

There was no objection.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. This is to cut \$21.9 million from an aircraft procurement account for spare parts. That \$21.9 million is more than what is required, and my amendment would merely remove that \$21.9 million from the \$117 million.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. FURSE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the amendment being offered. We are very much aware of the amendment and agree with this amendment, and we are prepared to accept it.

Ms. FURSE. I thank the Chairman and I thank the ranking member.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA), having assumed the chair, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, 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. 2126), making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

WAIVING PROVISIONS OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970 REQUIRING ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS BY JULY 31

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 89) waiving provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 requiring adjournment of Congress by July 31, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 89

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 132(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 198(a)), the House of Representatives and the Senate shall not adjourn for a period in excess of three days, or adjourn sine die, until both Houses of Congress have adopted a concurrent resolution providing either for an adjournment (in excess of three days) to a day certain or for adjournment sine die.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2200

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WELLER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

BLM LOBBYING AGAINST LIVESTOCK GRAZING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] is recognized for 10 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak with you about an issue that is taking place with regards to the activities of the Bureau of Land Management and the Rangeland Reform Act that is now pending before the committees here in the House and in the Senate. Shockingly the Bureau of Land Management, Mr. Babbitt, and the Clinton administration have ordered a communications plan designed to discredit the Livestock Grazing Act before committee hearings were even held on the act and before the legislation has been finalized. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that through this action the Clinton administration has no desire to work with Congress on grazing issues so important to our lifestyle, our culture, our economic base, and our way of life in the West.

Mr. Speaker, the job of the Bureau of Land Management is very plain and simply to carry out the laws passed by Congress, not to use taxpayer dollars to lobby the media or attempt to write their own laws.

Mr. Speaker, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management in the State of Nevada published in local newspapers a lobbying effort against this particular action. I am, Mr. Speaker, calling on the Bureau of Land Management to immediately cease spending taxpayer money to spread false and misleading information to the public on the Public Rangeland Management Act.

I need to remind the Bureau of Land Management that the Hatch Act under section 7322 of the United States Code clearly states that an employee in an executive agency or in the competitive service may not use his official authority or influence to coerce the political action of a person or a body.

Section 303 of the Interior Appropriation Act of 1995 clearly states that, quote, no part of any appropriations contained in this act shall be used for

any activities, for publications or distribution of literature that in any way tend to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal on which congressional action is not complete.

The Public Rangeland Management Act currently under consideration by the House and the Senate is the result of hard work and lengthy discussions from all parties involved with the use and management of public rangelands.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to work as a member of the House Committee on Resources to schedule a special hearing on the conduct of the Bureau of Land Management to this issue. It is imperative that we bring the separation of powers back under control as envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

Article I, section 1, of the United States Constitution suggests, and states, and mandates that the Congress shall form all laws. It is the administration's responsibility simply to carry out those laws. Many of these public employees are very well paid. They have very high positions, and to see them blatantly ignore the Hatch Act and other pieces of legislation which have kept and maintained that separation of powers over these years, to see it blatantly ignored, is alarming to me, Mr. Speaker.

You know, today I had the fortune of going to Fredericksburg and viewing the battlefield there, viewing the battlefield where 35,000 young men from age 12 up through their twenties are buried, where only 15 percent of those young men were identified with grave markers. So much has gone before us, Mr. Speaker, in order for us to maintain the concepts emboldened and embodied in the Constitution of the separation of powers, so much has gone before us in the way of sacrifice, and yet today, yet today, we see public officials blatantly ignore the laws of Congress with absolutely no retribution or no fear of retribution.

Mr. Speaker, it is only when we are able to bring this out in the public and the public is able to see and to say to the lawmakers and to the policy makers in this Nation it is time, it is time, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Bureau of Land Management and various other agencies abide by the same course of law and standard of law that nonpublic employees must live and abide by.

WILL MEDICARE SEE ITS 40TH BIRTHDAY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 10 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 30th birthday of Medicare, very important health care program for our senior citizens, and this week is very important, that we look to Medicare and see how we

can strengthen, preserve, and protect Medicare.

We have heard disturbing news, however, that Medicare, as strong as it has been, as much good as it has done, could be in trouble unless we make some changes. Currently the Medicare board of trustees has reported in a bipartisan fashion to the Clinton administration that in fact, if Medicare is not preserved, protected, and improved within 7 years' time, the Medicare funds will be depleted. In fact, the hospital insurance trust fund, which pays beneficiaries' bills, begins to run a deficit in the near future. Only 2 years following the initial problems we will find there to be \$126 billion in the hole.

Republicans and some reform-minded Democrats in the House of Representatives recognize the gravity of the situation, Mr. Speaker, we know that Medicare must be protected for the sake of current and future generations. To do this, we have determined that there are six basic principles which will guide our efforts to strengthen, preserve and protect the Medicare Program.

First, we must act immediately to preserve Medicare for current retirees and to protect the system for the next generation of beneficiaries. The President's trustees have reported that the Medicare Part A Trust Fund will be bankrupt in 7 years. Medicare must be preserved and prompt, decisive action—*at once*—is imperative.

Second, Medicare spending will increase at a controlled rate. Under the proposed new budget, spending per beneficiary would increase at least from \$4,800 this year to \$6,700 over the next 7 years, and that includes adjustment for new beneficiaries.

Third, senior citizens deserve the same choices available to other Americans. Medicare currently gives seniors only one choice—an outdated, bureaucratic fee-for-service program that is rife with waste, fraud and abuse. Our seniors, like all Americans, deserve to choose a plan that best fits their personal needs.

Fourth, Government must not interfere in the relationship between patients and their doctors. Medicare currently dictates to doctors how to treat patients, limits patient options and worse, it has buried both the patient and the doctor under an avalanche of duplicative regulations. To succeed in reforming the system, we need to ease this burden by reducing regulation and needless paperwork.

Fifth, senior citizens should be rewarded for helping to root out waste, fraud and abuse in the system. Seniors have proven themselves to be fine stewards of public funds by frequently calling attention to fraud and abuse in the Medicare system. We need to reward their efforts to make the system more efficient. According to the Government Accounting Office [GAO], there already exists \$44 billion in fraud, waste and abuse in the Medicare/Medicaid systems.

Sixth, strengthening Medicare is too important to be left to "politics as

usual." All Americans see how important it is for Medicare to be saved. They expect Republicans and Democrats to work together to get the job done and that is exactly what we will do, Mr. Speaker.

To help us find the best solutions on a local level, many of us have formed local Medicare preservation task forces, as I have in the 13th District of Pennsylvania. Our task force has taken public testimony from doctors, health care professionals, senior citizens, insurance companies, and health care consumers to suggest a course of action that we should take to preserve and protect Medicare. The task force has had four hearings, heard from dozens of witnesses and has read volumes of materials regarding possible solutions. They are drafting a report which has been prepared for my inspection on September 5 when I will have a public meeting in the district at a town meeting at Montgomery County Community College at 7 p.m. the day after Labor Day. I will present the task force report to the people of the 13th District, and thereafter, Mr. Speaker, I will transmit back to this House those suggestions so that we may make the kinds of legislative initiatives that will preserve, protect, and preserve Medicare as the outstanding health care program for our seniors which it has been.

Saving Medicare will make the 30th birthday of Medicare a happy occasion after all. By working together, Republicans and Democrats, we can save Medicare for the beneficiary of today and tomorrow, and by doing so we will insure that Medicare will have a bright future and many happy returns.

THE FAILURE TO ENFORCE ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS

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. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk tonight briefly about what happened with regard to the VA, HUD, and EPA appropriations bill, and specifically the amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] on a bipartisan basis which was in effect turned around tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I think many people do not realize in the House of Representatives you can vote once in what we call the Committee of the Whole, which is what happened with this bill last week, and have a vote one way, but again, when the bill comes to the full House, as it did tonight, you can have the same amendment or provision, and the bill can go another way, and what happened essentially, Mr. Speaker, is that over the weekend the Republican leadership spent a lot of time trying to convince Members and get Members back here so that in fact today, when this amendment came up again, the vote went the other way, and what I

consider a very good amendment that was sponsored on a bipartisan basis by both Democrats and Republicans was defeated. The appropriations bill that we took up today essentially does great damage to the environment by including something like 17 riders, as we call them, that would prohibit expenditures of funds for enforcement of environmental protection.

Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected to the House of Representatives back in 1988, I believe the main reason I was elected was because I said I would come down here and try to protect the oceans and try and protect the environment. We had gone through a summer in New Jersey where we had medical waste wash up on the beaches. Our beaches were closed. People were very concerned about what the Federal Government was doing to protect the environment, particularly clean water, and we passed some major legislation over the last 7 or 8 years that increases protection of the environment not only with clean water, but clean air and a lot of other areas, and the most important aspect of that is enforcement because, if you think about it, you can pass all the environmental bills you want, you can have every environmental agency that you can possibly have, but if you do not have the money to hire people to go out and enforce the law, you might as well not have the laws on the books, and that is what we were facing here today, a bill, an appropriations bill, that cut back by one-third the amount of money that was available to the Environmental Protection Agency to enforce the law and riders, if you can call them, or provisions that were put into this appropriations bill that made it difficult, if not impossible, for the EPA to enforce environmental laws.

The amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] would have changed all that and taken out these riders, and, as I said, it did pass last week, but over the weekend a lot of pressure was put on this Congress, particularly the Republican Members, to try to make sure that that bill, that amendment failed today, and it did in fact fail today.

□ 2215

To give you an idea of some of the provisions that are in this bill now, without that amendment having passed, the spending package includes more than 17 substantive riders which will gut key environmental provisions by prohibiting spending for implementation and enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the Clean Water Act, which is so important to my district and to coastal states. Basically, the bill would bring enforcement of the existing law to a halt. It stops enforcement of wetlands protection programs. It blocks the Great Lakes water quality initiative. It bars effluent guidelines and water quality