ROYBAL-ALLARD changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 829, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably detained in my district, but had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on both rollcall votes 822 and 823.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today because of inclement weather and airport delays, I was delayed on two votes.

For H.R. 2564, I would have voted ''yes''; and for H.R. 2099 I would have voted ''yes.''

□ 1315

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], to explain the schedule this afternoon and for tomorrow. If we are going on Amtrak tomorrow, I would ask the gentleman, why can we not do it today? It is 1 o'clock in the afternoon and we have a good part of the day left.

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

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this last vote is the last vote of the day. The Committee on Rules will be meeting at 2:30 or later this afternoon to write a rule on the Amtrak legislation that we intend to bring up tomorrow. We do not anticipate any vote on Friday or Monday.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if I can reclaim my time, I ask unanimous consent that we bring the Amtrak bill up today. There would not be any objection on this side of the aisle. We would be happy to take it up today. We do not need a rule, unless the gentleman plans to close the rule. We do not need a rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The Chair is unable to recognize the gentleman for that unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman to yield for the purposes of inquiring of my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished whip on the majority side, are we going to bring up the securities reform legislation?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will continue to yield, we intend to bring up that piece of legislation sometime next week.

Mr. DINGELL. Next week, not tomorrow or Thursday, Friday?

Mr. DELAY. Sometime next week.

Mr. DINGELL. Would it come up Monday or Tuesday of next week?

Mr. DELAY. We have not set the schedule for next week, but it would be sometime next week.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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 Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SCHROEDER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RECOMMITTING THE VA–HUD APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT WILL ALLOW FOR THE GREATER PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT

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 was very pleased to see that the VA–HUD appropriations conference report, which, of course, includes funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, was recommitted to conference today, primarily because of two provisions related to the Environmental Protection Agency. One is that the amount of money that is appropriated to the EPA is probably one of the lowest amounts for any agency, and specifically with regard to enforcement, there is a 25-percent cut in terms of the EPA's enforcement.

Already we know that the EPA has cut back significantly on inspections and on enforcement because of the level of funding that they have received pursuant to the continuing resolution. In other words, as we proceed in trying to put together an appropriations bill for the EPA, less money can be spent on a monthly basis since October 1, because we have not had an appropriations bill signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, the point I was trying to make is that this conference report, which fortunately was sent back to conference today, cuts back on EPA's enforcement ability by about 25 percent. Since we are already into fiscal year 1996 and we are operating on a continuing resolution which significantly cuts back the amount of money available to the EPA, already inspections and other enforcement actions have been reduced at the Environmental Protection Agency. This 25-percent cut in enforcement will simply magnify that problem.

What it means essentially is that, although we have good environmental laws on the books, they cannot be enforced. Polluters will go free, and there will not be the ability for the EPA to go in and even know exactly what is going on, whether someone, for example, is violating their discharge permit into waters.

In addition to the problem with enforcement, this House has several times, at least on two occasions now, voted to take out riders that were in the EPA appropriations bill which I characterize as anti-environment, because they prohibit the agency from actually enforcing certain actions pursuant to the current law. Yet, we know that of the 17 House riders that were in the EPA appropriations bill, two of them remain in the conference report, and at least half of them have been placed into what we call report language. They are not actually in the law, but they are placed in the conference report, and normally Federal agencies have some sort of requirement to try to go along with what the report, what the conference report language says.

Specifically, there are two provisions, two of the riders that are still in the bill and I hope will be taken out when this bill goes back to conference. One of the two would essentially say that the EPA has no ability to enforce wetlands protection. Right now the EPA has the authority under certain circumstances to permit the filing in of wetlands where the agency feels there has been substantial or will be substantial detriment to the environment. That has been taken out; that rider is still in the bill, but that prohibits the agency from providing any kind of wetlands protection.

The other rider that still is in the bill is one that would prohibit the designation of new Superfund sites. Again, if we are supposed to use a scientific basis, which we traditionally have, for deciding whether or not a hazardous waste site would be put on the national priority list for Superfund status, then there is no reason why an appropriations bill, or a conference report in this case, should specifically say that no new Superfund site can be designated.

In addition, through, Mr. Speaker, there are at least another eight or nine riders that are put into what we call report language. These are essentially loopholes that are created to provide

special treatment; for example, utilities and other industries seeking to prevent the EPA from expanding its disclosure program under the Community Right To Know Act, refineries facing compliance with air toxic emission standards, cement kilns that burn hazardous waste, air permitting programs for the State of Virginia, bioengineering plants, State audit shields for polluters, natural gas processors. In each case there is conference language requesting the EPA to create loopholes or other special treatment in these various categories.

Essentially, Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly that since agencies are supposed to follow the dictates of the appropriators, this shift to report language, taking the riders out of the statute but putting in the report language, really means that a lot of the damage will still be done to the environment. I hope that the conferees, when this bill goes back to committee, will make some additional changes so we have more money for environmental protection.

THE OCCUPATION OF BOSNIA

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend some time this afternoon and talk to us about the occupation of Bosnia. The President has already decided that we are going to be sending troops into Bosnia, approximately the number of 20,000, under the alleged peacekeeping mission. However, I think as we see the events of Bosnia unfold, we are starting to realize that there are many questions unanswered, in that the direction of those questions and the partial answers that we are receiving is saying that this is not a peacekeeping effort, and that this is a peacemaking effort which will probably result in an occupation unless we take some drastic changes of direction now.

Mr. Speaker, this is a big concern, I think, to every American. If it is not on their thoughts today, it should be. It will be tomorrow. I think it is a well-known fact now in the media and in Congress that the President is going to send troops to Bosnia. He has the constitutional authority to send those troops. He has thought this out. It has been planned in the Pentagon. There will be troops before the end of the year in Bosnia.

It is very frustrating for a Member of Congress, because we are unable to stop this action. We have repeatedly voted to stop from sending troops to Bosnia, yet every effort on the part of the Congress has been met with disdain, with the turning from our advice, and the President has not yet come to us with the arguments, with the right ideas, with the right plan in order to gain not only the support of Congress, but the support of the American public.

Some of the questions that are arising out of this tragic mistake that we are about to make are, No. 1, the President says there will be casualties. There are risks involved. I think this Member of Congress and others would like to know what is the acceptable level of casualties in Bosnia. Is it 1,300 troops per day? Is it the loss of 250 young men and women each day we are over there? Is that acceptable?

I can tell you what is acceptable in Kansas, in the Fourth District of Kansas. It is zero. No casualties. But that is not what we have heard. There will be casualties, but we do not know how many.

□ 1330

Another thing is that we were told that it is going to be 20,000 troops, but now we are finding out that it may be 30,000, maybe 35,000. There will be some held in float. There will be some stationed nearby. According to the War College, it takes seven troops to support one combat troop. So if it is 20,000, that means it is 140,000 with support personnel. If it is 30,000, it goes up to 210,000. Pretty soon, we are talking about a quarter of a million people, and they are in there for the alleged duration, which is supposed to be 12 months.

Will there be a rotation? If there is a rotation, where will the training take place? Does that mean that there is now a half a million troops involved? If so, what would happen if North Korea should cross the border and what would happen if Saddam Hussein again crosses another border? What would happen if a conflict occurs in Yugoslavia or some other place like Macedonia?

This country is not funded in the Department of Defense to handle a two-scenario conflict. Regardless of what the leadership in the administration has said, it is simply not there. Members of the Pentagon know that.

If this is an occupation, which it appears to be leaning towards, 20,000 is not enough. Probably 200,000 is more like what it will take, just ground troops. What is the mission here?

Another question is, what is the geographical area that we will be required to defend? Is it near the hottest area? Near the Serbs? Mr. Speaker, we have already had air strikes on the Serbs. There are some 40,000 to 60,000 rogue Serbs who do not agree with the peace agreement, and we will be near there. Our troops are planned to land at Tuzla, which is just about a mile from the Serb current locations. A mortar round can travel a mile.

Other questions are, is the duration of 12 months enough? We have had a century's old conflict and we think we can solve it in 12 months? What firepower will we have there? What is the funding level? It started out at $1 billion. It is now up to $3 billion. Would it not be more economical in terms of human lives to offer to rebuild the entire country with this $3 billion instead of spending it on troops, putting them in harm's way and accepting some level of casualties?

There are many more questions. One is the question of leadership. Will America not be a leader if we back away from this? There are many ways to lead, through NATO and through other ways. We can lead through air power, through intelligence, through strategy, through logistical support. We have many ways that we can lead. But to send troops into harm's way without the support of the American public, without the support of the America people, the Congress, the answer is no, Mr. President.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION BILL LIMITS OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICANS

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. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst, during these next couple of days, of making a recommitment to the American people that we are now serious about a budget reconciliation process that takes away the stridency and the gross imbalance that the present bill has offered.

I voted against the Budget Reconciliation Act that has been proposed by the majority in this House. This is not to say that the consequences of not balancing a budget is not of great concern.

I have been to my district. I have discussed the issue with a myriad of constituents: working Americans, also individuals who are looking to become independent, transitioning themselves maybe from public housing, from being recipients of welfare. But as they look to become independent and as working families are looking to become stronger, the Budget Reconciliation Act says to them that we will not join you in partnership.

This bill drastically cuts housing opportunities for affordable housing. This bill drastically cuts opportunities for poor working families to receive an earned income tax credit. What we may be saying sounds like a continuous recording sound, droning on and on. But what it actually does is impacts the lives of working and living Americans. It jeopardizes the fragile relationship of survival, whether they survive today or whether they do not survive tomorrow.

We find that when we cast aspersions and criticisms on those who receive welfare, this Budget Reconciliation Act, along with the proposed welfare reform plan, cuts child care, cuts job training, and disregards the opportunity for encouraging businesses and others to employ now present welfare recipients by providing a tax incentive to hire such persons. We find in the Budget Reconciliation Act that the job program that helped youth be employed during the summer the last