports by the year 2000.

The USDA recently concluded an exhaustive cost-benefit analysis of the MPP and the results are absolutely clear that a modest MPP Program greatly enables American agriculture to compete for high-value agricultural export markets.

Mr. Chairman, competition for agricultural markets in bulk commodities, intermediate, and high-value products is a high-stakes battle for good paying jobs here in the United States. Because of agricultural export programs like MPP, the U.S. agricultural industry currently enjoys a $19 billion trade surplus. With the help of the MPP, U.S. high-value agricultural exports have expanded by 75 percent over 7 years.

However, statistics and studies about the MPP do not reveal its total value. As the chairman of the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee, this Member witnesses daily the proliferation of nontariff barriers specifically designed to keep U.S. high value agricultural products out of developing markets. In Taiwan and Korea for example, MPP circumvents a host of trade barriers by creating consumer demand for United States products. This demand in turn leads to relaxation and reform of the tariff and nontariff barriers which deny consumers in those countries access to U.S. exports.

Mr. Chairman, MPP is an important export tool and a good lesson for other export-related industries; MPP enables our agricultural industry to sell directly to the consumers of some of the world's most protected markets.

This Member acknowledges that MPP is not perfect and agrees that certain reform of the MPP is necessary to ensure that it does not allow Federal dollars to replace rather than augment private sector market development efforts. Nevertheless, as the General Accounting Office has suggested, while reform of the program may be necessary, elimination of the program could substantially affect our ability to compete for lucrative and emerging markets throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, this Member urges his colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, here is the latest example of the bizarre sense of priorities prevailing in the House these days: Some of the same folks who have been arguing that this Government does not have enough money for school lunches are claiming that Ralston Purina and Fruit of the Loom should get more corporate welfare than ever before.

It seems we do not have money to clean up toxic waste sites, or to provide Medicare to elderly people, or to help students with college loans. But we apparently have plenty of cash lying around to give McDonalds to advertise Chicken McNuggets in Europe.

The truth is that in any year, the Market Promotion Program would be difficult to defend. But in this year when hundreds of efforts to help hard-working, middle-class families are being slashed or totally eliminated, it is simply astounding to see the Republican leadership actually increase this corporate giveaway program by $25 million taxpayer dollars.

We could be spending this $110 million to pay the salaries of 5,817 new police officers. Or we could pay for 56.1 million school lunches. Instead, we are going to engage in more business as usual: When it comes to tax breaks for the wealthy or corporate welfare for industry, there is no blank check the Republican leadership will not sign.

The Market Promotion Program is an insult to taxpayers and working Americans, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 154, noes 261, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

AYES—154

Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bilbray
Blute
Borski
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Burton
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Christensen
Chrysler
Coburn
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Coyne
Cremeans
Davis
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Engel
English
Ensign
Fawell
Foglietta
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hayworth
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
King
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Largent
Lazio
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Martini
McHale
McInnis
McNulty
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Porter
Portman
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Talent
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wolf
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—261

Ackerman
Allard
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Jones
Kaptur
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Klug
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Livingston
Lofgren
Lucas
Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy

McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Pryce
Radanovich
Rahall
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Seastrand
Serrano
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Spence
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—19

Abercrombie
Bateman
Brown (CA)
Clay
Collins (MI)
Cox
Crane
Dreier
Gallegly
Goodling
Markey
Meehan
Moakley
Quillen
Quinn
Reynolds
Stupak
Watts (OK)
Young (FL)

□ 1542

The clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Dreier for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Messrs. FLAKE, BEILENSON, FLANAGAN, and Ms. LOFGREN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. TIAHRT, DAVIS, YATES, GEJDENSEN, WELDON of Florida, LAZIO of New York, GUTIERREZ, DELLUMS, STARK, and BAKER of California, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follow:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: Page 71, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 726. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out a market promotion program pursuant to section 203 (7 U.S.C. 5623) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 that provides assistance to organizations with annual gross sales of $20,000,000 or more, unless it has been made known to the official responsible for such expenditures that the organization (a) is a cooperative owned by and operated for smaller organizations that are members of the cooperative or (b) would satisfy the Small Business Administration standards for a small business.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 20, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1545

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

The market promotion program is a program that is supposed to help provide funding for the promotion of U.S. agricultural products in foreign countries. Its original intent was to help the American farmer, I emphasize farmer, compete against heavily subsidized producers in Japan, Europe, and elsewhere.

This amendment is very simple. This amendment does not cut any money from the program. It simply says that you qualify for this program only if you are considered a small business under SBA definition, if you are a company with less than 20 million in annual sales, or if you are a cooperative representing a large number of small producers or companies and would under qualify the Small Business Administration standards for small business.

I have 10 top reasons for wanting to pass this amendment. They are as follows: Ernest & Julio Gallo received $6.9 million out of this program the last 2 years; Dole Corp., 2.4 million; Pillsbury, 1.75; Tyson Foods, 1.7; M&M Mars 1.5, Campbell Soups, 1.1; Seagrams, 793,000; Hershey's 738,000; Jim Beam Whiskey, 713; Ralston Purina, 434.

As I said last night, I have nothing against any of those products. I enjoy every last one of those products, every last one of them. But I would simply, while I like them, I would simply like to know that I am not subsidizing them with my tax dollars. I am happy to purchase them, but I do not want to subsidize them.

This amendment is not perfect, and I am sure opponents of it will find some reason to attack it for being imperfect, but I simply want to say to folks on both sides of this issue, to those like the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] who attacked this amendment during the discussion on the earlier bill, I would simply say this: Your amendment clearly overreached, but this is the only chance you have to send a signal to both the Committee on Agriculture and the Department that we want this program reformed.

To those of you who, like me, represent farm districts and would like to see no change in this program, I would simply say, sooner or later, if you do not reform it, you are going to lose it. With the kind of budget squeeze coming at the American people, with the cuts we are making or being asked to make in Medicare, with the cuts that are being imposed on us for education, for health, for job training, we have no business giving corporations on this list money to subsidize the exports of their own products.

I urge Members to support this amendment as a reasonable compromise.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the now famous, powerful committee.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding time to me. It is also good to see the gentleman from New Mexico. It is also good to hear from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] in his attempt here with this amendment to separate the wheat from the chaff and then try to export the chaff.

I rise in opposition to his amendment. Look, here is what this is all about. This is not going to take very long.

We must export high-value-added products. That is the future of agriculture program policy. The highest value ag products are branded products. These products are sold by brand loyalty.

The European Union has that all figured out. They will not let some branded products in. Here we have a Member of Congress that does not want to let the branded products out.

This amendment should be introduced in the Assembly of France or the Bundestag of Germany or the Parliament of maybe Great Britain. I have a better idea. What this is, basically, is just a revote on the previous amendment. You kill the branded products, you kill the program.

If that is what you want to do, go ahead and we can have a revote. But if you are really excited about a generic product as opposed to the laundry list of big companies who do such a great job on behalf of our farmers and ranchers and every consumer here with exports, let us just put it in a brown paper bag.

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

I would simply say, I am amused at the fact that some of the same Members in this House who will vote for a farm policy which will throw hundreds of thousands of small farmers over the cliff will bleed all over this floor for some of the largest corporations in this country.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The

able and brilliant author of this amendment has called it imperfect. I agree with him. It is imperfect. It has got two problems.

One is substantive. First, if you outlaw the brands because of certain corporate receipts levels, then what they are going to do is set up another entity that has lower receipts to channel the funds through there.

Also this, as the previous speaker said, should probably be handled by the World Trade Organization, the GATT language or whatever else. This is not the proper place to do it.

The second problem with this amendment, though, is an inherent problem, and that is that the big dog does have the tendency to eat first and, yet, in that process the little bitty puppies also get some of the bone. How can you promote American hamburgers without McDonald's getting their share of the market? How can you promote American wine products without Gallo being a recipient of it?

I think we have got these two problems in this amendment, Mr. Chairman. There is no need to rush it. This amendment does kill the MPP. Vote ''no''.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this amendment would preclude any corporation with more than $20 million in annual gross sales from participating in the program. How long are we going to hear about rich versus poor, big versus little?

I would remind my colleagues, if you are looking for a job, do you turn it down because the company is too big? No. We are talking about jobs, good jobs. Larger companies often provide higher paying jobs with better benefits. Besides, these companies buy products from smaller companies.

This program contributes to our positive agricultural trade surplus. Let us not divide and be conquered. Stand up for all American agriculture. Vote ''no'' on Obey.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, about the only agriculture I have in my district is at the swap meet. So this is not real big.

And I know the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has good intentions in this thing. I grew up in Sheldon, MO, about 2,113 folks. I went back just a couple of months ago. Every single one of those farmers are having to work two and three jobs just to hang onto their farm. I think where you have a bigger organization that supports those organizations all the way down, I think we need to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment as strenuously as I did the prior amendment.

We are talking competing country to country and small farmers in this country need large entities, in some cases, yes, corporations, to speak for them in the international marketplace.

There is no question that the Europeans are spending much of their taxpayers' dollars to compete with us, 10 times as much. And when you eliminate the entities that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] read off in the well, you eliminate thousands of small farmers whose ability to play a role in the international marketplace would be totally eliminated.

We have made it clear that small business has a priority in this program. These large entities will be using it less and less over time because promotions have a 5-year limit on them.

What is most important for people to understand can best be understood in the context of the wine industry in our State.

Yes, there are 101 wineries participating, 89 of them are small wineries. But when you look at it in detail, you will discover that the five largest harvest 90 percent of all the independently grown grapes in our State. They cannot succeed if this limitation is imposed.

Please defeat the Obey amendment.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 229, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No 551]

AYES—176

Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Blute
Borski
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bunn
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Christensen
Clinger
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Coyne
Cremeans
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Engel
Ensign
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Furse
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Goss
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hancock
Harman
Hayworth
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
King
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
Largent
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
McHale
McInnis
McNulty
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Petri
Porter
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Studds
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waldholtz
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wolf
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—229

Allard
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Frost
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graham
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hobson
Holden
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Livingston
Lucas
Manton
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meek
Mica
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Nethercutt
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Seastrand
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (TX)
Spence
Spratt
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Ward
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker

Williams	Wise	Wyden
Wilson	Woolsey	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—29

Abercrombie	Gallegly	Quillen
Baker (LA)	Goodling	Quinn
Bateman	Hefley	Reynolds
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Stokes
Burton	Houghton	Stupak
Clay	Lantos	Torricelli
Collins (MI)	McDermott	Watts (OK)
Cox	Meehan	Weldon (PA)
Crane	Metcalf	Young (FL)
Dreier	Moakley	

□ 1613

The Clerk announced the following pairs: On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Dreier against.

Mr. McDermott for, with Mr. Watts of Oklahoma against.

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. 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. KENNEDY of Massachusetts: Page 71, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 726. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the Market Promotion Program may be used to promote the sale or export of alcohol or alcoholic beverages.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 20, 1995, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be reduced to 5 and 5, 5 minutes on each side, and that the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] be allowed to control the remainder of the time on my side.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous ruling of the House and the agreement of the House, each side is given 10 minutes. We can, however, reach a consensus if both the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will yield back 5 minutes each.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, do we do that at the end of the debate?

The CHAIRMAN. the Chair will advise the gentleman, he can do it right now and preserve the other 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield back 5 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express concern about the proposed language contained in the Appropriations Committee report regarding the importation of Mexican avocados. This language is unnecessary and improperly seeks to create special procedural hurdles which the Secretary of Agriculture must overcome before determining whether to modify the embargo on Mexican avocado imports.

Moreover, the proposed language seeks to preserve technical barriers to trade of the type that Washington apple growers have been fighting for decades in Japan, Mexico, and elsewhere. Only recently have consumers in these countries been able to enjoy our apples while our growers enjoy the economic benefits of free trade. The United States is the most competitive producer of agricultural products in the world. Accordingly, we should act to encourage our trading partners to dismantle their technical barriers to U.S. agricultural exports.

THE COMMITTEE'S SPECIAL PROCEDURES ARE UNNECESSARY

The Department of Agriculture has been regulating agricultural imports successfully for over eighty years to protect American crops from the risks of imported pests or diseases. After extensive research and consultations with the Mexican authorities, the Department of Agriculture has now proposed a detailed plan under which avocados could be imported from one part of Mexico to the Northeastern United States, without risk to U.S. crops in the South or West. The Department has already held two public hearings on this issue and has scheduled five more hearings in August. Anyone interested in this issue may speak at one of the hearings or submit their views in writing. The Department will only decide whether to publish a final rule after considering all the views and evidence submitted.

The proposed language would state that the House Appropriations Committee ''expects'' the Department of Agriculture to ''ensure scientific credibility on pest risk assessment and risk management'' and to ''ensure that industry is provided with an opportunity to provide input on any proposed regulatory changes.'' This language is simply unnecessary. The Department has already published a detailed explanation of its ''systems approach'' to eliminate any risks posed by avocado imports. Moreover, the ordinary procedures for rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act already ensure that the industry will have ample opportunity to express its views in writing and at the five scheduled hearings. To the extent that the proposed language can be read to encourage the Secretary to apply a higher standard in this case than the scientifically-based standards ordinarily used by the Department, the use of this higher standard is unjustified and discriminatory.

The proposed language also suggests that the Secretary create an ''independent peer review panel'' before modifying the embargo on Mexican avocados. In other words, the proposed language seeks to create a special procedure applicable to only one product, from only one country. To adopt the proposed language would be to say: ''For all other crops, from all other countries, the Department's ordinary procedures and standards are good enough to protect American crops. But for some reason, the Appropriations Committee believe that the Department of Agriculture's well-established procedures and standards cannot be trusted with regard to one product: Mexican avocados.''

The committee language does not explain why these special, one-time-only procedures and standards are necessary in this case. But the reasons are apparent: referring a well-studied matter to an ''independent peer review panel'' is nothing but an attempt to further delay the import of Mexican avocados into the United States. The committee would cater to a special interest group at the expense of the American consumer by imposing delays and restrictions on the Secretary of Agriculture's ability to determine that continuing the embargo is scientifcally unjustified.

THE COMMITTEE'S APPROACH WOULD VIOLATE OUR TRADE COMMITMENTS AND HARM U.S. INTERESTS

Moreover, by encouraging the Department of Agriculture to delay the modification of an unjustified trade restriction, the proposed language would have the United States breach its obligations under two recent trade agreements: the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA] and the World Trade Organization [WTO]. Both of these agreements were approved by the Congress to promote economic growth in America, the region, and the world, and a committee of this House—particularly a committee which lacks jurisdiction over trade policy—should not lightly advocate breaches of these vital agreements.

Both the NAFTA and the WTO contain provisions expressly addressing this type of trade restriction, which are known as ''phytosanitary measures.'' In particular, these rules prohibit the application of phytosanitary measures in a manner which either discriminates against the produce of one country or operates as a ''disguised restriction on trade.'' These rules were included at the insistence of the United States. The American negotiators pressed for international rules on phytosanitary measures to prevent other countries from using such measures as non-tariff barriers to agricultural products from the United States. As the world's largest exporter, the United States has the most to lose from trade barriers, including the overbroad use of phytosanitary measures. Japan and other countries have used excessively strict phytosanitary justifications to restrict U.S. agricultural exports that compete with their local products.

It is simply inconsistent with U.S. interests to encourage other countries to delay changes to their trade restrictions by adopting special new procedures of the sort suggested by the Committee. You can rest assured that protectionists in other countries will be studying the Committee's language as a model for delaying access to their markets for U.S. apples, rice, and other agricultural exports, to the detriment of the American economy.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman from Utah, Mr. JIM HANSEN, who has cosponsored the amendment with me, and I appreciate all the hard work he has put into it.

□ 1615

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be titled the ''know when to say when'' amendment. It puts a halt on corporate subsidies to the alcohol industry to boost its booze abroad. It simply carves away a very targeted portion of the Market Protection Programs, the multi-million-dollar handout to the alcohol industry to lure drinkers in foreign countries. Over the course of the last 3 years, the taxpayers has reached deep into their pockets and handed over $24 million to the alcohol industry.

Let's just tell it like it is. The American taxpayers give subsidies to some companies that are making money hand over fist so that they can entice more people to drink. What we are doing here is financing a worldwide scam. We know what this kind of advertising is like. It is the most glamorous advertising in the world and hooks young people on the number one drug on this planet.

The wrongheadedness with which we subsidize alcohol exports and advertising by major alcohol corporations is compounded by the error of spending millions and millions of dollars to entice people to drink. It is a tragedy, and we should put an end to it.

Jim Beam last year got over $2.5 million to push its whisky abroad. Other whisky giants like Hiram Walker and Brown-Forman profited under this program. Even companies like Miller, Coors, and Stroh Beer get money under this program.

If that were not enough of a corporate scandal, we add insult to injury by asking the American taxpayer to foot the bill for some of the world's largest foreign alcohol giants. We actually pay these foreign alcohol companies to advertise our wine, our bourbon and our whiskey overseas. Seagrams, a Canadian company, received over $1 million from the United States taxpayers for wine promotion and nearly $150,000 to advertise Four Roses Whiskey in Europe and the Far East. Three English companies, including Guinness, have received almost $3 million to advertise United States-made bourbon and whiskey in Japan and Yugoslavia.

The Wine Institute itself spent $40,000 of United States taxpayers' money to fly a group of Japanese wine stewards to California for a weeklong adventure that included trips to several wineries.

The fact is that we are going to hear a lot of yakking from people that come from wine country that tell us that this is just a program to help out the small vintners of America. That is a bunch of hogwash. If you look at where the numbers go, notwithstanding the fact we heard the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] talking about the fact that 89 of the vintners are small, that is, 89 of 100 vintners are the small vintners. They also get the small dollars.

If we look at it, Ernest and Julio, the two brothers that stood up to Caesar Chavez, they get 57 percent of all the money that goes into this program. Fifty-seven percent to one company that only made $1.5 billion more. Fetzer Vineyards, owned by Brown-Forman, makers of Jack Daniels, Southern Comfort, and Canadian Mist, millions more. Vintner International, another one of the largest companies in this country in the wine business, millions more.

Meanwhile, the small vintners, oh, yeah, there are a bunch of them, Geyser Park received $999, Pine Ridge received $162. Santa Cruz Winery, $223, Santino Wines, $4,167; and Saints Berry, $3,892.

Ladies and gentlemen, let's break the back of those corporations that come in and try to jump on the back of the taxpayer in this hall and say to them that we are going to stand up to not only welfare mothers but we are going to stand up to this kind of corporate subsidy as well.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this amendment, while broadly worded, is frankly a loaded gun pointed at the American wine industry.

Second, it would not save any money under the gentleman's amendment. We all are aware frankly that our domestic wineries are at a competitive disadvantage as they attempt to compete with European and South American wines due to the export subsidies and frankly the trade tariffs that are imposed on our wine exports abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Fresno, CA [Mr. RADANOVICH], the first professional winemaker to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in protest to this amendment that is being offered currently. I am a winemaker. I do not take MPP's. I never will take MPP's. But when my industry is singled out among 20 to 25 commodities that are participants in the MPP program, I must rise in protest.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member also of the Committee on the Budget and I do not believe that programs like this are going to survive 7 years of budget cuts that are necessary in order to get to zero. But I do agree that those decisions regarding the fate of MPP must be budget-driven and they must be decided within the Committee on Agriculture under the direction of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], our chairman, not from someone who comes from a State where there is very little agriculture and no participation in the program. I rise in strong protest to this amendment and urge ''no'' vote on the Kennedy amendment.

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

Let me make two quick points. Even the gentleman from Massachusetts, the maker of the amendment, points out that 100 some odd wineries have been participating in the MPP. Of that group, 89 are small wineries. These are mostly small, family owned operations. Second, the five largest wine recipients of the MPP purchase 90 percent of their grapes from independent grape growers. The gentleman's amendment would hurt those small grape growers which again are for the most part small, family owned businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. What the Kennedy amendment does is single our independent grape growers across California. This penalizes farmers, farmers who grow grapes and sell them to the wineries in California and throughout this country. He is penalizing small, independent grape growers. If he has a beef with grape growers, do it a different way. This is not the way to do it.

There is $607 million paid in excise tax. That is what the wine industry does. It is a $9 billion industry in California. It is an important industry in California. It is about jobs, it is about American wine, and we should not single out this industry and discriminate against them. If we have got a beef with the grape growers, do it another way.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, although I respect the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do not support his amendment because this amendment directly and unfairly targets my constituents in Sonoma and Martin counties. These are the people who produce the best wines in the world. If this amendment passes, their world-famous wine would no longer be able to compete in the world market.

The amendment would devastate the small wine producers in my district, who rely upon Federal export assistance to enter the global marketplace.

Unlike Europe and South America, United States wine producers receive no production subsidies what-so-ever! Furthermore, our competitors out-spend the U.S. in export subsidies by more than 6 to 1!

Mr. Chairman, small California wineries cannot compete in such a lop-sided marketplace without some assistance.

The Kennedy amendment takes this critical assistance away from small wine producers. And, in doing so, it takes away jobs; it takes away trade; and, it takes away fairness.

We should help export California wine, not California's jobs!

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Louisville, KY, our mutual birthplace [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this amendment. This amendment singles out one industry for punishment. We all know we need to increase exports. We need to make our balance of trade come out better. I stand in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 30 seconds.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, in 1981 we had an interesting experience around here. We formed what was called the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving under Ronald Reagan. We spent 1½ years working on that. We took a lot of time to do it. I was privileged to sit on that committee and we did an exhaustive study of what was going on in America.

After we did all this and found out how many were dying as a result of drunk driving, paraplegics, quadriplegics and people with very serious back injuries, we found that the No. 1 reason was the enticement they had to get people to drink. This is a harmless little amendment. It makes a lot of sense. All we are asking to do is take away the advertisement in this area. We are not in any way changing some of these other areas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I point out that recent studies have indicated that moderate alcohol beverage consumption could actually be beneficial to personal health.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time evenly between my colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] will be recognized for 10 seconds, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] will be recognized for 10 seconds.

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of amendment that drives us all to drink. It is discrimination aimed at Wisconsin where we produce the finest beers in the world and we want all people around the world to share in it.

Beer is a very noble product, and an honored part of American history. Many American fortunes have been made in the liquor industry. The liquor industry played an early role in the wealth of some of the most prominent American families, as the sponsor may recall.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, we are almost out of time.

When we work the doors here, JOSEPH, because you are a fourth-generation Irishman and I am a redheaded second-generation Irishman, and remembering that redheaded patriarch of your clan, and some friends in Scotland assure me they will not be toasting you in the champagne regions of France and the distilleries of beautiful Bonnie Scotland.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Just say no, big BOB. Just say no.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] which would prohibit the use of funds in the bill to promote the sale or export of alcohol or alcoholic beverages.

This amendment is targeted at the Market Promotion Program [MPP].

MPP is a good program which is conducting important value-added marketing overseas. It works effectively, and MPP has been a crucial element of improving the export situation of our domestic wine industry, centered in California.

The California wine industry produces an award-winning, high-value product that can compete with the best of the world's wine industries—but we need MPP to help get that message out.

U.S. wine production represents approximately 6.5 percent of world production. However, despite aggressive export growth during the past 6 years, the industry has only a 3.0 percent market share of wine exports.

We need MPP to help us do better.

We need to remember that the European Union spends more on export promotion for wine than the United States spends in promoting all of our agricultural products.

The European Community wine industries are heavily subsidized—to the tune of $1.5 billion, which includes $90 million for export promotion.

Other countries then do even more. For example, the Italian Trade Commission is funded for an additional $25 million.

When it comes to the wine industry, MPP is a program that helps small business.

In 1994, for example, 101 wineries participated in MPP and 89 were small wineries.

MPP promotes independent business.

The five largest wine recipients of MPP funds purchase over 90 percent of their grapes from independent grape growers.

In short, we will continue to battle for our fair share of foreign markets. But we need an export promotion program to allow us to achieve our competitive potential.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the Kennedy amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, 1995, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTSCH

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. DEUTSCH:

Amendment No. 5: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 726. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to, or to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out a market promotion program pursuant to section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) that provides assistance to, the U.S. Mink Export Development Council or any mink industry trade association.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 20, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida for 10 minutes, and, in opposition, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman if he would yield back 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back 5 minutes before we begin.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is corporate welfare at its absolute worst; at its absolute worst. This is a program that spends about $2 million a year on the U.S. Mink Export Development Council, a council that is managed by four people, an attorney and assistant and representatives of two companies. Those two companies get 98 percent of the funds of that $2 million.

One of those companies happens to be a Canadian company. Actually, it is a subsidiary of a Canadian company whose gross revenues are 3.9 billion American dollars. What do they spend this money on every year? They spend it on fashion shows overseas and many times even work that is done to bring it back to the United States.

This is a copy of one of the fashion shows that does not even describe the minks or the mink stoles as America product.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an amendment against mink farmers; it is an amendment against the U.S. Mink Export Development Council program.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment, and I again say through the efforts of this committee we have forced the Department to redo the way that it manages the market Promotion Program and it now targets the small, nonbranded groups.

We cannot pick apart this program and make it work. This program is good for America. Do not destroy this program. This program means jobs to the United States. To pass this amendment means jobs in other countries. Vote no and save American jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Deutsch amendment, because what it boils down to is a short-sighted attempt to exclude one particular industry from participation in this promotion program simply because animal rights activists do not like that industry.

The funding to promote U.S. mink exports to foreign markets is by law used only to promote the sale of U.S. produced mink and only U.S. mink ranchers can benefit from this program. The funding benefits only U.S. entities, just as every other MPP-funded program does. Ninty-five percent of U.S. produced mink are sold through two auction houses; one of them a rancher cooperative, that is rancher-owned, the other is substantially owned by hundreds of U.S. mink ranchers.

It is ridiculous to say that the mink ranchers who produce all those pelts do not benefit by the marketing work done by these two companies. I cannot honestly understand how less than $2 million in marketing assistance to U.S. mink exporters can be truthfully characterized as ''wasteful spending.''

It is not a give away. It is a matching funds program which helps counter the massive subsidies that European countries give directly to their mink producers.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the questions we will answer when we vote on this amendment are these: Shall Congress discriminate against the MPP mink program just because it helps market U.S.-produced mink and not American seafood, paper products, grapes, walnuts, chocolate, cotton, raisins, feed grains, meats, wheat, rice, apples, wine or citrus from Florida and other States, even though the mink industry receives less marketing subsidy than any of these industries; and, shall Congress deny marketing assistance to the mink industry for the sole purpose of satisfying the extremists animal rights lobby?

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I think the rational answer to those questions, and the only real answer to those questions, is a resounding ''no.'' I urge my colleagues to join me in voting a resounding ''no'' on the amendment.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, this is another one of those squirrely little issues where you have friends on both sides of the issues. But of all the subjects in all of the trade issues on the planet, why either party should be helping mink manufacturers, I do not know.

This would be a hard sell at any town hall meeting in America, and I would say if there was ever an industry that was on its own, it ought to be the mink industry.

Before we end up discussing vicuna coats and plain-cloth Republican coats or Democratic coats, I know my party has had an image problem for about 50 years as the party of the big guy, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle get away with bloody murder, being the party of the little guy. I say let those little minks fight for themselves without Federal tax dollars.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is a major Idaho industry. With 21,000 farmers and ranchers, its annual production totals nearly $3 billion. This translates into billions of dollars in additional economic activity as well as an expanded tax base and tens of thousands of jobs.

This amendment arbitrarily excludes a small, yet very important part of this economy from participation in the MPP Program. Groups who do not believe that animals should be used for food, clothing or medical research are trying to prevent any MPP money from being used to retain and develop overseas markets for U.S.-produced mink.

MPP Program helps U.S. mink ranchers counter the efforts of massive production subsidies which go to foreign mink ranchers. In Idaho alone, the economic impact of the mink industry is $7.3 million a year. MPP funding to promote mink exports is an investment with a 5,000 percent return. For about $2 million, the MPP helps the U.S. mink industry achieve over $100 million in export sales each years.

Additionally, the United States mink industry has successfully promoted the superior quality of United States mink to quality-conscious furriers and importers in Italy, Japan, Hong Kong, and elsewhere. Over 95 percent of the U.S. mink industry's total sales will be exported this year.

Contrary to the comments made that MPP funds go to big corporations, all of the branded mink participants in the MPP Program are classified as ''small entities'' by the SBA. The industry is made up of small, family owned mink ranches in 28 States. MPP marketing assistance has helped the mink producers survive 5 years of global over production caused by direct and indirect subsidization in China, Russia, and mostly in Scandinavian countries.

I urge my colleagues to reject this anti-jobs amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly oppose the Deutsch amendment. My colleagues need to understand what is going on here. Ninety-five percent of our market of mink, the mink ranchers in my district, is overseas. They have no Government program. They have no other money that comes to them, except for this MPP program. It is only $1.9 million.

If we destroy this industry, what we are going to do is what we did with the wool and mohair industry; we are just going to give that industry to the foreign countries, to the Danish, to the Norwegians, to the Finlanders.

Mr. Chairman, I can personally tell my colleagues that these mink ranchers are having a tough time. They are on the verge of going out of business anyway. They do not need us to single them out with this amendment and make the situation harder.

Mr. Chairman, this is not about MPP. What this is about are the animal rights folks, who do not like these people, trying to drive one more nail in their coffin.

I ask my colleagues to strongly oppose this amendment and maintain the mink industry in this country. These are good people, family farmers. We do not need to put them out of business.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. During the last few days, we have heard clearly what the plot to balance the budget is all about. The plot to balance the budget is merely to squeeze out money from Medicare and Medicaid and money for the cities.

The plot to balance the budget is not sincere at all, because we are refusing to take away taxpayer subsidies for tobacco. We will not take away taxpayer subsidies for alcohol. We will not take away taxpayers subsidies for mink coats. How are we going to balance the budget?

It would be only fair if you were to offer export promotion funds for everybody. I have a used clothing processing plant in Brooklyn, the largest in the world, and they export used clothing to all parts of the world. The underdeveloped world buys a lot of used clothes. They should have the export advertising subsidy also. They should get in on it also.

All products, such as automobiles, have a hard time in Japan. They should have the export promotion program also. We should be fair and have socialized marketing across the board; never balance the budget, cut Medicare and Medicaid.

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], the cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I tried to avoid participating in the debate today, because we are all tired and we all feel strongly about these issues. But I have a hard time recognizing we have annual deficits at over $200 billion a year, our national debt is close to $4.8 trillion, and I am going back to my district and telling them we are slowing the growth of Medicare, we are slowing the growth of Medicaid. We are cutting housing programs, we are cutting education programs, but we are going to subsidize tobacco, alcohol, and mink export?

This, to me, is an obscenity. I join my colleague and thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such times as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated, this is truly corporate welfare at its worst. I ask my colleagues to take a look at the specifics of this particular program, what it really does. It is almost beyond belief what this program does. It is almost a parody of government gone crazy in terms of corporate welfare.

We have about $2 million a year, we give it to the U.S. Mink Export Development Council managed by 4 people, 2 of whom are representatives of companies. One is an attorney for the council and one an assistant.

Those people then all of a sudden, lo and behold, give 98 percent of the money that they get to the 2 companies represented on the board, at which point they then spend the money for fashion shows all over the world; Mainland China, Japan, Korea, Italy, and it is unclear what is going on.

One of the companies is a $3.9 billion gross sales a year Canadian company. It is foreign corporate welfare. We are doing so well today in America that we can afford foreign corporate welfare.

It is not about mink farmers; it is about this particular program. If we cannot get rid of this, we are not going to get rid of anything.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Deutsch-Shays amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New Mexico, Mr. SKEEN, for yielding, and thank my colleagues in the House for their endurance during this entire consideration of the agriculture appropriation bill.

The amendment that we have before us has been explained very clearly by my colleagues that have proceeded me. There are two exchanges that handle U.S. furs for mink producers in America. It is the Seattle Fur Exchange, a co-op of ranchers out West. Here in the East, it is the New York market and 36 percent of it is owned by small mink farmers around the country.

But this program is about helping small farmers around our country. It is not about helping corporations. It is about helping our farmers compete in a world market where they have to compete with subsidized furs from all around the world. This program has helped open markets for U.S. producers. They have been through 5 years of almost all of them going out of business. They are actually starting to make some money, and pulling the plug on this program at this time, frankly, is not fair to them.

In the budget, agriculture is taking its hit. We are going to be putting up somewhere between $17 and $20 billion over the next 7 years to balance the budget. We are going to do our share. But this is not the way to do it.

But let me say to my colleagues that this amendment is more than about cutting money. Some who are interested in this amendment are interested in it only for one reason, because they want us to kneel down at the altar of political correctness of those radical animal rights people who do not want you to wear mink, they do not want to wear mink. They are bringing this to the floor of the House and it is unfair. Vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH}.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and, pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, 1995, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, 1995, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

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

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a 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 refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEUTSCH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been requested. Those in support of the request for recorded vote will rise and be counted.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. A quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for an electronic vote ordered on the pending question following this quorum call.

□ 1645

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I had an amendment and enough people rose to ask for a recorded vote. You assured me that we had, and were going to have a recorded vote on my amendment. Are we having a recorded vote on my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair announced at that point, the Chair began to count for a recorded vote. The Chair then remembered the planned order to postpone any request for a recorded vote until later on. It was a mistake on the part of the Chair not to immediately postpone the request for a recorded vote, without counting for a sufficient number to support a recorded vote. When proceedings later resumed, the request was not supported by a sufficient number.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Wait a second, could I have unanimous consent to have another attempt to have that vote, please?

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

There was no objection.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote on the Kennedy amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will vacate all proceedings since the resumption of unfinished business, to include those on the point of no quorum raised by the gentleman from Florida,

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RIGGS. Just to establish the sequence of the votes now, will we be voting first on the Kennedy amendment followed by the Deutsch amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will begin again, and it will be clear in just a minute.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, proceedings will now resume on

those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

The amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] 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 CHAIRMAN. The Chair tells Members this will be a firm 17-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 268, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

AYES—130

Archer
Armey
Bachus
Barcia
Bartlett
Bass
Beilenson
Bereuter
Blute
Borski
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Christensen
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Coyne
Crapo
Davis
DeLay
Doyle
Duncan
Ensign
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Flake
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hayworth
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Inglis
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
King
LaFalce
Largent
Lewis (GA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Luther
Markey
Martini
McHale
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Mfume
Minge
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Porter
Poshard
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Scarborough
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Stockman
Tate
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waldholtz
Wamp
Waters
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wolf
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—268

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cramer
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hancock
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennelly
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Lipinski
Livingston
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKinney
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce
Radanovich
Rahall
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scott
Shadegg
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Studds
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Ward
Watt (NC)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—36

Abercrombie
Baker (LA)
Bateman
Brown (CA)
Burton
Clay
Collins (MI)
Cox
Crane
Dreier
Ehlers
Foglietta
Gallegly
Geren
Goodling
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hilliard
Houghton
Lantos
McDermott
Meehan
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Ortiz
Quillen
Quinn
Reynolds
Seastrand
Stokes
Stupak
Torricelli
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Young (FL)

□ 1707

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Dreier against.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. BARR changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CANADY of Florida, SMITH of Michigan, BARTLETT of Maryland, and GRAHAM changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEUTSCH

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] 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. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] has demanded a recorded vote.

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 232, noes 160, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—232

Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blute
Boehlert
Borski
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Burr
Buyer
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dixon
Doggett
Dornan
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gilman
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hayworth
Heineman
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
King
Klink
LaFalce
Largent
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Norwood

Olver
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Studds
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waldholtz
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—160

Allard
Armey
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bereuter
Bevill
Bishop
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clinger
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cramer
Crapo
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Frost
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefner
Herger
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kennelly
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Martinez
Matsui
McCrery
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Nethercutt
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Radanovich
Rahall
Roberts
Rogers
Rose
Saxton
Schaefer
Scott
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tucker
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Watt (NC)
White
Whitfield
Wise
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—42

Abercrombie
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Brown (CA)
Burton
Clay
Collins (MI)
Cox
Crane
Dreier
Ehlers
Foglietta
Gallegly
Geren
Goodling
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hilliard
Houghton
Johnston
Lantos
McDermott
Meehan
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Ortiz
Owens
Quillen
Quinn
Reynolds
Seastrand
Shadegg
Stokes
Stupak
Torricelli
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Young (FL)

□ 1716

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Barton against.
Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. Ehlers against.
Mr. Dreier for, with Mr. Hastings against.
Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. Dermott against.
Mr. Shadegg for, with Mr. Watts against.

Messrs. JOHNSON of South Dakota, GORDON, HOKE, VOLKMER, GREENWOOD, SMITH of Texas, and MANZULLO changed their votes from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, at this point in the RECORD I insert a table that shows a comparison of accounts in the bill.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	2,801,000	2,886,000	10,227,000	+7,426,000	+7,341,000
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist		4,240,000	3,748,000	+3,748,000	-492,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics	540,000			-540,000	
World Agricultural Outlook Board	2,496,000			-2,496,000	
National Appeals Division		12,166,000	11,846,000	+11,846,000	-320,000
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	5,795,000	5,899,000	5,899,000	+104,000	
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization		724,000			-724,000
Total, Executive Operations	8,833,000	23,029,000	21,493,000	+12,660,000	-1,536,000
Chief Financial Officer	580,000	4,952,000	4,133,000	+3,553,000	-819,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	596,000	616,000	596,000		-20,000
Agriculture buildings and facilities (USDA)	135,193,000	135,774,000	135,774,000	+581,000	
Payments to GSA	(87,957,000)	(89,971,000)	(89,971,000)	(+2,014,000)	
Building operations and maintenance	(18,614,000)	(20,216,000)	(20,216,000)	(+1,602,000)	
Repairs, renovations, and construction	(28,622,000)	(25,587,000)	(25,587,000)	(-3,035,000)	
Advisory committees (USDA)	698,000	695,000	600,000	-128,000	-95,000
Hazardous waste management	15,700,000	15,700,000	15,700,000		
Departmental administration	26,187,000	27,347,000	27,886,000	+1,799,000	+539,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	1,764,000	1,836,000	3,797,000	+2,033,000	+1,959,000
Office of Communications	5,198,000	5,890,000	5,198,000		-692,000
Office of the Inspector General	63,418,000	64,739,000	63,639,000	+221,000	-1,100,000
Office of the General Counsel	25,992,000	27,860,000	27,860,000	+1,868,000	
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics	520,000	535,000	520,000		-15,000
Economic Research Service	53,936,000	54,665,000	53,131,000	-805,000	-1,534,000
National Agricultural Statistics Service	81,424,000	89,837,000	81,107,000	-317,000	-8,730,000
Agricultural Research Service	714,889,000	709,810,000	705,810,000	-9,079,000	-4,200,000
Human Nutrition Information Service	(10,618,000)				
Buildings and facilities	43,718,000	30,200,000	30,200,000	-13,518,000	
Total, Agricultural Research Service	758,407,000	740,010,000	735,810,000	-22,597,000	-4,200,000
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Activities:					
Research and education activities	433,436,000	432,212,000	389,372,000	-44,068,000	-42,840,000
Native Americans Institutions Endowment Fund		(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)	(+4,600,000)	
Buildings and facilities	62,744,000			-62,744,000	
Extension Activities	438,744,000	437,552,000	413,257,000	-25,487,000	-24,295,000
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Activities	934,926,000	869,764,000	802,629,000	-132,297,000	-67,135,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs	605,000	625,000	605,000		-20,000
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses	443,651,000	430,279,000	433,664,000	-9,987,000	+3,385,000
Special fund, user fees 1/	(96,660,000)	(100,254,000)	(100,254,000)	(+3,594,000)	
Buildings and facilities	6,973,000	12,541,000	12,541,000	+5,568,000	
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	450,624,000	442,820,000	446,205,000	-4,419,000	+3,385,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services	56,591,000	50,807,000	46,862,000	-9,929,000	-3,945,000
New user fees	(4,452,000)	(3,887,000)	(3,887,000)	(-565,000)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(57,054,000)	(56,461,000)	(56,461,000)	(+1,407,000)	
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	10,309,000	10,451,000	10,451,000	+142,000	
Payments to States and possessions	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,000,000	-200,000	-200,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	66,100,000	62,258,000	58,113,000	-8,987,000	-4,145,000
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration	23,314,000	23,679,000	23,058,000	-256,000	-621,000
Inspection and Weighing Services (limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(42,784,000)	(42,784,000)	(42,784,000)		
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety		580,000	450,000	+450,000	-130,000
Food Safety and Inspection Service	516,738,000	594,889,000	540,365,000	+23,627,000	-54,524,000
Lab accreditation fees 2/	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)		
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	3,178,784,000	3,254,178,000	3,062,196,000	-116,588,000	-191,982,000
Farm Assistance Program					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	549,000	570,000	549,000		-21,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Consolidated Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses		811,771,000	805,888,000	+805,888,000	-5,883,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, salaries and expenses	785,217,000			-785,217,000	
(Transfer from export loans)	(589,000)	(609,000)	(589,000)		(-19,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(1,036,000)	(746,000)	(745,000)	(-291,000)	
(Transfer from ACIF)	(200,227,000)	(214,163,000)	(208,446,000)	(+8,219,000)	(-5,717,000)
Total, salaries and expenses	(987,069,000)	(1,027,287,000)	(1,015,668,000)	(+28,599,000)	(-11,619,000)
State mediation grants	3,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
Dairy indemnity program		100,000	100,000	+100,000	
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers	2,995,000	3,000,000		-2,995,000	-3,000,000
Total, Consolidated Farm Service Agency	791,212,000	817,871,000	807,888,000	+16,776,000	-9,983,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	(78,061,000)	(70,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(-43,061,000)	(-35,000,000)
Guaranteed	(540,674,000)	(540,687,000)	(550,000,000)	(+9,326,000)	(+9,313,000)
Subtotal	(618,735,000)	(610,687,000)	(585,000,000)	(-33,735,000)	(-25,687,000)
Operating loans:					
Direct	(500,000,000)	(542,860,000)	(400,000,000)	(-100,000,000)	(-142,860,000)
Guaranteed unsubsidized	(1,735,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(-35,000,000)	
Guaranteed subsidized	(230,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Subtotal	(2,465,000,000)	(2,442,860,000)	(2,300,000,000)	(-165,000,000)	(-142,860,000)
Soil and water loans:					
Direct		(2,898,000)			(-2,898,000)
Guaranteed		(1,422,000)			(-1,422,000)
Subtotal		(4,320,000)			(-4,320,000)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(750,000)	(-250,000)	(-250,000)
Emergency disaster loans	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)		
Credit sales of acquired property		(45,000,000)	(22,500,000)	(+22,500,000)	(-22,500,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(3,184,735,000)	(3,203,867,000)	(3,008,250,000)	(-176,505,000)	(-195,617,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership:					
Direct	10,983,000	16,373,000	8,187,000	-2,796,000	-8,186,000
Guaranteed	20,870,000	19,681,000	20,019,000	-851,000	+338,000
Subtotal	31,853,000	36,054,000	28,206,000	-3,647,000	-7,848,000
Farm operating:					
Direct	56,565,000	74,209,000	54,690,000	-1,875,000	-19,529,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized	9,360,000	18,360,000	18,360,000	+9,000,000	
Guaranteed subsidized	29,425,000	17,960,000	17,960,000	-11,465,000	
Subtotal	95,340,000	110,529,000	91,000,000	-4,340,000	-19,529,000
Soil and water loans:					
Direct		606,000			-606,000
Guaranteed		30,000			-30,000
Subtotal		636,000			-636,000
Indian tribe land acquisition	123,000	274,000	208,000	+83,000	-66,000
Emergency disaster	26,290,000	32,080,000	32,080,000	+5,790,000	
Credit sales of acquired property		8,226,000	4,113,000	+4,113,000	-4,113,000
Negative subsidies	-782,000	-296,000		+782,000	+296,000
Total, Loan subsidies	152,824,000	187,505,000	155,605,000	+2,781,000	-31,900,000
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	229,735,000	214,852,000	208,935,000	-20,800,000	-5,717,000
Administrative expenses	14,031,000	12,606,000	12,606,000	-1,425,000	
Total, ACIF expenses	243,766,000	227,258,000	221,541,000	-22,225,000	-5,717,000
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	396,590,000	414,763,000	377,146,000	-19,444,000	-37,617,000
(Loan authorization)	(3,184,735,000)	(3,203,867,000)	(3,008,250,000)	(-176,505,000)	(-195,617,000)
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,188,351,000	1,233,204,000	1,185,683,000	-2,668,000	-47,521,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
CORPORATIONS					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	219,107,000	1,263,708,000	1,263,708,000	+1,044,601,000	
Commodity Credit Corporation:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses	15,500,000,000	10,400,000,000	10,400,000,000	-5,100,000,000	
Hazardous waste (limitation on administrative expenses)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)		
Borrowing authority (emergency)	1,000,000,000			-1,000,000,000	
Total, Corporations	16,719,107,000	11,663,708,000	11,663,708,000	-5,055,399,000	
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	21,086,242,000	16,151,080,000	15,811,587,000	-5,174,655,000	-339,503,000
(By transfer)	(201,882,000)	(215,518,000)	(209,780,000)	(+7,898,000)	(-5,738,000)
(Loan authorization)	(3,184,755,000)	(3,203,887,000)	(3,008,290,000)	(-176,505,000)	(-195,617,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(104,838,000)	(108,245,000)	(108,245,000)	(+1,407,000)	
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	677,000	696,000	677,000		-19,000
Natural Resource Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	555,082,000	645,735,000	629,986,000	+73,924,000	-15,749,000
River basin surveys, investigations, and watershed planning			14,000,000	+14,000,000	+14,000,000
River basin surveys and investigations	12,970,000	11,210,000		-12,970,000	-11,210,000
Watershed planning	10,548,000	7,542,000		-10,548,000	-7,542,000
Watershed and flood prevention operations	70,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	+30,000,000	
Resource conservation and development, Great Plains conservation program, forestry incentives program, and Colorado River Basin salinity control program			47,000,000	+47,000,000	+47,000,000
Resource conservation and development	32,845,000	28,900,000		-32,845,000	-28,900,000
Great Plains conservation program	15,172,000	11,000,000		-15,172,000	-11,000,000
Forestry incentives program	6,825,000	6,825,000		-6,825,000	-6,825,000
Colorado River Basin salinity control program	4,500,000	2,881,000		-4,500,000	-2,881,000
Wetlands reserve program	93,200,000	210,000,000	77,000,000	-16,200,000	-133,000,000
Total, Natural Resource Conservation Service	801,920,000	1,023,693,000	867,986,000	+66,066,000	-155,707,000
Consolidated Farm Service Agency:					
Agricultural conservation program	100,000,000	50,000,000	75,000,000	-25,000,000	+25,000,000
Water quality incentives program	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(-4,000,000)	(-4,000,000)
Emergency conservation program		3,000,000			-3,000,000
Conservation reserve program	1,743,274,000	1,926,370,000	1,781,785,000	+38,511,000	-144,585,000
Total, Consolidated Farm Service Agency	1,843,274,000	1,979,370,000	1,856,785,000	+13,511,000	-122,585,000
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	2,645,871,000	3,003,759,000	2,725,448,000	+79,577,000	-278,311,000
TITLE III - RURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Economic and Community Development	568,000	586,000	568,000		-18,000
Rural Housing and Community Development Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Low-income housing (sec. 502)	(1,200,000,000)	(1,200,000,000)	(900,000,000)	(-300,000,000)	(-300,000,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(1,000,000,000)	(1,300,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(+500,000,000)	(+200,000,000)
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(36,000,000)	(36,000,000)	(36,000,000)		
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(15,915,000)	(16,482,000)	(15,000,000)	(-915,000)	(-1,482,000)
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(220,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(-70,000,000)	(-70,000,000)
Site loans (sec. 524)	(832,000)	(832,000)	(800,000)	(-32,000)	(-32,000)
Credit sales of acquired property		(75,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(+35,000,000)	(-40,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(2,471,547,000)	(2,847,114,000)	(2,635,800,000)	(+164,053,000)	(-211,314,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family (sec. 502):					
Direct	227,520,000	251,880,000	188,910,000	-38,610,000	-62,970,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	17,200,000	2,210,000	2,550,000	-14,650,000	+340,000
Housing repair (sec. 504)	11,690,000	14,193,000	14,193,000	+2,503,000	
Farm labor (sec. 514)	7,911,000	9,482,000	8,629,000	+718,000	-853,000
Rental housing (sec. 515):					
Direct	115,500,000	92,973,000	82,035,000	-33,465,000	-10,938,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(1,000,000)			(-1,000,000)	
Credit sales of acquired property		13,073,000	6,100,000	+6,100,000	-6,973,000
Total, Loan subsidies	379,821,000	383,811,000	302,417,000	-77,404,000	-81,394,000
RHIF administrative expenses	389,818,000	395,211,000	390,211,000	+393,000	-5,000,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Rental assistance:					
(Sec. 521)	517,108,000	566,583,000	530,000,000	+12,892,000	-36,583,000
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D))	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000		
Total, Rental assistance	523,008,000	571,483,000	535,900,000	+12,892,000	-36,583,000
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund	1,292,647,000	1,350,505,000	1,228,528,000	-64,119,000	-121,977,000
(Loan authorization)	(2,471,547,000)	(2,847,114,000)	(2,635,600,000)	(+164,053,000)	(-211,514,000)
Self-Help Housing Land Development Fund:					
Loan authorization	(803,000)	(803,000)	(803,000)		
Loan subsidy	11,000	31,000	31,000	+20,000	
Administrative expenses	14,000			-14,000	
Rural Community Facility Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct 3/	(225,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(-25,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
Guaranteed 3/	(75,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(75,000,000)		(-25,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(300,000,000)	(350,000,000)	(275,000,000)	(-25,000,000)	(-75,000,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct 3/	21,375,000	(43,800,000)	34,880,000	+13,505,000	+34,880,000
Guaranteed 3/	3,728,000	(4,740,000)	3,555,000	-173,000	+3,555,000
Total, Loan subsidies	25,103,000		38,435,000	+13,332,000	+38,435,000
Administrative expenses 3/		(11,247,000)	8,836,000	+8,836,000	+8,836,000
Very low-income housing repair grants	24,900,000	24,900,000	24,900,000		
Rural housing for domestic farm labor	10,900,000	10,900,000	10,000,000	-900,000	-900,000
Mutual and self-help housing	12,850,000	12,850,000	12,850,000		
Supervisory and technical assistance grants		2,500,000			-2,500,000
Rural community fire protection grants 3/	3,400,000	(3,400,000)	1,000,000	-2,400,000	+1,000,000
Compensation for construction defects	495,000	495,000	495,000		
Rural housing preservation grants	22,000,000	22,000,000	11,000,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000
Rural housing performance partnerships program		90,602,000			-90,602,000
Subtotal, grants and payments	74,345,000	164,047,000	60,045,000	-14,300,000	-104,002,000
RHCDS expenses:					
Administrative expenses		53,650,000	53,315,000	+53,315,000	-335,000
(Transfer from RHIF)	(369,818,000)	(362,074,000)	(377,074,000)	(-12,744,000)	(-5,000,000)
(Transfer from ACIF)		(171,000)	(171,000)	(+171,000)	
(Transfer from RCFLP)		(11,114,000)	(8,731,000)	(+8,731,000)	(-2,383,000)
Total, RHCDS expenses	(369,818,000)	(447,009,000)	(439,291,000)	(+49,473,000)	(-7,718,000)
Total, Rural Housing and Community Development Service	1,392,120,000	1,568,233,000	1,389,190,000	-2,930,000	-179,043,000
(Loan authorization)	(2,772,150,000)	(3,197,717,000)	(2,911,203,000)	(+139,053,000)	(-286,514,000)
Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service:					
Rural Business and Industry Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct 3/		(50,000,000)			(-50,000,000)
Guaranteed 3/	(500,000,000)	(750,000,000)	(500,000,000)		(-250,000,000)
Total, loan authorizations	(500,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(500,000,000)		(-300,000,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct 3/		(3,505,000)			
Guaranteed 3/	4,750,000	(8,825,000)	6,437,000	+1,687,000	+6,437,000
Total, Loan subsidies	4,750,000		6,437,000	+1,687,000	+6,437,000
Administrative expenses 3/		(19,742,000)	14,868,000	+14,868,000	+14,868,000
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization) 3/	(55,036,000)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)	(-26,036,000)	(-30,000,000)
Loan subsidy 3/	46,000,000	(53,885,000)	35,790,000	-10,210,000	+35,790,000
Administrative expenses 3/	1,476,000	(2,961,000)	1,792,000	+316,000	+1,792,000
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	47,476,000		37,582,000	-9,894,000	+37,582,000
(Loan authorization)	(55,036,000)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)	(-26,036,000)	(-30,000,000)
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans (limitation on obligations)	(12,865,000)	(14,091,000)	(12,865,000)		(-1,226,000)
Direct subsidy	3,077,000	4,085,000	3,729,000	+652,000	-356,000
Administrative expenses		864,000	584,000	+584,000	-280,000
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Revolving Fund	6,500,000	8,000,000	5,000,000	-1,500,000	-3,000,000
Loan authorization		(25,000,000)			(-25,000,000)
Loan subsidy		7,138,000			-7,138,000
Administrative expenses		500,000			-500,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Rural business enterprise grants 3/	47,500,000	(48,000,000)	46,000,000	-2,500,000	+46,000,000
Rural technology and cooperative development grants 3/	1,750,000	(3,500,000)	1,500,000	-250,000	+1,500,000
Local technical assistance and planning grants 3/	1,750,000	(2,500,000)		-1,750,000	
Rural business performance partnerships program		112,315,000			-112,315,000
RBCDS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses 3/	57,294,000	(8,546,000)	9,520,000	-47,774,000	+9,520,000
Salaries and expenses, FmHA	37,811,000			-37,811,000	
Rural business performance partnerships program		61,874,000			-61,874,000
(Transfer from RBILP)		(19,582,000)	(14,747,000)	(+14,747,000)	(-4,835,000)
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(1,476,000)	(2,946,000)	(1,764,000)	(+308,000)	(-1,184,000)
(Transfer from RETLP)		(864,000)	(584,000)	(+584,000)	(-280,000)
Self-Help HLDF (by transfer)	(14,000)			(-14,000)	
RBCDS (by transfer)		(32,119,000)			(-32,119,000)
Total, RBCDS expenses	(96,595,000)	(117,367,000)	(26,635,000)	(-69,960,000)	(-90,732,000)
Total, Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service	207,908,000	194,776,000	124,220,000	-83,688,000	-70,556,000
(By transfer)	(1,490,000)	(66,513,000)	(17,115,000)	(+15,625,000)	(-36,398,000)
(Loan authorization)	(568,036,000)	(915,000,000)	(550,000,000)	(-28,036,000)	(-365,000,000)
Rural Utilities Service:					
Loan authorizations:					
Water and waste disposal facility loans: Direct	(905,523,000)			(-905,523,000)	
Loan subsidies:					
Water and sewer: Direct	126,502,000			-126,502,000	
Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(90,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
Telephone 5%	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(-5,000,000)	(-5,000,000)
Subtotal	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(-15,000,000)	(-15,000,000)
Treasury rate: Telephone	(297,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(+3,000,000)	
Muni-rate: Electric	(575,250,000)	(575,250,000)	(500,000,000)	(-75,250,000)	(-75,250,000)
FFB loans:					
Electric, regular	(300,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(300,000,000)		(-100,000,000)
Telephone	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)		
Subtotal	(420,000,000)	(520,000,000)	(420,000,000)		(-100,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(1,467,250,000)	(1,570,250,000)	(1,380,000,000)	(-87,250,000)	(-190,250,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%	9,703,000	23,520,000	21,168,000	+11,465,000	-2,352,000
Telephone 5%	5,497,000	14,955,000	13,958,000	+8,461,000	-997,000
Subtotal	15,200,000	38,475,000	35,126,000	+19,926,000	-3,349,000
Treasury rate: Telephone	60,000	60,000	60,000		
Muni-rate, electric	46,020,000	62,300,000	54,150,000	+8,130,000	-8,150,000
FFB loans: Electric, regular	450,000	3,360,000	2,520,000	+2,070,000	-840,000
Negative subsidy		-1,715,000			+1,715,000
Total, Loan subsidies	61,730,000	102,480,000	91,856,000	+30,126,000	-10,624,000
RETLP administrative expenses	29,982,000	34,385,000	29,982,000		-4,403,000
Total, Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account	91,712,000	136,865,000	121,838,000	+30,126,000	-15,027,000
(Loan authorization)	(1,467,250,000)	(1,570,250,000)	(1,380,000,000)	(-87,250,000)	(-190,250,000)
~~Rural Telecommunication Partnership Loan Program Account:~~					
Loan authorization		(15,000,000)			(-15,000,000)
Loan subsidy		594,000			-594,000
Administrative expenses		1,110,000			-1,110,000
Total		1,704,000			-1,704,000
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:					
Direct loans (limitation on obligations)	(175,000,000)		(175,000,000)		(+175,000,000)
Direct loan subsidy	770,000		770,000		+770,000
RTB salaries and expenses	8,794,000		3,541,000	-5,253,000	+3,541,000
Distance Learning and Medical Link Grants	7,500,000	15,000,000	7,500,000		-7,500,000
Rural water and waste disposal grants	500,000,000			-500,000,000	
Solid waste management grants	2,995,000			-2,995,000	
Rural utilities performance partnerships program		785,183,000	562,000,000	+562,000,000	-223,183,000
Solid waste management grants, rural water and waste disposal grants, and water and waste disposal facility loans (administrative expenses)			12,740,000	+12,740,000	+12,740,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
RUS salaries and expenses		19,627,000	19,211,000	+19,211,000	-416,000
Electric and telephone loans (by transfer)	(29,962,000)	(34,366,000)	(29,962,000)		(-4,403,000)
Rural telephone bank (by transfer)	(6,794,000)		(3,541,000)	(-3,253,000)	(+3,541,000)
Water and waste disposal loans (by transfer)		(17,760,000)			(-17,760,000)
Rural Telecommunication Partnership Loan (by transfer)		(1,110,000)			(-1,110,000)
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund (by transfer)		(318,000)	(318,000)	(+318,000)	
Rural partnership (by transfer)			(12,623,000)	(+12,623,000)	(+12,623,000)
Subtotal	(36,776,000)	(73,230,000)	(66,675,000)	(+29,899,000)	(-7,555,000)
Total, Rural Utilities Service	738,273,000	956,379,000	727,600,000	-10,673,000	-228,779,000
(By transfer)	(36,776,000)	(53,803,000)	(46,464,000)	(+7,688,000)	(-7,139,000)
(Loan authorization)	(2,372,773,000)	(1,585,250,000)	(1,380,000,000)	(-992,773,000)	(-205,250,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(175,000,000)		(175,000,000)		(+175,000,000)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,336,869,000	2,721,974,000	2,241,578,000	-97,291,000	-480,396,000
(By transfer)	(430,064,000)	(502,475,000)	(449,555,000)	(+19,471,000)	(-52,920,000)
(Loan authorization)	(5,732,961,000)	(5,897,957,000)	(4,851,203,000)	(-881,758,000)	(-846,754,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(187,865,000)	(14,091,000)	(187,865,000)		(+173,774,000)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	540,000	553,000	440,000	-100,000	-113,000
Food and Consumer Service:					
Child nutrition programs	2,202,274,000	2,369,942,000	2,354,566,000	+152,292,000	-45,376,000
Transfer from section 32	5,249,077,000	5,520,492,000	5,597,858,000	+348,781,000	+77,366,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	7,451,351,000	7,920,434,000	7,952,424,000	+501,073,000	+31,990,000
Special milk program	18,069,000			-18,069,000	
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	3,470,000,000	3,820,000,000	3,729,807,000	+259,807,000	-90,193,000
(By transfer)			(4,000,000)	(+4,000,000)	(+4,000,000)
Commodity supplemental food program	84,500,000	86,000,000		-84,500,000	-86,000,000
Food stamp program:					
Expenses	26,167,710,000	26,119,887,000	25,954,828,000	+787,118,000	-165,059,000
Reserve	2,500,000,000	2,500,000,000		-2,500,000,000	-2,500,000,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico	1,130,528,000	1,143,000,000	1,143,000,000	+12,472,000	
Cattle tick eradication	12,472,000			-12,472,000	
Total, Food stamp program	29,830,710,000	29,762,887,000	27,097,828,000	-1,732,882,000	-2,665,059,000
Food donations programs for selected groups:					
Needy family program	33,154,000	78,639,000	65,000,000	+31,846,000	-13,639,000
Elderly feeding program	150,000,000	151,250,000	150,000,000		-1,250,000
Subtotal	183,154,000	229,889,000	215,000,000	+31,846,000	-14,889,000
Soup kitchens	40,000,000	40,000,000		-40,000,000	-40,000,000
Total, Food donations programs	223,154,000	269,889,000	215,000,000	-8,154,000	-54,889,000
The emergency food assistance program	40,000,000	40,000,000		-40,000,000	-40,000,000
Commodity purchases - TEFAP	25,000,000			-25,000,000	
Commodity assistance program			168,000,000	+168,000,000	+168,000,000
Total, The emergency food assistance program	65,000,000	40,000,000	168,000,000	+103,000,000	+128,000,000
Nutrition Initiatives:					
Nutrition support		45,528,000			-45,528,000
Nutrition promotion		4,218,000			-4,218,000
Food program administration	106,465,000	141,360,000	108,323,000	+1,858,000	-33,037,000
Total, Food and Consumer Service	40,249,269,000	42,090,314,000	39,271,382,000	-977,887,000	-2,818,932,000
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs	40,249,809,000	42,090,867,000	39,271,822,000	-977,987,000	-2,819,045,000
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service, direct appropriation	108,880,000	120,201,000	114,547,000	+5,667,000	-5,654,000
(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(4,914,000)	(5,176,000)	(5,176,000)	(+262,000)	
(Transfer from export loans)	(2,792,000)	(3,137,000)	(2,792,000)		(-345,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(1,425,000)	(1,005,000)	(1,005,000)	(-420,000)	
Total, Program level	(118,011,000)	(129,519,000)	(123,520,000)	(+5,509,000)	(-5,999,000)
Scientific activities overseas (foreign currency program) (limitation on administrative expenses)	(1,062,000)			(-1,062,000)	

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Public Law 480 Program Account:					
Title I - Credit sales:					
Program level	(320,342,000)	(177,857,000)	(316,342,000)	(-4,000,000)	(+138,485,000)
Direct loans	(291,342,000)	(161,440,000)	(291,342,000)	.....	(+129,902,000)
Ocean freight differential	29,000,000	16,417,000	25,000,000	-4,000,000	+8,583,000
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level	(821,100,000)	(795,703,000)	(821,100,000)	.....	(+25,397,000)
Appropriation	821,100,000	795,703,000	821,100,000	.....	+25,397,000
Title III - Commodity grants:					
Program level	(157,442,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(-107,442,000)	.....
Appropriation	157,442,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	-107,442,000	.....
Loan subsidies	236,162,000	131,833,000	236,162,000	.....	+104,329,000
Debt restructuring	.....	1,800,000	.....	.....	-1,800,000
Salaries and expenses:					
General Sales Manager	1,425,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	-420,000	.....
CFSA	1,036,000	745,000	745,000	-291,000	.....
Subtotal	2,461,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	-711,000	.....
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level	(1,298,884,000)	(1,023,890,000)	(1,187,442,000)	(-111,442,000)	(+163,752,000)
Appropriation	1,246,165,000	997,203,000	1,134,012,000	-112,153,000	+136,809,000
CCC Export Loans Program Account:					
Loan guarantees:					
Short-term export credit	(5,000,000,000)	(5,200,000,000)	(5,200,000,000)	(+200,000,000)	.....
Intermediate export credit	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	.....	.....
Emerging democracies export credit	(200,000,000)	.....	.....	(-200,000,000)	.....
Loan subsidy	394,393,000	374,347,000	374,347,000	-20,046,000	.....
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager	2,792,000	3,137,000	2,792,000	.....	-345,000
ASCS	589,000	608,000	589,000	.....	-19,000
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	397,774,000	378,092,000	377,728,000	-20,046,000	-364,000
Total, title V, Foreign assistance and related programs	1,752,819,000	1,466,466,000	1,626,287,000	-126,532,000	+130,791,000
(By transfer)	(9,131,000)	(9,318,000)	(8,973,000)	(-158,000)	(-345,000)
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	819,971,000	828,999,000	819,971,000	.....	-9,028,000
Prescription drug user fee act	(79,423,000)	(84,723,000)	(84,723,000)	(+5,300,000)	.....
Mammography clinics user fee	(6,500,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(+6,500,000)	.....
New user fees	.....	(38,740,000)	.....	.....	(-38,740,000)
Total, Program level	(905,894,000)	(965,462,000)	(917,694,000)	(+11,800,000)	(-47,768,000)
Buildings and facilities	18,150,000	8,350,000	15,350,000	-2,800,000	+7,000,000
Rental payments	46,294,000	46,294,000	46,294,000	.....	.....
Total, Food and Drug Administration	884,415,000	883,643,000	881,615,000	-2,800,000	-2,028,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Financial Management Service: Payments to the farm credit system financial assistance corporation	57,026,000	15,453,000	15,453,000	-41,573,000	.....
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	49,144,000	59,711,000	49,144,000	.....	-10,567,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(40,420,000)	(39,900,000)	.....	(-40,420,000)	(-39,900,000)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	990,585,000	958,807,000	946,212,000	-44,373,000	-12,595,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(40,420,000)	(39,900,000)	.....	(-40,420,000)	(-39,900,000)
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	69,084,195,000	66,421,993,000	62,722,934,000	-6,341,261,000	-3,699,059,000
(By transfer)	(841,067,000)	(727,309,000)	(872,308,000)	(+31,241,000)	(-55,001,000)
(Loan authorization)	(14,817,716,000)	(14,601,834,000)	(13,559,453,000)	(-1,058,263,000)	(-1,042,381,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(148,320,000)	(148,145,000)	(108,245,000)	(-40,075,000)	(-39,900,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(187,885,000)	(14,091,000)	(187,885,000)	.....	(+173,774,000)

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Agricultural programs	21,066,242,000	16,151,090,000	15,911,587,000	-5,174,655,000	-239,503,000
Title II - Conservation programs	2,645,871,000	3,003,788,000	2,725,448,000	+79,577,000	-278,311,000
Title III - Farmers Home and Rural development programs	2,336,888,000	2,721,874,000	2,241,578,000	-97,291,000	-480,296,000
Title IV - Domestic food programs	40,249,809,000	42,080,867,000	39,271,822,000	-977,987,000	-2,819,045,000
Title V - Foreign assistance and related programs	1,752,819,000	1,496,486,000	1,626,287,000	-126,532,000	+130,791,000
Title VI - Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration	990,585,000	956,807,000	946,212,000	-44,373,000	-12,595,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority	69,064,195,000	66,421,893,000	62,722,934,000	-6,341,261,000	-3,698,959,000

1/ Such sums as available from AQI user fee account for FY 1996.
2/ In addition to appropriation.
3/ On 9/2/95 the Administration amended its FY 1996 request (H.Doc. 104-63). This table reflects the program levels as submitted in the original budget.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. speaker, on Thursday, July 20, I missed four rollcall votes and on Friday, July 21, I missed three rollcall votes during consideration of H.R. 1976, Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

On rollcall vote Nos. 542, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, I would have voted ''nay.''

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1976, the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996, represents a serious effort to cut Federal spending on agriculture programs. I am pleased that this bill cuts funding from current levels by nine percent. But we can go even farther. This bill preserves a number of agricultural subsidies that I believe should be reviewed in light of our desire to move toward reducing our deficit. Although this bill preserves Federal subsidies for several agricultural programs which I believe should be cut or eliminated, I am encouraged by the assurances from Chairman Roberts of the Agriculture Committee that he will ensure votes on these subsidy programs during consideration of the farm bill later this year.

This bill recognizes the importance of child nutrition programs funded through the Department of Agriculture. I am pleased that the Republican leadership recognized the shortsightedness of their initial proposal to reduce funding for school lunch and breakfast programs. H.R. 1976 provides $8 billion in funding for school lunch and breakfast programs, an increase of $501 million over fiscal year 1995, and $32 million more than the President's request.

This bill was also improved when an amendment offered by Representative HALL was accepted to remove the cap on the number of participants in the nutrition program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]. WIC is a cost-effective program which has significantly reduced rates of infant mortality, low birthweight, and anemia. If food cost inflation is lower than previous years, or if a State manages the program efficiently, the cap would have prohibited the state from enrolling additional eligible women, infants and children.

I do, however, remain concerned about the removal of the competitive bidding requirement included in this bill. If history serves as a guide, this will translate into higher costs for infant formula and fewer infants being served under the program.

Prior to enactment of the competitive bidding requirement in 1989, only half of State WIC programs used competitive bidding. The other half used industry-favored cost containment systems that saved 35 percent less than competitive bidding. For this reason, Congress passed the competitive bidding requirement in 1989 with bipartisan support and with support from the Bush White House.

Competitive bidding works. Competitive bidding saved the WIC program $1.1 billion last year. Nearly 25 percent of women, infants and children served by WIC last year were served with savings from competitive bidding. In my home State of Rhode Island, the competitive bidding requirement has enabled the program to serve an additional 5,000 infants.

If we are searching for deep cuts across programs, surely it makes sense to support an incentive for states to utilize competitive bidding, given the documented costs savings that result. The Bush administration supported the competitive bidding requirement in 1989 because it utilizes the free market to secure the lowest prices for infant formula, thereby making the most efficient use of the taxpayers' dollars and stretching WIC funds to serve more participants.

In States that do not use competitive bidding the losers will be vulnerable infants, pregnant women, and children. We should not sell out to large infant formula companies at the expense of infants, and I will urge my colleagues in the Senate to retain competitive bidding.

Finally, this legislation does not contain funding for the Coastal Institute at the University of Rhode Island. I am hopeful that through my continued effort and through the effort of the Senate, funding for this worthwhile project will be included in the conference report. The State of Rhode Island is enthusiastic about this project and voters have already approved a bond referendum for $7 million. Bonding authority and other approved matching sources are at the $12.56 level in support of this project. The Institute will focus on the major sources of estuarine pollution, including urban development, agriculture, and deep water activities. The Institute's mission has important implications for both these activities and for the world's fisheries. In addition, the Coastal Institute will contribute to the economic well-being of the region through the training and research that will be conducted.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 1976, the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. I commend Mr. SKEEN, my colleague from New Mexico, for putting together a good bill which makes a firm contribution toward achieving our goal of a balanced budget by 2002. This bill funds important programs necessary to provide agricultural research, nutrition, conservation, health and safety, and farm sector stability.

I appreciate the hard work that Mr. SKEEN, and the other Committee members have put into allocating scarce resources among the many worthwhile projects covered by this bill. I look forward to working with the chairman in the future on programs important to the agricultural sector of our economy.

I offered an amendment to this bill that would have cut $12 million from the Department's administrative accounts. This would have been less than 4 percent of the administrative funds. I was encouraged by the fact that 196 members of the House share my view that the Department's headquarter's bureaucracy should be further downsized at a time when farm programs are being cut dramatically. However, I accept the majority view that the Department's administrative downsizing is progressing at a sufficient pace.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bunning amendment to eliminate funding for the Food and Drug Administration [FDA].

FDA plays an important role in the lives of every American. It is the last stage in translating life saving medical innovation to consumers. It examines the medications and feeds for farm livestock and household pets. It insures the safety of the foods we eat, and it regulates one-fourth of every dollar Americans spend. Yet, the FDA budget is only one-tenth of 1 percent of the industries it regulates. Its employees work in facilities that are out of date and in decrepit condition.

Currently the agency is located in over 48 leased and owned buildings at 20 different sites across Maryland and the District of Columbia. Many FDA facilities are in appalling condition. It has become increasingly difficult to attract the caliber of employees the FDA needs to perform its mission, especially with respect to drug and medical device product review.

Who will ensure that the food in American grocery stores is safe? Will the manufacturers and the distributors do a better job? Will the pharmaceutical companies protect the public against dangerous drugs and medical devices? Must we have another Thalidimide scare before we appreciate the good work of this agency?

Vote against the Bunning amendment and protect the health and safety of the American public.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my serious concern about the Committee Report accompanying H.R. 1976, the fiscal year 1996 Agriculture appropriations bill, which contains a provision that will seriously affect the availability of food on Indian reservations nationwide, and will dramatically increase hunger and hardship for some of America's most underserved population, our low-income Native Americans.

In the report, the Appropriations Committee directs the Secretary of Agriculture to begin the termination of the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, commonly known as the commodities program. Indians who benefit from the commodities program will be transferred to the Food Stamp Program.

This small non-controversial program has not been a target for cuts under any previous administration. The administration requested $78.6 million for reservation commodities in fiscal year 1996. The Committee's bill provides for $65 million for commodities, a difference of $13.6 million (17 percent). Should this severe underfunding and eventual phaseout proceed, more than 110,000 Native Americans on reservations in 24 States will be virtually cut off from monthly food supplements. This misguided shuffling of programs would result in increased costs to the Federal Government and add to our ever-increasing deficit.

When Congress and the Nixon administration instituted the Food Stamp Program nationwide in 1974, one exception was made. Then, as now, the supply of commodity food items directly to Indian tribes for distribution among low-income tribal members made better economic sense than the State-administered Food Stamp Program. Indian reservations are some of the most remote and sparsely developed areas in this country. Currently, Indians can participate in either the commodities or food stamps programs but not both. The Food Stamp Program requires individuals to trade food coupons for food at grocery stores. In many reservation areas, there are not many stores. Travel to stores may take hours by car. In addition, the prices for foods at on-reservation stores are generally higher than in urban or suburban areas. Thus, food stamps buy less food at reservation stores than off-reservation stores.

In addition, while tribes operate the distribution of commodities, States operate the Food Stamp Program. Conversion to the Food Stamp Program will require Native Americans

to travel vast distances to the nearest State food stamp office. Other problems with the Food Stamp Program include a differing set of eligibility rules, and the likelihood that nonperishable foods, which make up the bulk of the commodities programs, will be less available under the Food Stamp Program because stores are less likely to stock them. Without a continued commodities program, food shortages will result and people will go hungry.

Finally, it appears that conversion to the Food Stamp Program will result in increased costs to the Federal Government. In fiscal year 1994, the average per month cost of food stamp benefits was $69.01, compared to $33.51 for commodities.

There are nine federally recognized tribes in South Dakota, whose members collectively make up one of the largest Native American populations in any State. At the same time, South Dakota has 3 of the 10 poorest counties in the Nation, all of which are within reservation boundaries. In fiscal year 1994, 11,600 low-income individuals living on or near reservations in my State were served through this program. This poorly thought out reshuffling of existing successful programs will severely impact the health and well-being of Native Americans in my State and across the country.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman. I want to inform the body that I am a farm owner and am involved in the Federal Farm Program, as I had been for many years before coming to Congress. I believe my involvement in and resulting knowledge of farm programs make me a more informed member of the Agriculture Committee. While I will vote present on this amendment to avoid any hint of conflict of interest, I am in opposition to the amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill submitted by Representative LOWEY barring those with off-farm incomes of $100,000 or greater from participating in Federal farm programs.

First of all, farm programs are a part of this country's food security policy, not our welfare programs. Means testing ag payments make as much sense as means testing those who invest in Government bonds. The Clinton administration has repeatedly stated the need for outside investment in rural America. Landowners who own but do not operate farms represent outside capital that agriculture needs to finance farming, conserve soil and water resources, and support the economy of rural America. Forty-three percent of all U.S. farmland is owned by someone who does not actually farm the land. In my Illinois district some 70 percent is owned by absentee landowners. This provides most family farmers with the opportunity to operate on a scale that is economically viable. Land prices prohibit farmers from purchasing all the land necessary to provide for a viable operation.

If landowners with off-farm incomes of $100,000 or more are prohibited from participation in farm programs, land leases will move from share-rent leases to cash-rent. A share-rent lease simply means that both the tenant and landowner split costs and production, both assuming risks inherent to farming. Cash-rent leases represent a total shift of risk to the farmer. The tenant pays the landowner for the privilege of farming the land, then pays for all expenses and keeps all production.

I commend Representative LOWEY for trying to reduce Federal spending. The problem is, this amendment will not save money. Shifts in rental agreements will prevent this from happening. Ms. LOWEY'S amendment will not reduce spending, but it will hurt family farmers.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman. I strongly support the Agriculture Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996. Not only does this bill provide much needed funding for farm programs, it provides vital funding for research in the field of nutritional health.

The Children's Nutritional Research Center [CNRC] at Baylor College of Medicine is located in the heart of the Texas Medical Center in Houston. This center is currently our Nation's only Federal facility dedicated to investigating the food needs of pregnant and nursing women and of children through their adolescence.

Since its inception in November 1978, the Children's Nutritional Research Center has focused on critical questions relating to women and nutrition. These include determining how the diet of a pregnant woman affects her health and the health of her child and how a mother's nutrition affects by lactation and the nutrient contents of her milk. The center also has researched the relationship between nutrition and the physical and mental development of children.

In addition, CNRC has conducted amazing research which has identified the genes contributing to nutrient intake and determined the factors that regulate these genes. This research will lead to valuable discoveries in the field of genetics.

This year, CNRC will fully activate the two remaining units of its research program, the Metabolic Research Unit and the Greenhouse. The Metabolic Research Unit will serve as the central laboratory for detailed nutrition studies in the center. The 12 apartments, 2 nurseries, metabolic kitchen, and four recreational areas in the unit will allow family participation in CNRC's research activities. Studies will examine the nutrients associated with growth and development and the role of diet in birth weight.

The Greenhouse will prepare plant foods to study the digestion of carbon, nitrogen, iron, and calcium in foods eaten by pregnant and nursing women and their children. Recently, CNRC scientists uncovered a major research breakthrough by using labeled foods to accurately determine essential and nonessential nutrients. The Greenhouse will further study this phenomenon and is unique among the Department of Agriculture's nutrition research centers.

I am pleased that the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee has agreed to maintain funding for the Children's Nutrition Research Center. Under the Guidance of Baylor College of Medicine, one of the premier academic health science centers in the Nation, I am certain CNRC will continue to lead the way in the field of nutritional research.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution No. 188 and the order of the House of July 20, 1995, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAPO) having assumed the chair, Mr. KLUG, 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. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 188 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 adopted by the Committee of the Whole? 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 313, nays 78, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

YEAS—313

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cramer
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski

Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Sabo
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stenholm
Stockman
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—78

Ackerman
Baldacci
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Blute
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Coyne
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Duncan
Ensign
Eshoo
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gutierrez
Hancock
Harman
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kleczka
LaFalce
Lofgren
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Menendez
Mfume
Mineta
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Petri
Pickett
Rangel
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Slaughter
Stark
Stearns
Studds
Stump
Taylor (MS)
Torkildsen
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Waters
Waxman
Williams
Yates

NOT VOTING—43

Abercrombie
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Brown (CA)
Burton
Clay
Collins (MI)
Cox
Crane
Dreier
Ehlers
Foglietta
Fox
Gallegly
Geren
Goodling
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hilliard
Houghton
Johnston
Lantos
McDermott
Meehan
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Moorhead
Ortiz
Quillen
Quinn
Reynolds
Seastrand
Stokes
Stupak
Taylor (NC)
Torricelli
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Young (FL)

□ 1734

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Watts of Oklahoma for, with Mr. McDermott against.

Mr. Dreir for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. Ballenger for, with Mr. Stokes against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1944. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. 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. 1976, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAPO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON VETERANS AFFAIRS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1996

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for VA, HUD and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader, to explain the schedule for next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, by now it is obvious to most of the Members that we did not make our 3 o'clock departure today. Mr. Speaker, before I give the details of next week's legislative schedule, let me first outline what we need to accomplish next week in order to protect the August recess for Members. I recognize that we have all worked very hard for many long hours during this appropriations process, and I think by and large that we have made good progress.

We have worked these long hours for many reasons, not the least of which is our strong commitment to preserve the right of every Member to offer amendments to these important pieces of legislation. I want to thank each and every Member for their patience and diligent efforts to keep the House on schedule.

That being said, to protect the August departed tour date, next week we need to complete the Transportation appropriations bill, as well as the Commerce, Justice, State, and the VA–HUD appropriations bills.

I realize that working all night every night is unhealthy and is not overly productive. With that in mind, I will outline a schedule I feel is more reasonable and fair to Members.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for the morning hour and 12 o'clock for legislative business. Members should be advised that there will be no recorded votes before 5 o'clock on Monday, During the time when no recorded votes are expected, we plan to consider the rule and amendments to H.R. 70, the Alaskan oil export bill. If any recorded votes are ordered on H.R. 70, they will be postponed. We then plan to return to the Transportation appropriations bill. We will rise no later than 10 o'clock p.m. on Monday night, hopefully, after completing consideration of the Transportation bill.

On Tuesday, and the balance of the week, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday, we plan to consider H.R. 1943, the San Diego Coastal Corrections Act. We will then return to the appropriations bill, hopefully taking up the Commerce, State, Justice bill. We plan to rise on Tuesday by no later than 8 o'clock. Members will take note that the House will meet in joint session with the Senate at 11 a.m. on Wednesday to receive the President of Korea. We hope to rise no later than 10 p.m. on Wednesday night.

On Thursday, we hope to finish no later than midnight, unless a few extra hours of work would allow us to complete our scheduled business and get Members home to their districts and their families at an earlier time.

Members should realize that when we finish the schedule I have outlined, we will go home. But if we have not, the House will work on Friday and through the weekend to finish the business I mentioned earlier.

Again, I would like to thank the Members for their help and patience thus far during this difficult process, and I would simply close by saying that no one is looking more forward to the August break and to a good fishing hole than I am. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate particularly the 8 o'clock departure on Tuesday night, which I think accommodates both parties. But I did have some questions about some of the bills that were not listed on the calendar.

I wonder if you could tell us whether or not the deficit reduction lockbox bill would be brought up. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] has asked me to inquire about that bill, and indicate if it will be before the body at any time over the next 2 weeks, whether or not it would be available for amendments.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that bill is under consideration in the committee. We do not expect to be able to consider it next week. We have many Members on our side that are also anxious for it and we are trying to move as fast as we can, and we will try to be as open as we can on the rule, but of course that would be the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, that bill, of course, has a great deal to do with all of the appropriations we are passing, and I gather that we are probably going to pass all of the appropriations bills before we take up the lockbox?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. We are moving as fast as we can on the matter.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, it looks like the last two bills that will be coming up during the getaway week would be the defense appropriations bill and the health human services and education labor bill; is that correct?

Mr. ARMEY. I expect that is correct, and of course, depending on the progress we make, if possible, possibly telecommunications.

Mr. FAZIO of California. That was my question. I was wondering, that is a major bill. Do you hope to bring it up before the August break, and if so, how much time do you think would be devoted to such an important measure?

Mr. ARMEY. It is an important piece of legislation, as the gentleman knows. It is kind of a slippery thing. And so we are just sort of playing it by ear. If we can sort of get everybody in agreement at a time that is opportune, we will try to bring it up and try to be as generous as we can on the rules relating to this consideration.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, we do appreciate the heads-up about next Friday and into the weekend, but as the gentleman has indicated, we will stay in Thursday night as late as reasonable, if we could complete our work, in hopes of avoiding the possibility of a Friday session, which I know had been originally left vacant for Members to plan in their districts other activities. At the moment, however, it looks like Friday is a very likely prospect; is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, of course, all of this depends upon how much progress we have on the floor management, and the managers frankly deserve our appreciation. But assuming they can have success, we might be able to finish it on Thursday night, and I think most Members, if we get close to that, recognizing then the chance of being home on Friday, of approval or moving on.

I have to tell you, I have a—I fear that it is more likely that we will be in Friday than not, and although I think with all of our efforts and a good cooperative week, we could avoid Friday. So that too is a strong possibility that we do not want to ignore.

Mr. FAZIO of California. But Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, July 31, which had been noticed as a day available to Members in their districts, with any luck at all will not be encumbered; is that correct?

Mr. ARMEY. I think the gentleman actually put his finger on the key point, with any luck at all.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] who is the chairman of the family friendly caucus, which I might say has had a rather bad year here in Congress.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that very kind and gracious introduction. I appreciate that.

As the majority leader knows, we put together a family friendly schedule at the beginning of this year, and it has not performed very well. I am delighted that I did not sign the resolution stating that this was going to be a family friendly Congress.

Let me ask the gentleman a couple of questions. Speaker GINGRICH said on this floor at that podium back in January 4, and I quote, we are going to set schedules we stick to so families can count on time to be together, unquote.

Certainly, 10 p.m., Monday night, 9 p.m. Tuesday night, 10 p.m. Wednesday night, and then midnight, at least, Thursday night, maybe Friday, maybe Saturday, I don't know that we are going to see our families. I also am not sure that this is what the American people want us doing. We have been in session 300 more hours, 150 more rollcall votes, 54 percent of the time, we have been adjourning after 9 p.m. And while you are announcing the schedule earlier to us, it certainly is not good news for next week.

I have a couple of questions.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, let me make this point, and then if the gentleman would please excuse my impatience, I too have a plane I would like to catch to get home to my family.

I take my chapter and verse from Jimmy Buffet who has a wonderful song called ''Trying to Reason with Hurricane Season.''

□ 1745

I have been singing Mr. Buffett's song to a little bit different lyrics called ''Trying to reason with the appropriations season.'' That is the season of inconvenience to the body at large, out of consideration for the rights of the Members at large.

I would say to the gentleman, count up the notes, and in addition to the information you have I think you would also find an extraordinarily high number of votes on motions to rise and motions to adjourn.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, we are happy to work as hard as we were during the first 6 months, and I voted for many items in the contract, but the Speaker himself said after the first 6 months that we would have a more reliable schedule, a schedule where we would occasionally see our families and children, a schedule which was predictable.

Now we are not going to have that between now and August, nor will we have it in September or October. Can the gentleman give us some indication of September and October and when we will adjourn? Is it going to be right before Christmas?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, and let me remind the gentleman I, too, am trying to catch my plane, and I can only tell the gentleman that the only thing I have to fly by right now is my best hopes and aspirations and the faith and confidence I have in the goodwill of my colleagues.

Mr. ROEMER. Further, Mr. Speaker, could I make some suggestions to the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. ARMEY. Yes.

Mr. ROEMER. We certainly want to work hard, Mr. Majority Leader, we do not have any complaint with that, but we want to work smart. If I could give the gentleman some suggestions, could we come in at 8 o'clock in the morning and start our 1-minutes, so those people that want to give 1-minutes are here at 8 o'clock, they give 10 minutes on each side, 20 on each side, and we start the legislative business by 9 o'clock in the morning? Those are American work hours.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, this kind of suggestion, especially particularly the gentleman—I cannot believe you guys are trying to make me miss my plane.

Mr. ROEMER. We have been missing lots of planes for 7 months, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ARMEY. These are all under consideration. We are working with it, but I have to tell the gentleman, one of the things that does in fact make it difficult to come upon a universally agreed upon comfortable arrangement is that we insist on paying regard to the legitimate rights of the individual Members. That sometimes makes it a little bit more complicated.

Gentleman, I welcome all your suggestions, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] has given me a suggestion in writing and gotten a list of cosigners for his suggestion, and I am sure he is here to present that to me.

Mr. ROEMER. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, I could want to let the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] have just one question, and let the gentleman get off to Margaritaville.

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

Mr. ROEMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Majority Leader, have a great flight, but when you fly away, think about working on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., and I would appreciate that.

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] has been very generous.

If the gentleman will continue to yield for one quick moment, I think we have a statement here that needs to be clarified. I would like to make it very clear so there is no misunderstanding regarding working on Monday, July 31. It is very clear that we will work, and it will be necessary for us to work on that, but hopefully not on the weekend before.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the leader for his comments.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2076, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, STATE, AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–200) on the resolution (H. Res. 198) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2076), making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 24, 1995

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on vote 547, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, I inadvertently voted ''yes.'' I intended to vote ''no,'' and I request that the RECORD reflect that.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1404

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 1404.

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

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF THE HONORABLE RICHARD K. ARMEY TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 20, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable RICHARD K. ARMEY to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

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 are recognized for 5 minutes each.

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. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GOSS 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 California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HORN 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 Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE 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 Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE WORST OF TIMES FOR AMERICA'S WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado, [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I must say this has been really quite a week. There was some question whether I wanted to stay and do a special order. The more I looked at what happened in this week, I really feel it is very historic and it is very important to take the floor and say to the American people that I hope they are digesting what is transpiring. Right now, if we look at all the things going on between Waco hearings, Whitewater hearings, all the trials on television and Bosnia, I think very few people realize what is transpiring to their rights here.

This week ended with such a fitting end that really says it all. As we know, our Speaker kind of got elected as the prince of angry white men, and I think it is very fitting that he ended up celebrating the end of this week where he is now. We have our Speaker off at the Bohemian Club. Many people may say, ''what is the Bohemian Club? Why do we think we heard that name?'' We heard it a lot during the prior Republican administration, and then we have not heard it for quite some time. However, the Speaker has put it back into our whole lexicon.

Herbert Hoover once called the Bohemian Club and its annual party the greatest men's club on Earth. The San Diego Union described it the following way:

The Bohemian Club is known for its raucus campouts in the grove. Their woods north of San Francisco are where powerful politicians, executives, and many others, partially clad or dressed in drag, meet each year for 2 weeks of carousing and networking. The grove gatherings are known for raunchy skits, speechmaking, sing-along, gambling, open urination on trees, and other targets.

I guess they are all there celebrating, because at the end of this week they will all say it probably is the best of times for rich white men in America, and so obviously that is where the Speaker belongs.

However, I must say after this week, it is really the worst of times for America's women. This has been a week where issues on women have been absolutely pounded. Things we never thought we would see happen have happened on this floor, and I do not think America's women know it. Women, if you want to know why they are out there running around in the trees, partially clothed, no women are allowed, people are picketing, all sorts of noise going on in San Francisco, let me tell the Members what the Speaker and his friends are celebrating.

No. 1, they passed a ban so that Federal employees cannot even purchase health insurance that would cover perfectly legal abortion rights. Even for rape and incest they cannot buy health insurance. That is pretty astounding, and for people who believe in individual rights, that is really amazing.

No. 2, the 25-year-old family planning program that is known as title 10, that provides all sorts of family planning services, pelvic exams, Pap smears, screening for sexually transmitted diseases, and many other things, that was zeroed out this week.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, do I understand, I would ask the gentlewoman, that, for example, Planned Parenthood of Boston and planned parenthood organizations and other community family planning across the country have not just been reduced in scope, like so many of the slash-and-burn efforts here in the Congress this week, but have been totally eliminated in the measure that came out of the appropriations bill?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct.

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentlewoman is not just talking about the controversial subject of abortion, that right being denied for all of our Federal employees and for all of their families, but the gentlewoman is talking about any form of Federal participation in family planning for families that want to plan, who do not want to face the choice of abortion, but want to actually have a variety of alternatives presented for family planning, they are going to get zero, zip, in the way of Federal support?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman from Texas has really hit the nail on the head. I think the gentleman from Texas probably also knows, because he has visited those family planning clinics, many of them are the primary care for many of America's low-income women during their childbearing age. That is where they go for their physical, their Pap smears, their breast checks, that is where they go for their entire range of health care services during that period in their life. To just zero it out, and say there will be no family planning, absolutely zero it out, which I still cannot believe it happened, but they did, because we heard so many people who were antiabortion saying, ''But I am always for family planning.''

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

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, joining in with the gentleman from Texas and the gentlewoman from Colorado, this is a 25-year-old-program that the Federal Government has been involved in. Not only does it provide funding for organizations, private and nonprofit, like Planned Parenthood, but it also provides grants to public entities and agencies. Those agencies have served an estimated 4.3 million people in 1995 through a network of 4,200 clinics provide key reproductive services. The gentlewoman has talked about those services, services that are screening for sexually transmitted diseases, for Pap tests, for pelvic exams, and other important tests. What essentially they are doing is cutting off health care, health care to women and to young ladies and to girls.

I rise in consternation with what has happened this week, because I am a father of a young teenager. Telling her over the phone this week about this, she was absolutely shocked. She said, ''Daddy, does that mean because you buy Blue Cross health insurance from the Federal Government, that if I get raped, that your health care policy cannot take care of the medical exam that I would have to have and the services that I might need?'' And I said, ''Yes, isn't that disgusting?'' She said, ''I can't believe it. You mean that is what you have done in Congress this week?''

Mrs. SCHROEDER. It was not a proud week. It is not a proud week, and it is very difficult to explain. I am glad the gentleman from California was awake and the gentleman from Texas was awake. I do not know how we get everyone else awake to understand it. We talk about fundamentalists in other countries, but it seems like fundamentalists kind of took over this Congress, because when you go after family planning, that is really kind of as American as apple pie.

Mr. DOGGETT. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield further, indeed, the family planning program as described by our colleague, the gentleman from California, it actually is a program that has had support even of some of the people that have probably been members of the Bohemian Club. It has had broad bipartisan support from Republicans and Democrats until the extremists took control of the committee, is that not correct?

□ 1800

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman from Texas always has such an interesting mind.

You know, I had never thought of that, but I will bet if you could poll the members of the Bohemian Club, you would find a very high percentage of them are significant donors to Planned Parenthood. Because I think that is the one thing I have always found very interesting on family planning, that most people understand how important it is and contribute a lot.

But as much as they contribute, Federal funding has always been very, very essential, because there are so many women in their childbearing age, and they need this—we are talking visits every 6 months to a year. It is very essential. You cannot just say, well, they had their visits so they do not need to go back for 40 years. Wrong, believe me.

So my guess is that there are an awful lot of the contributors there, and I wonder if they would be frolicking with the Speaker quite as much and skipping through the trees, doing whatever they do, if they knew that while he was away the appropriations zeroed this out.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentlewoman yield for a moment?

Let me just add on that. You realize that I am from California, and the Bohemian Club Grove is in Marin County, CA, and it has been there for over about 100 years, I think, of people. It is sort of the corporate heads of America go there, and the irony is that their own corporations, 70 percent of all the private health care plans in America, provide services which Congress denied to Federal employees.

So there is a—I mean, this—if you are going to make government more like the private sector, you certainly do not want to begin by denying health care, medical services to women that the private sector, major corporations in America and those CEO's that are running around, as you say, in the Bohemian Club Grove are providing to their own employees.

Mrs SCHROEDER. Well, I think that is a very interesting point, too.

Is it not a shame—you know, the gentleman from Ohio often says, ''Beam me up.'' Is not it a shame the three of us cannot be beamed up to the Bohemian Club and go around and run a poll saying to all the people there playing in the trees at camp, ''Did you know that we have just made Federal employees second-class citizens this week? Did you know we just zeroed out family planning? Did you know we also unraveled Roe versus Wade and, for the first time, this House has declared a medical procedure illegal, which is absolutely astounding?''

And we could say, ''Did you know this week we had a committee prohibit medical schools from teaching, even teaching abortion procedures. That is pretty interesting. Did you know we prohibited in one of the committee

Federal funding on human embryos, which is going to hamper contraceptive research, and also the search to look for curing birth defects and different diseases?''

We could lay a whole bunch of things on these guys, and I honestly think they would be with us. They may be celebrating without knowing what has really been done.

Mr. FARR. Did you know, following up on that, that the defense authorization bill prohibits private-funded abortions for our service men and women, and I say men because they are overseas with their families, from being performed in overseas military hospitals? Private services.

So that means if you are in the military or you are a military dependent and you want to use your own money and you choose your own military hospitals, which we have there for our military active duty personnel, that you are denied. You have got to go out into the foreign market.

At what risk do you go at that foreign market? We are subjecting people who are giving their lives to military service from just the basic benefits that their own relatives receive working for private corporations in America.

We have gone—this antiwoman attitude in this Congress is, I think, beginning to show itself so strongly in how we are trying to set up women as a second-class citizenship in America.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. You know, I am very pleased that both of you came to talk about this, because usually it is the women who are here railing about this, and maybe that is why we do not get through. But it is really great to have people here who do get it and who are starting to be as frightened as some of us, wondering what is coming next.

I mean, we are getting ready to celebrate women having had the vote for 75 years. Maybe this is the year we really learn how to start using the vote if we see much more of this going backward.

Mr. DOGGETT. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I would be delighted to.

Mr. DOGGETT. So we have seen our military forces being treated as second-class citizens. They are discriminated against even in the case of rape of a servicewoman or the spouse of a serviceman. These services are not available.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Absolutely. Even if you are overseas.

Mr. DOGGET. This week the members of our Federal work force all across the country, whether it is a park ranger or a nurse in a VA hospital or a security person right here at the Capitol, a young woman doing that very important work, again, if there is rape or incest, there is discrimination. No longer will they be able to have health care services available to other Americans.

And then, in addition to that, we have even got these extremists coming in and saying they will dictate accreditation standards for medical schools, they will say what kind of research we can and cannot have.

With all of this interference in the lives of young American women, where you say do not consult with your spouse, do not consult with your minister or rabbi, do not consult with your family, go take it up with your Congressman and interfere in those private decisions, do you think that instead of hearing so much in the news about angry men, we ought to be hearing something about angry young women who should be angered and upset that extremists would do this to them and interfere in their very most personal decisions?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is precisely my point. I think if they just had any idea what is happening, they would be very angry.

And my fear is about a year from now, when this starts to really have an impact, they are going to come running through our doors screaming, ''Why didn't anyone tell us?''

I feel rather like Paul Revere riding through saying the British are coming. Only we are saying the fundamentalists have won. You know, we are in real trouble here.

I also have to say that, for every woman, there are some very serious thoughts here about who in the world would think about being an OB–GYN.

If you were a young man 30 years old and you are thinking about a specialty in medical school, would you be an OB–GYN with the Congress here telling you what kind of procedures you can have, what kind of research you can do, what you can and cannot learn in medical school, what you can and cannot say to your patients and also cutting funding right and left?

And, furthermore, if you ever did it and you ever even treated one woman because you were concerned about her condition, you could never be Surgeon General, like Dr. Foster.

Mr. DOGGETT. When you get put on one of these wanted posters which have now spread to the political realm, but one group is putting up wanted posters for physicians performing legal procedures and another group is putting up wanted posters for Members of Congress who have the audacity to support that basic constitutional right.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. You do wonder who is running the show.

I am one of the people on the wanted poster for politicians, so I now know how the doctors who are on those wanted posters feel. And if you were a young person planning your future, I do not think you would go sign up to be an OB-GYN, such as your daughter or I think your daughter—

Mr. DOGGETT. She will be getting into medical school this next month. I know that will be one of the areas that she studies in her practice, but I have to say, as a father, I cannot help but have concern that if she chooses to go into that area of specialty she may actually risk her life, as so many physicians are doing today, as so many people at these Planned Parenthood and other community planning agencies risk their lives to simply provide basic health care services that our young American women need.

Mr. DOGGETT. What is so surprising about all this is this is the year of the conservative attitude in the House of Representatives and Congress, an the whole attitude here is get government off your back. But, indeed, these policies get government so far involved in the most personal issues in one's life. Because in order to monitor and prohibit you have got to police it.

I cannot imagine what kind of trickle-down enforcement procedures are going to be there. And the message it says, let me just read you from a Sara Lowenthal, who lives in Santa Cruz, a community that I represent. She wrote this to me. She says, ''As an HIV educator who works directly with at-risk teens, the attack on title X scares me. One of the most direct, effective and influential ways that local teens can get information about HIV is through Planned Parenthood. The elimination of title X is not just a rightist attack on reproductive rights. It is a deconstruction of an educational block that protects Santa Cruz teens from HIV. I am deeply disheartened by the actions of the radical right.''

She is an educator at the local level, and these educators are hard to get, because they do not get paid a lot. They volunteer a lot of their time. And I think that message is not just a message about what specialty to go in. It is also a negative message about what kind of an educator to become.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. It is truly amazing that as we are saying get government out of regulation, get government out of all these areas, we are moving right into the classroom, into the doctor's office, into people's bedrooms, into all of these different areas, and we are going to totally regulate this area vis-a-vis women, and, as I say, long term, since almost all women get their primary care from OB-GYN's.

If we do not have any good OB-GYN's, we are all in trouble in the future if we do not have good doctors watching after our health care.

There are some other instances that are kind of did-you-knows this week. I mean, we all saw Kiri Jewell, that beautiful young 14-year-old, talking about the problems that she had had—I mean, I get chills even thinking about it. But her father having to go to court and do all of this because at 10 she is raped by David Koresh.

Well, did you know there are Members in this body who are saying, ''That is really a side show, that is really irrelevant, that really did not matter''?

I mean, has the NRA so totally taken this place over we cannot hear a young woman's voice saying, ''Let me tell you what happened to me in Waco'' and how she had been taught to teach—to do suicide by David Koresh? They do not hear.

We had many couples come here wanting to talk about the abortion procedure outlawed by the Committee on the Judiciary, and only one person got to testify. Nobody listened to their voices. It is like they are road kill. We have an agenda. We are rolling right over you. And these were all people who had gone through very, very difficult trying times and thought that they had a right to petition their government.

Mr. DOGGETT. If any of these young women came today to the Congress where all of us were working, this House in session past midnight last night—I know our crime task force got together before 8 this morning. If any of those young women or young men came here to this Congress, would they have found Speaker GINGRICH here today?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. No. He is in California playing in the trees.

Mr. DOGGETT. What is going on out there? I missed the first part of your remarks.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I must say, I was really surprised when I read in the New York Times, and I have seen it in several other newspapers now so I assume it is true, that the Speaker today arrived at the Bohemian Club's 2-week camp-out.

And, you know, I guess neither one of you were here when we used to have incidents about that. If you remember, there were women trying to get hired by the Bohemian Club at one time, and they said, no, they would never—they did not care what the Federal law said, they would never hire women because it would inhibit the members in their 2-week frolic.

I am not quite sure what they all do, but, apparently, it is quite a frolic.

Mr. DOGGETT. Is he gone for 2 weeks?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think he is probably coming back next week, but I do not really know. I guess it started last week, so he got out there today.

But while we are here, he is playing, and we are doing some very serious things. And I just—I find these kind of—I guess it is a group of great, powerful men that love to go to the woods, and I guess they dress up like druids and do different things. I am not quite sure. But it is some privately owned redwoods, and that is where he is.

Mr. DOGGETT. Is this part of the book tour or what.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I do not think they sell books there. I have never seen anything about them buying—I do not think they read books there either. I think they do something different.

But I understand he is coming back through Iowa and then will come here. So maybe he is selling books in Iowa.

Mr. FARR. I think that the issue here, or the symbol, is that this has been a week in which the Gingrich-led Congress, the conservative aspects of it, have taken away rights that protect women, taken away the rights to buy health care policies that provide services for medical abortions.

They have zeroed out family planning money. They have affected the defense authorization bill that prohibits private funded abortions from being performed in overseas military hospitals.

□ 1815

They have cut back, major cutbacks in the international planning funds, and then to cap that off by going off to an all-male retreat, I think, is really symbolic of this sort of take away from women or discounting women or trying to put women as secondary citizens. It is symbolic of what is going on, and I think the women of this country ought to wake up and become involved.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I certainly hope they do. I join the gentleman from California for being actually very saddened. It is actually like they are tap dancing on women's rights that have been burned this week in different legislation that have come out. I certainly am saddened by that, and I certainly hope that women in this country do wake up and start saying to people wait a minute, wait a minute, we pay the same taxes as everyone else, which we do. They do not say, ''Women, hey, we are going to give a 50-percent discount because we do not think you are quite up to handling things, and we are going to micromanage your lives because we do not think you are up to handling things,'' and so forth.

I think women have come a long way in this country. They really have believed progress was preordained. I think most American women would be totally shocked to know this has all been done, especially family planning. We go back to where we started, family planning, research, we worked so hard to make progress that was made on trying to catch up on women's health, and, boom, 1 week it all blows up.

Mr. FARR. I as a father, you as a mother, can understand what we try to do as parents is ensure or give hope to our kids that there will be a better, sounder, safer, saner world which they can grow up in. I only have one child. It is a daughter. I guess that makes me a feminist because I really want to see the world in which women have equal opportunity.

I am very proud to tell her that just this week I met with the highest-ranking woman in the Navy, and she is coming out to be the commandant or provost of the naval postgraduate school and, I think, someday will be chief of naval operations, and I hope so. She is a very talented woman, and to be able to show symbols of where women in society have become equal to men so that she, as she grows up, and with her colleagues, that women can see that they can do everything that any male can do. We have certainly seen that in winning Olympic Gold Medals, and we will see that in Atlanta when the Olympics come, and certainly in every profession, Sally Ride being the first woman into space and so on.

But I come here as a new Member of Congress, a relatively new Member, and I am just shocked because California is a pretty big State, and serving in the State legislature, I thought I had seen conservative politicians. But I have to tell you I never heard on the floor of the State legislature in California the kind of rhetoric I heard here this week. That led me to be so shocked that I wanted to come and join with you and share with you my concerns as a father and as a representative of one congressional district in the United States that I think that the Congress, under the new leadership, is doing a great disservice to women. It is setting up and saying, if you are a woman and you want to go into Federal employment, do not go there.

We pointed out in our dialog today, if you go into the private sector, you can receive benefits that you will not be able to receive in the public sector, not even an equal playing field for health care delivery services that we know we have a lot of teenage pregnancies, we know we have HIV issues to deal with. You deal best with that with education. That is what the title X moneys are all about. Then they have taken away those things.

We have told people if you are going to go overseas, you cannot even use your private money in an American-sponsored military hospital to get these services.

What kind of message are we trying to send as a country as to how we respect women if we are going to discount, disregard, and really put them in jeopardy?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman makes a very good point. Let me ask a question of you as a father.

Do you think your daughter needs special congressional oversight, much more so than the young men that you have probably met that are her friends, do you really think that she needs this additional guidance and her doctors need additional guidance and her teachers need additional guidance? Is there something about women that I am blinded to that I do not see?

Mr. FARR. Absolutely not. I think you see it very clearly. I can see clearly now, and what I can see clearly now is that the new majority here wants to make women second-class citizens. I am appalled by that, my daughter is appalled by that, my wife is appalled by that, my father is appalled by it. I think all of our family is looking at this and saying what is going on in Washington, DC?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. It has been a very tough week. Then we hear the family-friendly stuff. People are not home enough. People are telling me they are keeping pictures of themselves by the door, ''If this man comes to the door, let him in, it is your father,'' because they are afraid they will think it is a stranger. Nobody can ever get home. They are working hard. What we are doing is blowing everything up. This is

kind of slash-and-burn week for women's rights, I will tell you, and everything has been slashed and burned that I am aware of.

I just hope it starts to get better. I really thank the gentleman from California for joining me in this. His daughter should be very proud.

As I say, as a mother of a son and a daughter, I do not think one needs more congressional guidance than the other. They are equal in my eyes. I think they ought to be equal in the eyes of the Congress.

Mr. FARR. I absolutely agree. I hope what we do need guidance for is America, wake up. Women in this country, wake up, come to Washington. We need to hear your voices. We need to hear your concerns. We need to change attitudes here in Washington that are taking away the rights you have as citizens of this country by denying you services which all other people in our society are entitled to.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

I think this is the 200th day of this Congress in which we have been in session 300 hours longer than we were at the same time last year, and we have done more damage to women and children, the elderly. It is really not a proud record.

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAPO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we are told every day about a revolution in Congress. Day after day, my colleagues from the other party, the Republican Party, advance one or another bill, and they call it or label it revolutionary.

But what is revolutionary about a bill that prohibits the government from updating and improving meat inspection? How is it revolutionary to prohibit cleaner, safer meat? And what is revolutionary about legislation that cuts environmental cleanup funds by one-third, or a bill that makes it impossibly expensive and cumbersome to protect delicate wetlands in our country?

Under this kind of legislation the Republicans advocate this year, the government would have to pay slave owners to emancipate their slaves if it was 130 years ago. In fact, the kind of things that the Republicans have talked about this year are purely and simply an effort to turn the clock back, to force us back into the darkest ages of economic exploitation.

For instance, their attitude on meat inspection is a rank arrogant betrayal of a fundamental premise of what was, at the turn of the century, a revolutionary reform, the commitment of the government to ensure that the Nation's food supply is not contaminated and is safe to consume.

The back-door repeal of statutes designed to clean up the Earth, which we have been everything almost weekly, and prevent its further despoilation is simply a return to 19th century ideas that no one has any responsibility to either neighbor or to future generations.

The Republican agenda is not revolutionary. It is, plain and simple, an attack, an all-out attack on ordinary standards of decent human conduct. Decent human conduct requires that those who have great power and wealth to refrain from manufacturing and selling poisonous products, but the Republicans would say that 1906 meat inspection standards cannot be changed, cannot be made better, despite the fact that hundreds of people die every year from foul meat, and Republicans would say that land developers should be perfectly free to destroy wetlands despite the fact that these lands are the vital source of anything resembling a thriving national fishing industry.

These are not revolutionary ideas. They are merely the candles that quiet the tantrums of impatient, powerful, wealthy donors who feed endless millions of dollars into the political maw of this machine and who want nothing more than to exploit this country as ruthlessly as the robber barons did in a bygone era.

But I do not want to talk about the mindless cruelty of the present majority. These cruelties will soon enough be understood by the American people. Eventually they will have their distilled judgment as the full facts are known, and they will be, and who are smart enough to understand that this is merely a spreading of an endless banquet for the rich and the powerful and that the feast has been paid for by a vast transfer of wealth from ordinary wage-earners to the wealthier of those among us.

What I do want to talk about is the great pain and frustration that ordinary Americans feel today, the uncertainty they feel about the future.

The truth is that ordinary, law-abiding work-a-day Americans are themselves sliding backward in their feeling that they know they are. They are angry. Let there be no mistake, they are frustrated. Let there be no mistake in understanding that.

They went to see their lives get better, not worse. These frustrations are not the figments of anyone's imagination. They are the product of a real longstanding slide backward for most of our fellow citizens.

I pride myself in being in the most intimate contact one human being could have with those is that he has as actually serious responsibility that no one man could really fully fulfill to represent, a multitude, but in good faith tries to do so by being in immediate and most intimate contact.

It is understood from what I hear and where I meet every weekend when we are in session and when we are not, I go nowhere but in the district, and the immediate beneficiaries of this frustration and anger are those that now have the power, the majority.

But their policies will make the problems worse, and they will not be able to gloat for too long.

Now, I belong to a party, and have been proud to do so since the beginning, that interprets as fundamental premise, as one that is very basic in what I tried to adhere to in all of my career, in my position first as a local representative, then as a State and now as a national since 1961.

Representation is what I have sought, no other kind of political elective office but this, and that is what I have best understood and strived to perform.

We have got to work in such ways and always at all times to redeem the great traumas of this Nation, its historic commitment that every person have a decent, hopefully rising, standard of living and being.

□ 1830

The American Revolution is not about the freedom to be exploited. It is about the freedom to political and religious expression, the freedom to be protected against an intrusive government, and it is about equal protection under the law, and it allows us the right to enjoy, above all, the fruits of your own labor.

By that standard the Republican Party on all levels fails. The Republicans are simply trying to install a whole new system of what is tantamount to exploitation exploitation of irreplaceable resources, exploitation of hard-pressed and lowly wage earners, exploitation of frustration and fear, which they hope can be used to keep quiet the very people that are being exploited.

The sad fact is the people of the country are playing a losing game. They are working harder, they are producing more, and they are being rewarded considerably less. I do not think there has been another time in modern history which this has happened that I can recall, and I have been aboard on this level now more than three decades, much more, approximating four, and I can tell you that that is my assessment.

Now it is a so-called white-collar worker whose own standard of living is declining, whose job security is threatened more and more every day, and it is a two-income family who now are finding it harder and harder to stay even or even to stay employed, and more and more professional workers are reduced to part-time employment or contract work, the equivalent of piecework in the old clothing-stitching factories, garment factories.

There were a plethora of them in the hard Depression period of my youth and that I can recall to this day, my aunts, and my mother and other relatives getting up at 4:30 in the morning, and all through the day, with the

exception of the middle of the week where I would accompany my aunt to go there because she could not speak English to this garment factory to deliver the hand-stitched products that day and night my mother and my aunts, my sister and all, would be doing during the week. What was the reward? A man at the window would pick that garment, and look at it, and examine it, and then, if he okayed it, it was 5 cents.

Of course I have got to translate here. With a nickel in that day and time you could buy a loaf of bread, you could buy a whole quart of milk, so there is no way to extrapolate those standards. The world has long gone by in which no power I would be able to summon could describe to my colleagues of these newer generations.

Now obviously the numbers indicate that job growth is taking place. But that job growth is in service and in retail jobs which are the low end of the economic pecking order. As a result, incomes have been going down collectively. For a while a family could stay even and perhaps even get ahead by having a second wage earner in the family, but presently even the number of two-earner families is shrinking, and we have more and more families that are less and less able to meet the daily necessities of life, a house or apartment, some kind of access to transportation, some way to buy clothing and food, and some way to pay for medical care.

Perhaps it is not too visible to a lot of us that have the comforts, good clothing, perhaps free of debt, good place to go home and sleep in comfort with all the creature comforts anybody could summon in today's living standards, have a full meal three times a day. It is hard to conceive, very hard to conveive, of anybody not comfortable if we are comfortable.

We see the evidence of this desperation everywhere in the burgeoning numbers of beggars and homeless. I walk down the street here to go to the local drugstore or grocery store, and where it used to be that there would be none, in half a block I will encounter four mendicants pleading for a handout. That was not so since I came to the Congress until fairly recently of just a few years ago.

So the evidences are in the burgeoning numbers of beggars and homeless, and declining support for schools, and more and more people depending on government for health and medical care, and most all of it in the growing frustration and anger which sometimes expresses itself at the ballot box, and some seek to explain it by one wild conspiracy theory or another in which most express by a kind of cynical anger which has been most artfully exploited by radio talk shows.

We are not losing jobs because American workers are unproductive. In fact, productivity is up by 37 percent just during the last decade or the 10 years. That kind of productivity increase is normally accompanied by an increase in real income, but that is not happening now. If you look at real earnings, that is earnings expressed in constant 1982 dollars, American workers today are earning 40 cents an hour less than they did 10 years ago. What is more, real wages in this country hit their peak in 1972, and I said so at the time and said at that time real income has dropped from $8.55 an hour in constant dollars to $7.30 an hour, a drop of $1.25 an hour. To put it another way, American workers are about 12 percent poorer today than they were in 1972.

No wonder people have tried to supplement their incomes with a second job. No wonder so many are unable to even think about a new car for instance. Car prices have risen far faster than incomes, and so have the prices of housing, medical care, and the other essentials.

More and more Americans are being forced to take temporary jobs because companies do not want to hire full-time workers, and so the temporary-job business has increased by 50 percent in the past 5 years alone, and some 2¼, 2.25 million Americans, are so-called temps or temporaries. In other words, for every 10 Americans in a solid manufacturing job, there is 1 American who is hanging on by doing temporary work, work that pays few, if any, benefits, usually does not include health care, and pays less per hour for the same work as a regular employee would earn.

Even when jobs are not just disappearing, millions of Americans have seen employers transform these job into low-pay situations. A major airline, for instance, spun off its reservation business to a subsidiary owned by that same company. The subsidiary then told the employees they were welcome to the jobs, but the jobs would pay less than half the present rate. With that kind of story common, used every day, is it any wonder that housing starts today are 20 percent below the rate of a decade ago?

None of this is happening because corporate profits are too low. In fact, corporate profits are at record levels. This slide in wages is not happening because of high unemployment. Unemployment is less than 6 percent, the lowest in 6 years. The slide is not happening because of a stock market crash. The market has never been higher. What is happening is that fewer and fewer Americans are taking more and more of the economic pie, and so we are seeing a creeping pauperization of this country.

What saddens me is that the current majority in control wants to enact policies that would accelerate this pauperization. They would enact a tax system that would transfer more money from the poor to the rich. They will enact cuts in all kinds of programs, from education to Medicare, that we will pay for that transfer the wealth from the bottom to the top, and they would blame the social ills that flow from all of this on the very poor victims themselves.

Sixty years ago the country was on the verge of a great class struggle. I was there and was of an age that had it indelibly imprinted in my mind, heart, and soul to this day. This was the age of the immense struggle over unionization. It was the age of the picketing line, the lockout, the violence that I witnessed in my hometown and the whole panoply of antilabor laws sought by industrialists who were determined to share no power with the workers of the Nation.

Today we hear our counterpart party Members, Republican Members, accusing Democrats of fomenting class warfare. That is not unlike the segregationist accusing civil rights protesters of being agitators. But the truth is, unless there is an injustice, unless there is a grievance, nobody gets excited by an orator who denounces something as evil or wrong.

The Republicans know that there is injustice, and, if they do not know, then they are far more dense than I ever will believe they are. They know that they are wrong. They should know that people are angry. But they want to blame all this on educators who are guilty of nothing more than telling the truth. If we are about to enter into some kind of class warfare, there can only be one reason for it. Too many people have been pushed too far. We need to understand the fact about what is happening in this country, and what is happening is that too many hard-working Americans are finding that they are losing ground no matter how hard they work, how hard they strive, how frugal they may be. Too many Americans are losing wages and benefits for no good reason at all because they know they are producing more and better goods and doing all the things they are supposed to do to make this a great and growing economy.

No wonder they are beginning to ask, ''Well, what about me? What is my share?'' No wonder they are asking why they cannot plan on being able to retire, or why they cannot afford to get ill, or why they cannot have a decent place to live.

Now there is no question about it because a party identifies itself with these policies. The Republican Party and its policies do not address any of this, and frankly I am not certain that my own party that I have adhered to, the Democrat Party, is doing much more either, which is a terribly sad confession to make to the people of this country who are in urgent need to have some reaction from those sources of power that have been built in their country as forces or institutions that are supposed to meet that. This is the premise for the existence of these two great parties, but twiddle-dee-dee, twiddle-dee-dum, when it comes to these basics, it hurts me. I have always identified as a Democrat, but then the choice was impossible to do otherwise in the manner I came up. But I must

say truthfully today, and I have spoken out, I have antagonized some of my so-called fellow Democrats both here and at home. So what? As we used to say, if the shoe fits, put it on.

So we will see a great, and growing and greater anger in this country. It does not take a genius to predict that. I have seen it. I have had it told, and I have visibly registered. I pride myself in coming from a level that I have never lost contact with the society back home, and I know of the frustration. I know that when people lose hope, then we have trouble. We will see a general revolt as people demand a fair share of the wealth they have helped to create.

□ 1845

As they demand a secure future for themselves and their families, as they demand a decent environment to live and work in.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray not to see that. I have seen it in my youth, and I recall to this day the bitterness and the anger and how the scars remained for at least some generations there. True, the Lord has been kind and has preserved me to witness the emergence from those dreary days, but I am fearful, I must confess.

I am never one to have been governed by fear. Fear, I think, is the big enemy all along. I have always tried to act not in reaction to fear, but with as detached and as cool as possible a judgment would enable me to see.

Those who think they saw agitation in the civil rights struggle, those who think they saw unrest during the Vietnam period, did not live through the squalid and violent times through the 1930's as I have, when the Army drove squatters from the Washington areas here with violence, when States tried to keep America from crossing their borders to find work, and when people did not hesitate to fight and die for the right to unionize, or even to protest.

I would not want to see the kind of deprivation that causes that, not again, when there is no need. God has blessed us. We must deserve that blessing too, and make sure that we have wisely and charitably and with consideration made use of this gift of plenty.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to avoid repeating history, I say to my colleagues, we must all listen better. We must all show compassion, and we must all show more concern for ordinary people than I have seen thus far this year, or indeed in recent years. Most of all, we must have a passion for justice that I see as almost entirely missing from this body today. A passion, a passion for justice, not just a desire or a hope, but a passion for justice. An unquieted, uninterrupted passion for justice. I have not seen it, unfortunately, not lately.

To those I say that the American people have never lost their thirst and passion for justice. It is there. They are crying out for it, maybe in a temporary wilderness, maybe not, and sooner or later, one way or the other, they will be heard.

LOOKING BACK TO VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAPO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, I am going to be the last speaker, and most of our colleagues are in automobiles and airplanes heading back to their districts across the country. I will be shortly myself back on the trail. I want to be respectful of our hard-working reporters of official debate. They are understaffed by three people at the end of the week, and this has been a particularly arduous week for them. They can begin a well-deserved rest after they put in the several, more than several hours compiling all of the records today at the end of the day.

So I do not intend to take the hour. I had thought I was going first. Next week is going to be more hectic than this week, and the week after that, before we take our August break, is going to be one rapidly-moving treadmill. But I have something that I must get out to the American people through C–SPAN. There are not many folks in the gallery tonight, and I want this on the record. I will send the written RECORD to people. But it is important.

As with most of my presentations, I will put a bit more energy into it to hold onto my audience than the two preceding presentations. You always like to have a good lead-in with a lot of energy and an exciting topic so you do not lose the C–SPAN audience to the evening news, which is filled with more terror and modern American controversy.

I have promised people in all 50 States, as I have been out there on the campaign trail, that I will do something about McNamara, Robert Strange McNamara's insulting book, cruel book, ripping open the wounds of Vietnam, rending the hearts of now aging mothers and dads and beautiful young widows that are now in middle age with grown up children, and children who were toddlers that are not in their thirties, early forties, late twenties, with families of their own who are still trying to find answers for the agony of Vietnam. Both POW/missing-in-action groups are in town, the League of Families and the Alliance of Families of our missing. I made promises to them.

I believe that of all people to end up in the White House, William Jefferson Blythe Clinton was the last human being of all the 42 Presidents, or anybody who has ever run for President, to normalize relations with war criminals in Hanoi who broke every single paragraph and line, who violated every letter of the spirit and the intent of the Paris peace accords worked out between Le Duc Tho, war criminal, and Henry Kissinger, never described as naive, but certainly naive in this case; they violated all of it. The Communist rulers in Hanoi today, and we see other Members of the other Chamber, the United States Senate, going over there on John F. Kennedy's funeral airplane, literally Kennedy's Air Force One that brought his broken body home from Dallas, the very plane that Lyndon Baines Johnson became President on, the 36th President of the United States, sworn in on that airplane.

That airplane, on a nonbipartisan trip, all members of one party, all of them liberals, all of them with $12.50 of per diem in their pockets, on their way to Hanoi and Saigon to congratulate the war criminals for their victory over at least three of the dominoes, South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

Mr. Speaker, I have been doing a lot of thinking about my last two special orders where I said I had made an historical statement on this floor, and that I was going to stand by it. My words were taken down, my speaking privileges were removed for the day. I could have appealed the ruling of the Chair. In retrospect, I thought it would have been an easy party line victory that was an historical statement that I used against Mr. Clinton.

I have rethought it, and I said I would do it again on the floor, and I probably will not. There are many ways to discuss history without using words and trying to understand why decent men who are parliamentarians found three simple words worthy of being stricken from the RECORD.

Let me approach this gingerly. Here is the U.S. Constitution. A handful of us carry it around with us almost every day, try to have it every day. Here is article 3, section 3. It gives the definition of treason against the United States.

When the Constitution was written, the United States were always spoken of in plural. As any historian will tell you, this ended with the Civil War where we became truly one union, one entity. So I will explain this as I read section 3, article 3. It said, Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them. ''Them'' means the plural of the handful of States that existed then, the 13 agricultural Colonies of the original United States. It shall consist only in levying war, and war is capitalized, against them. Or, in adhering to their, all 13 States, Enemies, with a capital E, giving them Aid, with a capital A, a simple word, and Comfort, with a capital C.

So there is where the term came from. Aid and Comfort, capital A, capital C, and adhering to their enemies, plural. New sentence: No person shall be convicted of treason unless, on the testimony, for some reason testimony is capitalized, of two witnesses, witnesses capitalized, to the same overt act, two witnesses to an overt act, of

giving aid and comfort to enemies, or a confession in open court.

Now, this says, the Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason, but no retainer of treason shall work, corruption of blood or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attained. A rather archaic 1787 language.

Now, because of those words, to put those three words together, enemy in any juxtaposition with two very simple words we use all the time in medicine, giving aid or giving comfort, it constitutes an inference of treason. I never intended to give that inference on the day after the State of the Union, and I have never even applied it to Jane Fonda, because without a declaration of war, which we had in neither Korea or the Vietnam war, we were in the peculiar position of seeing Americans do whatever they felt like to demoralize our troops in the field who were shedding blood, or to assist a Communist cause anywhere in the world and describe it as a nationalist cause, and many people felt that.

With the emergence of McNamara's book, an arrogant and self-serving a piece of writing, and not very good quality writing, at that, and Clinton, in answer to a CNN reporter, Wolf Blitzer by name, that this gave him vindication for what he did overseas during the Vietnam war, it is a stunning offense and hurt to everybody who lost a loved one in the decade of Vietnam's bloodshedding or anyone who is in a wheelchair today, or left a limb behind in Vietnam, or saw a young boyhood friend blown to pieces or die slowly in their arms.

Mr. Speaker, I have several books here that I want to recommend for Americans to read if they think they are qualified to debate me on this subject of our Commander in Chief or Vietnam.

□ 1900

When I was in Des Moines, IA, last March, a Vietnam veteran gave me this book, ''Working-Class War,'' by Christian J.G. Appe, subtitle: American Combat Soldiers in Vietnam. It is a perfect historical piece to describe that Vietnam was fought by working-class kids, the sons, and in the case of the 80 females' names on the wall, Army nurses, almost every one of them, that it was a war where the middle class of America gave up their sons; very few, very few from the Ivy League schools.

The best and the brightest, I believe, were the ROTC students, the graduates of West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy of Colorado Springs who, by the very volunteer nature of their going to the academies to get a commission, or the ROTC, or the OCS, that they were the best and brightest, standing up to communism in that period.

What triggered my thought response to Mr. Clinton was his reference in the State of the Union, with the Medal of Honor winner sitting up here, who had won the Medal of Honor 6 days past his 17th birthday in the battle of Iwo Jima, he made reference to the cold war, that we have won the cold war. When somebody says ''we,'' they are including themselves in that process.

I cannot think of a single, solitary effort in his entire life that Mr. Clinton gave or performed to have added to the success of what President John F. Kennedy called the long twilight struggle against communism. There are other Members in this Chamber and in the Senate who I do not believe lifted a tiny pinkie in their entire lives to contribute one scintilla of effort to winning that cold war. There are those who never wore the uniform, voted for a strong defense budget, or gave support to our men in uniform; verbally, town hall meetings, with just nothing much more than respect.

There are women, of course, who have never been subject to a draft in this country, mothers who gave their sons, sisters who saw their brothers go off and supported them, wrote to them, kept their morale up, and there are people who are 4–F, God's call, who worked in the defense industry, gave money, or paid their taxes willingly. You can come down a long thermometer of effort to find some tiny contribution, but there are Members of this Chamber and the other body, and Mr. Clinton, who did nothing. If you did nothing, that is better than contributing to the other side.

Mr. Speaker, here is McNamara's ugly, hurtful, self-serving book called ''In Retrospect.'' Let me put something in retrospect. When you read this book, you learn what has stunned me for years, that Mr. McNamara resigned after 7 years in the position of Secretary of Defense, the architect of this war, almost the sole architect, as President Johnson never, ever had a feel for military affairs.

In spite of the fact that he wore a Silver Star to his grave, he did not earn that Silver Star. The B–26 Martin Marauder that he was on on a mission for Sam Rayburn as a Congressman on a leave of duty to be a lieutenant commander, starting at the top is nice, in the U.S. Navy, to bring back some firsthand information for Speaker Sam Rayburn, the aircraft that he was on by name the Harried Hare, H-A-R-E, turned back with a generator problem before it had seen any combat. It was never fired upon. The log shows 1 hour and 5 minutes, about 30 minutes out to the north coast, heading toward the north coast of New Guinea to bomb Lei, came back before it got over the Owen Stanley Mountain Range.

For that he was awarded a Silver Star by PR types in General McArthur's campaign, I am sure MacArthur never knew this, and he accepted this, knowing in his heart he had done nothing but fly a short mission that never went into combat. Even if it had, what was he doing except being hunkered down in the back of an airplane? Men have given their lives to get a Bronze Star with V for valor and have paid for it with their life or their limbs of the health of their body for the rest of their lives.

LBJ let McNamara run rampant for 7 years with this noble cause, as Ronald Reagan always referred to it and still does, and still do I, this noble cause, crippled politically in this Chamber, the other Chamber, and mainly at the White House under LBJ and under Nixon, who by his own admission, on a television show to David Frost, said ''The biggest mistake I made in my career, Mr. Frost, was I did in 1972 in Vietnam what I should have done in 1969. I should have done it all in 1969 my first year in office, and maybe there would not have been killing fields in Cambodia, 1 to 2 million people dead, no 68,000 people executed by death list of our Vietnamese allies, no 100,000 or 200,000 killed in Laos, no 750,000 drowned or torn apart by sharks or human sharks called pirates on the South China seas or along the Thai or Vietnamese coast.'' All of that agony and grief was caused by Nixon waiting to win a second term, raw ego. But Nixon accounts for 18,000, 19,000 names on the wall.

The other 39,000 to 40,000 are LBJ's, so LBJ gave McNamara his head. McNamara resigned on leap year day, February 29, 1968. He was so clever, he thinks, although David Halberstam told me in a radio discussion with me that he does not think McNamara was very bright, and that was the key to the whole thing, in spite of his academic achievement, or his 2 months as president of Ford Motor Co., or less than 90 days, anyway.

He writes in this incredible self-serving book that in his resignation ceremony at the river entrance of the Pentagon, he was supposed to have a fly-by. Who is going to give him a fly-by? Vietnam vets, veterans of aerial combat over Southeast Asia? Maybe a Korean ace thrown in there? What were they going to use, F–100's that I flew in peacetime, or F–4 Phantoms, which were used by Marines, Navy, and Air Force? What were they going to fly for him? F–105 Thunderchiefs, that he decimated the whole 1,000-plane fleet against the hills and thud ridge of the Red River Valley of North Vietnam, so much so that the aircraft picked up a name by the pilots of ''the Thud'' itself, that big, beautiful long Tunderchief? Is that what was going to fly a tribute to Robert Strange McNamara—that is his mother's maiden name, by the way—it really is strange. I feel like calling him Robert Evil McNamara, as does historian Col. Harry Summers. I will call him that. I have called him that.

He resigns on the day that only pops up every 4 years, Presidential years, interestingly, February 29, 1968. Well, God rained on his parade. There was weather, no fly-by. Everybody was drenched. They went inside, and then he took his what appears to be lovely

wife, Marge, and off they go to Aspen, Snow Mass at Aspen.

I took my young kids there, my two young sons, and three daughters stayed home, a month after Saigon fell, to show them millionaire Robert Strange McNamara's home on the ski run at Snow Mass at Aspen, and it was an energy crisis period, and there were tiki lights, burning gas lights, all around this millionaire's hideaway at Aspen.

That is where he went for all of March 1968, and Mr. Speaker, March is when our hospitals in Vietnam and Laos and in the Philippines and Trippler hospital in Hawaii were filled with more wounded than any point or month during the entire war. There were more amputees and double amputees and triple amputees and young men dying in those hospitals and dying on the air shuttle hospital planes back to Hawaii and other hospitals, more people being returned broken to their families, more names were put on that wall in the month of February and March, when he is skiing in Aspen, than any other 2-month period of the entire war.

As a matter of fact, in the first 10 days of the Tet offensive of the month he resigned, I remember the figure, it is pretty easy, 1,111 Americans killed in action. He did not want to touch it, because he was quitting that month. He had given his notice to President Johnson, who let him pick his departure date, Leap Year Day, months before.

I remember Johnson telling Walter Kronkite, in a goodbye or finale audio interview, that McNamara made a speech in Canada that we could never win the war. That is what this book is basically about, only he made that decision in 1963 before we had had any Americans—two dozen were killed in action when he decides we cannot win it, and 58,000 end up paying with their lives, and 100,000 others with broken bodies.

There is a page in here, interestingly, page 105, listen to this. I read this on the floor last week. I feel like doing it every month until I retire from here. He is in Washington, returning from Vietnam, and Kennedy is not in the grave 26 days. This is 1 day shy of Kennedy's assassination day, November 22. This is December 21, 1963. He comments on a secret program that is about to be launched bailing out courageous young South Vietnamese officers into North Vietnam. We did it all that next Spring, and every one of them was captured and tortured to death. Is that fascinating? McNamara sent all these people north to be tortured to death, young Vietnamese officers. In this whole book, he treats our Vietnamese allies in the South disgracefully, either by ignominiously dismissing them, or talking about how corrupt they are, as though the heroes are the Communists up in Hanoi.

He says, McNamara, quoting from his book directly, page 105: ''Upon my return to Washington of December 21, I was less than candid when I reported to the press. Perhaps a senior government official could hardly have been more straightforward in the midst of war.'' He is calling it a war, and it is December, 4 days before Christmas of 1963, 2 dozen men are killed in action. That was over a 2-year period. Jim Davis, the first man killed, on this exact date, December 21 of 1961, so it is 2 years since the first man was killed and we are still under 30.

He says: ''I couldn't have been more straightforward in the midst of a war. I could not fail to recognize the effect discouraging remarks might have on those we strove to support—the South Vietnamese—as well as those we sought to overcome—the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese. It is a profound, enduring, and universal ethical and moral dilemma: How, in times of war and crisis, can senior government officials be completely frank to their own people without giving aid and comfort to the enemy?''

Mr. Speaker, there is the term that got me in trouble, ''aid and comfort to the enemy.'' He is applying that just about a Secretary of Defense at a press conference, being too candid with the press and then transmitting the truth to the American people. Let us flash forward. I will keep this little newspaper clipping at this point in McNamara's book for the rest of my life. Some great-grandchildren will remove it some day and say, ''Interesting similarity.''

Let us flash forward from December 21, 1963, to May 20, 1995. Here is Mr. Clinton, challenging the NRA to donate the proceeds of that controversial letter that was stupidly and offensively written about bucket helmets and jackboots, when it should have merely been written combat helmets and combat boots.

Why were we using M–1 tanks, two of them, M–2 Bradley fighting vehicles, 4 of them, they wanted 14 to assault the compound of a religious cult that was accumulating weapons and seducing young children, children as young as 10, but the women were obviously hostage prisoners, and there were 24 little babies left in there when 51 days later they hit it again, but obviously it was in violation of posse comitatus to use tanks that were not available to Mogadishu 6 months later, let alone all these Bradley fighting vehicles that could have blown through simply-made roadblocks, that caused Rangers to bleed to death all night because we did not have one Bradley or one Abrahms tank 6 months later, 5½ months later in Mogadishu.

Here is the article in the liberal Washington Post, by Ann Devry, and the title again: ''Clinton Challenges NRA to Donate Letter Proceeds.'' Listen to this. He says, ''The money should be given over,'' which is an interesting point, because they, the NRA, made the money by attacking the police. They admitted they did the wrong thing, the NRA, and they ought to give the money up. Interesting, Clinton, who has fought the antigun control forces of the NRA through his Presidency, added ''I hope the NRA knows by now that anyone who pretends that police officers are the enemy is only giving aid and comfort to criminals, who are the real enemy.''

□ 1915

So Clinton likes that term now, aid and comfort to the enemy, the enemy being criminals, if you are criticizing police officers. So, I wonder does he think, it seems to be a Democratic theme at the hearings that two of our subcommittees have joined together to have and that they are having on the Senate side about this atrocity at Waco, and then we will get around to the atrocity, even worse, because of greater loss of life at Oklahoma City. But does Clinton think our hearings are giving aid and comfort to criminals in the street?

Is everybody who belongs to the NRA a criminal for wanting to own, under the Second Amendment, for their own self-defense weapons? Because, as I said in that same speech where four or five of my words were removed, the Second Amendment has nothing to do with hunting. It is not about hunting; hunting mallard ducks or bears or stags or anything. It is about political freedom.

As I said, it is about situations like Grozny in Chechnya, or Bosnia. I did not mention Bosnia, but I did mention 1776. Somebody has to dissect this McNamara book that so cavalierly uses this term from article III, section 3 of the Constitution about aid and comfort.

Now, I took off our computer screen in our office's WordPerfect thesaurus, it is the computer thesaurus on all of our word processors, to look for synonyms for ''aid'' and ''comfort.'' And I got Roget's II Thesaurus, and I decided never again would I use that term, even about Jane Fonda or even about people who, like Tom Hayden, a State senator in California, in violation of our State Constitution, which is far more specific than our beautiful Federal Constitution, because it does not say that you need a declaration of war.

It says anybody that assists or gives aid and comfort to any fighting force in conflict with our men must never be allowed to serve in office in California. And I went there the day years ago when we almost threw Hayden out as an assemblyman. The vote was 36 to 33; 11 people did not have the guts to show up for the vote.

Now, he is in the State senate, serving against our Constitution. Again, somebody who gave aid and comfort to Hanoi. And, unfortunately, we only have 17 Republicans. If he were in the assembly today, he would be thrown out by our California Constitution.

So if you take ''aid'' and look for a synonym, in Roget's II Thesaurus it says ''help.'' That is a verb. Or a noun: ''help'' or ''helper.''

For ''comfort,'' verb. ''Console, solace, soothe, relieve.'' Noun: ''consolation, solace.'' Synonym for enemy: Simple, ''opponent, foe.'' It did not even have ''adversary''; that is too neutral.

You come down to our computer thesauruses, Mr. Speaker, on your own office word offices, to get rid of that word, ''aid.'' You can use ''aid, abet, assist, succor, sustain.'' There is a good word. If you need a noun, which is the way I used it, ''assistance, relief, support, comfort, assistant, attendant supporter.''

If you are looking for another word for ''comfort,'' which the word computer uses perfectly as a synonym for ''aid,'' you could use ''cheer, console, reassure, soothe.'' If a noun is needed, ''consolation, solace, succor, contentment, abundance, luxury.'' It goes off the point here.

''Enemy,'' they use in the thesaurus, ''adversary, antagonist, betrayer, foe.'' A song I learned to sing at 8 years of age: ''Let's remember Pearl Harbor as we did the Alamo, let's remember Pearl Harbor as we go to meet the foe.'' In that case, Japan and Germany and Italy. ''Nemesis, opponent, rival.''

So if I want to talk about Jane Fonda going to Moscow, which she did on the way to Hanoi and on other trips, of course, coming back from Hanoi, if I want to talk about Jane Fonda going to Moscow or Beijing, which she did later when she decided that Russia was not nice to her when she was making Doll House. The unions abused her when she was making the Ibsen movie, I do not think anybody ever saw it in Moscow studios. She decided China was the place of the future, Beijing. She didn't like that much either. She is used to a millionaire lifestyle.

But suppose we said Jane Fonda went to Moscow to help the foe in Hanoi; to sustain the communist forces in Hanoi; to give them assistance and to support. Suppose we said Jane Fonda went to Moscow to sustain and support, to give cheer and to reassure the foe of our fighting forces in Vietnam.

Now, of course she sat in a gun pit. she made radio broadcasts. And when our POWs were released in 1973, and the issue was still in doubt as to whether South Vietnam would prevail as a democracy with 44 newspapers in Saigon, of course there is one now, a communist rag, she called our colleague, PETE PETERSON, on that side of the aisle, and SAM JOHNSON on this side of the aisle, and Senator MCCAIN, on the Republican majority side in the Senate, she called them liars, professional killers, and hypocrites.

If you are scratching your head, Mr. Speaker, colleagues or Americans watching the proceedings, by hypocrite, she meant how could they fight in a war and then, if they were tortured, not expect to the tortured. She knows nothing about the Geneva Convention, so that is hypocritical.

When Bill Clinton went to Moscow, and here is a book I recommend: Clinton Confidential, a Climb to Power, by George Carposi. He and I have chatted on the phone. He wants to show me his research on page 64 to explain this paragraph, and it answers the question that Congressman JOHNSON, Congressman HUNTER, Congressman DORNAN and Congressman CUNNINGHAM, the three of us from California, SAM from Texas, could not get answered on this House floor in September and October. Nobody would phone in this information to our offices, and we were each taking over a thousand calls a day: Why did Clinton go to Moscow for only 2½ days at 27 degrees below zero, 10 inches of snow cover.

And I am at the airport with four wives of missing-in-action heroes, one Marine three Air Force, and we are under arrest. And Ross Perot is cooling his heels in Denmark, at 40 years of age, a billionaire with a 707 filled with food and medicine for the POWs delayed from Christmas. Came all the way around the world, across the Pacific, Vientiane, Laos, down through India, up through Europe and into Copenhagen waiting for clearance as the Russians promised in the Russian embassy, for him to fly it in, even without him on the airplane, even with a Russian crew, to go to Moscow where they would go fly it back to Hanoi.

He never got into Moscow. I was kicked out of the airport. Four of us out of five, including me, coming down with pneumonia, because there was no heating in the old hotel where they locked us up.

What was Clinton doing? Broke. No money. Freezing cold. And he arrived all by himself on New Year's eve with no money. Here is the answer, page 64: Clinton's activities in Moscow remain a mystery in full. He has never discussed with the media ever, ever, Mr. Speaker, to this day, either that trip or his travel to at least one other known defector country, Norway. The defector from NATO, as far as our effort in Vietnam is concerned. However, one phase of his short visit to Moscow has been ascertained.

Clinton attended the January 2, so-called peace rally and banquet held in the National Hotel's ballroom. That is where he was put up, for free, I guess. That had as guest of honor, U.S. Senator Eugene McCarthy, the Minnesota Democrat that was defeated in 1968 by Vice President Humphrey.

There are no other details of Clinton's trip to Moscow, which presumably ended when he boarded another Aeroflot jet, he came down by train from Leningrad, just the next day and the plane took him to Prague, where he stayed for 4 days.

Now, Moscow was far more interesting in that period than Prague, but he stayed for 4 days with an Oxford classmate, Jan Kapold, and that family. Jan's grandmother and I discussed this with a Czechoslovakian gentleman at this hall today. I had forgotten her name and he knew it right off of the top of his head. The woman whose party threw Jan Masaryk, the Czech hero during World War II, out of the window and called it a suicide.

Jan, one of his classmates at Oxford, her grandmother was Maria Smernova. Not even a Czech. She was a Rumanian, I found out from this gentleman. And this author, George Carposi of this book, Clinton Confidential, went up to the Czechoslovakian consulate in New York and found out that she was truly the founder of the Communist party in Czechoslovakia just after World War II. The murderers Jan Masaryk.

And she was its first president, a position she still held when Clinton stayed with them in Prague in 1970. And the book gets more interesting than that on every level; Whitewater, personal life, everything.

Mr. Speaker, that is the sixth book that has come out last year. And if people want to check with me about why I wear a Clinton countdown watch that shows 473 days until a glorious election, I hope, November 5, 1996, when the Grand Old Party controls, hopefully, again this distinguished body of parliamentarians and the House of Lords, as I lovingly call the U.S. Senate.

If we can control the White House and sync up those three bodies of power, maybe we can begin to roll back $5 trillion worth of debt that has been heaped on my nine grandchildren and my five grown children and my Sally and me and we have a 10th grandchild well on the way. Maybe we can do that.

But to do it, we cannot do this with kid gloves, as my Navy-attack, torpedo-bomber-pilot, 58-combat-mission friend George Bush tried to do. We have to take the gloves off. Honorably, Marquess of Queensbury debate rules, looking for the proper synonyms of ''sustenance'' and ''solace'' and ''comfort'' and ''sustaining'' and find other words for Hanoi than the word I, unfortunately, used. Use ''foe,'' ''adversary,'' ''Communist killer,'' ''war criminal''; a lot of other ways to describe this.

And you are going to have to read some other books if you want to be one step ahead of me. I have not found one Congressman or Senator yet who has read The Rise of Bill Clinton, that is the subtitle, On The Make, by Meridith Oakley.

This book is by a young female reporter who is shown here with Bill Clinton as the attorney general back in 1978; a picture with young Meridith Oakley who followed his entire career. That came out less than 2 years ago.

And then it was followed by Bob Woodward's book, ''The Agenda.'' How many Congressmen and Senators have read this? Look at this fascinating confrontation on page 287. Senator BOB KERRY, medal of honor winner, arguing with Clinton over the greatest tax increase in the history of civilization. In all of recorded history, nothing has been as massive as the Democratic-engineered tax increase of the summer of 1993. Not a single Republican on this

side of the aisle, or in the other body, voted for it.

KERRY does not want to vote for it, the Medal of Honor winner who left a leg on an island in Vietnam. Clinton pleads with KERRY that he needs his vote. ''My presidency is going to go down now,'' he said sharply, by now shouting at the top of his voice. KERRY comes back, ''I do not like the argument that I am bringing the presidency down.''

Hey, this is by a Pulitzer Prize winner. Maybe commander and hero of advocacy journalism, Bob Woodward. His name is as big as the title on the book. In the paperback it says ''Bob Woodward's The Agenda.'' He is a hot author.

He has Kerry saying, ''I don't like the argument that I am bringing the presidency down,'' he shouted back getting fed up. Clinton shouted that the defeat would do precisely that. KERRY could not flee from his responsibility.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, KERRY eventually voted for the big tax increase, but he extracted a good price; the commission that our colleague, CHRIS COX was on that JUDD GREGG of New Hampshire cochaired, where KERRY and JUDD GREGG, two U.S. Senators said, in 20 years there will only be three lines in the U.S. budget: interest on the debt, Social Security, and Medicare. No Coast Guard lighthouses, no Marine Corps, no tower operators, crime running wild in the streets. Just three items. KERRY extracted that from him.

Clinton shouts ''You are going to wreck my presidency.'' And KERRY says, bottom of page 287, The Agenda, ''I really resent the argument that somehow I am responsible for your presidency surviving,'' KERRY bellowed, is the word Bob Woodward chose.

Clinton comes back. The ultimate four-letter word, there are pages in the Chamber, the ultimate four-letter word followed by the pronoun ''you,'' Clinton yelled. Turn page. When I read this book I cold not hardly move fast enough to see if what KERRY's rejoinder was; whether he was going to echo the President. He did not.

KERRY felt he always tried to be respectful of the Commander in Chief, but he also wanted to defend himself and he continued shouting back. Clinton pressed on two themes. He had to have KERRY's vote. ''I need it,'' he said at one point plaintively. ''I need it.'' He also said that if KERRY denied him the vote, KERRY would wreak national havoc.

I've got the responsibility for me,'' KERRY replied. Now he is not shouting. ''I have got my vote. My vote matters. I vote based upon what I believe is right' always have. I don't particularly on big issues like this, like to shave it and so that's where it is.'' ''Fine,'' said Clinton brusquely. ''Okay. If that's what you want to do, go do it.'' Both crushed their phones down.

□ 1930

Interesting verb. Crushed their phones down. Clinton was irate, turned to his advisers after the conversation and said, ''It is going to be a no.'' No was a yes. Got to read the Agenda. This is the one that talks about purple rages, lava flowing from the top of his head, the Commander-in-Chief treating George Stephanopolous like an abused wife. Book two, Agenda.

Then out came—let me get these two straight now. Yes, inside the White House, Ronald Kessler, seen him do several interviews, best-selling author of the FBI and inside the CIA. Subtitle: The Hidden Lives of the Modern Presidents and the Secrets of the World's Most Powerful Institution.

It was the revelations of the Kennedys that sold the book. And Inside the White House, the cooks talk, the butlers talk, the Secret Service talks, the hired help talk. And what the revelation says is what the British would call is all about unseemly speech in front of the hired help and explosions and domestic quarrels. Book three.

Book four. Young picture of handsome Bill Clinton looking for all the world like Mickey Rooney with a lot of hair, honest, open, innocent face, looks like a Dornan in a way. Biography of Bill Clinton, first in his class. And it does not mean that he graduated first in grade school, high school, college. It means he was first of the baby boomers to achieve such raw naked power.

Another winner of a Pulitizer Prize, David Moraniss, M-O-R-A-N-I-S-S. I ought to give the publishers on these.

On the Make, Regnery; Bob Woodward, Simon and Shuster; Inside the White House, Pocketbooks; First in His Class, back to Simon and Shuster again.

Seen a lot of interviews with this man. This was serialized for 4 days, 3 or 4 days in the liberal Washington Post. Fascinating book. Read this and you will understand why there is chaos in our country and why every other week Clinton alternates in a race back to the center or back to his liberal core of beliefs.

And in between all of this, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, if you read this book, POW, written in our bicentennial year or written for over a 3-year period, researched over 5 or 6, published in 1976 by John G. Hubell, H-U-B-E-L-L, association with Andrew Jones, and Kenneth Tomlinson, this book, POW, will tell you about why the Vietnamese are war criminals.

You will read lines like this from one-term Senator Jerry Denton, a more honorable and decent man I have never served with at either Chamber. He was so tortured, the white heat coursing through his body, the white, red-hot pain, that he was sure his spine would snap. Jerry had never known pain to equal this.

SAM JOHNSON, the same. Do not understand that you could suffer such pain and not lose consciousness. Stockdale, same thing. Robby Reisner, same thing.

And these men, the ones that are most tortured, the ones that won the Medal of Honor, the Medal of Honor with valor written across it, the only word on the Medal of Honor, by sustaining unbelievable torture so as not to make a broadcast, they begged William Jefferson Blythe Clinton, do not normalize relations with the war criminals.

I came across a quote from Senator Denton the other day. They are all—all the POWs are going to have a reunion in Annapolis this weekend. I was going to go up there, and then I talked to one, and they said, ''We are really just going to have a few beers and share some good memories and some awful memories.'' And they said, ''We would love to have you, but no politics.'' And I decided, no, that is their moment. This is just that incredible band of brothers that suffered so under the war criminals that are now laughing in our face in Hanoi.

If you read this working-class war, read POW, you do not have to read such else about Vietnam.

This week coming up, we will dedicate the Korean War Memorial, the war that I joined at 19 and was mercifully on my to pilot training when it ended so I never had to shoot at another mother's son or end up broken or a POW.

My dad always told me about World War I. His prayer was, ''Take me to heaven, Lord, but don't burn me and don't cripple me.'' And his prayers were answered, although he had three wounds, two of them for poison gas.

I was raised in a military family. I understand what sacrifice is all about. The brave die but once, cowards die a thousand times.

And those that did not understand that this cold war was exactly what Kennedy called it, a twilight struggle against what Pope Pius the 11th called the intrinsic horrible evil of communism, those who did not want to join any noble cause or any part of that struggle against communism, they can laugh themselves all the way to Hanoi and back, all the way to Havana and back, all the way to Moscow and back, all the way to Beijing and back, but they still in the end have to live with themselves and their delusions that we were the imperialist interventionist, evil bad guys, we were the enemy of Vietnam.

I remember that Pogo line being thrown in my face by college, smart-ass punks saying, we have met the enemy, the enemy is us, we are the evil ones. Ho Chi Minh is George Washington. He is the arrow. I can hear Clinton repeating all of that at the teaching he did at London while he was giving a class at Oxford. On the way back, he told them, ''Get lost. I can do anything I want.''

Senator MCCAIN told about the war, and I have got to rake JOHN over the coals for that, that normalization was

a 48 Hours story. No, Senator, it is not a 48 Hours story.

The Committee on Rules gave us our day in court today. We will have a debate on this floor about no money going toward setting up a U.S. embassy in an enemy-foe-adversary-opponent capital where the war criminals, those who actually got the blood of our men on their hands, lieutenant colonels and the majors, they are now the ones that are the colonels and the generals in the political military/political leaders.

The war criminals have taken over, the ones that are not dead that are older, like General Giap who sent 13- and 12-year-olds into battle to die, who had a thousand people, most of them civilians, executed along the Pearl River during McNamara's cowardly bug-out month, during February 1968, 5,000 people executed. That was under Giap's order.

Giap is the one who sent hundreds of thousands of young peasant children to die against B–52s that McNamara was using improperly in this 7 years of his crime.

I had a major, Army major, he is now a U.S. Congressman from Indiana, come up to me and say, Mr. Chairman, he is on my personnel committee, why can we not subpoena Kissinger and Eagleburger and current Secretary Winston Lord to tell us why everything went wrong with the Paris Peace Accords, why we never got a single live prisoner back from Laos, not one? A couple before the war really spooled up who escaped, and one after in 1974, but who—civilian was shot down after the war was won. It was over in Vietnam. Why did we not get back 399 men shot down in Laos?

And I said, you know, it is a simple idea. I said, we should have Kissinger. We will not have to subpoena him. He is a good man. He will come. So will Larry Eagleburer. I know Larry. So will Winston Lord. He did not come this time, but he will next time. He knows I am ready to subpoena anybody who does not want to come and face up to this ugly book of McNamara's.

Then STEVE BUYER came to me, Congressman BUYER of Indiana, just a few days ago. He wrote me a letter. He says:

> ''Why can't we subpoena Robert Strange McNamara to come before the full National Security Committee and answer for this book? Why can't he help us write laws so that no Defense Secretary or no President ever again will allow American fighting men to be called 'detained by a hostile power' instead of 'prisoners,' why he will allow our people to be treated as criminals and air pirates instead of respectful fighting men following the orders of their country?''

You notice, Mr. Speaker, we never called Scott O'Grady a prisoner of war for the 6 days he was missing. We did not hardly have a title for him. They gagged on the words ''detained by hostile power.'' They did not know what to call it. Was it a hostage?

What penalty have the Bosnian Serbs paid for destroying a $125 million piece of American equipment and trying to kill one of our officers? Nothing.

Instead, we are starting to put men in there with a man who avoided serving his country three times and the last time had an induction date of July 28, 1969, politically suppressed, reversed, obliterated, and mauled by a Governor, Senator Fulbright, by the draft board and by completely deviously telling the commander of the ROTC at Arkansas that he fully intended to join the ROTC unit, which obviously he did not, was already making plans to go back to Oxford and set up demonstrations on October 15, on October—and November 15.

Remember that it was Hanoi who called Clinton's organized November 15, 1969, demonstrations the fall offensive. That was a Communist title from the foe in Hanoi. The adversary, opponent, the killers of our Americans, the foe of the Hanoi called it the fall offensive and Clinton was part of the fall offensive. Sympathetic, coordinated demonstrations against the United States of America in Stockholm, Oslo, Helsinki, he visited all those capitals within days, in Moscow, London, Paris, New York, Washington, D.C., and I think in Atlanta, I know in L.A., San Francisco, and I know in Chicago, all coordinated worldwide.

I have just had an intelligence officer write to me that the Communists in Hanoi were obsessed with their image synching because Jeremiah Denton, POW, some day to become a U.S. Senator from Alabama, had tapped out with his eyelashes the words torture.

And then Bob Frischman came back. I met with him after he had been debriefed, had no elbow, saw his picture in prison holding up his arms, one arm with no elbow, let his wounds heal improperly. He was released early for some public relations reason. And Bob Frischman came back and told the horror stories of torture.

I do not know why my friend, Melvin Laird, served here for almost three decades, maybe more than that, he was Secretary of Defense under Richard Nixon, replacing Clark Clifford's 1-year tenure who replaced McNamara after McNamara's 7. He went through the 7 days of January, 1969, all of February, all of March, all of April, and all of June.

I was dying during this period because I knew what was going on in Hanoi. On July 10, 1969, Mel Laird had a massive press conference at the Pentagon, full world-court press, and said, ''Our men are being tortured in Hanoi, some to death.''

The story built through August, September, October, November, December, January, February, and this intelligence officer is sending me intercepts that he had in Tan Son Nhut.

Monday, I toured the NSA for 4 or 5 hours, National Security Agency. That is where we listen to everything around the whole world. NSA was as big then as it is now. They were listening to all the communist traffic that they were obsessed with, covering the torture stories. And did they find a hero in a Hill staffer who served in this House and has now gone to the Senate? They sure did. He went down with a Government camera, Government film that he later sold to Life Magazine and took pictures of the so-called tiger cages on Con Son Island, 125 miles southeast of Saigon and said, ''Well, we are brutalizing them.'' They had their story.

Life Magazine published these purloined Government pictures, and that story began to go around the world feeding people like Jane Fonda. At that time, she was still going to orgies with Roger Vadim in Paris, but it ricocheted around the world that oh, my God, the Americans are torturing people just like the Vietnamese, so they are all hypocrites. One story cancels out the other.

PHIL CRANE told me this week that as a freshman Congressman he was in Taiwan on a fact-finding trip by himself. He got a call from Saigon, headquarters at Tan Son Nhut. Come on down here, Congressman, and we will send you out to the Con Son tiger cages to show you that they have been cleverly photographed, and they are not the brutal places of imprisonment used to counter the stories of our men, truthful stories of being tortured and beaten to death.

And PHIL CRANE told me he will get the pictures for me, that he brought them to the House floor here all blown up, late 1970s showed them. Said he will give them free to any of the press but not to Life Magazine.

□ 1945

Some people published them as a big story in ''Human Events'' they are sending me Monday, and PHIL CRANE did his best as a freshman Congressman to try to counter the damage done to our fighting men in prison in Hanoi by the efforts to say that we did to them what they were doing to our men, and it just was not true.

I will never forget Jane Fonda when we returned the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong prisoners across the divide on the DMZ, the 17th parallel. Jane Fonda said, ''Well, you notice that all of these men are on crutches, and they're amputees, and none of our prisoners have a single amputation because they killed everybody or allowed them to die if they lost an arm or a leg.'' We patched up the North Vietnamese prisoners. That was obvious to a premed student, to a high school or grade school kid, that people survived our captivity with arms and legs gone, but not a single American came home with a limb missing or in bad mental state. If an American lost his sanity in prison, Irkle Beale, J.J. Connell, they were taken off and either murdered or allowed to die. Some of their remains have come home, and some of their remains have not come home.

So, if anybody out there across America wants to discuss this with me, they have got a lot of reading to do. It

is fascinating reading. It is current history. It is current events. It will give you an understanding and a feel for the men and women who wear the uniform, not just in our military services, but in the Coast Guard and in all of our law enforcement agencies, marshals, sheriffs, deputy sheriffs, cops up and down the line in all cities, American towns, and villages, and hamlets, people who will give their life not just for your life, but for your property.

Read this material, and you will understand why BOB DORNAN is sometimes aggressive, sometimes passionate, always dedicated, and always wanting to keep my eye focused on changing the leadership at the top to sync up with the worthy people up and down the chain of command like the 19 men who died in Mogadishu on October 3, 4, and 6, 1993, deaths that I predicted on this House floor in September and October of 1992, that I said would happen if we put someone into the White House who did not understand this dangerous world we live in.

I wanted to speak shorter than this, and I apologize to the official reporters, but obviously to this American this is very, very important, and I would point out, Mr. Speaker, and those that try to keep some modicum of civility here on this House floor, that I did not mention a book called ''Passion and Betrayal,'' which was the sixth book called ''Passion and Betrayal,'' which was the sixth book to come out in the past 18 months because I believe that book should be called ''Lust and I Got Just What I Deserved'' because you cannot make a credible case with a bimbo against somebody who traffics in that kind of person.

So I do not recommend reading what the Washington Post recommended people read because they said it was the first long-awaited Presidential pornography and it is about time was the reviewers smart-aleck attitude in recommending that dumb book. Do not waste time. Do not look for articles in Playboy or Penthouse, although somebody told me there is even a factual article in Penthouse last month and the month before, that you really can get away with saying you read the articles. Do not do that. Read these five books. Read the McNamara book. Try to get it from a library. Do not give him any money. And read ''Working Class War,'' and you will understand why some of us are passionate, and it is not a 48-hour story.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GOODLING (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for July 20 after 6 p.m. and for today, on account of illness.

Mr. DREIER at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. CRANE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness in the family.

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

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. MCNULTY.

Mr. NADLER.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Ms. NORTON, in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mr. COLEMAN.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

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

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. BLUTE.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

Mr. PACKARD.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1944. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 24, 1995, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1238. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request to make available appropriations totaling $100,000,000 in budget authority for the Department of Health and Human Services for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program and to designate the amount made available as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(a)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 103–333 (H. Doc. No. 104–102); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1239. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting a joint report pursuant to section 329 of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1240. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on abnormal occurrences at licensed nuclear facilities for the first quarter of calendar year 1995, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5848; to the Committee on Commerce.

1241. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. E–95 which relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 91–19 of May 25, 1991, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(5); to the Committee on International Relations.

1242. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting notification to Congress that Floyd B. Justice, the inspector general of the National Archives and Records Administration, has accepted a position with the Department of State's Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95–452, sec. 8E(e) (102 Stat. 2524); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1243. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, transmitting a copy of the report of audit for the year ending March 31, 1995 of the association's accounts, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(41) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1244. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's report on a study on reflectorization of taxiway and runway markers, pursuant to Public Law 102–581, section 126(b) (106 Stat. 4885); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. MCINNIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 197. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 70) to permit exports of certain domestically produced crude oil, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–198). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALKER: Committee on Science. H.R. 1814. A bill to authorize appropriations for environmental research, development, and demonstration activities of the Environmental Protection Agency for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104–199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 198. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–200). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS of California: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2099. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. LUTHER (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. CONDIT):

H.R. 2090. A bill to reduce the number of executive branch political appointees; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2091. A bill to exclude certain veterans' compensation and pension amounts from consideration as adjusted income for purposes of determining the amount of rent paid by a family for a dwelling unit assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee):

H.R. 2092. A bill to expedite State reviews of criminal records of applicants for private security officer employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mrs. CHENOWETH (for herself, and Mr. CRAPO):

H.R. 2093. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to include seed crops among the list of crops specifically covered under the noninsured crop disaster assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 2094. A bill to amend section 1864 of title 18, United States Code, relating to tree spiking, to add avoidance costs as a punishable result; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. FURSE:

H.R. 2095. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that capital gains not be recognized if invested in certain small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 2096. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend eligibility to use the military health care system and commissary stores to an unremarried former spouse of a member of the uniformed services if the member performed at least 20 years of service which is creditable in determining the member's eligibility for retired pay and the former spouse was married to the member for a period of at least 17 years during those years of service; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for investment necessary to revitalize communities within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2098. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to manage the cash positions of the U.S. Government whenever it is unable to borrow sufficient funds to meet its needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of California:

H.R. 2099. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. Res. 199. Resolution amending clause 2 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House to prohibit the introduction or consideration of legislation designating a building or any other structure in honor of a person who is serving or has served as a Member of Congress, a Federal judge, or an officer of the executive branch before the date that is 5 years after the person has retired from that office; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

140. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to urging the Congress of the United States to adopt proposals that are equitable to all States for regulating the air quality within the area surrounding the Grand Canyon; to the Committee on Commerce.

141. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to the visitor facilities program at the Hoover Dam; to the Committee on Resources.

142. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to urging the Congress of the United States to approve the designation of the National Highway System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 109: Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 244: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 359: Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 468: Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 475: Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 528: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 549: Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 743: Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 783: Mr. COBURN.
H.R. 785: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 803: Ms. DUNN of Washington.
H.R. 881: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 957: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 974: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1003: Mrs. KENNELLY and Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 1046: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1061: Ms. HARMON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FRAZER, and Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 1090: Mr. MONTGOMERY.
H.R. 1161: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1384: Mr. WARD and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1385: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1430: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1501: Mr. BASS, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 1532: Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 1560: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1566: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1604: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 1610: Mr. FAZIO of California.
H.R. 1637: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. HYDE.
H.R. 1661: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PAXON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. WICKER.
H.R. 1709: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 1744: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DOOLEY, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 177: Mr. GOSS, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1776: Ms. NORTON and Ms. MCCARTHY.
H.R. 1791: Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1833: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BARR, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and Mr. MANTON.
H.R. 1866: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. KING.
H.R. 1872: Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1893: Mr. WOLF, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. MANTON.
H.R. 1915: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H.R. 1972: Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. HORN, and Mr. TANNER.
H.R. 1973: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LUTHER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 1994: Mr. SKEEN.
H.R. 2008: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2026: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 2030: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2066: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. MILLER of California.
H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. FILNER.
H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. COYNE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KING, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H. Con. Res. 79: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H. Res. 174: Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. STARK, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. YATES, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. JACOBS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1404: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 4 by Mr. BRYANT on House Resolutions 127: Fortney Pete Stark.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 70

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 1 Page 6, line 17, strike the closing quotation marks, semicolon, and ''and''.

Page 6, and after line 17, insert the following:

''(7) The total average daily volume of exports allowed under this subsection in any calendar year shall not exceed the amount by which the total average daily volume of oil delivered through the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System during the preceding calendar year exceeded 1,350,000 barrels per calendar day.''.

H.R. 70

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 5, line 14, insert ''constructed in the United states,'' after ''vessell''.

H.R. 70

OFFERED BY: MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. EXPORTS OF ALASKAN NORTH SLOPE OIL.

Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185) is amended by amending subsection (s) to read as follows:

''EXPORTS OF ALASKAN NORTH SLOPE OIL

''(s)(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) through (6) of this subsection and notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law (including any regulation) applicable to the export of oil transported by pipeline over right-of-way granted pursuant to section 203 of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act (43 U.S.C. 1652), such oil may be exported unless the President finds that exportation of this oil is not in the national interest. The President shall make his national interest determination within five months of the date of enactment of this subsection. In evaluating whether exports of this oil are in the national interest, the President shall at a minimum consider—

''(A) whether exports of this oil would diminish the total quantity or quality of petroleum available to the United States;

''(B) the results of an appropriate environmental review, including consideration of appropriate measures to mitigate any potential adverse effects of exports of this oil on the environment, which shall be completed within four months of the date of the enactment of this subsection; and

''(C) whether exports of this oil are likely to cause sustained material oil supply shortages or sustained oil prices significantly above world market levels that would cause sustained material adverse employment effects in the United States or that would cause substantial harm to consumers, including noncontiguous States and Pacific territories.

If the President determines that exports of this oil are in the national interest, he may impose such terms and conditions (other than a volume limitation) as are necessary or appropriate to ensure that such exports are consistent with the national interest.

''(2) Except in the case of oil exported to a country with which the United States entered into a bilateral international oil supply agreement before November 26, 1979, or to a country pursuant to the International Emergency Oil Sharing Plan of the International Energy Agency, any oil transported by pipeline over right-of-way granted pursuant to section 203 of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act (43 U.S.C. 1652) shall, when exported, be transported by a vessel documented under the laws of the United States and owned by a citizen of the United States (as determined in accordance with section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. App. 802)).

''(3) Nothing in this subsection shall restrict the authority of the President under the Constitution, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), or the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) to prohibit exports of this oil or under Part B of title II of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6271–76).

''(4) The Secretary of Commerce shall issue any rules necessary for implementation of the President's national interest determination, including any licensing requirements and conditions, within 30 days of the date of such determination by the President. The Secretary of Commerce shall consult with the Secretary of Energy in administering the provisions of this subsection.

''(5) If the Secretary of Commerce finds that exporting oil under authority of this subsection has caused sustained material oil supply shortages or sustained oil prices significantly above world market levels and further finds that these supply shortages or price increases have caused or are likely to cause sustained material adverse employment effects in the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, may recommend, and the President may take, appropriate action concerning exports of this oil, which may include modifying or revoking authority to export such oil.

''(6) Administrative action under this subsection is not subject to sections 551 and 553 through 559 of title 5, United States Code.''.

SEC. 2. GAO REPORT.

(a) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of energy production in California and Alaska and the effects of Alaskan North Slope oil exports, if any, on consumers, independent refiners, and shipbuilding and ship repair yards on the West Coast and in Hawaii. The Comptroller General shall commence this review two years after the date of enactment of this Act and, within six months after commencing the review, shall provide a report to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report shall contain a statement of the principal findings of the review and recommendations for Congress and the President to address job loss in the shipbuilding and ship repair industry on the West Coast, as well as adverse impacts on consumers and refiners on the West Coast and in Hawaii, that the Comptroller General attributes to Alaska North Slope oil exports.

H.R. 2002

OFFERED BY: MR. ANDREWS

AMENDMENT NO. 18: Page 15, line 8, strike ''$1,600,000,000'' and insert ''$1,563,000,000''.

H.R. 2002

OFFERED BY: MR. ANDREWS

AMENDMENT NO. 19: Page 54, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 346. None of the funds in this Act may be used for planning or execution of the military airport program.

H.R. 2002

OFFERED BY: MR. COBURN

AMENDMENT NO. 20: Page 30, line 19, strike ''$200,000,000'' and insert ''$135,000,000''.

H.R. 2002

OFFERED BY: MS. DANNER

AMENDMENT NO. 21.: Page 25, line 25, strike ''$2,000,000,000'' and insert ''$1,974,000,000''.

Page 26, line 1, before the colon insert ''and $26,000,000 of budget authority shall be available solely for purposes of 49 U.S.C. 5311''.

H.R. 2002

OFFERED BY: MR. KIM

AMENDMENT NO. 22: Page 12, line 7, strike ''$4,600,000,000'' and insert ''$4,582,500,000''.

H.R. 2002

OFFERED BY: MR. LATOURETTE

AMENDMENT NO. 23: Page 2, line 8, strike ''$55,011,500'' and insert ''$49,011,500''.

Page 7, line 20, strike ''$2,566,000,000'' and insert '$2,572,000,000''.

H.R. 2002

OFFERED BY: MR. LATOURETTE

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 2, line 8, after the fist dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $6,000,000)''.

Page 7, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $6,000,000)''.

H.R. 2002

OFFERED BY: MR. LATOURETTE

AMENDMENT NO. 25: At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to close, consolidate, realign, or reduce to seasonal status any Coast Guard multimission small boat station.

H.R. 2002

OFFERED BY: MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 26: Page 16, line 6, strike ''$495,381,000'' and insert ''$402,131,000''.

H.R. 2002

OFFERED BY: MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 27: Page 26, line 8, strike ''$6,000,000'' and insert ''$3,000,000''.

H.R. 2076

OFFERED BY: MR. BARR

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Sec. Limitation on the Use of Funds for Diplomatic Facilities in Vietnam

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to pay for any cost incurred for (1) opening or operating any United States diplomatic or consular post in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam that was not operating on July 11, 1995; (2) expanding any United States diplomatic or consular post in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam that was operating on July 11, 1995; or (3) increasing the total number of personnel assigned to United States diplomatic or consular posts in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam above the levels existing on July 11, 1995.

H.R. 2076

OFFERED BY: MR. MOLLOHAN

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 24, line 6, strike ''$2,000,000,000'', and all that follows through ''1995'' on line 9, and insert the following:

''$1,790,000,000 shall be for Public Safety and Community Policing Grants authorized by section 10003 of the 1994 Act; and $210,000,000 shall be for carrying out the crime prevention programs authorized under sections 30202,. 30307, 30702, 31904, 31921, 32101, 40121, and 50001 of the 1994 Act''.

H.R. 2076

OFFERED BY: MR. MOLLOHAN

AMENDMENT NO. 4: On page 24, line 13, strike ''$475,000,000'' and insert ''$505,000,000''

On page 24, line 18, strike ''$300,000,000'' and insert ''$270,000,000''.

H.R. 2076

OFFERED BY: MR. MOLLOHAN

AMENDMENT NO. 5: On page 43, line 2, strike ': Provided, That'' and all that follows through ''grants'' on line 10.

H.R. 2076

OFFERED BY: MR. MOLLOHAN

AMENDMENT NO. 6: On page 44, line 4, strike ''$1,690,452,000'' and insert ''$1,752,652,000''.

On page 44, line 14, strike ''$1,687,452,000'' and insert ''$1,749,652,000''.

On page 43, line 16, strike ''$60,000,000'' and insert ''$50,000,000''.

On page 45, line 14, strike ''$42,731,000'' and insert ''$32,731,000''.

On page 51, line 4, strike ''$2,411,024,000'' and insert ''$2,388,824,000''.

On page 57, line 4, strike ''$1,716,878,000'' and insert ''$1,706,878,000''.

On page 59, line 3, strike ''$363,276,000'' and insert ''$353,276,000''.

H.R. 2076

OFFERED BY: MR. PORTMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 51, line 4, strike ''$2,411,024,000'' and insert ''$2,409,024,000''.

Page 51, line 6, strike ''$14,454,000'' and insert ''$13,454,000''.

Page 51, line 8, strike ''$11,000,000'' and insert ''$10,000,000''.

H.R. 2076

OFFERED BY: MR. RICHARDSON

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 57, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 72, line 20, strike ''$28,000,000'' and insert ''$28,500,000''.

H.R. 2076

OFFERED BY: MR. STENHOLM

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 80, line 19, strike ''$278,000,000'' and insert ''$250,000,000''.

Page 80, line 20, strike ''$265,000,000'' and insert ''$237,000,000''.