

CALIFORNIANS SEE THE TRUTH ABOUT REPUBLICAN REFORMS

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, where are our friends this morning from the other side of the aisle? Where is the celebrating that they expected to be taking place? It was not 6 weeks ago that the head of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], said, "And we will, we do, expect to win in California." Did they have a bad day yesterday? Did they have a bad night? Was it a bad week? Has it been a bad year? Is it going to be a bad decade? I think it is, because the American people have spoken.

Maybe the media will wake up. Maybe the media will tell the truth. Twenty-three points, was that close? Is that a close election? Twenty-three points in what was supposedly going to be a Democratic victory. Why is it? Because the American people are too smart to be demagogued on this stuff. They are too smart to believe the pack of half-truths and distortions and untruths that are being fed to them. They will not buy it. They will not stand for it. They have spoken. Today we have something very great to celebrate in California.

□ 1030

SUPPORT OUR TROOPS IN BOSNIA

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I came here to talk about Bosnia, but in response to my friend let me remind him that one election does not necessarily a majority make.

I congratulate the Republicans for their victory, but there are going to be some more, and in Florida we are going to have one evermore big-time fight. The question keeps being asked around here, what is the United States stake in Bosnia and why does the United States participation make a difference.

Let me answer through the words of Adm. Snuffy Smith. "The question is about United States leadership in the world," he said. "If we don't go in, our credibility goes to rock bottom. The next time when vital United States interests are engaged, are our allies and friends going to be with us? Probably not. If we don't go in there, there will be more killing, the war can spread. Do not underestimate the volatility of the Balkans."

This gentleman is the commander in charge of our troops. Our troops are ready and well-trained. Let us support the United States troops that are being deployed to Bosnia.

FRIVOLOUS CHARGES CLOUD DEBATE ON REAL ISSUES

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all congratulate my colleague Tom Campbell from California for his stunning victory in California. He and I came in together in 1988 and I am just very pleased to have him return here to Congress.

Former Speaker Sam Rayburn quipped, "A jackass can kick a barn down, but it takes a carpenter to build one."

Well, the truth of Mr. Rayburn's words has never been more apparent as it is today. The donkeys are kicking at the barn doors, but we have a carpenter trying to work, trying to build a better form of government, and that carpenter is NEWT GINGRICH, our Speaker.

Despite all their efforts to the contrary, they are trying to offer these frivolous charges. Instead of working on the difficult issues ahead, they trump up another bogus ethics charge against the Speaker.

They, in fact, have fabricated a total of 65 charges against the Speaker. All but one of these charges have been dismissed. The remaining charge simply pertains to a technical section of the IRS code. In time it will be resolved.

The Democrats' attempt in the Campbell election to demonize the Speaker has not worked. I call on all our Members to welcome Tom Campbell again in to our fold.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET CUTS HEALTH CARE TO PAY FOR TAX BREAKS TO WELL OFF

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, one only has to examine the priorities in the Gingrich budget to understand for whom the Republican Party stands. The \$500 billion in corporate welfare is going untouched while seniors, pregnant women, and the disabled are expected to absorb \$433 billion in health care cuts.

And yes, these are health care cuts because Medicare and Medicaid spending will not keep pace with medical inflation. When you consider that Medicare and Medicaid care for the oldest and sickest people in our society, any reductions that do not keep pace with medical inflation are cuts, plain and simple.

So now, Mr. Haley Barbour, please send your million dollars to Grady Hospital in Atlanta, with an explanation that the Gingrich budget does not cut Medicare and Medicaid to pay for tax breaks to the well off.

DISPOSING OF SENATE AMENDMENT 115 TO H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 296 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 296

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment numbered 115 thereto, and to consider in the House the motion printed in section 2 of this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. All points of order against the motion are waived. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on that motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. The motion to dispose of the amendment of the Senate numbered 115 is as follows:

Mr. Callahan (or his designee) moves that the House recede from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"Authorization of Population Planning
"SEC. 518A. Section 526 of this Act shall not apply to funds made available in this Act for population planning activities or other population assistance pursuant to section 104(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act or any other provision of law, or to funds made available in title IV of this Act as a contribution to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for a motion—to be offered by Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman CALLAHAN or his designee—to dispose of the remaining amendment in disagreement to the conference report on H.R. 1868. This is a straightforward and fair rule, providing for an hour of debate and an up-or-down vote on the motion. As you recall, the House passed the Foreign Operations conference report on October 31. This legislation makes tremendous improvements in the way we allocate our limited tax dollars to overseas interests. H.R. 1868 significantly reduces

total foreign aid spending, and it takes steps to shrink the Government bureaucracy that has funded many wasteful and duplicative foreign aid projects. The Senate has also passed the conference report for H.R. 1868—and for the past 7 weeks, the two Chambers have been trying to resolve a single disagreement over Senate amendment No. 115, concerning funding for population planning.

Mr. Speaker, the House has voted four times in favor of its position on this issue. Each time the Senate has disagreed. Chairman CALLAHAN's motion would make the population planning funds in the bill subject to authorization—or a later waiver—allowing the ultimate decision on population planning policy to be made in the foreign aid authorization bill, which is after all, the appropriate place for it. Chairman CALLAHAN's notion is a reasonable effort to move beyond the stalemate and finally pave the way for the foreign operations bill to be sent to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent visit by Israeli Prime Minister Peres, I would also note that the funding for the Middle East peace process is contained in this bill. The negotiations are at a critical phase, and despite the tragic assassination of Prime Minister Rabin, there is real hope that further progress towards a lasting peace can be made. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for bringing this resolution to the floor.

House Resolution 296 is a rule which provides for the offering of a motion to dispose of the one amendment reported in disagreement by the conferees on the fiscal 1996, foreign operations appropriations bill.

As my colleague from Florida has ably described, this rule provides 1 hour general debate, equally divided between the proponent and an opponent of the motion.

The motion to be offered under this rule would require funds for the population planning activities of AID, and for the U.S. contribution to the U.N. Population Fund, to be authorized before they could be obligated.

Though the House has already passed the conference agreement and this morning's debate is over one narrow related issue, I want to take the opportunity to again thank Mr. CALLAHAN, the chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, for the emphasis he placed on children throughout this appropriations process. I am pleased that the final conference agreement has paid special at-

tention to children's programs such as child survival, UNICEF, and basic education.

While the conference report did not include many earmarks, there was a strong recommendation that UNICEF would receive \$100 million. In response to my question during the Rules Committee hearing last night, Mr. CALLAHAN again reaffirmed the desire of the conferees that UNICEF should receive the recommended \$100 million. I appreciate Mr. CALLAHAN's continued support on this matter.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that I have no requests for time, and I will reserve my time. If he has no requests, I would be prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if one ever wanted an example of why this Congress has failed to pass its appropriation bills on time, necessitating plunging the country into a needless Government shutdown and silly political arguments about continuing resolutions, this bill, and the way it is being handled today, is a spectacular example.

First of all, in terms of scheduling, we were told this bill was going to be up this afternoon. Now with virtually no notice to the committee, we find it on the floor.

Second, we are told on this side of the aisle that the committee intended to offer a compromise proposal which contained compromise language. Instead, what we get is the most confrontational approach that could possibly be taken, virtually assuring that this turkey is going to go nowhere.

Now, we have a serious problem in this country. The problem is that this Congress has not finished a number of appropriation bills, and because of that, we face an imminent Government shutdown again on the 15th of this month.

I had thought that the proper way to address that problem would be to try to find ways to compromise out these bills so that you can get more of them signed by the President and reduce the lack of performance on the part of this Congress.

We have already had the Foreign Operations bill tied up for over 2 months because Republicans in the House have not been able to agree with the Republicans in the Senate on what to do on family planning. Now the wizards who put together this strategy this morning are now saying, "Well, I'll tell you what we're going to do. What we're going to do is to send over, not compromise language to the Senate, but language which shuts down all family planning funds internationally."

What is more, this rule proposes to make in order an amendment on international programs which the House al-

ready turned down on domestic programs by a vote of 221-207.

Obviously family planning programs are important within the borders of the United States, but they are even more important on a substantive basis internationally because population growth in many countries around the world is flatly out of control, and if we do not find a way to rationally reduce that curve, that upward curve, we are going to have an even greater hunger problem, an even greater environmental problem, an even greater problem of social disruption than you have today in many parts of the world. Yet today the wizards who proposed this language are saying the way out of it is to send over to the Senate language you know they will not accept in 100 years.

□ 1045

There is not a chance of a snowball in you know where that this language is going to be approved by the Senate, and yet the House, at a time when we ought to be working out ways to compromise our differences is in essence throwing a "Hail Mary" to the Senate knowing full well that the Senate is not going to swallow it. That is not a constructive way to do business.

This rule is going to inflame the situation. This approach is going to inflame the situation. It is going to make it much harder to pass a bill than it has been to date, and I see absolutely no constructive purpose whatsoever for proceeding in this manner.

Now, I think my record shows that whether this House has been controlled by Republicans or Democrats I have tried to help further the passage of this legislation in a bipartisan way, but the approach that is being taken here this morning is tactically idiotic, and I would urge the Members of the majority, if you are interested in finding any way at all to reconcile your differences with Members of your own party in the other body, you ought not to be doing this this morning.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Members, I agree largely with the points that the gentleman from Wisconsin made concerning procedure.

But just addressing the merits of this legislation as it is currently drafted would mean it would eliminate all family planning funds that the United States provides all over the world. Now, I remember our colleague, our ex-colleague, Mr. Lehman from Florida, one late night we were doing a markup, and he remarked that if you took the family planning money out of the foreign operations bill you might as well not have a foreign operations bill, because there is nothing more important in Third World countries bettering their standard of living than family planning. This would eliminate family planning for all of the Third World countries that have enormous birth rates and thereby hinder their economic growth and hinder their hope for

prosperity and their hope for a better way of life.

Finally, I would just like to say, in my opinion, this will actually slow down the progress of this legislation, because we absolutely know we are certain that the Senate will not accept it, and we are certain that if the Senate did accept it that is would be vetoed. So to me it is sort of an exercise in futility without any logical purpose.

So, therefore, I would urge a vote against the rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] a question or two. I understand that the legislation before us today is simply to address one issue. However, I wish to clarify one aspect of the conference report, the funding level for UNICEF and for basic education.

The gentleman has been a leader with respect to children with this particular subcommittee appropriation bill, and I know that there has been some very strong language that has gone back and forth in the committee report, and one of the things that was put in the conference committee report that was pretty firm in both the Senate and House, that UNICEF would get \$100 million and that basic education would get a substantial appropriation of about \$108 million, as I remember, and I just want to ask you: Is it still your intention to push for that?

Mr. CALLAHAN. If the gentleman will yield, certainly, it is my full intention to support both. I had not heard before our conversation just yesterday that there might be a plan under foot to do otherwise. But the bill very clearly states that it is the intent to send \$100 million to UNICEF and \$108 million for child education.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his assurance. I appreciate very much his support.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 296, the resolution now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 178, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 849]

YEAS—241

Allard	Fawell	Mascara
Archer	Fields (TX)	McCollum
Army	Flanagan	McCrery
Bachus	Foley	McDade
Baker (CA)	Forbes	McHugh
Baker (LA)	Fowler	McIntosh
Ballenger	Fox	McKeon
Barcia	Franks (NJ)	Metcalf
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Mica
Barrett (NE)	Frisa	Miller (FL)
Bartlett	Funderburk	Molinar
Barton	Galleghy	Mollohan
Bass	Ganske	Montgomery
Bateman	Gekas	Moorhead
Bereuter	Gilchrest	Murtha
Bilbray	Gillmor	Myers
Bilirakis	Gilman	Myrick
Billey	Goodlatte	Nethercutt
Blute	Goodling	Neumann
Boehner	Goss	Ney
Bonilla	Graham	Norwood
Bono	Gunderson	Nussle
Browder	Gutknecht	Ortiz
Brownback	Hall (TX)	Orton
Bryant (TN)	Hancock	Oxley
Bunn	Hansen	Packard
Bunning	Hastert	Parker
Burr	Hastings (WA)	Paxon
Burton	Hayes	Peterson (MN)
Buyer	Hayworth	Petri
Callahan	Hefley	Pombo
Calvert	Heineman	Portman
Camp	Herger	Poshard
Canady	Hillery	Pryce
Castle	Hoekstra	Quillen
Chabot	Hoke	Quinn
Chambliss	Holden	Radanovich
Chenoweth	Hostettler	Regula
Christensen	Houghton	Riggs
Chrysler	Hunter	Roberts
Clinger	Hutchinson	Rogers
Coble	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Coburn	Inglis	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (GA)	Istook	Royce
Combest	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Cooley	Jones	Sanford
Costello	Kanjorski	Saxton
Cox	Kasich	Scarborough
Crane	Kelly	Schaefer
Crapo	Kildee	Schiff
Creameans	Kim	Seastrand
Cubin	King	Sensenbrenner
Cunningham	Kingston	Shadegg
Danner	Klink	Shaw
Davis	Knollenberg	Shuster
de la Garza	Kolbe	Skeen
Deal	LaFalce	Skelton
DeLay	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Diaz-Balart	Largent	Smith (NJ)
Dickey	Latham	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	LaTourette	Smith (WA)
Dornan	Laughlin	Solomon
Doyle	Lazio	Souder
Dreier	Leach	Spence
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Dunn	Lightfoot	Stenholm
Ehlers	Linder	Stump
Ehrlich	Livingston	Stupak
Emerson	LoBiondo	Talent
English	Longley	Tate
Ensign	Lucas	Tauzin
Everett	Manzullo	Taylor (MS)
Ewing	Martini	Taylor (NC)

Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz

Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White

Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—178

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Owens
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Pallone
Andrews	Gordon	Pastor
Baesler	Green	Payne (NJ)
Baldacci	Greenwood	Payne (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Becerra	Hall (OH)	Peterson (FL)
Beilenson	Hamilton	Pickett
Bentsen	Harman	Pomeroy
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Porter
Bevill	Hefner	Rahall
Bishop	Hilliard	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hinchev	Rangel
Bonior	Hobson	Reed
Borski	Horn	Richardson
Boucher	Hoyer	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Jacobs	Rose
Bryant (TX)	Jefferson	Roukema
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Chapman	Johnson (SD)	Rush
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
Clayton	Johnston	Sanders
Clement	Kaptur	Sawyer
Clyburn	Kennedy (MA)	Schroeder
Coleman	Kennedy (RI)	Schumer
Collins (IL)	Kennelly	Scott
Collins (MI)	Klecza	Serrano
Condit	Klug	Shays
Conyers	Lantos	Sisisky
Coyne	Levin	Skaggs
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lincoln	Spratt
DeLauro	Lipinski	Stark
Dellums	Lofgren	Stokes
Deutsch	Lowe	Studds
Dicks	Luther	Tanner
Dingell	Maloney	Thompson
Dixon	Manton	Thornton
Doggett	Markey	Thurman
Dooley	Martinez	Torkildsen
Durbin	Matsui	Torres
Edwards	McCarthy	Torricelli
Eshoo	McDermott	Towns
Evans	McHale	Trafficant
Farr	McKinney	Visclosky
Fattah	McNulty	Ward
Fazio	Meehan	Waters
Fields (LA)	Meek	Watt (NC)
Filner	Menendez	Waxman
Flake	Meyers	Williams
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Wilson
Ford	Minge	Wise
Frank (MA)	Mink	Woolsey
Franks (CT)	Moakley	Wyden
Frost	Moran	Wynn
Furse	Nadler	Yates
Gejdenson	Neal	Zimmer
Gephardt	Oberstar	
Geren	Obey	

NOT VOTING—13

Brewster	Mfume	Tucker
Brown (OH)	Morella	Velazquez
Engel	Olver	Vento
Lewis (CA)	Roth	
McInnis	Stockman	

□ 1111

Messrs. FROST, BOEHLERT, SHAYS, and HOBSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. DANNER and Mr. LAFALCE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.