United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 1996 No. 95—Part II

House of Representatives

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3666, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 456 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H.RES. 456

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. 3666) making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, 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 2(l)(6) of rule XI, clause 7 of rule XXI, or section 302(f) 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. Points of order against provisions in the bill (other than sections 204 and 205) for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. The amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. 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. 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 fifteen minutes. After the reading of the final lines of the bill, a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted shall, if offered by the majority leader or a designee, have precedence over a motion to amend. 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 68, line 23, strike ''future legislation'' and insert in lieu thereof ''future appropriations legislation''.

☐ 1345

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], 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. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 456 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3666, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and independent agencies for fiscal year 1997.

The rule waives points of order against the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI and clause 7 of rule XXI, which require the 3-day availability of the printed hearings and committee reports on appropriations bills. However, I'd like to inform Members that the committee report has been available since last Wednesday.

The rule additionally waives clause 2 of rule XXI prohibiting unauthorized appropriations and legislation on an appropriations bill, and clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting transfers of unobligated balances, against the bill with the exception of sections 204 and 205. These two sections pertain to housing matters, and have been left unprotected at the request of the chairman of the authorizing committee, Mr. LEACH.

Section 302(F) of the Budget Act is waived against consideration of the bill, and the rule provides for adoption of the amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution to remedy the Budget Act violation.

The rule allows for 1 hour of general debate, and provides priority in recognition to those amendments that are preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under the rule, the Chair may postpone and cluster rollcall votes, and may reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

This rule allows the majority leader or his designee to offer a motion to rise and report the bill after the final lines of the bill have been read.

Finally, the rule allows one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, once again, Chairman JERRY LEWIS and Ranking Minority Member LOU STOKES have done an outstanding job of addressing the needs of our country's veterans by ensuring

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

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

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

adequate funding to provide compensation and pension benefits, educational and vocational training, housing credit assistance, and medical care for over 70 million recipients of veterans benefits. There is a VA medical center located in my district in Johnson City, TN, and I've seen first hand the critical medical needs of our veterans and I'm proud of the excellent medical care provided by all of the VA medical centers across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see that this bill provides an increase in spending for veterans programs—these funds are desperately needed to ensure that our veterans get the benefits they deserve for their unselfish devotion and sacrifice to their country.

H.R. 3666 also provides funding to meet the housing needs of the poor, the elderly, the disabled, and the homeless. Additionally, the bill funds various independent agencies, including the Environmental Protection Agency, NASA, FEMA, and others.

The Appropriations Committee did a remarkable job at funding all of these important programs at sufficient levels while still contributing toward the ultimate goal of achieving a balanced budget. I applaud their bipartisan spirit and I urge my colleagues to support this open rule and this important appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD:

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

[As of June 19, 1996]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-Open [2]	46	44	75	60
Structured/Modified Closed [3]	49	47	33	26
Closed [4]	9	9	17	14
Total	104	100	125	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 structured or 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 June 19, 1996]

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: 229–199; A: 227–197 (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	PQ: 217–202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230–189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409–1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255–156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323–104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414–0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388–2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241–173 A: 375–39–1 (9/20/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of June 19, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304–118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344–66–1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231–194 A: 227–192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235–184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228–191 A: 235–185 (10/26/95).
		H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237–190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241–181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216–210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220–200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220–185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 249–176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239–181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223–183 A: 228–184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands	PQ: 221–197 A: voice vote (5/15/96).
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H. Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	PQ: 230–188 A: 229–189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PQ: 228–182 A: 244–168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	Tabled (4/17/96).
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: voice vote A: 235–175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	C	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	A: 251–157 (3/13/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PQ: 233–152 A: voice vote (3/19/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PQ: 234–187 A: 237–183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/21/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	A: 244–166 (3/22/96).
H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)	C	H.R. 3136	Contract w/America Advancement	PQ: 232–180 A: 232–177, (3/28/96).
H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)	MC	H.R. 3103	Health Coverage Affordability	PQ: 229–186 A: Voice Vote (3/29/96).
H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)	MC	H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.	PQ: 232–168 A: 234–162 (4/15/96).
H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)	O	H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	A: voice vote (4/17/96).
H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 1675	Natl. Wildlife Refuge	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)	C	H.J. Res. 175	Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 418 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2641	U.S. Marshals Service	PQ: 219–203 A: voice vote (5/1/96).
H. Res. 419 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2149	Ocean Shipping Reform	A: 422–0 (5/1/96).
H. Res. 421 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 2974	Crimes Against Children & Elderly	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 422 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 3120	Witness & Jury Tampering	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 426 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 2406	U.S. Housing Act of 1996	PQ: 218–208 A: voice vote (5/8/96).
H. Res. 427 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 3322	Omnibus Civilian Science Auth	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 428 (5/7/96)	MC	H.R. 3286	Adoption Promotion & Stability	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 430 (5/9/96)	S	H.R. 3230	DoD Auth. FY 1997	A: 235–149 (5/10/96).
H. Res. 435 (5/15/96)	MC	H. Con. Res. 178	Con. Res. on the Budget, 1997	PQ: 227–196 A: voice vote (5/16/96).
H. Res. 436 (5/16/96)	C	H.R. 3415	Repeal 4.3 cent fuel tax	PQ: 221–181 A: voice vote (5/21/96).
H. Res. 437 (5/16/96)	MO	H.R. 3259	Intell. Auth. FY 1997	A: voice vote (5/21/96).
H. Res. 438 (5/16/96)	MC	H.R. 3144	Defend America Act	
H. Res. 440 (5/21/96)	MC	H.R. 3448	Small Bus. Job Protection	A: 219–211 (5/22/96).
	MC	H.R. 1227	Employee Commuting Flexibility	
H. Res. 442 (5/29/96)	O	H.R. 3517	Mil. Const. Approps. FY 1997	A: voice vote (5/30/96).
H. Res. 445 (5/30/96)	O	H.R. 3540	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/5/96).
H. Res. 446 (6/5/96)	MC	H.R. 3562	WI Works Waiver Approval	A: 363–59 (6/6/96).
H. Res. 448 (6/6/96)	MC	H.R. 2754	Shipbuilding Trade Agreement	A: voice vote (6/12/96).
H. Res. 451 (6/10/96)	O	H.R. 3603	Agriculture Appropriations, FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/11/96).
H. Res. 453 (6/12/96)	O	H.R. 3610	Defense Appropriations, FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/13/96).
H. Res. 455 (6/18/96)	O	H.R. 3662	Interior Approps, FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/19/96).
H. Res. 456 (6/19/96)	O	H.R. 3666	VA/HUD Approps	

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. This is an open rule which will allow for amendment and ample debate on the important issues related to funding for the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. However, many of my colleagues will oppose this rule and during the debate, it is my intention to yield to opponents in order to allow them the opportunity to explain their position.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 3666. This bill reflects a spirit of cooperation between the majority and minority to craft an appropriation for these agencies that was not present in the last funding cycle. I commend the subcommittee chairman, Mr. LEWIS, for working closely with his ranking minority member, Mr. STOKES, to create this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the programs funded by this appropriation affect a wide range of essential Government services and projects—everything from low-income housing, to health care for our Nation's veterans, to our space program. Reconciling the funding needs of all these programs within the limits established by the budget resolution is no easy task. While this bill is not perfect and many Members may disagree with the priorities it establishes, this bill does reflect an honest attempt to fashion a bipartisan agreement.

I would also like to thank the Appropriations Committee for providing the funds necessary to begin construction of a new national veterans cemetery for the Dallas/Fort Worth area. For nearly 10 years I have worked closely with north Texas veterans to establish this cemetery. The Dallas/Fort Worth area is home to one of the most concentrated veterans' populations in the country—more than 1 million people eligible for burial in a veterans cemetery live within 100 miles of the site of this new cometary, yet there are currently no burial facilities for eligible veterans in this area. The Veterans' Administration has cited the North Texas region as one of the top 10 areas in the Nation most in need of additional burial space.

This funding, a total of $16.2 million, will change this situation and will enable this facility to open by the spring of 1999. For the veterans of the north Texas region who have worked so diligently on this project, the inclusion of these funds is the culmination of years of work. I want to thank them for all of their assistance in seeing this project through, from start to finish. I also want to especially thank Chairman LEWIS and Mr. STOKES for ensuring that this project was included in this appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, while this bill does not adequately fund many programs that are of vital importance to many Americans, we all understand that funding levels for domestic programs are rapidly shrinking. Given that fact, this bill represents an honest effort to fund the programs encompassed by the VA–HUD appropriations bill, and I urge support of this rule so that the House may move on to the consideration of this appropriation.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman emeritus, Mr. QUILLEN, for yielding me the time. I rise in support of this open rule. I'd like to commend Chairman LEWIS and ranking member STOKES for demonstrating that, even in this charged partisan environment, Republicans and Democrats can work together for the good of our citizens. The bipartisan cooperation that is evident in this VA–HUD appropriations bill is certainly a welcome breath of fresh air in Washington.

I am pleased to point out that this legislation provides funding for some of this Nation's highest priority commitments—those that we have made to our veterans. For too many years we have seen precious veterans' dollars parceled out to support projects in areas of the country where veterans' populations are declining, while those regions with growing populations of veterans made do on shoestring budgets. I am pleased to note that we have reversed that trend, and this legislation continues the effort to send the dollars where the veterans are. Veterans in southwest Florida know that we spent years seeking the modest funding needed to expand our dreadfully overworked and under-resourced Fort Myers Outpatient Veterans Clinic. This year, as part of the omnibus spending bill we passed a few months ago, we finally got the funding secured and the leasing effort is currently underway—so that in short order we will be able to provide more services to more people in our area. I wish to once again thank Chairman LEWIS and Ranking Member STOKES, as well as Chairman STUMP and Chairman LIVINGSTON for their assistance in making that a promise kept—at long last—to our more than 150,000 southwest Florida veterans.

Mr. Speaker, there is a ''Dear Colleague'' going around that talks about some turf fight going on with regard to this matter. I would suggest that the rule we have is a good, open rule and will get the job done, and I urge support for this rule from all colleagues.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because the rule contains language that would amend the appropriation legislation to make $861 million of Superfund money contingent upon a future appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, basically what happened is about a week ago, many of the Republicans involved in this legislation and some of the projects announced that they were going to provide significant funds for the Superfund program in this appropriations bill. But what we found out is that a significant part of that money, as I said, $861 million, is essentially not real. It was put in with a contingency that the Superfund bill would be reauthorized. Apparently the parliamentarian correctly ruled that that would have to be scored as an allocation under the appropriation which would raise the appropriation to a level that was unacceptable based on the allocations that had been provided by the Republican leadership. And so now in the rule the language is changed to say that this money is contingent upon a future appropriation. Well, when an appropriation is contingent upon a future appropriation, essentially there is no appropriation at all. What that means is that in a sense we are being told that money for the Superfund program will be made available that is not going to be made available. The level of funding for the Superfund program is actually about $50 million less than what the administration proposed.

In addition to that, there is every reason to believe that the idea behind this $860 million is to ultimately give it back to polluters in the forms of rebates, because the Superfund reauthorization bill that has been proposed by the Republican leadership would require the Federal Government to rebate to the polluters for moneys that they have already spent in cleaning up Superfund programs. That is not the way to go. The principle of the Superfund program is that the polluter pays, not the taxpayer. It would be wrong to sneak into this bill this kind of contingency that would suggest that that money would be going back to the polluters.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to have some amendments later with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] to address these problems, and I would hope that I could get support from my colleagues.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I do wish to point out to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] that the retroactive liability discount that concerned him also concerned me. That is off the table. That is not part of our proposal. That is history, as it should be.

Mr. Speaker, I do want my colleagues to know that I rise in support of the rule and in support of H.R. 3666. This bill increases the funding for the Environmental Protection Agency over the fiscal year 1996 spending levels. This is a good bill for the environment, and I urge Members to support it.

I would like to commend Chairman LEWIS and Chairman LIVINGSTON for providing $1.339 billion in funding for the current Superfund Program. I appreciate the constraints we face in this era of declining Federal spending. However, the cleanup of uncontrolled hazardous waste sites is very important and it must continue even though the statute that governs those programs is in desperate need of a major overhaul.

□ 1400

I wish my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and we could get together and have that meeting for Superfund reform. What our Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations have done is provide a mechanism that will allow increased funding for Superfund when we get a bill. Let me stress that: when we get a bill that overhauls Superfund in a way that requires additional funding and when the Superfund taxes go back into effect.

In the budget resolution, the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. KASICH] provided a Superfund reserve account that allows him to increase the allocations of spending authority when new money is brought into the Treasury through the extension of those business taxes that fund the Superfund Programs. This reserve account will allow Chairman LEWIS and Chairman LIVINGSTON to appropriate $2.2 billion, $861 million more than the current funding level for Superfund, without busting the budget. That is a responsible way to proceed.

What the VA–HUD appropriations bill before us does is make the firm commitment that our Committee on Appropriations will appropriate that additional money after all the conditions are met. We are all committed to fully funding any reforms we make to the Superfund Program, and this bill demonstrates that we are ready, willing, and able to make good on those promises.

Now, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI], and I love them dearly, we work so well together, would like to call this promise smoke and mirrors. Well, it is not. The commitment to provide additional funding for a reformed Superfund is right there in black and white in the bill. All we need to do is agree on a Superfund reform package and reauthorize the Superfund taxes. So what are we waiting for? We are waiting for the administration and the leadership of the Democrat Party and the leadership of the Committee on Commerce from the Democrat side and the Democrat leadership of the Committee on Transportation to make good on their promises to work with us to achieve a fair and a responsible and fully funded reform of Superfund.

Last year I was very hopeful that we could achieve a bipartisan agreement. I really felt good about it. As a matter of fact, in July 1995, I issued a proposal to reform Superfund liability by allowing the most complex sites to proceed to clean up directly without waiting for years of litigation and negotiation among hundreds of parties. I wanted to

get out of the courts and get in the field and clean up these toxic waste sites. As a matter of fact, the EPA Administrator, Carol Browner, and I would love to call her Madam Secretary because I think that agency should be at Cabinet level, she called this proposal a very attractive proposal. Those are her words, not mine, but I was flattered. I agreed with her, as a matter of fact. She said it was one that the Clinton administration would feel very, very comfortable with, but the Administrator was pulled back by the political types at the White House.

Quite frankly, I think somebody is whispering in the President's ear, shhh, do not do it. Do not do that Superfund reform. If you dare do it, then the Republicans will claim credit because they are in charge and they are the one that proposed it. Do not do it, Mr. President.

Now, I am not one to question motivation, and I am not sure I have the inside track to the inside of the White House, but I think that is probably what happened.

Now, if I were cynical, I would say there is a conscious effort to deny the Republicans, which are trying to go forward with responsible Superfund reform, with an opportunity to claim that we have done something meaningful in this very sensitive area. I would like to see us move ahead with Superfund reform. I think we are, I know we are very serious about it. We have been working very hard, long and hard, people like my good friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. BORSKI, and I, have had hearings on this subject, extensive discussions. I know my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], who represents the southern part of the downriver area of Detroit is interested. We all are. Why are we not moving ahead with Superfund reform? We should be. Now is the opportunity. Let us do it, but this bill has the money to fund the program if we have the get up and go to do it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], has left the floor, because the remarks I am about to make would have been of some use to him.

This is a wonderful day for scams and shams, and we are seeing them hard at work. I would like to first begin by telling the gentleman that they have the votes on that side. You want a Superfund bill? Report it out. If you want Democratic cooperation on a Superfund bill, talk to us, we will be glad to work with you.

What is at stake now in the committee is that my Republican colleagues want a Superfund bill which pays the polluter. They want to pay the polluter. They do not want to have the polluter pay. Now, this is nothing more or less than conversion of Superfund into a fine polluter entitlement program.

Now, having set the record straight, if the gentleman wants to support that kind of bill, I would urge him to work with Republican members of the Committee on Commerce, who are diligently working towards that end. The simple fact of the matter is that my Republican colleagues on the Committee on Commerce recognize that that stinks so bad that they cannot bring it to the floor. That is the problem.

Now that I have enlightened my good friend, I want to talk about some other matters which are of concern here. We have heard that there are precious few dollars available for Superfund cleanup. Citizens have been waiting for cleanup for a long time, yet my Republican colleagues have spent much of the time of this Congress in crafting what I have already described as a polluter entitlement program and other mechanisms to spend money for paying polluters instead of paying for cleanup.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the Superfund is a seriously flawed program, and I will support reasonable changes in it which will make it necessary for industry, which will reduce the enormous volume of litigation which that program contributes. I would remind my colleagues that when I was the chairman of the conference, I did everything I could to prevent that kind of situation obtaining with regard to Superfund. If I would have had more help from the gentleman from New York, and some of the other people that are now complaining about this, perhaps we would be discussing a different kind of Superfund package.

I would like to think that this rule, which includes a self-executing amendment making $861 million available for the Superfund program contingent on the enactment of a subsequent appropriation bill extraordinary. I want to commend my good friend, the gentleman from New York, Closed Rule SOLOMON, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for the innovation that has gone into that step, that it might provide more money for cleanup. Unfortunately, the rule here is just meaningless from the standpoint of providing any real money for the program.

In short, we have no assurance that this money will ever be available. It is a wonderful paper entry, and what happened is my friends on the Republican side suddenly found that they had spent money which was going to break the budget, so they went then to the Committee on Rules to get that problem cured by converting the whole thing into what, frankly, is nothing more or less than a sham.

In any event, if this money then becomes available under the legislation that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] was speaking about, I can assume that the money will then be make available not for the cleanup of pollution but rather for paying polluters along the lines of the splendid ideas that my colleagues on the Republican side have been setting forth today.

Last week we read with interest reports that the Committee on Appropriations had approved an additional $861 million for the Superfund program contingent on the enactment of a Superfund reauthorization bill. This now makes the appropriations of this money contingent on the passage of an appropriation bill. But the passage of the appropriation bill is not contingent on the passage of an authorization bill. So in point of fact, what is going to transpire here today is a great deal of nothing and probably a lot of subsequent finger pointing, but certainly nothing significant with regard to cleanup of pollution or Superfund site.

The plan, I would note, which was put together was foiled when appropriators realized that CBO would have to score that money and, in the process, blow the caps off the VA–HUD bill and subject it to a fatal point of order under the budget act. So the Committee on Rules provided this wonderful and I say adroit self-executing amendment making the $861 million contingent on the enactment not of a future authorization bill but on the enactment of a subsequent appropriations bill, something I have never seen before in the few years that I have had the pleasure of serving this body.

In other words, the new money will be appropriated in the future if new money is appropriated in the future. I hope that my colleagues on the Republican side have listened to that, because if there ever was a pea under the walnut shell game, this is it here.

Let us see who is being fooled here. CBO does not have to score these additional funds because they are not being appropriated now. So all the claims we have heard from our chairmen that more money is available to finance their proposed Superfund reform are false. There is no money.

What about the VA–HUD subcommittee's ability to appropriate these funds in the future? They cannot do that without an increased allocation or authorization. Between the budget resolution, the Superfund bill, and the VA–HUD appropriation bills, there is almost $900 million waiting to spill out, blowing an even bigger hole in the fiscal 1997 budget deficit that most of my colleagues have found reason to be distressed about.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to defeat this rule. It is a scam. It is a pea under the walnut shell, and I would urge my colleagues to look around and try and figure out under which walnut shell the pea is. I suspect that they will not be able to find the pea. In the great traditions of the carny showmen and scam artists who engage in that, I am certain that they will find that there is probably no pea at all here. Not a pea which has fallen under the table through a hole in the table, but it is probably in the hands of

one of my good Republican colleagues who is even at this minute clutching that pea with a hard grasp.

I would simply urge my colleagues to vote no. This is a scam, this is a sham, this is a game. My Republican colleagues are not approving money for Superfund. They want to complain about the fact that the Democrats do not want to pass a bill on Superfund which will pay the polluter instead of causing the polluters to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I include a communication to the chairmen for the RECORD.

Hon. THOMAS J. BLILEY, Jr.
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

Hon. MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Hazardous Materials,
Washington, DC.

Hon. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN BLILEY, SHUSTER, OXLEY, AND BOEHLERT: We are writing concerning the status of Superfund reform legislation. We greatly appreciate your efforts to seek a bipartisan consensus on this issue. Democrats and Republicans alike, as well as President Clinton and Administrator Browner, agree on the need for Superfund reform. Thus, your agreement in February to commence bipartisan negotiations was a welcome departure from last year's divisive and partisan proceedings. Since we commenced negotations in March, your staffs and ours have spent significant time and energy, as has the Administration, reviewing and analyzing scores of issues, proposals, and counterproposals. These activities have yielded a better understanding of each other's positions and a narrowing of our disagreements in certain areas.

Despite out mutual efforts, however, fundamental differences continue to separate us. Perhaps the most obvious example is our conviction that any responsible legislation must conform to the basic ''polluter pays'' principle underpinning the Superfund law. Upon careful analysis, we have concluded that all of your liability proposals are premised on some notion of ''paying the polluter.'' Your rejection of the fundamental ''polluter pays'' principle fails to meet our mutual objective of responsible reform.

Regrettably, we view the three ''options'' that you presented to us in your latest counterproposals as a mere reiteration of positions taken by the Majority before our negotiations began. Prior to our negotiations, Administrator Browner and others testified before House and Senate committees, and otherwise expressed their grave concerns about the site carve-outs contained in H.R. 2500 as introduced, and the wholesale exemptions for generators and transporters of hazardous substances set forth in Mr. Bliley's February 21 draft. Yet, we have been asked to choose among three options based entirely upon these same carve-outs and exemptions.

Our inability to reach an agreement with one another on this fundamental principle is particularly disappointing in light of the amount of time and energy we all have expended in the Superfund reform effort to date. During the 103rd Congress, Democrats and Republicans worked together to produce Superfund legislation that was approved unanimously by the Energy and Commerce Committee and on a voice vote in the Public Works and Transportation Committee. Seeking to build on this bipartisan compromise, the Democratic leadership of the two committees introduced H.R. 228 in January 1995. It was a great disappointment to see our compromise bill languish for ten months without so much as a hint of bipartiship. The contentious Commerce subcommittee markup in November confirmed the wide gulf between our vastly different approaches to cleaning up toxic waste sites and assuring that responsible parties and pay the costs of cleanup. Unfortunately, it wasn't until February 1996, well after the subcommittee vote, that you agreed to commerce bipartisan negotiations.

In the spirit of compromise, our April 1 proposals went significantly beyond H.R. 228 to address the liability of certain classes of parties, all within the framework of Mr. Bliley's February 21 proposal. These proposals were a significant step for us and for the Administration. We sought to address the liability of the same responsible parties that you specifically identified as most in need of relief, such as small businesses, municipalities, and contributors of minimal amounts of waste. Given the great deal of interest which we share in affording relief to these parties, reducing transaction costs, and most importantly expediting site cleanup, we are most disappointed that we have progressed no further toward achieving these mutual goals. We believe our proposal, as summarized below, can be signed by the President and will establish a fairer Superfund liability regime, including the allocation of liability and costs.

Our proposal significantly changes current law to create a fair share allocation system for parties who are not exempt from liability. This proposal essentially eliminates third party contribution lawsuits and was unanimously supported by the Commerce Committee and overwhelming supported by the Public Works and Transportation Committee in the 103rd Congress. However, in a genuine effort to find common ground, our proposal addresses many of your stated concerns and also contains the following additional liability relief provisions:

Our proposal would exempt small businesses with 25 or fewer employees and earning less than $2 million in annual gross revenues that are liable under Superfund as generators or transporters of hazardous substances from liability for activities prior to the date the legislation is enacted. Consistent with Mr. Oxley's stated desired to ''get the little guys, the small businesses whose margins are razor-thin to begin with, out of the system,'' this proposal recognizes the practical reality that these very small companies typically do not have the financial means to contribute meaningfully to the costs of a cleanup.

Our proposal would exempt from liability all businesses with fewer than 100 employees, residential homeowners, and small non-profit organizations that are liable under Superfund as generators and transporters of municipal solid waste. This provision would exempt thousands of parties from liability, including the Girl Scouts and the people who disposed of things like ''pizza boxes''—two types of generators frequently cited by Mr. Oxley as examples of those who should be relieved of Superfund liability.

In addition to businesses with fewer than 100 employees, residential homeowners and small non-profit organizations, our proposal also would exempt all other generators and transporters of municipal solid waste from Superfund liability at NPL sites for activities prior to the date of enactment. For activities after the date of enactment, the proposal limits liability at 10% of the total response costs at the site, so long as the generators and transporters participate in a qualified household waste collection program.

Our proposal would cap the liability of municipal owners and operators of landfills that accepted predominantly municipal waste.

Our proposal would double the ''de micromis'' exemption contained in H.R. 228 to exempt parties that, as generators or transporters, contributed less than 110 gallons of liquid materials containing hazardous substances or 200 pounds of solid materials containing hazardous substances.

Our proposal provides for expedited *de minimis* settlements for parties at National Priorities List sites who contributed a small volume of waste, presumed to be 1% or less of the total waste at the site, unless EPA determines that site specific conditions indicate that another greater or lesser amount constitutes a small volume.

Altogether, the Administration estimates that our proposal would provide relief from Superfund liability and a shield from contribution litigation for more than 40,000 parties. For the parties who remain liable under Superfund under our proposal, the process would be greatly streamlined, transaction costs would be reduced, and settlements would be expedited. Our proposal improves fairness and takes numerous smaller parties out of the liability net, but still preserves fundamental principles of corporate responsibility, which require as a general rule that companies responsible for hazardous substance contamination pay their fair share of the cleanup costs. This concept was endorsed by a wide range of industry and other stakeholders in the compromise bill in the 103rd Congress.

The principal difference we have identified between our proposals and yours is that your broader liability exemptions (and consequent allowance of fair share funding) will exempt those generators and transporters of significant amounts of hazardous substances that in most cases are driving up the cost of the remedy and the health hazards at Superfund sites, as well as the owners (in your second and third options) who profited from the disposal of hazardous substances. We believe the additional parties you are proposing to exempt from liability generally are able and should be willing to pay their fair share of response costs in order to clean up the contamination for which they are responsible.

We were informed by Commerce Committee Majority staff that Mr. Bliley's February 21 proposal had rejected site carve-outs in favor of retaining liability for the ''true polluters,'' *i.e.*, the owners and operators. Nevertheless, your latest counterproposal contains two options for site carve-outs which would exempt owners and operators. The Administration has informed us that of the approximately 250 codisposal sites, about seventy percent contain predominantly hazardous waste that is contributing significantly to the type of remedy selected or cost of the response action, and that was disposed of by generators or transporters. We believe that neither the Fund, which needs to be preserved for cleaning up abandoned sites, nor the citizen taxpayer, who contributes to the $250 million General Treasury portion of the Superfund budget and who will pay substantially more if the Fund cannot cover the cost of cleanup, should assume the responsibility of those who created the mess.

It is no answer in our view to say that the polluters pay because the Superfund into which they deposit taxes would bear the costs of your proposals. Superfund taxes are imposed on corporate taxpayers regardless of whether they are responsible for contamination at any site, and the greatest source of Superfund revenues, the Environmental Income Tax, is imposed regardless of the type

of business in which the corporation is engaged. Revenues from these taxes should be used to support the cleanup program and to fund cleanup of sites where insolvent, defunct, or recalcitrant parties are responsible for the contamination.

Quite apart from these fundamental policy considerations, we are troubled by recent developments in the Appropriations and Rules Committees relating to the Superfund appropriation. At our meeting on April 25, you sought to persuade us that the Appropriations and Budget Committees had signed off on, and would make available, hundreds of millions of new dollars for Superfund cleanups that would fund your liability proposals. Apart from our philosophical differences over whether the Fund should be used to let polluters off the hook, we expressed our skepticism that such funds could in fact be appropriated without offsetting reductions in other important environmental programs and priorities. Although it appeared at first that the Appropriations Committee last week would indeed make an additional $861 million available subject to enactment of a reauthorization bill, it quickly became clear that such a provision ran afoul of the Budget Act, would exceed the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee's allocation, and would be subject to a fatal point of order. The Rules Committee's self-confessed remedy for this Budget Act violation has been to make the $861 million subject instead to passage of a future appropriation. In other words, the additional money is either completely illusory and provides no independent justification for support of your liability proposals—or, the money may be appropriated at some indeterminate future time if the Appropriations Committee can figure out how to blow the top off the Subcommittee's allocation. This does not inspire great confidence.

For all these reasons, we cannot agree to proceed on the basis of any of the three options outlined in your letter. We are, however, willing to consider compromises that work within a basic framework consistent with the ''polluter pays'' principle. With productive and creative attention to these issues, perhaps a bipartisan compromise on liability remains possible. In this context, we would be willing to discuss additional funding, pursuant to the Administrator's discretionary mixed funding authority, for the purpose of facilitating comprehensive settlements at codisposal facilities that accepted predominantly municipal waste.

Your April 30 letter also presents a number of proposals on other issues that merit our response. Our review of your remedy selection proposals persuades us that they would result in a significant and unacceptable rollback of human health and environmental protection. During Subcommittee hearings on H.R. 2500, Administrator Browner testified that the bill inadequately protects human health and the environment and lacks sufficient emphasis on reliable, long-term protection at a reasonable cost. We support your efforts to make cleanup decisions based upon reasonably anticipated future use of property and to eliminate ''relevant and appropriate'' (as opposed to legally applicable) state standards. But any new remedy selection provisions must in our view meet the same test the industrial community and other key stakeholders used to favorably judge H.R. 228—the provisions must consider costs and risks ''realistically, fairly, and pragmatically.''

In particular, we believe that legally applicable state standards should apply to cleanups as they do in current law. Subjecting such standards to an incremental cost-benefit test weakens current law at the expense of human health and the environment. Moreover, preserving legally applicable state standards in remedy selection is an issue of vital importance to the overwhelming majority of states. We also believe, based upon staff discussions, that your groundwater proposals fail to provide adequate protection even for aquifers that may provide drinking water supplies, in part because your proposals maintain the prerequisite for establishing a ''substantial probability'' that groundwater may be used for drinking water in the future. Further, the proposals do not contain the necessary emphasis on restoration of precious groundwater resources that are of increasing importance to our communities' economic development. And we are finding it increasingly difficult to reconcile your Leadership's professed support for returning power to the states in some areas—for example, Medicaid and welfare reform—with the apparent willingness in so many other areas to override state laws when they are inconvenient for the business community.

Many of your proposals threaten to mire the cleanup process in litigation and delay. Under a process even more cumbersome than initially introduced in H.R. 2500, your proposal allows for reopening records of decision and eliminating the current law's bar on preenforcement review of remedies. This promises more delay and litigation, as past decisions are reconsidered and judges are asked to second-guess cleanup choices that were previously made by EPA or states. We fail to understand how these provisions can be reconciled with the overarching concern about reducing transaction costs that you have expressed in our liability discussions. Under these provisions of your proposal, bulldozers will be idled, health risks will remain unaddressed, and affected communities will have to wait for cleanup, while lawyers and consultants clean up with hundreds of new fee-generating opportunities.

While we could support limiting the preference for treatment in current law to the most contaminated and highly mobile toxic waste (hot spots), we cannot support a complete elimination of the preference for treatment. Rejection of this fundamental tenet of the President's Superfund reform proposal would create more brownfield sites that, for all practical purposes, could never be suitable for redevelopment or other productive future use.

Changing long-standing concepts, such as the definition of environment and minimum health standards (even as modified in your latest proposal), creates ambiguous and ill-defined terms and certainly will result in a litigation bonanza. These changes are, in our view, ill-advised and unnecessary.

While we are willing to consider adding a Governors' concurrence provision for new additions to the NPL, we cannot support the arbitrary constraints, or ''caps,'' contained in your proposals. Both the General Accounting Office and the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials have concluded that many states do not have the funding to address sites within their boundaries that otherwise would be placed on the NPL.

We also are highly concerned about your proposals for natural resource damages, a set of issues that are as important to us as liability and remedy. In our view, your proposals would dramatically limit the ability of federal, state, and tribal natural resource trustees to restore natural resources injured by releases of hazardous substances and allow losses to remain uncompensated. As you proposed, we are pleased to have our staff participate in stakeholder discussions on natural resource damages which commenced this week.

In summary, H.R. 2500—and the proposals you have made based on it—seeks to create a regime that abandons the ''polluter pays'' principle, rewards egregious and recalcitrant behavior, delays cleanups, drastically minimizes health and environmental standards, jeopardizes restoration of natural resources, encourages litigation (even to the extent of opening up previously settled decisions governing cleanups), and leaves states responsible for enormous financial obligations for cleanup. We cannot support such an approach.

If we are to achieve our shared goal of Superfund reform this year, we urge you to consider an approach that addresses concerns about further liability relief within the bounds of genuinely available fiscal resources and at the same time adheres to the basic ''polluter pays'' framework that always has been central to Superfund.

If you conclude that a comprehensive Superfund reform bill is not achievable this year, perhaps we can achieve some success yet. With a little futher work, we feel that we can reach agreement on issues relating to federal facilities, clarification of lender liability, grants to local government to assist in redeveloping brownfields, and providing liability relief to bona fide prospective purchasers of property.

The Commerce Committee's recent achievement of a comprehensive safe drinking water reauthorization bill makes clear that we can achieve consensus, even on highly contentious issues surrounding protection of human health and the environment. We look forward to continuing to work with you in that spirit.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Ranking Member, Committee on Commerce.

THOMAS J. MANTON,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Hazardous Materials.

JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ROBERT A. BORSKI,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,
Washington DC, June 24, 1996.

Hon. THOMAS J. BLILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the commitment EPA Assistant Administrator Elliott Laws made in May, I am writing in response to your proposal on liability issues, presented to us in your past letter.

I recognize that much hard work has been devoted to achieving our shared goal of Superfund reform in this Congress. We believe that the past several months of legislative negotiations have been productive in identifying issues where we may achieve a common understanding and clarifying issues where we still remain divided on substantive policy differences.

It is my firm believe that we can achieve responsible Superfund reform only through a genuine commitment to a bipartisan legislative process by you and the House leadership. I had hoped our negotiations would have helped revive the bipartisan dialogue that existed in the House Commerce and House Transportation Committees during the Superfund legislative process in the 103rd Congress.

At the start of the 104th Congress, we expected to build on the consensus developed in the bipartisan bill passed 44–0 by the House Commerce Committee and by near unanimous voice vote by the House Transportation Committee in the prior year. The bill was reintroduced as H.R. 228 with the hope that we could begin a bipartisan dialogue and finish our earlier work in the first session of this Congress.

We were disappointed when Superfund reform legislation was introduced that departed significantly from the bipartisan bill supported by a broad coalition of industry, small business, state and local governments, community groups, and environmental organizations that was crafted in the preceding Congress. H.R. 2500 as introduced did not reflect this consensus nor the Superfund reform principles supported by the Administration. My testimony on H.R. 2500 reflected the Administration's strong opposition to provisions that would compromise the ''polluter pays'' principle; increase litigation and delay cleanups; compromise cleanup standards at the expense of human health and environmental protection; and devastate the natural resource damage (NRD) programs administered by federal, state, and tribal natural resource trustees.

Unfortunately, the lack of a genuine process of bipartisan negotiation in which to resolve our differences resulted in a highly divisive Commerce subcommittee markup, and a significant delay in progress toward responsible Superfund reform.

Liability. In congressional testimony before both the House Commerce and House Transportation Committees in 1995, I urged that we begin a bipartisan process to pass responsible Superfund reform legislation. Regrettably, it was not until March of 1996 that you initiated bipartisan negotiations on H.R. 2500. You asked us to be open to compromise on all issues, and to base our liability and allocation discussions on a new liability repeal proposal that had not been the subject of a subcommittee hearing or markup. In an effort to further address your stated concerns that the current Superfund liability system generated too much litigation that resulted in large transaction costs, we improved upon the compromise liability proposal that we had all developed in the 103rd Congress, and offered a new liability proposal that would increase fairness and reduce transaction costs.

The Administration liability proposal offered on April 2, 1996, moved significantly beyond the compromise we had developed in the prior Congress. We eliminated parties from the system—such as small businesses—whose actual responsibility for contamination at a site, or whose limited ability to pay cleanup costs, was disproportional to the litigation generated and transaction costs associated with bringing them into the liability scheme. In these cases, the polluter pays principle is best served by eliminating the inefficiency associated with retaining these parties in the liability scheme, while preserving incentives for responsible behavior. We also sought to reduce transaction costs and promote certainty for other parties by capping or eliminating liability for parties whose liability is based on disposal of municipal solid waste (MSW).

Taken together, we estimate that the relief provided by these proposals would remove more than 40,000 parties from Superfund liability and provide transaction cost relief for many more parties that otherwise could be entangled in Superfund litigation. For the parties who remain in the system, the process would be simplified and settlements would be expedited. Our proposals would still preserve the polluter pays principle and maintain the principle of corporate responsibility that those companies responsible for hazardous waste contamination pay their fair share of the cleanup costs.

When we met in April, Chairman Bliley indicated that we could expect a counteroffer that would show ''substantial movement toward'' our position. Notwithstanding this suggestion, your letter of April 30 effectively rejected our proposal with no discussion as to the policy reasons for the rejection. As Assistant Administrator Elliott Laws outlined in his letter of May 2, the three liability options you proposed were essentially variations on prior liability repeal proposals made by the three Chairmen over the course of the past year. Your decision not to address our proposal of April 2, other than one small addition to your liability options, failed to provide the impetus for moving the discussions forward.

I have given careful and serious consideration to each of these options, evaluating each according to three criteria: fairness; efficiency, and the polluter pays principle in current law and our proposed administrative and legislative reforms. Under these criteria, I believe that all three of your options compare unfavorably to the Administration's liability proposal.

Option 1 consists primarily of a repeal of liability for generators and transporters of hazardous substances. This proposal replaced the fifty percent ''retroactive liability discount'' adopted at the Commerce subcommittee markup. This approach would exempt many large hazardous waste contributors who can afford to pay for cleanup, while retaining liability for owners and operators of those same sites. This disparate treatment of parties is unjustified, would significantly increase the transaction costs associated with determining the time of disposal; and would violate the polluter pays principle. By repealing liability for so many parties, this proposal would require a massive transfer of cleanup responsibility from private parties to the federal government, resulting in lost efficiencies and cleanup delays as sites are transferred to EPA.

Option 2 proposes a ''site carve-out'' that would exempt from Superfund liability all parties at certain co-disposal and recycling sites which together account for approximately twenty-five percent of the hazardous waste sites on the National Priorities List. There appears to be no principled basis or coherent policy rationale for eliminating these sites from the liability scheme while retaining others. Any purported reduction in transaction costs will be more than overwhelmed by other budgetary and social costs of the proposal, including the transaction and inefficiency costs of a massive transfer of sites into a government-conducted cleanup program under Superfund.

In addition, an analysis of the sites and parties who would be exempted from liability under this scheme has made clear that this proposal would exempt very contaminated sites, and would exempt from liability many large industrial generators of hazardous waste who should be called upon to pay for the cleanup before resorting to Federal Trust Fund dollars. Our review of these sites has also found that the recycling sites that would be carved out under your proposal include a number of sites at which serious environmental contamination has resulted from egregiously irresponsible conduct.

Option 3 is essentially similar to Option 2, except that it would append a portion of our liability counterproposal on top of the broad site carve-out in Option 2. While I acknowledge the attempt to accommodate our counterproposal in some small manner, combining Option 2 with our proposal fails to alter in any way the flaws we have identified in Option 2.

I also remain concerned by the lack of any assurance that adequate funding will be available for these proposals without rolling back remedy standards, compromising the pace of cleanup, or cutting funding for other environmental programs that are essential to protecting public health and the environment. Our analysis suggests that the cost of Option 1, for example, will far exceed the increases in funding proposed in your letter. Should any additional funds over and above the current Superfund appropriation be actually appropriated for the Superfund program, they should not be spent on proposals that delay cleanup, reduce protectiveness or violate the polluter pays principle.

Other Issues. You also placed other, non-liability issues on the table in your letter. Unfortunately, many of the proposals are so general in nature that it is difficult to respond in a meaningful manner. However, the proposals appear to remain far short of meeting our fundamental principles that Superfund cleanups remain protective of public health and the environment and that the current pace of cleanup be maintained or increased.

Your proposals still appear to place too much emphasis on cost as opposed to public health and environmental protection in the balancing test used for selecting cleanup remedies. There remains far too many qualifiers on when, if ever, groundwater would be cleaned up as opposed to selecting exposure control remedies. There is no requirement for treatment of the most highly toxic and mobile hazardous waste at Superfund sites. Hundreds of RODs would still be reopened under your proposals, potentially costing years of delay at Superfund sites. The arbitrary cap on listing NPL sites will undoubtedly leave hundreds of hazardous waste sites unaddressed by states that simply do not have the resources to clean them up.

In addition, your proposals to limit the ability of Federal, state and tribal natural resource trustees to restore damaged natural resources is unacceptable public and environmental policy.

Next Steps. I feel I must also respond to the letter sent by Chairmen Bliley and Oxley dated June 17, 1996. I am deeply disappointed that the Commerce Committee Chairs would question my commitment to enacting Superfund reform legislation. EPA has worked for more than three and one half years to secure a Superfund reform bill, while at the same time implementing significant and successful administrative reforms. No one has worked harder than this Administration to make Superfund faster, fairer, and more efficient. In my congressional testimony and private discussions with congressional committee chairs and ranking members, I have steadfastly urged that a bipartisan legislative process be developed so that we can build the consensus necessary to secure passage of a responsible Superfund reform bill. I remain committed to that goal. If you genuinely share that goal, I challenge you to offer responsible Superfund reform proposals that protect public health and the environment and that do not violate the polluter pays principle. Working together, we can enact Superfund reform legislation in this Congress.

Sincerely,

CAROL M. BROWNER.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman emeritus and would ask the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN

DINGELL, if he would stand around just for a minute.

''This is a scam, this is a sham.'' Now, all of the Democrats voted for this. ''This is a scam, this is a sham,'' and I would just say to my good friend, and he is a very good friend and one of the most respected Members of the body, nobody came to complain. We work in the Committee on Rules 18 hours a day. We were up there the other evening putting this rule out, finally, and nobody complained. As a matter of fact, I think the rule, this open rule, incidentally, passed by a unanimous vote.

I would just say to my good friend, too, he ought to be careful about how he refers to Members because you could have your words taken down. I would never do that to one of my best friends, but we should be accurate. The gentleman, I happen to know, has served under former Democrat chairmen by the name of MOAKLEY and Pepper and Boland and Delaney and Madden and Colmer and Howard Smith of Virginia, and if you want to talk about closed rules, you ought to see them. We have turned that around where now we have mostly open rules, thank goodness.

Mr. Speaker, let me just talk about this thing that seems to be bothering some people. We have done one thing up in the Committee on Rules at the request, I think, of the Congress; it was not the request of any one particular person. But we changed one word. We did not change one word, we simply added a word, and that word was ''appropriations.'' We say ''future appropriation legislation,'' instead of ''future legislation.'' We simply add the word ''appropriation.''

Why did we do that? We do it because the Congressional Budget Office requires us to do it. We do it because the Committee on the Budget requires it of us. But let me tell you why we really did it. Because JERRY SOLOMON, this Member of Congress, requires it of us, because we are not going to do anything that is going to get us off that glidepath to a balanced budget.

The gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, is sitting in the back of the room. He has got us on that glidepath for the second consecutive year, and we are going to continue for the next 5 years and we are not going to veer off it, no matter what. The most serious problem facing this Government today is these unconscionable deficits that are turning this Nation into a debtor nation, no better than a third-world debtor nation, and the American people have had it and we have had it.

Let me get back on to the bill itself, because I want everybody to come over here and I want Members to vote for this rule, then I want Members to vote for the bill. The major part of this bill is the funding of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and it is funded at a level that is going to take care of the veterans of this Nation. Why is that necessary? Because we have a contract with them. This is not some kind of welfare program or social program we are dealing with in funding the hospital medical care delivery system under the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Veterans Affairs now. In other words, that is an earned benefit and that is what we are doing here today. As a matter of fact, we are going to have an amendment by a good Democrat, the gentleman from Mississippi, SONNY MONTGOMERY, and a good Republican, the gentleman from New York, JERRY SOLOMON, and the gentleman from Arizona, BOB STUMP, and we are going to increase that a little bit.

We are going to take less than one-half of 1 percent out of all these other bureaus and agencies and offices that are funded under this complex little bill here, and we are going to take that $50 billion plus $15 million and we are going to add it into the Veterans' Administration hospital care delivery system because that is what it is going to take to keep that solvent and keep it going so that we do not loose ground.

So that is really what this entire debate is all about today. Let us not quibble over one word. We are doing it because we cannot afford to violate the Budget Act and then have CBO and all of these other people come down on us. We are going to change that one word, but then we are going to pass this, one of the most important appropriation bills that we have coming before this Congress this year.

□ 1415

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that no man holds the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules in greater esteem than do I or has greater affection for him, but he has just admitted, just admitted that there is no money in that $861 million. It is illusion. It is blue smoke and mirrors.

I want to compliment the gentleman because never before have I seen this so adroitly done, even in the Committee on Rules, where he reigns supreme and issues closed rules and handles the business of this House up there behind closed doors.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and in partial response to my friend, the chairman of the committee, I would like to insert some material in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress the Republican majority claimed that the House was going to consider bills under an open process.

I would like to point out that 60 percent of the legislation this session has been considered under a restrictive process.

Mr. Speaker, additional information for the RECORD follows:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 101	To transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico.	H. Res. 51	Open	N/A.
H.R. 400	To provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park Preserve.	H. Res. 52	Open	N/A.
H.R. 440	To provide for the conveyance of lands to certain individuals in Butte County, California.	H. Res. 53	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open	N/A.
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open	N/A.
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Open	N/A.
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open	N/A.
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive	N/A.
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed	None.
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed.	H. Res. 88	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A.
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A.
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive	5D; 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A.
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open	N/A.
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open	N/A.
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A.
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa.	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A.
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility.	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A.
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive	3D; 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act; FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open	N/A.
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag.	H. Res. 173	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 1944	Recissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 1977 *Rule Defeated*	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 187	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open	N/A.
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open	N/A.
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open	N/A.
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive	2R/3D/3 Bipartisan.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	H. Res. 215	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization	H. Res. 216	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lock Box	H. Res. 218	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 219	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1617	To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS).	H. Res. 222	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2274	National Highway System Designation Act of 1995	H. Res. 224	Open	N/A.
H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995	H. Res. 225	Restrictive	2R/2D.
H.R. 743	The Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995	H. Res. 226	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions	H. Res. 227	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1601	International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 228	Open	N/A.
H.J. Res. 108	Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 230	Closed	.....
H.R. 2405	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 234	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2259	To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments	H. Res. 237	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	H. Res. 238	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 2492	Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill	H. Res. 239	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 2491	7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform.	H. Res. 245	Restrictive	1D.
H. Con. Res. 109				
H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995	H. Res. 251	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 2546	D.C. Appropriations FY 1996	H. Res. 252	Restrictive	N/A.
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 257	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit	H. Res. 258	Restrictive	5R.
H.R. 2539	ICC Termination	H. Res. 259	Open	.....
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 261	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt	H. Res. 262	Closed	N/A.
H. Res. 250	House Gift Rule Reform	H. Res. 268	Closed	2R.
H.R. 2564	Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995	H. Res. 269	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment	H. Res. 273	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995	H. Res. 289	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act of 1995	H. Res. 287	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2621	To Protect Federal Trust Funds	H. Res. 293	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995	H. Res. 303	Open	N/A.
H. Res. 304	Providing for Debate and Consideration of Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia.	N/A	Closed	1D; 2R.
H. Res. 309	Revised Budget Resolution	H. Res. 309	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act	H. Res. 313	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2677	The National Parks and National Wildlife Refuge Systems Freedom Act of 1995.	H. Res. 323	Closed	N/A.
	PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION			
H.R. 1643	To authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (MFN) to the products of Bulgaria.	H. Res. 334	Closed	N/A.
H.J. Res. 134	Making continuing appropriations/establishing procedures making the transmission of the continuing resolution H.J. Res. 134.	H. Res. 336	Closed	N/A.
H. Con. Res. 131				
H.R. 1358	Conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts.	H. Res. 338	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 2924	Social Security Guarantee Act	H. Res. 355	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 2854	The Agricultural Market Transition Program	H. Res. 366	Restrictive	5D; 9R; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 994	Regulatory Sunset & Review Act of 1995	H. Res. 368	Open rule; Rule tabled	N/A.
H.R. 3021	To Guarantee the Continuing Full Investment of Social Security and Other Federal Funds in Obligations of the United States.	H. Res. 371	Closed rule	N/A.
H.R. 3019	A Further Downpayment Toward a Balanced Budget	H. Res. 372	Restrictive	2D/2R.
H.R. 2703	The Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996	H. Res. 380	Restrictive	6D; 7R; 4 Bipartisan.
H.R. 2202	The Immigration and National Interest Act of 1995	H. Res. 384	Restrictive	12D; 19R; 1 Bipartisan.
H.J. Res. 165	Making further continuing appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 386	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 125	The Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996.	H. Res. 388	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 3136	The Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996	H. Res. 391	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 3103	The Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996	H. Res. 392	Restrictive	N/A.
H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment	H. Res. 395	Restrictive	1D
H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	H. Res. 396	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996	H. Res. 409	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1675	National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995	H. Res. 410	Open	N/A.
H.J. Res. 175	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 411	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 2641	United States Marshals Service Improvement Act of 1996	H. Res. 418	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2149	The Ocean Shipping Reform Act	H. Res. 419	Open	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 2974	To amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to provide enhanced penalties for crimes against elderly and child victims.	H. Res. 421	Open	N/A.
H.R. 3120	To amend Title 18, United States Code, with respect to witness retaliation, witness tampering and jury tampering.	H. Res. 422	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2406	The United States Housing Act of 1996	H. Res. 426	Open	N/A.
H.R. 3322	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996	H. Res. 427	Open	N/A.
H.R. 3286	The Adoption Promotion and Stability Act of 1996	H. Res. 428	Restrictive	1D; 1R.
H.R. 3230	Defense Authorization Bill FY 1997	H. Res. 430	Restrictive	41 amends; 20D; 17R; 4 bipartisan
H.R. 3415	Repeal of the 4.3-Cent Increase in Transporation Fuel Taxes	H. Res. 436	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 3259	Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 1997	H. Res. 437	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 3144	The Defend America Act	H. Res. 438	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 3448/H.R. 1227	The Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996, and The Employee Commuting Flexibility Act of 1996.	H. Res. 440	Restrictive	2R.
H.R. 3517	Military Construction Appropriations FY 1997	H. Res. 442	Open	N/A.
H.R. 3540	Foreign Operations Appropriations FY 1997	H. Res. 445	Open	N/A.
H.R. 3562	The Wisconsin Works Waiver Approval Act	H. Res. 446	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 2754	Shipbuilding Trade Agreement Act	H. Res. 448	Restrictive	1R.
H.R. 3603	Agriculture Appropriations FY 1997	H. Res. 451	Open	N/A.
H.R. 3610	Defense Appropriations FY 1997	H. Res. 453	Open	N/A.
H.R. 3662	Interior Appropriations FY 1997	H. Res. 455	Open	N/A.
H.R. 3666	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 456	Open	N/A.

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation 1st Session, 53% restrictive; 47% open. *** All legislation 2d Session, 60% restrictive; 40% open. **** All legislation 104th Congress, 56% restrictive; 44% open. ***** NR indicates that the legislation being considered by the House for amendment has circumvented standard procedure and was never reported from any House committee. ****** PQ Indicates that previous question was ordered on the resolution. ******* Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103d Congress. N/A means not available.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the VA–HUD appropriations bill, as reported to the House, allocates, apparently, $2.2 billion for Superfund, but of that amount $861 million is contingent upon future legislation to make the funds available for obligation. Actually, we are talking about $1.3 billion that is really available for Superfund.

The majority clearly is trying to point to this appropriation of $2.2 billion as evidence of their commitment to Superfund and their commitment to environmental protection, but the Committee on the Budget, Congressional Budget Office, and the Parliamentarian scored the provision as exceeding the budget allocation and subject to a point of order. The Committee on Rules therefore included a self-executing provision in the rule that makes the additional $861 million available only upon a subsequent appropriation.

Now, I view that as a form of doublespeak intended to make Superfund appropriations seem larger than they really are. The appropriations provision does not include any money above $1.3 billion. So what is the status of that $861 million? That money is available only if subsequently appropriated. And what does that mean? There will be no additional money for Superfund unless Congress acts a second time to appropriate it. And then, at that time, the appropriation will be subject to budgetary ceilings. And that further means that at that subsequent time the Committee on Appropriations will have to come back and find $861 million to cut someplace else in these programs. Otherwise, they will run up against the caps. They will have exceeded their cap.

Now, that is not being candid and fair and open and honest about this process. We need real money to clean up hazardous wastesites, we need real money to protect human health and the environment, and doublespeak is not going to get us there.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER].

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time to address the House and rise in support of the rule and in support of this VA–HUD appropriations bill.

I represent probably the most diverse district in the State of Illinois. I represent part of the city of Chicago, the south suburbs in Cook and Will Counties, bedroom communities, farm towns, and a lot of corn fields. When I represent a very diverse district, I always look for things where there is a very common consensus, and in my district there is one item where there is unanimous consensus and that is for redevelopment of the Joliet Arsenal, a former military facility, largest single piece of property in northern Illinois, to redevelop that for peacetime uses.

Frankly, I am very pleased that this effort, which has been a bipartisan effort, continues to move forward. The President signed our legislation in February to accomplish our goal setting aside 19,000 acres for conservation, 3,000 acres for job creation, 985 acres to create the second largest national veterans cemetery. The VA–HUD appropriation bill continues that effort by working to make this veterans cemetery a reality.

The Chicago area is now facing a shortage. We need new places to honor and bury our veterans. This legislation provides $18.4 million in funding for redevelopment and complete construction of this new veterans cemetery. I want to point out that the funding that is in this bill is exactly what the VA says they need in order to have this veterans cemetery in place and honoring our veterans by 1999.

Again, I want to thank the chairman, my friend, the gentleman from California, Congressman LEWIS, for his assistance, and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. STOKES, the ranking member, for making this project, which has been a bipartisan project, to redevelop the Joliet Arsenal a reality. This legislation funds our veterans cemetery, and again I want to thank the House and urge bipartisan support and passage of this appropriations bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in last year's appropriations bill the Republicans attacked the EPA and the Superfund Program, and they attempted to slash the Superfund Program by 25 percent.

When President Clinton refused to go along because of our success in highlighting this issue, the President vetoed the bill. The Republicans, because of Superfund and other programs, shut the Government of the United States down twice because they wanted to see programs like Superfund gutted. The truth of the matter is that there were furloughed Superfund Program workers all over the country and delays in the cleanup of toxic waste sites all over our country.

Now, in this bill the Republicans contend they are putting in $2.2 billion for Superfund. Sounds really great, but the truth is that this is really kind of a legislative sneak preview of coming attractions. But, like many Hollywood movie trailers, it is very deceptive, because while they are advertising that their bill is ''Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farms,'' the truth is that their actual bill is more like ''Nightmare on Elm Street,'' because in reality the $862 million which they contend is being put in the bill is not going to be appropriated this year in this bill. They are not putting the money in.

So, here they are today saying, well, we are going to add in an extra $860 million or so, but we are not putting it in this year; we are going to put it in sometime in the future. And by the way, when we put the money in, it is

going to be to give rebates to polluters. That is right. Instead of the polluter who messed up a particular neighborhood paying to clean up the site, we, the American taxpayers, we are going to pay the polluter.

Now, what kind of program is this? This is the Ed McMahon Polluters Rebate Sweepstakes program. That is right, the Ed McMahon Polluters Sweepstakes van pulls up in front of your corporate headquarters and announces that you may be a winner. If you have already been accused and accept responsibility for polluting and for cleaning up a hazardous waste site in your community, you may be eligible for million of dollars of taxpayers' money as the taxpayer pays the polluter for having cleaned up a site which they polluted.

Rather than using these hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up orphan sites, to clean up sites that would not be cleaned up otherwise, no, the money in the Republican bill will be used to hand it over to the polluters.

We must vote ''no'' on this proposal. It, in fact, represents just the opposite of where the American people want our Superfund Program to be headed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

In last year's appropriations bill for VA–HUD–independent agencies, the Republicans attacked EPA and the Superfund Program. They tried to slash funding for Superfund by almost 25 percent. And, when President Clinton refused to go along with their radical proposals, they shut down the Government twice. They furloughed Superfund workers and delayed the cleanup of toxic waste sites in dozens of communities around the Nation, including several in Massachusetts.

This year, instead of mounting a direct assault on the program's funding, the Gingrich Republicans are claiming to provide Superfund with $2.2 billion in funding, nearly a billion dollars more than they provided last year. But when you look at the bill—and especially when you look at the convoluted rule they have crafted—it is clear this sham increase is really only an advertisement for future money. It's a special legislative sneak preview of coming attractions. Unfortunately, like so many Hollywood movie trailers, the preview is much different than the actual film. In this case, we've been offered previews of a legislative ''Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm'' when the actual bill is more like a ''Nightmare on Elm Street.''

The sad truth is that the Republican Superfund appropriations bill is still mean and still extreme. Instead of trying to slash Superfund funding, however, the GOP is trying to turn the Superfund program on its head by replacing the polluter pays principle with a new program of paying the polluter. The extra $861 million—if it is ever really appropriated—will be set aside in a polluter's slush fund, where it could be used to fund the new polluter's entitlement program contained in H.R. 2500, the Republican's Superfund reform bill which was approved last November by the House Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Hazardous Materials. That bill replaces the polluter pays principle of the Superfund law with a requirement that taxpayer dollars and trust fund moneys be used to pay polluters rebate checks for cleaning up Superfund sites that they contaminated and may already have agreed to clean up themselves.

Under the Republican proposal, Superfund will be tansformed into the Ed McMahon Polluter's Clearinghouse Sweepstakes. Superfund polluters will be getting letters in the mail announcing the good news:

> Congratulations, polluters, you may have already won millions of dollars in fabulous cash rebates. All you have to do is wait for Congress to pass this Superfund ''Reform'' bill. Then, our Superfund Sweepstakes prize van will be pulling up to your corporate suite—with a big ol' rebate check in hand to pay you for cleaning up sites that you polluted!

We should oppose such radical and extreme proposals. Those who polluted the environment with hazardous wastes should bear personal responsibility for their actions. During House floor consideration of this bill I will be offering an amendment later in the debate, along with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] that would preserve the current policy of polluter pays and prevent taxpayer dollars and Superfund trust fund moneys from being misused to pay rebate checks to polluters. Those who are liable for contaminating a Superfund site or have entered into a court-approved consent decree to pay the costs of such a cleanup should pay these costs themselves. At the same time, our amendment will not impair mixed funding for cleanups in those circumstances where EPA has reached a consent agreement with a polluter that a portion of the clearnup will be funded from Superfund moneys.

This amendment has the support of the Clinton administration, as well as a broad range of environmental and public interest groups, including the U.S. Public Interest Research Group, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Friends of the Earth, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and the Environmental Information Center. It will be one of the key environmental votes of the year, and we look forward to the floor debate on this critical issue.

At this time, I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule. We should not be passing rules which transform appropriations bills into advertising promos for future appropriations bills. Let's be honest about how much funding Superfund will receive this year, and let's be honest about how these funds will be spent.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and congratulate the gentleman from California, [Mr. LEWIS], the chairman of the committee, and the chairman and members of the Committee on Rules for putting together a very effective rule.

Let me answer my friend from Massachusetts, who was so concerned about the reform of Superfund becoming the ''Nightmare on Elm Street.'' I would say the ''Nightmare on Elm Street'' has been running for the last 15 years, and it is called the existing Superfund law that has fostered litigation to the point where we are spending half of the money on lawyers and we have only cleaned up about 5 percent of the sites.

Anybody who knows anything about the Superfund Program knows what a disaster it has been. Whether they are the most green of green environmentalists or whether they are an evil corporate polluter, they know that the Superfund Program as exists today is not working. We are trying to change that program.

Now, the gentleman from Michigan talked about scams. Let me show my colleagues what a scam is. I have a program there that shows how the cleanup of the Superfund sites takes place under today's program. Now, that is probably the lead-in to the ''Nightmare on Elm Street,'' and it may be the cartoon, but look at all the hoops one has to jump through. And meanwhile, meanwhile, the program has cost some $30 billion. That is billion with a ''B.''

We are here to change the program and make a lousy program work. I am disappointed with my friend from Massachusetts and others who apparently want to stay in a position where they are defending the status quo. I do not think that is defensible.

I see my friend from California, the chairman of the committee, and I would like to ask him a question. If, in fact, we pass a Superfund reform bill, I want to know what is going to happen to the funding of the Superfund Program under the rule that we are debating today.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding. This bill is a bill that funds some 20 Federal programs including the EPA. The Superfund Program is a piece of the EPA. Presently, within this measure is $1.33 billion for the Superfund Program.

If we see a reauthorization bill, and the kind of work that will allow this program to go forward in a positive measure, we would add back the $861 million that is the subject of this discussion.

If the gentleman will continue to yield, I was a bit astonished by the comments of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY]. Almost since I have been here in the House, I have sat back in wonderment as the gentleman has been a member of the committee responsible for authorizing Superfund. The Administrator of EPA 1½ years ago told us this program was broken. I have never seen the gentleman's proposed legislation. I do not see fixes coming out of the committee. I do not see fixes coming from the department.

I hope that the authorizing committee will go forward with the bipartisan effort and support necessary for the program to work.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman and I think that is really the point here.

This is a big carrot out for the members to work in a bipartisan way to get a reauthorization of the Superfund Program so that that extra money is available and we can take that money, instead of giving it to the lawyers, and we can put it into cleanup.

That is really what the essence of this is all about. I am just disappointed with my friend from Massachusetts, who will be offering an amendment, as I understand during the title III of this bill, that apparently just says, hey, the status quo is fine. We can just continue on our merry way and pour money down a rat hole instead of really solving the problem. That is why I say I am disappointed with my friend.

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

Mr. OXLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my good friend, the gentleman from California, that in fact we passed the bill 44 to nothing out of the Committee on Commerce reforming Superfund in 1994. And just to let the gentleman know, as he remembers, it died there in the waning bitter days of the end of the 1994 Congress. We had reformed Superfund on a bipartisan basis out of our committee on 1994, Democrat and Republican alike, unanimously.

The larger question is where is this $850 million going to come from in subsequent years unless we lift the cap on the VA bill without increasing the deficit in other places?

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] because I think this puts it into light in terms of the budget caps and the flexibility therein. The gentleman knows a lot more about it than I do.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, let me say that, first, we are about appropriating funds that are available under the lids that dramatically impact all of these agencies, VA, HUD, EPA, et cetera. Within that limitation, we are attempting to produce as much money as possible and can be meaningful insofar as the Superfund is concerned.

I remind the gentleman that the other party controlled the House and both Houses during the last Congress. They controlled this House for 40 years. They controlled the House since the Superfund was created. Everybody has known that the program has not worked almost from the beginning. It seems to me it is long past due that a bill was passed and sent to the President that changed this.

Indeed, they produced a bill last year that supposedly was going to work. For some reason, the director, Ms. Browner, has not chosen to take that bill up and send it up here and said, yes, this is the answer.

There is no doubt this is a complicated process. There has to be a reauthorization, hopefully to make this process make sense. There has to be appropriations. That is our job. There also has to be ways and means work that reexercises the tax in order to provide the fund in the first place. So it is a complex issue. We have to get on with it, indeed, instead of pointing fingers at other Members.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding the time, and I rise in opposition to this unique rule. It is a rule which appears to say that about $860 million is appropriated but it is not appropriated. It is not counted.

This is and of itself is sort of strange. Then we have a strange provision in the Budget Act with says this money can be allocated to the Committee on Appropriations if certain things happen.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is just sort of a method of hiding the fact that many of the discretionary limits set by the majority simply were not working, are not workable and they are trying to find a variety of ways to get around the fact that their top dollar numbers simply do not work for discretionary spending. But this money appears to be very unique.

If the committee acts and the Congress acts to reenact some taxes that relate to the Superfund, it appears that money can be spent twice, once for the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to increase the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations so the money can be spent on the Superfund; but the revenue base was not increased, so these same dollars can be counted as offsets to other tax cuts for pay-as-you-go purposes.

So it would appear under the Budget Act we have these dollars in this bill now which are appropriated but we are going to be told have to be reappropriated again in some future time in a special budget allocation which makes some money available, if a tax increase for Superfund is enacted, but that can be both spent and used to offset other tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very unique type of rule, very unique type of budget process that is the ultimate in game playing.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule allowing for the consideration of H.R. 3666, the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriation for fiscal year 1997.

My problem with this rule should come as no surprise to anyone, because it embodies precisely the shortcomings which are inevitable when supporters try to make a bill be all things to all people. The price of being less than forthright, the cost of refusing to decide what your priorities are, is always a dependency on gimmicks and parliamentary gymnastics, employed in the hopes that our colleagues, first, and our constituents, second, will fail to see through the ruse.

I stand here as one who wants to see the Superfund Program reauthorized. I largely support the majority in their efforts to reform the Superfund Program. I commend Mr. OXLEY and Mr. LEWIS for the work they have done in reforming the Superfund Program. I also stand here as one who believes we must be honest about the cost of those things which we say are a priority and then we must pay for those priorities by finding savings elsewhere.

This rule attempts to have it both ways when it comes to the cost of the Superfund Program. To those who support the $861 million appropriation, the bill says, ''Sure, we'll take care of you—here's your money.'' To those who are concerned about how this additional spending will add to the deficit, the rule says, ''Not to worry—you don't have to count this $861 million. We'll take care of that later on in a supplemental appropriation.''

Back home we call that being ''too cute by half.'' Not only is it dishonest; it also insults the people who are expected to buy off on a rationale that conflicting goals can be accommodated without sacrifice being made anywhere else.

There were many times during the previous Congresses that I spoke out against rules which abused a sense of democratic fairness. I especially protested the regular waiving of the Budget Act, an act designed to protect the integrity of the legislative process and impose a measure of fiscal discipline. But I have to say we are testing new depths of parliamentary gimmickry in this Congress with this rule. We have now waived the Budget Act over 700 times since its enactment. In addition to making a mockery of the act, this sort of behavior adds to the skepticism and cynicism which continues to undermine the credibility of this institution.

There are simple questions to be answered here: Are we appropriating funds or aren't we? If we are appropriating funds, are they adding to the deficit or have we made cuts elsewhere to support this priority? Are we honoring allocations and appropriation caps or are we attempting to spend nearly a billion dollars outside of the normal budget disciplines?

These are questions that should be easy to answer in a bipartisan way if legislation is being presented in a strightforward way.

Unfortunately, today's rule is anything but straightforward. Vote ''no''.

Mr. FROST. Mr. 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. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about two amendments that I have filed which deal with modernizing the FHA single family mortgage program. I rise now because I expect that these amendments would be ruled out of order as legislating an appropriations bill. Therefore, I will not offer these amendments during the consideration of the bill, but let me explain them.

One of the most successful Government programs is the FHA single family loan program. Since its inception, it has provided over 50 million mortgages and has played an important role in increasing home ownership. In fact 40 percent of first-time home buyers use FHA. And it has been successful at no cost to the taxpayer.

Two years ago, the House enacted a housing bill which included important provisions to improve and modernize the FHA program. Unfortunately, these proposals died when the other body failed to act on that bill. With the end of the 104th Congress in sight, it is frustrating that there has been no legislative vehicle in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services to revisit these proposals.

Therefore, the first amendment I filed is an end to the law which prohibits parents from lending money to their children for a down payment on a home financed by FHA. This prohibition is antifamily and anti-home ownership. Why should the Government be telling parents they cannot lend money to their children?

The second amendment is an effort to simplify FHA regulations, reduce costs, reduce bureaucracy, and ultimately lower closing costs for FHA borrowers. It contains two parts: The first is a simplification of the unnecessarily complex two-part down payment calculation, which is a nightmare. This provision would greatly simplify the process, maintaining the same general down payment levels.

The second part allows designated FHA lenders to issue their own mortgage certificates. This change would remove a bureaucratic roadblock to the execution of FHA mortgages ending costly delays faced while waiting for HUD to issue certificates. Since such lenders have already been giving designated underwriting authority, this change will not affect the quality of loans approved. But it will reduce the need for HUD personnel and will eliminate unnecessary delays.

All three of these provisions passed the House 2 years ago with bipartisan support. They are supported by HUD, and they pose no additional risk to the solvency of the FHA reserve fund. They ought to be enacted into law, and we should find a way to do it before we adjourn this year.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON].

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, the majority's self-proclaimed love affair with an open and fair rules process appears to have soured. They apparently reserve the right to shamelessly use the rule to subvert the legislative process and fool the American people.

In crafting this rule for the VA–HUD appropriations bill, they have elevated legislative deception to a new height. This rule contains self-executing amendments that circumvent the majority's own budget caps and waives points of order against the bill for exceeding spending limits. Why? So the majority can claim they are spending more money on Superfund cleanup when, in fact, the money simply does not exist.

Clearly, the majority wants to improve their image on the environment. They have been severely battered by the public and the press for their aggressive attempts to dismantle environmental legislation and reverse the real progress that has been made on this front over the last 25 years. This has led to all types of proenvironment shenanigans, including today's attempt to paint themselves green with claims of substantial funding for the Superfund Program, an imaginary $2.2 billion.

But, therein lies the hoax, $861 million of that total is contingent not only on reauthorization of the Superfund Program, but more importantly, it is dependent on an appropriation that would potentially occur at a later date.

Last year, the majority shut down the Government demanding a budget based on honest numbers using CBO projections. But the so-called funding the majority has included in this measure for the Superfund Program is so illusory, CBO wouldn't even score it.

The blue smoke is getting thick. I urge my colleagues to defeat the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I really am just, I am sort of shocked at what I am hearing here. I am going to tell my colleagues something, they defeat this rule, this bill does not come to the floor, they better look out when it comes back the next time. As a matter of fact, I have a list of cutting amendments over there in the drawer. We might just offer all 75 of them.

I am getting a little fed up with this. We could have brought this rule to the floor and did what the Democrats have done for the last 40 years. That is, just waive the Budget Act, and let the deficits go up. We did not do that, my colleagues. What we did in order to get this bill to the floor, we waived the Budget Act, but then we self-executed the correction of the violation so that, when the bill comes to the floor, there is no violation.

Let us get something straight. President Clinton vetoed the Superfund business taxes that now have expired. If he had not vetoed them, they would now be in effect. So where we stand now is that the Committee on the Budget created a Superfund reserve fund in the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution. I see the chairman standing over there, the former chairman, the ranking member. But this reserve fund allows the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman KASICH, to increase the committee allocations when the Superfund Program is reformed and new money is provided by an extension, and this is the key, by an extension of the Superfund business taxes.

This is neutral and has nothing to do now that we have self-executed this portion out, has nothing to do with unbalancing the budget. That is where we stand.

I want my colleagues to come over here and vote for this rule. It is an open rule. If they have a problem with it, come over here and offer amendments. They are all in order, anything they want to offer that is germane, come over here and do it. Let us have it out, and have an even and fair debate. That is what this is all about, fairness.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule. This Congress's continued attack on our Nation's environment is unforgivable. If this rule passes, the air we breath and the water we drink will become dirtier.

The American people need to know that more than $800 million included in this bill for cleaning up toxic waste dumps does not exist. How can this be, you ask? Even though this amount of funding is printed in the bill, the congressional majority has attached strings to the legislation that will prevent the money from becoming available.

The rule is bad for two reasons. First, it is budgetary smoke and mirrors. It contains money that doesn't exist. And second, it will prevent a vote on an amendment by Representatives MARKEY, PALLONE, and BORSKI that would make this $800 million for toxic cleanups available at the beginning of the 1997 funding period. The rule for the VA–HUD bill prevents this vote, and that's why I oppose it.

In my congressional district, children and families will continue to be threatened by a toxic waste dump because this trick of the light money for the Federal Superfund Program will not be available at the beginning of next year. For more than 80 years, Raymark Industries sent asbestos, lead, dioxins, and PCB's into the air. Stratford, CT became a dumping ground for

Raymark's toxic waste. Children's parks and schools were contaminated.

The Environmental Protection Agency has made great strides in cleaning up the Raymark site. It is on the verge of being a model of success, with development proposed for the site that will create jobs and bring in tax revenue. But this bill both cuts the cleanup program and prevents the expenditure of $800 million.

If any American believes that these cuts will not prevent the cleanup of toxic sites like Raymark, they are being misled. I ask my Republican colleagues to help defeat the budget gimmickry and the antienvironmental extremism this bill represents.

□ 1445

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the need to provide fair and adequate housing for our Nation's poor and to recognize the importance of support for our veterans and, as well, for us to stay ahead in space exploration. But however we find ourselves with a rule, once again, on appropriation legislation that helps some and hurts many.

A cornerstone of this country's public housing is affordability. The elitist notion that $25 a month is not too much to ask for rent is the same notion that resulted in the underfunding of this Nation's public and affordable housing. I believe it is important that public housing authorities have few requirements in creating a voice for residents of public housing, the decision-making process that affects their homes. It is important that when one is poor, the poor have the opportunity to have good housing.

I would simply like to add as well that we have a rule that has a funny mechanism that allows Republicans to pretend they are providing an additional $861 million for Superfund cleanups when, in fact, the funds cannot be spent until a second appropriation bill is approved.

So we have a rule that in fact disallows us helping some and hurts many. I would like to also add that because of what we face in my community that I will add an amendment to this process to give more flexibility to adding one-for-one replacement where there are waiting lists of 6,000 or more.

We need to confront the issues of this appropriations bill in a fair manner. This rule disallows that, and I ask my colleagues to not support this rule.

Mr. FROST. I have no remaining requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say this is an open rule and for the life of me I cannot understand why people would, any Member of this body would, oppose it, and I urge the adoption of the rule and passage of the bill.

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 (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 166, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No 269]

YEAS—246

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dixon
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stokes
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—166

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—21

Andrews
Boucher
Browder
Bryant (TX)
Chrysler
Coleman
Cubin
Fields (TX)
Ford
Furse
Houghton
Istook
Lincoln
Longley
McDade
Ney
Peterson (FL)
Roth
Roukema
Schumer
Towns

□ 1509

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina changed his 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.

DEATH OF THE HONORABLE BILL EMERSON

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 459) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 459

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Bill Emerson, a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee on such Members of the House as the Speaker may designate, together with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the dean of the delegation, is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, as dean of the Missouri delegation, I rise today to pay tribute to a great man from Missouri, a thoughtful and pragmatic Member of this body, a widely respected colleague, a friend, and a man who truly loved this institution and all the good that it represents.

To know BILL EMERSON was to respect BILL EMERSON. I know of no other more likable Member of this institution. On many political issues, he and I had genuine disagreements. But it is not those differences of opinion that I remember as I recall the life of BILL EMERSON. Rather what I remember is that BILL EMERSON was a man who was not limited by ideology and party label. If a compromise could be reached, BILL would reach for it. If BILL EMERSON thought that political differences could be bridged in the best interest of the people of his district, his home State, or the people of this great Nation, BILL would help erect that bridge.

As we bid farewell to BILL EMERSON, let us be forever mindful of his gallant leadership to eradicate world hunger. As vice-chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger, BILL walked the walk by placing his own personal comfort and safety on the line. He traveled to Somalia in 1992 to gain firsthand knowledge of the horrors of mass starvation going on in that far-off land. Later, when that Select Committee was targeted for elimination, BILL joined our colleague TONY HALL, in his fast to bring attention to that regrettable decision by this institution. And, finally, BILL EMERSON made his own pledge to contribute $10,000 to the hunger caucus formed to fill part of the void left by elimination of the hunger committee.

On behalf of my family and the people of the First Congressional District of Missouri, let me express deepest sympathy to BILL's wife Jo Ann, his daughters, and other members of BILL's family. Thank you for sharing this decent and compassionate human being with our Nation. Rest well, BILL. All of us who serve in this institution that you loved so dearly will miss you.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great sadness to join in the sorrow of this institution at the loss of our dear friend and colleague, BILL EMERSON. As our friend and leader from Missouri stated so aptly, BILL was one of our colleagues who was always there to work in a bipartisan way on the priorities of this country. Whether it would be the problem of hunger in the world or in this country, or agricultural problems that affect so many districts, or whether it be our relations with Germany, where BILL was so instrumental in starting the Bundestag, the congressional effort to strengthen ties, BILL EMERSON was in fact this institution's leader.

However, I knew BILL EMERSON in a different light, Mr. Speaker. In the last session of Congress he was named to be a bipartisan cochair of a task force dealing with disaster issues with our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN]. Having had the pleasure of serving with both of them, we worked for 6 months on looking at ways that we could improve the response to handle those disasters that affect all of our districts, and in BILL's case the terrible floods that ravaged the people of Missouri and the central part of this great Nation. Again, BILL EMERSON rose to the task and was a leader in this institution and helped us craft a bipartisan bill that now enjoys the support of over 260 of our colleagues.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, last month BILL EMERSON was recognized by the 1.5 million men and women of this Nation's fire and emergency services as the 1995–1996 legislator of the year. That is because of BILL EMERSON's tireless efforts on behalf of those people who have to face the problems and tragedies associated with disasters in this great Nation.

On behalf of all of those people who have suffered and all of those 1.5 million people who day in and day out respond to disasters, I rise to pay tribute to our friend and colleague. I can think of no more fitting tribute, Mr. Speaker, than if this body would take up the Natural Disaster Protection Partnership Act, BILL EMERSON's bill, in this session to pay tribute and homage to this great American leader.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity and the privilege for some 7 to 8 years to ride to and from McLean, VA to the Capitol with my fellow Missourian, BILL EMERSON. We would start out the day, we would solve all of the problems of the world and, unfortunately, by the time we went back to our houses in the evening together, all of the problems would fall apart. He was a wonderful companion, a wonderful friend.

Memory and friendship are funny things. They go hand-in-hand. I will long remember the discussions we had: Political, legislative, Missouri, Westminster College, where he went to school; families, angels, agriculture, Fort Leonard Wood, the gamut of subjects was nearly covered by our conversations. It was always in a spirit of warmth, joviality, kindness, and yes, vision, that he spoke of things we discussed.

This is a fitting tribute, and I compliment the gentleman from St. Louis, MO, Mr. CLAY for bringing it to the floor, for BILL EMERSON will long be remembered in this body, but he will long be remembered at home where he really cared for the people that he represented.

He talked about them. He told me stories about them. He was proud of them. He liked to talk about the unusual legislation that he had from time to time, the wild horses bill and how the bureaucrats were trying to do them in and how he won that here on the floor. How proud he was of his family, those wonderful four young ladies and his lovely wife, Jo Ann. BILL EMERSON will long be remembered, not just as a legislator, not just as one who was a child of this House, knowing that he started out as a page here, but he will long be remembered by so many of us as a warm and good and decent friend. I am so pleased and honored to have walked along life's pathway with him through those years.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I guess it was about 7½ years ago I was sworn in as a Member of the U.S. Congress. I had known BILL EMERSON for quite some time. He had been up here for about 8 years. BILL and I used to stand back there at the back row and I would ask him for his advice and counsel, but I remember long about February 1989, the first substantive vote that we actually had up here in the Congress, and I do not remember what the vote was, but I was green as a gourd and I did not really understand the process.

I had never held a public office, I had never held a legislative position. I was back there kind of scratching my head and BILL walked up to me and said, he

said, what is the matter, MEL? He said, you have a problem? And I said, well, I do not know for sure how to vote on this. He said, well, he said, here in the Congress you have one of two choices. You can either vote politics or you can vote what is right. Sometimes they are the same, sometimes they are not. But he said, I know you, and I know southwest Missouri, and I know the people of the State of Missouri. And he said, MEL, if you will just vote your gut feeling on anything that comes up here in Washington, DC, that we are voting on, he said, you will probably be right about 99 percent of the time.

Following that conversation, I went ahead and voted, and I thought about it regularly when some of these tough decisions come up. The only time, and there has only been once or twice that I did not follow his recommendation, and I went home at night and could not sleep about it. I decided that that was not going to happen.

So for the past roughly 7½ years when the tough decisions come up, I think back to what BILL EMERSON told me right back there at the rail about 6 weeks after I became a Member of the U.S. Congress. With the conversations we had, his loyalty to this organization, the House is going to seriously miss the institutional memory that BILL EMERSON had.

It is with deep regret that I think all of us mourn the passing of BILL EMERSON, but I also think we can be positive because of the way BILL did pass. He stayed here, he did his job, he was concerned right up to the very day that he went to the hospital about maintaining a voting record, and one of the things BILL EMERSON used to say is, the vote I cast here in the Congress does not belong to me, it belongs to the people that I represent. A great American, a great individual.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in honoring a person who to me was not just a colleague, but like many others was a friend. It is a day of sadness for us all, and it was a great day of sadness when I heard Sunday of the death of my friend BILL EMERSON.

Mr. Speaker, BILL and I go back. I was here a few years before he came, but when he came in 1981 and began his service on the Committee on Agriculture, and I was a member also of the Committee on Agriculture, we worked together, he for the people of southeast Missouri and I for the people of northeast Missouri.

Our districts border along that same Mississippi River, he in Cape Girardeau and I in Hannibal. We had a lot of similar interests in our districts and then we had some differences. We discussed them not only during meetings of the Committee on Agriculture, but as our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK], has said before, back behind the rail many times discussing things, whether sitting on the floor, other times in our offices. Either he would visit me or I would visit him, and we would discuss legislation and what was good for our districts.

Just to give you some examples of things that we worked together on, back in the 1993 flood, it hit the northeast part of Missouri before it hit the southeast, but it hit the southeast just as hard as it did the northeast. We worked together working with the Corps of Engineers and others to bring about some relief for the flood victims.

One of the things that when I came up with the buyout bill so that people would be able to move out of that floodplain. It was his efforts in the Committee on Public Works, when that bill had to go through the Committee on Public Works, along with others on the committee, but primarily BILL, that he was able to move that bill within a few short weeks out of the House, through the Senate and on to the President's desk.

He not only had a love for the House of Representatives, he had a love for government in general, and he knew government. He believed firmly, strongly, in a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and I too wish to join in saying to the people of the great State of Missouri and of the United States, we have lost a leader. To his wife, Jo Ann, who has lost a great husband, his four daughters who have lost a great father, I offer sincere condolences, to Jo Ann and the children, and I also wish that all of us would be able to attend the funeral, but I know that is not going to be possible. But I know that all of our hearts are with the family at this time, and to his mother who awaits him now in Cape Girardeau, I send my condolences also.

□ 1530

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. DANNER].

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, a good friend passed away the other day. BILL EMERSON was a friend of the Congress, a friend of the people of Missouri, and a friend of mine.

BILL was the type of individual whom others hope or aspire to become like. His interest was the public interest. His concerns were the public concerns, and his conscience was indeed the public conscience.

One of the many reasons BILL was so beloved by the people of Missouri and the other Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans alike, is because of his unique genuineness of character. People know that when they met BILL EMERSON, the candidate or the legislator, that they were first and foremost meeting BILL EMERSON, the man.

He always had a very clear understanding of where campaigning ended and when the business of legislating and serving began. If we had more public servants like BILL EMERSON, I have no question that the cynicism many Americans hold toward their Government would evaporate and be quickly replaced by the hope and optimism that was so evident in BILL EMERSON.

BILL was a man of enormous kindness and thoughtfulness, traits that even the scourge of cancer could not take away.

BILL worked diligently, he worked hard, and he worked faithfully right up until the very end. The very first day I noticed that he was not on the floor and was missing his first vote, I learned it was because one of his daughters was graduating from high school. Until the very, very end, he was on the floor voting for his constituents.

At a time here in the Congress, and in our United States, when the shifting demographics raised serious concerns that the voice of rural America, an area many of us represent, among others, would be reduced to a whisper, BILL stood as a giant for our small towns, farms, and the entire agricultural community.

All the while, he also stood as a bastion of civility, using reason and friendship to accomplish what others had failed to do through bombastic rhetoric and political gamesmanship.

I consider it a very real personal privilege to have worked so closely with BILL in prior weeks on some bipartisan legislation he supported so strongly, one that would provide more food for the hungry in our Nation, an effort that was ever foremost in his mind, that of nutrition and feeding the hungry amongst us.

I will miss BILL'S friendship, BILL'S leadership, BILL'S compassion, as will innumerable others. He departs our world leaving the State of Missouri and the U.S. Congress infinitely better because of his presence.

The career we honor in fitting ceremony today, the people of Missouri will remember in more everyday ways for years to come as their lives have been enriched by BILL EMERSON, an American treasure and one of the best and brightest ever to serve our State of Missouri.

BILL, we will miss you.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend of mine, and a fellow Missourian, who dies this week after a lifetime of service to his country and to his community. Of course we are talking today about our dear friend, Representative BILL EMERSON.

BILL'S passing is a tremendous loss for me personally and for all of us who came from his State. We worked very closely over the years, and I always knew him as a man of quiet peace and decency to every person that he ever met. He was simply one of the finest human beings to ever pass through these halls. How he did love this institution of the House of Representatives in which he spent most of his life.

But his passing is also a tremendous loss for the entire U.S. Congress. He was someone who could always reach across the aisle and work with both Democrats and Republicans for the sake of his beloved Missouri and the entire country.

He had more accomplishments than we have time today to list, like his dedication at home to improving Highway 32 or fighting for a new bridge across the Mississippi River, or just fighting for his constituents, in so many ways. All of this will serve as monuments to his life and to his work.

We all came to respect BILL's levelheadedness, even in the most tumultuous debates. His courage in the face of his illness is something that will stay with all of us for our entire lives. He missed only five votes in this Congress. His was a record of constant and consistent achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join all of us in a celebration of the life of BILL EMERSON. His mark on this institution will forever be remembered. Our thoughts and our prayers and our wishes are today with his dear family, his dear friends, and all the loved ones who so much grieve today his passing.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. MCCARTHY].

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to my fellow Missourian, the gentle man from Missouri, BILL EMERSON, and to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for bringing this resolution before the House.

I joined the Congress a year and a half ago, but I have long admired Mr. EMERSON's ability to build bridges between this aisle, which oftentimes is very wide. He made friends with his engaging personality and he kept them with his honest and fair approach to lawmaking.

I had the opportunity to serve with him on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure where he was a wonderful mentor to me. We worked together to bring Federal assistance to Missouri, to three grossly deteriorated bridges across the State, the Chouteau Bridge in my district and Representative DANNER's district, the Hannibal Bridge in Representative VOLKMER's district, and a bridge in Cape Girardeau, which I hope will one day bear his name in tribute to his great efforts in this Congress.

We must never forget Representative EMERSON's commitment to upholding the integrity of this body, and we must embrace his cooperative spirit, which I hope will guide us through the remainder of this 104th Congress and the challenges that face us.

It has been an honor to have served with him, and he will be missed by all of us. I envy those who served with him far longer than I did. I will treasure those quiet, witty, thoughtful conversations, so rich in history and so full of wisdom.

I send my heartfelt condolences to his family, to the citizens of the 8th District, and to this great Nation, and I join with my leader in celebration of his goodness.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

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

Mr. Speaker, BILL EMERSON was loved by all of us in this body and he will be missed by all of us.

We all knew BILL EMERSON was a skillful legislator who represented the best in public service. I always knew BILL EMERSON the person. He was one of my closest friends here. I knew the loving, caring, honest guy BILL was. He cared deeply about people, all people, from all walks of life. But his passion, Mr. Speaker, was to reach out to people like me, people recovering from alcoholism. Until his cancer incapacitated him, BILL held meetings in his office every Wednesday noon, always there, for all of us, always there with a listening ear, always there to help others still suffering the ravages of alcoholism and drug addiction, always there setting up interventions for families, always there to talk to spouses of Members who are in trouble with this disease of alcoholism. BILL EMERSON was a true inspiration to all of us who care about this disease of alcoholism. I am not breaching his anonymity because BILL EMERSON has given this talk before, publicly. He was a true profile in courage, a true profile in courage for the way he lived and the way he died.

I talked to BILL EMERSON a week before he passed on. He said, ''JIM, if I'm not going to make it, I'm going to go sober.'' BILL left us sober, and he left us a wonderful, wonderful legacy, those of us recovering and all of us as well as those still suffering from this disease. To Jo Ann and BILL's four wonderful daughters, thank you for sharing this truly wonderful human being with all of us. BILL, we love you.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, that moving speech by the gentleman from Minnesota is certainly one that is not going to be equaled for me to repeat, because I did not know Congressman EMERSON in the same sense that Mr. RAMSTAD did. In this fast and furious pace, Members touch us in different ways. While I am not a member of the Missouri delegation, Mr. EMERSON taught many of us by example a number of things. One was courage.

Mr. EMERSON was wheeled into this body about 2 weeks ago in his wheelchair with his oxygen on and I went over to say hello to him and asked if there was anything I could do. He removed the oxygen from his nose and he started to get up out of his wheelchair, and he said, ''TIM, you make sure you go around telling all my colleagues and all my friends that I'm going to beat this thing. This wheelchair only helps me get back and forth from my office to the floor to cast my votes.''

This place where BILL EMERSON started as a page was not just the House of Representatives. It was like BILL EMERSON's home. BILL EMERSON taught me the lesson not just of courage in casting votes up until the end, he taught me about civility and about being kind, to Democrats and Republicans, and treating everybody the same here. My heart goes out to Jo Ann and the four daughters and I will thank BILL EMERSON for the lessons that he taught me from farther away.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I join my friends from Missouri and thank them for giving all of our friends in the Congress and the friends of BILL EMERSON a chance to say how much we loved and respected our colleague.

I had the privilege of coming to this Congress with BILL EMERSON in 1980. We sat next to each other on PAT ROBERTS' Agriculture Committee and we reminisced and we talked and we went through so much.

The three things that I think come to mind: It is the courage, it is the basic decency, and it is the commitment to governing. The courage of commitment, the courage of the fight, the courage to be above it all and to be gracious in the most difficult of times.

The basic decency. He was, as few have talked about here, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Nutrition. He was the one who said in the midst of all of this effort to reduce the budget, ''Let's not forget our commitment to the hungry and to those on food stamps.''

It was his courage, I think, and his partnership with PAT ROBERTS that made sure that as we block-granted these programs, we kept a Federal commitment on the food stamps.

And then the final issue is the basic commitment to governing. No one would ever call BILL EMERSON a revolutionary, because BILL EMERSON believed in this institution and he believed in this Government and he believed in this country. It was his goal to preserve them and to make them work and to make them something that all of us could be proud of.

Ralph Waldo Emerson defined success as to laugh often and much; to win the respect of intelligent people and the affection of children; to earn the appreciation of honest critics and endure the betrayal of false friends; to enjoy beauty; to find the best in others; to leave the world a bit better place, whether by a healthy child, a garden patch, or a redeemed social condition.

□ 1545

To know that even one person has breathed easier because you have lived, is to succeed. Ralph Waldo Emerson did

not know it at the time, but he wrote the eulogy for our friend, BILL EMERSON.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for this resolution and a chance to get up and say something about our friend, BILL EMERSON. He died Saturday night. I had the chance to visit with him Saturday morning at the hospital. It was very heard to see. It was excruciatingly hard to see how sick he really was, but there was peace about him in that room that in a way was a lovely thing to see. My heart goes out to him and his wife and his children, his mother. They loved him deeply. He was a great friend of so many of us, Republicans and Democrats alike. As a matter of fact, if he had any enemies, I would not know who they would be. He loved people and he cared for them deeply, both in his own district and in this country and overseas. He was a great humanitarian, and he had a wealth of knowledge about many subjects.

He was kind of a historian, especially about Lincoln and about the history of this place. As a matter of fact, the last time I had a long talk with him, he was again in his hospital room getting chemotherapy, and I asked him to tell me about Lincoln. An hour and a half later he was still talking about Lincoln. He did not take a breath. It was fascinating, it was exciting to hear about Lincoln and hear things I had never heard before, and that is the kind of person he was. He was enjoyable to be with, fun to be with, and a great man.

He is doing OK now. He is with his Lord. It is us that are really hurting. He was a great friend of all of us.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time and for introducing this resolution commemorating the service and the life and times of our good friend, BILL EMERSON.

We have talked a lot about BILL's beliefs and his enthusiasm, his principles and his character. I speak from the perspective of one who regarded BILL EMERSON not just as a friend and a colleague but as a mentor. From the moment I became involved in running for Congress, all through my service in the Congress, he was always available on a very practical level to help me; and he always did, and you knew you could trust him.

Another great Missourian, Harry Truman, said one time, ''If you want a friend in Washington, buy a dog.'' Well, that was not true with regard to BILL EMERSON. I look around at the people here on this floor and I know everybody regarded him as a friend and somebody that you could trust and confide in. I walked up to him in the Cloakroom one time. It was my first year here, and I was going through a bout of freshmanitis. I just felt like I was carrying the weight of the world around. I said, BILL, can I talk to you for a minute? He said sure. I said I am just so uptight. It is kind of vague anxiety. He says, ''Well, what is it? What is wrong, TALENT?'' I said, I just feel like it is hard for me to keep going day after day, there is so much going on that I do not understand. He said, ''What do you mean?'' He kept drawing me out. I finally said, it is like my neck is all tight. It is like I just cannot seem to move it. He said, ''Well, what you need, TALENT, are neck exercises.'' He started moving his head back and forth, and then he started laughing and I started laughing. By the time we were finished, my depression was gone. He knew exactly what I needed. He looked right down into my soul and he gave me the help that I needed.

He was a big fan, we have mentioned here, of Abe Lincoln. I do not know if anybody before I came talked about what a fan he was of Winston Churchill's. Winston Churchill said one time in a speech about Neville Chamberlain, and I think everybody in public life can relate to it, he said:

> At the end of the day, history is going to judge what we do, and we do not know what it is going to say. But at the end of the day, at the end of a life, the only shield you really have is the rectitude of your conscience.

Mr. Speaker, by that shield, our friend BILL EMERSON will do very well in the reckoning of history. He lived by his principles. He was faithful to his beliefs in his constituents. He fought the good fight. He finished the race. He kept the faith. It was a privilege to have known him.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCNULTY].

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri, BILL Clay, for yielding me the time.

BILL EMERSON was one of my best friends, not just this Congress, but in life. When I first met him, it was not on the floor of the House of Representatives. It was not in Washington, DC. It was not even in this country. We were in the Horn of Africa and BILL was working with Mickey Leland and GARY ACKERMAN and others to try to see to it that the tragedy of 1988, when 250,000 people in Sudan died of starvation, did not recur. He was successful, along with Mickey, in that effort.

He came to the House of Representatives as a page, and he loved this institution until the day of his death. He was an outstanding legislator, an expert on agricultural issues, a great family man, a man of deep religious conviction, and he was a great friend to all of his constituents, to all of his colleagues, and especially to the hungry and the homeless of the world and all of those who had special needs.

I extend my deepest condolences to his wife Jo Ann, to his four children, to his lovely mother whom I had the opportunity to meet at the hospital last week, and I join with all of my colleagues in expressing the hope that our good friend BILL will continue to watch over all of us.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, all of us feel the loss of BILL EMERSON because he was a friend to most of us and our condolences go out not only to his family, for which it is such a loss, but for the members of his constituency who could not have been better represented in this Chamber than he represented them. We all know BILL as a kindly person, a great sense of humor and a fine storyteller. He was a wise person.

He was truly a man of the House. I recall when I joined the committee on which he served, besides Agriculture, then called the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, he took me in hand and showed me a lot of the ropes.

Most of us have seen the photo which is in the Republican Cloakroom of a young page helping to carry Members off the floor who had been shot at and wounded. BILL was a hero as a page. He was a hero to all of us in his legislative craftsmanship, not only in Agriculture, in nutrition, but on our committee, now the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

It was first the Mineta-Emerson Act, and then the Emerson Act—the Natural Disaster Act, H.R. 1856. I hope that in his memory during this session or perhaps the coming session that we can bring that legislation to the floor and pass it in his name because that measure meant so much to him. He had the constituency, as many of us do, that had suffered from a number of major disasters, and he thought the Federal Government could do better.

As has been said many times today, BILL EMERSON believed in governing, and this craftsmanship was certainly a good example of it. So our condolences to all of his family and to all of his constituents. A great man has been taken from us.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for organizing this resolution so all of us can speak.

I did not know BILL EMERSON as well as most but had the opportunity to work with him on agriculture, and I also had the opportunity to know one of this pet concerns; that is, feeding the hungry. We also worked on a number of issues. BILL EMERSON was a man who cared about people deeply. I disagreed with BILL EMERSON on some issues, but even in his disagreement, he taught us how to disagree with activity.

He taught us how to have an advocacy for a position that differed from others, but yet respect. I was honored along with BILL EMERSON on two different occasions, so we got to be friends about the issue of hunger.

We should celebrate the life of someone who deeply cared about people. We also should share and celebrate the life of someone who had very strong positions that differed with others, but he could be an advocate for those positions with a sense of civility and respect. He will leave us a standard for the rest of us to be good legislators, to be advocates for our position, but also to honor this position.

His life brings honor to this House. If we could emulate that, we would honor the life that he has served.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the time and taking out this time to talk about BILL. STEVE HORN just left and spoke about the picture. I would ask all colleagues who have not seen it to take a look at that picture of BILL EMERSON carrying the stretcher on which resided a Congressman who was shot up in, I believe it was, the 1954 shooting in the House Chamber when several Members were hit.

The picture of BILL EMERSON in that picture, I think, is representative of what we saw in our association with him in the House as a Member of Congress, because there was BILL EMERSON, the lead carrier on that stretcher. He was pointing out the direction in which they should go with that thing. As usual, he was big, he was fearless, he had a lot of courage. Just as he was in his career in Congress, he was right in the middle of things and that represented BILL.

BILL was a real fighter, and when he took on a cause, whether he had two people on his side or a majority, it did not make any difference. He believed in the good fight and yet he was also very forgiving. He was forgiving to us, his colleagues, when we disagreed with him on issues. On a personal basis, he was very forgiving, too.

We were sworn in in 1980, and as the Speaker knows, I was holding my son in my arms, little Dunk. BILL had his daughters on the floor. Incidentally, little Dunk held me in his arms the other day and would not put me down and it upset me. But BILL decided to buy firewood from the Hunter firewood organization. My boys would go up to the Blue Ridge Mountains with me. We would cut firewood, load it in a horse trailer and find victims, I mean customers, for that firewood in Washington, DC. I see the gentleman from Texas, LARRY COMBEST, back here is one of our victim purchasers.

I asked BILL after I delivered him about three loads of firewood, most of which daddy cut and the boys handled a little bit, but after I delivered that wood to him for several weeks and he had paid my sons, I asked him how it was burning. He said it is wonderful. He said, ''If you will just reimburse me for the gasoline I am having to put on it, everything will be fine, HUNTER. But that represented BILL EMERSON, big hearted, forgiving to his friends and all of his colleagues.

The Founding Fathers, in putting together this great structure for a government, for a democracy, needed one important ingredient, and that was to have people in this Chamber who were compassionate, who had courage, and were forgiving and would relentlessly represent the ideas and the philosophies of their constituents. BILL EMERSON was such a man.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, it is a real sad time for me to have to reflect on the life of BILL EMERSON, but BILL is the kind of person I think that I will never, ever forget. If there has ever been a person who represents what is stated in the 25th chapter of Matthew:

> When I was hungry, you gave me meat. When I was thirsty, you gave me drink. When I was naked, you gave me clothing. When I was in prison, you came unto me. When I was sick, you ministered to me.

BILL EMERSON was such a person.

BILL EMERSON was bipartisan. He was a leader. He was my subcommittee chairman on the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Nutrition, and Foreign Agriculture. He gave me the assurances that everything would be all right when we were worried about those people that were hungry and what would happen to them in this Congress.

1600

He gave me the assurance that it would be OK, and I am happy that BILL EMERSON was there. I am happy that BILL EMERSON was subcommittee chairman, and I am just happy to have been able to call BILL EMERSON my friend and my leader.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CLAY, for yielding this time to me and also for setting up this effort on behalf of Mr. EMERSON.

It seems like we spend a lot of time on this floor berating each other and talking down the institution of Congress. I think it is wonderful that we are able to spend a little time now remembering some of the good things that happen here, and especially I think it has been interesting to me to sit here and listen to the many good things said about Mr. EMERSON.

He has been a real inspiration to me. I think he has been to many of us, and that is why so many of us are here on the floor today. I kind of thought that I had a special relationship with him, and so many of my colleagues have talked about instances that they had with him. I do not know how he was able to spread himself around so much.

I first saw him when he fought hard against our leadership last year to preserve the task force on hunger. As the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] said, there were times that he fought if he only had two on his side. I think he was alone at that time., and he fought very hard because he believed in helping the underdog, those who needed help.

Later I had the opportunity of serving on the task force on disaster that was set up by the Speaker, and he and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] headed up that task force. In serving with him on that, I had the opportunity to go to his office, and it is full of memorabilia. If Members have not visited his office, they should go do it. He has the picture there of him and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] when they were helping carry the Congressmen out of here when they served as pages.

He also served here as a staff member and then served as a Member of the House. And he loved the House and he loved each of the Members of the House and he loved all his constituents and his family. He had a great capacity for love.

When we had our kickoff for the 104th Congress, I had the opportunity of setting up some of the day's activities, and the first thing we started with was the prayer service in the morning. I asked him if he would head that up and he did a fantastic job. He did not suffer from ego. He was just here to serve, and it was just a wonderful thing to work with him.

I think the thing that hit me the most about BILL EMERSON was the last few months here when he was fighting this illness, and every time I have talked to him he has been an encouragement to me. He did not talk about his suffering. I know he was going through great pain, but he always had a big smile and always was uplifting. Fantastic. Reminds me of the words of John Donne:

> No man is an island. No man stands alone. Each man's joy is joy to me. Each man's grief is my own. We need one another, so I will defend each man as my brother, each man as my friend.

He was a great friend. He epitomized those words. We will miss him greatly, but I will always remember BILL EMERSON.

MR. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS].

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. BILL EMERSON was a friend of mine with strength, his compassion and his dedication to the ideals of America.

I met BILL on a CODEL to Somalia, where we both flew into a small town to witness the hunger and the lines of women and children to get nourishment. I did not know that BILL EMERSON was a Republican because he was

not the kind of person who was Republican or who was Democrat; he was an American.

In spite of all his trials and tribulations, he still found time to give me words of encouragement, and I would like to share those words with my colleagues because, to me, they personify the strength of BILL EMERSON.

He said, ''Barbara Rose, you must be strong to persevere and resolute to overcome.'' And he repeated that to me three times. ''You must be strong to persevere and resolute to overcome.''

I will never forget those words of encouragement and I think that those words describe BILL EMERSON and his work in the House. A good friend to America.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time, and I rise in tribute to a great guy and a good friend, BILL EMERSON, the third of my friends to pass away in the last 2 months, all under 58 years of age.

We would all like to think we can make a difference in this world when we go. BILL EMERSON can certainly say he made a difference, whether as a page with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, PAUL KANJORSKI, when this place was shot up, as memorialized in the photograph that has been mentioned earlier, or as a graduate of Westminster College, where earlier Winston Churchill gave his famous Iron Curtain speech; whether through his efforts to travel to Africa and elsewhere to exhibit his concern for the hungry and the needy, to try to feed those who were most in need; whether through his dedicated and devoted representation of his constituents, or his guidance and oversight of the Mississippi watershed, taking trips to New Orleans with the wonderful people along the Mississippi River, go down there and try to make sure that those who needed flood protection were able to have that protection from the devastation of floods, and at the same time to partake of a little bit of New Orleans jazz and seafood, which he deeply loved and enjoyed with his wife Jo Ann.

In fact, he will be remembered for the love that he bore for his wife Jo Ann and his four daughters. BILL EMERSON, in fact, did make a difference. He was a good man and we will all remember him fondly, and we wish his family well.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas, [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his effort and leadership. As has been indicated many times, there is a picture of BILL EMERSON when he was a page in the Republican cloakroom leading the way in regards to assisting the wounded Members that were shot back in 1955, and he has been leading the way ever since.

We have had a virtual outpouring of affection and love for BILL here on the floor, as was the case a week ago Wednesday when the Jefferson Island Club, made up of many Members on both sides, named BILL their man of the year.

I think the word that really applies to BILL more than anything else is courage. I know the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and myself were there when he took that very courageous step to go to the Betty Ford Center, and he has been such a leader and has exhibited even more courage in such a manner to those, as expressed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

BILL was a back rail troop, as has been indicated by the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. VOLKMER, and the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. TALENT, and others. He would be back there as of today probably saying this is going on a little too much. In that regard, we had many discussions about Eisenhower and Taft and Lincoln and politics and Kansas and Missouri and family and everything else.

We are family in the House Committee on Agriculture, and we said this as of last Monday, ''We suffered a deep loss both professionally and personally at the passing of our dear friend and colleague, BILL EMERSON.''

From a personal standpoint, we came to Congress together back in 1981. We have served side-by-side on the Committee on Agriculture ever since. Four farm bills, countless legislative battles, he has been a unique champion for farmers and ranchers.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] the distinguished chairman emeritus of the Committee on Agriculture, has a statement as well, but I think it is interesting that at 1:30 in the morning when we finally finished the farm bill, BILL did not comment on some of the amendments, he did not comment on the farm bill, but when it came time to pay tribute to Mr. DE LA GARZA, the longest serving chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, BILL got up, and even though he was sick and had lost his voice, he paid tribute to KIKA It was at that time that I turned and said, BILL EMERSON, we love you.

Something has already been said about his motto for living. It was only a week ago Thursday he was sitting right over there looking very much like Winston Churchill, and he was in the process of making all those votes, and he got this quorum call card and he gave it to me, and as has been said before, he wrote on it, ''ROBERTS, I want you to be strong to endure and resolute to overcome.'' How many Members did he say that to? It is what the Prince of Wales said to the troops prior to World War I, and I have kept it. I have kept it ever since and I will keep it.

My colleagues, Helen Steiner Rice said this on such occasions.

> When I must leave you for a little while, please go on bravely with a gallant smile. And for my sake and in my name, live on and do all things the same. Spend not your life in empty days, but fill each waking hour in useful ways. Reach out your hand in comfort and in cheer, and I in turn will comfort you and hold you near.

That is BILL EMERSON. God bless you, BILL, and we miss you.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the last image that we have of BILL is one of courage and strength, an oxygen tube in his mouth, confined to a wheelchair. But the BILL EMERSON that will live on in our minds and our hearts is a gregarious man, just full of energy and goodness and pride that he was part of this institution.

I had the privilege of representing BILL and Jo Ann and their four daughters at their home-away-from-home in McLean, VA. In fact, I had a wonderful day one day when his daughter Tori shadowed me for the full day. And I will never forget when BILL joined us for lunch of seeing the pride in his eyes as he looked at his daughter, so beautiful, so bright, so accomplished, and he knew that this was largely because of his investment of time and caring and love in her and the rest of his family.

He lives on in that family, as he does in this body. He invested so much of himself in making this the kind of legislative organization that is the pride of Western civilization. he spent most of his life here. He loved this body. He loved its Members and we loved him.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for introducing this resolution.

I join with my colleagues in sending our condolences and love to Jo Ann and the entire Emerson family. Much has been said here today about the selfless individual that served among us as the Representative from Missouri. There are two things I would just like to remember with my colleagues about him that stand out for me.

Eight months ago, when we were considering whether or not we should continue the Select Committee on Hunger, BILL EMERSON asked me to go to lunch with him and a couple of staff people. He wanted to talk about this, just one-on-one, to talk about the passion he felt for that select committee and the work that it was doing.

I did not have to ask him, ''BILL, why are you doing this; what is in it for you?'' I knew there was nothing in it for him, but I knew how much he believed in it; that he took the time to meet with Members one by one to talk to them about this.

□ 1615

The other thing was his service as chairman of the page board. I had the

privilege these last 2 years of serving with him on the page board. Like him, I started here as a page, though in the other body. Like him, I loved this institution of Congress. BILL EMERSON loved the institution of Congress that he started serving at such a young age, but he also loved the pages. He loved the young people that worked in that program. He took the time to talk to them. He took the time to understand what the program was about and how important it was.

Just 3 weeks ago when the group of pages that had served us for this last year left, he came to the floor. He wanted so much to lead the tribute to the pages, but he was taking oxygen, he was in a wheelchair. And he said: JIM, would you take this 5-minute special order to do this? He said: I really want to do it, but I just cannot.

But he stayed here on the floor. He listened to what was being said because he really cared about it, and he put his remarks in the RECORD so that they would appear there. BILL ended his life as he lived it, with courage, with love, and with caring. Sometimes we have to have a sad event like this to remind us that this body is not about Republicans or Democrats, conservatives or liberals, urban or rural, northerners, southerners. It is about people, flesh and blood who love and laugh and cry and hope and grieve.

Bill's life demonstrated that, and his leaving reminds us of it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I join in the sadness of the loss of BILL EMERSON, and I join my colleagues in the joy of celebrating his life and all that he did. As a Member of Congress, as a citizen, as a husband, as a father, as a friend, I had the fortunate opportunity to serve with him in the committee, to work on many of his endeavors, to share with him the zest for the underprivileged, for the hungry, not only here but around the world.

He dedicated his effort and his life, but for the grace of God, he was not on the plane with Micky Leland. He traveled to all of the corners of the world where most Members do not go. He traveled to where there was hunger, to where there was famine, to where there was a problem. We had a very pleasant relationship because I never could spell, and I do not think that I can spell now Cape Girardeau, so that was a constant thing with us.

As we recalled some of the personal relationships, my wife made me a present of a beautiful tie with continental type drums. The day that I wore it with great pride, he came straight to it and said, that is a beautiful tie, about three times. That evening I told my wife, I said: Do you know who liked your tie? BILL EMERSON. Can we get him one. She said: I got this in New York someplace. It was the last one. I do not know if we can. And I said: Well, if you do not mind, I am going to give it to him. And she said: Well, I think it would be nice.

We already knew that he had this ailment. So the next day I gave him the tie. May you wear it in good health. That afternoon he was on the floor showing me the tie. Those are the things that we will remember.

What we cannot forget is that we cannot say all these things about BILL EMERSON today and forget him tomorrow. We need to dedicate our lives, our service here to that which was his first interest, beyond his family, beyond his country, were those that needed nutrition, the hungry of the world, the hungry of our country.

I hope that we as a House and we as individuals dedicate ourselves and remember BILL EMERSON when we work, not necessarily on the budget or the priorities but that there are people hungry who need to be fed. That is what his purpose in life turned out to be. I hope we honor that.

I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for allowing me the time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, BILL EMERSON and I came to Congress together in 1980. We were in a great class of Congressmen. We were fast friends over a long period of time. I ran a number of leadership races. He supported me in every one of those, very committed through thick and thin, even those where I did not do so well.

I can remember on projects the hours he would spend actually making those telephone calls personally or rounding up whatever votes either for leadership or for a bill on the floor where necessary. Whenever BILL EMERSON made a commitment, he lived up to those commitments.

I remember a few years ago he made a tough decision that he consulted with me on more than one occasion about whether he should run again for Congress. He thought about retiring. I encouraged him strongly to continue. I knew his love for this institution, and I knew what he gave to his country and what it meant to all of us. He made the right decision to stay. In fact, it was not too many days ago that he reminded me of that and told me so. I was pleased that I was party to helping make that decision.

I also know that he had friends elsewhere. He was involved with the Interparliamentary Group with some of us with the German Parliament, the Bundestag. Just about 10 days ago I was reminded of that by a friend in that group from over in Germany where we spent a week together a year ago who asked me to be remembered to him, and I did that here on the floor of this House. BILL EMERSON was my friend. I wish him well. If there is a heaven, he is there.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

BILL EMERSON never gave up that he would not whip his cancer. That is the way he was in life. If he had a strong matter he was interested in, he would try and try.

He felt so much love for his wife Jo Ann and his family. Really, he knew that the good Lord would protect him and take BILL home when the Lord was ready for BILL.

At the House prayer breakfast every Thursday morning, we saw him gradually get weaker and weaker. He missed a few times, when he was taking chemo, from the prayer breakfast. he would call one of us the day before: ''I will not be at the prayer breakfast today but just think about me.'' Then we saw him come with a breathing apparatus, but he kept coming. Then soon he was coming in a wheelchair to the prayer breakfast but he kept coming.

As has been said here today, BILL EMERSON was one of the most beloved Members of the Congress. He was such a part of this House.

Now, BILL, you will be buried in the rolling hills of Missouri on Thursday. And as someone said earlier, if there is a haven, there is a heaven and BILL is looking down on us today.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine shock and sadness that I rise to join our colleagues in memorializing the passage of and honoring an outstanding Member of this body, BILL EMERSON of Missouri. We have all been aware for some time that BILL was grievously ill. However, this did not lessen the shock of his passing.

We all recall how he remained courageously active until the very end and, in fact, did not miss any rollcall votes, even though in a wheelchair just until a week before his passing. BILL EMERSON loved this institution from the time he served as a page until the present days. He was beloved back in his home district, the Eight of Missouri, and he served on the Agriculture and Transportation and Infrastructure Committees of the House. His dedication on both of those committees earned him the respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

In addition, BILL was a productive member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress and in may ways the reforms adopted by this House are a living memorial to BILL EMERSON. He was a 28-year veteran of the Air Force Reserves and his dedication to the needs of our veterans and our Nation is well known.

BILL leaves behind his widow Jo Ann and their four beautiful children. Hopefully Jo Ann and the children may receive some small solace from the knowledge that many share their loss, both here in the Congress and at home in Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget the efforts BILL EMERSON made to enhance the work of our Select Committee on Hunger a few years ago. As a member of our Hunger Select Committee, he became one of our more energetic, productive, and dedicated members. We shall all miss BILL EMERSON. His shoes will be difficult to fill.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague, BILL CLAY for this opportunity to give testimony to our friendship and the admiration that we have for our departed friend, BILL EMERSON.

I came to Congress with BILL EMERSON in the same class, but it was not that alone that drew us together. A few short years later Bob Michel appointed us to the Select Committee on Hunger, I, as the ranking member. and BILL as my strong right arm. And I will tell you, it was not long after that that Micky Leland brought us to Ethiopia at the height of the worst famine in history ravaging the country and it was also war torn and enduring a civil war. I will tell Members, once you go to Ethiopia together, you are bonded in friendship forever. It was an extraordinary character-building experience.

We saw children, women, and men dying in the streets from starvation. And BILL and I determined then that we would be in a partnership forever to help wherever that help was needed. I must tell you, even this year, when it came to food stamps and the school lunch program, and maintaining the agriculture nutrition standards, we always knew that BILL EMERSON was there. No children would go hungry while BILL EMERSON was on the job.

I must agree with what Mr. DE LA GARZA has stated. We in this Congress must continue that dedication in BILL'S memory. No child should go hungry on our watch.

To his daughters, Liz and Abigail, with whom my daughter Meg went to school back in Ridgewood, NJ, I want to say to Liz and Abigail, cherish the memory of your wonderful father and always remember the hope, the faith, the dedication, and the valor that he brought not only to life but to his death.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me.

BILL EMERSON, we will miss you and yet your influence will continue to inspire all of us.

BILL EMERSON was a man of commitment, compassion, civility, and courage. What an example he set for us. He was fair-minded, bipartisan and, as Members have attested, he never did complain. The House and Congress was his life, from the time he was a high school student and was a page here, and then as he worked for someone who became my mentor, Senator Mac Mathias, which is when I first met BILL EMERSON many years ago.

BILL then was elected in 1979 to Congress himself. And he then married into a family that are very close to me. His father-in-law is the late Ab Hermann, who became a political sage of mine. His mother-in-law, Sylvia Hermann, continues to be a leader in Montgomery County, MD. He married a beautiful Jo Ann Hermann and has raised four wonderful children who have all been inspired by their mother and indeed by their father.

He is a man who cared very much about the community. We know how he cared about the fact that people needed to be nourished, to be nourished in many ways, spiritually as well as physically nourished, and he was there. He does inspire us.

I am reminded of, as BILL EMERSON leaves, the Tin Man in the Wizard of Oz. The Tin Man was looking for a heart. When he meets the Wizard, he says, ''Now I know I have a heart, because it is broken.'' And the hearts of all of us in this House and in this Chamber are broken.

□ 1630

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the wound of this loss is so fresh for all of us that it is difficult to place into words the kind of love and respect and admiration that we held for our friend, and truly BILL EMERSON was a personal friend. He was not just a friend, he was a personal friend to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, it is rare that we will find this many Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle that would take the time and feel compelled to come here and say these words, whatever we say, to our friend, BILL, and yet that was the kind of magnetism that this personality, this loving, kind person, held for all of us.

There was always something personal that he would find between himself and another person that bound them together. He and I came here together. He always bragged that he was one day younger than me, born just the next day after I was, and that was his way of forming that friendship. All of my colleagues had some kind of connection in that respect with BILL.

And yet it was much more than that because BILL EMERSON, as has been said here, was a patriot. He loved history, was a great student of history and felt extremely and highly honored that he was serving in this body because it represented, so much, the history of our Nation and his participation in it.

As has been said many times here today, BILL EMERSON loved this House. As my colleagues know, it is fashionable these days, it seems, for many of our Members to be critical of the House, hoping, I guess, to find some sort of sympathy from the public in criticizing this body. But you never heard that from BILL EMERSON. We only heard respect and love for this body.

His greatest achievement in life, outside his family, I think, was presiding there in that chair, and he did it so wonderfully well, none better, and I always picture BILL EMERSON sitting in the Speaker's chair because I think that was the height of his professional life in his own mind.

It has been said that duty makes us do things well, but love makes us do them beautifully, and, BILL EMERSON, you made things so beautiful.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I thank him for bringing this resolution today, and I send my condolences to the family of BILL EMERSON.

I came here in a special election, so friendship is very important, and BILL EMERSON showed me that friendship. I came here, and I was invited to the prayer breakfast by BILL EMERSON, and it became a very important part of my existence here in this Capitol. I come here today because I need to express my grief and my loss for this friend, and I say to all of my colleagues.

Let us look at what BILL EMERSON has given to us. He has shown us the way, love of country, love of family, love of each other, and finally he had such a deep love for his God that I know he is in good hands, and we should learn from his lessons.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we continue for 1 hour and that I control the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I was a real admirer of BILL EMERSON, and there was an old former gospel singer I just happened to draw upon memory from, a gospel song writer from Missouri, Albert E. Bromley, who is one of the greatest gospel song writers in the world, and I think this just fits BILL EMERSON, and the words go something like this:

I'll meet you in the morning with a how do you do, and we'll sit down by the river and

with rapture our acquaintance renew, and you're going to know me in the morning by the smile that I wear, when I meet you in the morning in the city that is built four square.

If anybody is going to make it, BILL EMERSON is going to make it. He was one of the finest men that I have met, ever met, in this body, and he, and Bill Natcher, and men of that statute are going to make making it to Heaven worthwhile working for and something to look forward to.

And, BILL EMERSON, we are going to miss you more than you will ever know.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our hearts and our prayers go to BILL's wife and daughter, certainly to all of his constituents, as well as his good friends.

BILL was my big brother when I came into Congress in 1993, and he just contributed so much time and so many hours in helping me learn how to adjust to Washington and to Congress.

So I wanted to be part of, if my colleagues will, this honor guard, thanking BILL again for all that he has done for many of us, certainly all that he did for me personally. BILL was a friend.

I served with BILL on the Committee on Agriculture. I mean his dedication, his willingness to study and learn and work with both Republicans and Democrats is not only to be admired, it is to be a good lesson for all of us.

BILL EMERSON was a great American.

BILL, we hope you continue to guide us, and our prayers are with you.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] for yielding time to me.

As a new Member of this body, it is wonderful just to sit here and listen to the more senior Members who have known BILL EMERSON longer than I have come before this body and lift up praises to him for the outstanding, not only the outstanding work that he did while he was in Congress and the outstanding family man that he was, but just the type of person; all those wonderful characteristics that we all look up to, that we all want to emulate, and I can verify from the 18 months that I knew BILL EMERSON that he certainly was that type of person and certainly led by example. I know when I was selected to join the Committee on Agriculture, he was one of the first folks I sought out, and he gave me wonderful advice and counsel throughout the entire time.

I also had the special occasion to go to Missouri with him one time and attend a hearing that he was conducting, and I know for a fact that BILL EMERSON loved his district, he loved it very strongly. He stood very strongly for he was a man of commitment for that district, and I know during the 18 months that I was here he displayed it very strongly. But having the occasion to go to Missouri and visit people there, I know that Missouri loved BILL EMERSON.

BILL was a wonderful congressman, a wonderful man, a wonderful father, a wonderful husband, a wonderful role model to many of us in Congress, and I know that he has gone on to better things, and I know that we are certainly going to miss him, I know that Missouri is certainly going to miss his presence here in Congress, and all we can do at this point is just add our appreciation to his family for what he did and continue to lift up his family in prayer because these are difficult circumstances, and I know all those Members here would agree with me on that, and we will continue to hold his family at this special time of their bereavement.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, it was a young but brave BILL EMERSON who as a page helped move the mortally wounded Members of this body from the floor on a stretcher after a terrorist assassination attempt. Even as a teenager BILL EMERSON saw his duty, and he did it without any thought for his own safety.

BILL EMERSON and I had many things in common, our careers paralleling one another, we both worked here in Washington before returning home at young ages and being elected as Members of this body. BILL's personal office and staff is located next to mine in the Rayburn Building. Our families were neighbors in McLean, VA, and we were neighbors and colleagues on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Only four doors down from my family in McLean were BILL EMERSON, his wife Jo Ann and his four children. Our children attended school together, were often found in each other's homes, and participated in school and church activities together. BILL was a devoted family member and a devoted church member.

I know that my daughter Suzanne will never forget the times when BILL's daughter, Tori, and later Katherine, who we later called, ''Kat,'' would babysit. They loved having each other over, spending the night together, doing their home work together, baking cookies together.

I recall one instance when we noted in the neighborhood a large truck outside of BILL and Jo Ann's home. It was a huge delivery truck, and they had just unloaded hundreds of cartons in front of BILL's driveway. So we strolled over to see what was going on. Could not imagine what was being delivered to their home.

''These are my books,'' BILL said very proudly with a sense of excitement.

''Where on earth will you put them all,'' we asked him.

His wife Jo Ann laughed and said, ''That's a good question.''

The cartons went inside, and Jo Ann and BILL found a space for quite a library of their beloved history books.

So, BILL was not only a great team player here in this body, he was a great team player in his neighborhood. Theirs was a close-knit family. Their strength, their hopes, their faith over these past months as BILL struggled to ''beat this thing,'' as he put it, never faltered.

BILL, his wife Jo Ann and his four daughters are a source of love and stability for each other throughout this ordeal, but amazingly they took time to reassure and give strength to their neighbors as well, showing their deep and abiding Christian faith at all times.

So as we say goodbye, for a short time anyway, to our friend BILL EMERSON, we say it to a very honored, respected, and beloved friend of all of us, and while he is gone from us for a short time, he will live on through his wife Jo Ann and his four daughters and his mother, but more, he will live on through all of us in this body who had the great good luck and good fortune to have known BILL EMERSON and to have served with him.

MR. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute and honor to the memory of a good man, a special man, Congressman BILL EMERSON. BILL was a good Congressman, a good friend and more than anything else a good human being. He was a man who truly cared about his fellow man, here at home and across the world. BILL EMERSON was a gentle man.

In 1992 I had the great privilege of cochairing a congressional delegation to Somalia with BILL. It was a dangerous trip. Somalia was still filled with gangs of armed warlords and we had to wear flak jackets as we drove through the streets. But BILL EMERSON was committed to the starving people of Somalia. He put their health and their welfare above his own personal security. that was the kind of man BILL EMERSON was.

BILL had a warm, caring and sharing spirit. His sense of humor was able to overcome any situation, to break down any barrier.

I will miss BILL EMERSON. I will miss his wit and his wisdom. I will miss his caring and his compassion. More than anything else I will miss his companionship. BILL EMERSON was my friend and I will miss him, as we all will, greatly.

My condolences and my love go out to BILL's family and friends.

□ 1645

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, to those watching this debate, whether by television or in the gallery or wherever,

think it is obvious that they can see that this is not just an ordinary Member, this is an extraordinary Member that is being remembered here today; not in a flashy, necessarily charismatic sense, but as a solid, stable, and caring legislator who touched so many of us in so many different ways. He was a Member in the finest way, not a Democrat and not a Republican, necessarily, but a solid Member.

He brought me, as he brought so many of you, into a new experience. BILL recruited me to join with him when he was chair of the Congressional Study Group in Germany. He sort of brought me up through the ranks and made sure I was ready to handle the responsibilities. He made me the vice chair and this year, the chair. I got to visit BILL's district. A lot of us are used to visiting Members' districts with Members. I got to see BILL's district without BILL being present, because at the time that the Congressional Study Group on Germany was holding its meeting, and it was holding it in Cape Girardeau, BILL was not able to be there because of his chemo treatment. He hated that. He had arranged the whole trip. He wanted very much to be with the group. He had been with it for many years. It was being held in his district. He could not be there. Yet he carried on, his staff carried on marvelously.

I got to then represent BILL, so I saw firsthand the love and respect and caring that his constituents had. Of course, BILL checked in daily and did a phone conference with us. He wanted to make sure everything was running fine. We hear a lot about Republicans and we hear a lot about Democrats. I understand why BILL always won so handily, because I got to meet another party: Emercrats. These were folks who were voting for BILL, no matter what happened. I got to meet a lot of them, too.

One of the memories that I have most about that several-day visit was that at the end of it there was a function that BILL had arranged for the visiting German parliamentarians in a large hall. It was to be a reception and dinner with a lot of citizens in that area. They knew BILL was not going to be there. BILL had been very open about that. They still came. They came out and packed that hall. They came out for BILL EMERSON, because they knew that is what BILL wanted to do. Of course, every one of them was asking how BILL was doing.

If we could all live our lives as openly as BILL lived his, whether here on the House floor, fighting every day his fight against cancer, not asking for any sympathy, but just being here, and that being a message in itself; the struggles that he has fought openly. His constituents knew him and they loved him. They lived with him, they suffered with him, and they prayed with him.

Mr. Speaker, we all live through our children. As we all seek some balm for BILL's death, the balm that there is that BILL left four wonderful children that he talked about with me, as I know he talked about with you. But to Jo Ann and his four daughters, BILL lives through you, and for that we are all very lucky.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, this is not a happy occasion for me to be standing here before my colleagues and to pay a special tribute to the late Congressman BILL EMERSON from the State of Missouri.

BILL EMERSON, I think, can adequately be described as stubborn as those Missouri mules, as I understand it, but BILL EMERSON also had a heart. He had a heart full of compassion, and one of real appreciation for the needs of America's elderly and the poor and the hungry.

It was my privilege to serve as a member of the Select Committee on Hunger, where BILL EMERSON was also one of the senior members of the committee. The occasions that I have had in having hearings with him and to listen to this man, I certainly have respected him very highly for his opinions about the needs of America's hungry.

It was also my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to attend or to be a member of the delegation that went to Somalia, as it was cochaired by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS]. BILL EMERSON was a member of that delegation. It was not until that trip that I felt the real sense of compassion that this man had for those who are really in need.

As my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, indicated earlier, we had to wear jackets for our safety because of the dangerous situation that the people of Somalia were confronted with at that time. BILL EMERSON was there because he had compassion. I believe personally that it was because of his strong convictions that he was able and was one of the forces which led President Bush to send the troops that were needed from the resources that America had, that he wanted for humanitarian reasons to help the needs of that nation.

BILL EMERSON was a dear friend because he helped me, and I am sure this was true of so many of my colleagues here. For my elderly people and the disabled in my district, BILL EMERSON was one of the key players who helped me provide the legislation for their needs. I certainly would like to convey my heartfelt condolences to Jo Ann and to the members of his family and to this great gentleman, not because he was a Republican, but because he was a great American.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the representative of the 18th Congressional District in Texas, a district that was previously represented by the Honorable Mickey Leland. I know that if Mickey was here, he would have wanted to offer just a word of thanks for the life of BILL EMERSON.

BILL EMERSON and Mickey Leland were very good friends. They were good friends, but as well, they were committed to a singular cause. That cause was to ensure that there was no more hunger in this world and in this Nation, particularly as it relates to children.

As a freshman, let me say to BILL EMERSON's family, Jo Ann and his four daughters, that we can only wish that others would follow in the tradition of the friendship of BILL and Mickey, and that they would also follow the cause, to ensure that all would be able to live free in this world, in this Nation, without hunger and hopelessness.

Let me also say as a freshman, just watching BILL EMERSON on the floor, knowing what he was dealing with physically, all I could see was a genteel and sincere individual, committed to public service, with a love for his country. Just a moment ago I was with Joe Hillings, a constituent who served as a page with BILL EMERSON. He offered his grief and his concern for a man who did nothing more than to give to his fellow man. He was a servant, he was a lover of people, and I do believe if Mickey was here, he would say to his friend, BILL EMERSON, ''Well done, good and faithful servant.''

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

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

Mr. Speaker, when I first came here in 1993, I, like most Members of Congress, was somewhat intimidated by everything and everybody, and I needed a friend, just as we all need friends during that period of time, and certainly as we continue our career. BILL EMERSON was one of those guys that I found to be open and friendly to new Members, and always helpful.

I could go to BILL for advice on agriculture. I served on the Committee on Agriculture with him. All those agriculture issues, as we know, are very complicated; understanding the milk program, the peanut program, the wheat program. They are just endless. I do not think anybody knew as much about those programs on the committee, who had the time to sit there and share with you, and so forth. I would go to BILL and I would say, okay, what is going on on this? He would explain the intricate USDA policy on that.

One could also go to BILL and ask him, about the political side, and he could tell us which groups and which committees and which people here, Members of the House, how they stood and what would probably happen. He could predict what was going to be the outcome of legislation many weeks before it ever got on the floor.

If you only knew BILL in that political sense, as a guy who could give advice on agriculture issues and politics, you were missing something entirely more important to him. That was BILL EMERSON, the person. Because as a man, he was one who was philosophical. He could sit there and with a sense of humor sort of say, well, this is where we Republicans are going to line up on this, but those old Democrats, they have a good point here, and here is where I agree with them, and here is where we disagree. He could just rise above the rough edges of this institution and deliver somewhat of a balm, an ointment to the Members, so we could all feel a little bit better, not just about ourselves but about the legislation and about service in Washington. That is the kind of guy BILL EMERSON was.

I, Mr. Speaker, am going to miss BILL EMERSON. He always would stand back there and kind of peer over the banister, and I believe in many respects he will continue to peer down on us, just as he sat back there. You could always reach him. I think now we can look high up in the heaven and BILL EMERSON is in good company with all of the other angels of the Lord.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for allowing me this time to speak this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen so many of our classmates that came to orientation back in 1980 with BILL EMERSON, as I was privileged to come to this Congress at the same time. And in thinking about the life of BILL EMERSON which we celebrate today, and of course, his passing, which we mourn today, I think all of us feel a little richer for having been with him and a little poorer for now missing him from this body.

But when we think of his lifespan, starting as a page in this body and ending over the last year with his sitting here and presiding as Speaker of this House and working in this House, I do not think that any man has ever been loved more that served in this House, or any man has loved this House more than BILL EMERSON loved this House. He loved the process and he loved its Members. I think that is something we need to think about more today as we see that things are becoming more tense here on the floor of this House, and as we work through our legislative process.

We often think of Tip O'Neill as being the man of this House. I think we certainly can also refer to BILL EMERSON as being the man of this House from the Republican side, as Tip O'Neill was from the Democrat side. As speakers ahead of me have said, he seemed to have a way to cut through the politics and make things happen. He was very practical in wanting to make good legislation. We have heard about his concern for the hungry, not only of this country, but also of the world. His great heart, that no longer beats, had such compassion for his fellow men, had compassion for the people that he served with.

I remember just a few weeks ago BILL was on the floor and he was standing right over to my left, where we remember seeing him for the last time in a wheelchair. And he was walking. He was still walking over for each vote, carrying a little tube of oxygen with him, and losing his breath. He was concerned about his losing his energy. When he came over here, he had lost his breath.

I mentioned to him that perhaps he ought to think about getting a wheelchair. and he said, my goodness, I do not want to do that. People will look at me and think I am dying. BILL fought right up to the very, very end.

Of course, then he decided that he would save his energy so he cold spend his time in a productive way when he was on the floor, and the last few days of his life here on the floor he would appear here in the wheelchair. What a wonderful man BILL was. We are certainly going to miss him. Our hearts and our feelings go out to his wonderful wife Jo Ann, who is a wonderful friend of my wife Emily, and of course BILL EMERSON, who was a wonderful friend of all of us.

I think it would be a great tribute for each one of us in our hearts and in our daily work to think of BILL EMERSON when we try to get together and pass meaningful legislation; as we go through the last months of this 104th Congress, that we dedicate each day to a greater understanding of each other, in the true memory of BILL EMERSON.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to pay tribute to BILL EMERSON, a great man, a great Congressman, a great Christian, a great friend, and, as we have all heard, a great family man, which is so important, and was so important to BILL.

I had the privilege of serving with BILL on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for 6½ years. When I was on that committee with him, I was a Democrat while he was a Republican, and so I have heard a number of the speakers talk about the bipartisan way that BILL would work with Members.

Having been a Member of both political parties last year, I can vouch firsthand that Bill was such a wonderful individual. He treated each Member, regardless of party or ideology, with great respect and would work with them on finding solutions to problems. Being senior to me on the committee, I respected his advice. There were countless times when he said: ''GREG, think about taking this approach; why do we not work at it this way?''

So it is no wonder that so many people have come to the floor today to talk about what a wonderful individual BILL EMERSON was, because we were all proud.

As the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. SKELTON] would vouch, as I asked for 30 minutes to an hour to talk about BILL EMERSON, every Member of this body could do that. As we would talk about him, we would always want to put the word great in front of friend, great in front of Congressman, great in front of family man, because BILL EMERSON was that kind of individual. So we in this body who count BILL as our friend are blessed to have had BILL EMERSON.

This Nation was blessed to have had Bill Emerson as a citizen and as a Congressman. We know from his love and the way he expressed his love and affection for his family, his family was blessed, as we all were, that BILL EMERSON was a part of their lives as we were in our lives. So America has been blessed, as his family was, by the good Lord that BILL EMERSON was a part of their lives, as ours.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SKELTON, arguably the best friend that BILL EMERSON had in the House, for yielding me this time.

We have heard a lot today about BILL EMERSON, about his commitment as a public servant, his friendship to Members on this floor on both sides of the aisle. I want to talk just very briefly about something, a little gift that BILL EMERSON passed on to me, and that was BILL EMERSON's faith.

BILL EMERSON was diagnosed with what he must have known was a terminal condition. It was amazing to me how calm BILL EMERSON was in the face of staring death square in the eye. I went to BILL EMERSON, and I said: ''BILL, what about this peace? You do not seem to be struggling, you do not seem to be angry. What about this?''

He said: ''Well, JOHN, you have to understand, a number of years ago I started working on my faith, my faith in God and my faith in Jesus Christ.'' And he said: ''JOHN, at some point in our lives we have to decide whether it is just a game or whether it is real. I have decided that it is real. My faith is real. I will see my Lord in heaven. And either way it goes, I am going to be a winner. Either I am going to recover and I am going to be able to be a servant of God right here on earth, or I am going to go and meet my Lord and Savior in heaven. So, JOHN, everybody has to decide, for those that go to church, for those that read the Bible, is this just a game that we play with ourselves, or is it something that we accept and believe and practice, and believe as real as my talking to you.''

That is why BILL EMERSON had such an incredible struggle with his cancer. That is what BILL EMERSON passed on to me, a giant piece of his personal faith.

Mr. Speaker, we can always tell whether people really practice their

faith, really believe wholly in their faith when the chips are down, when their backs are up against the wall. BILL EMERSON never got angry, BILL EMERSON never was frustrated, and he never blinked when he went eyeball to eyeball with death. BILL EMERSON believed in his heart and in his mind that death was nothing more than a transition to a promised land that he has believed in.

Today, I have to tell my colleagues, that face shines bright in my mind. He gave me a piece of it. He made me more peaceful in my heart about the future and what a terrific, tremendous, wonderful gift the faith of BILL EMERSON that he passed on to many of his friends, his family, and his colleagues. God bless you, BILL. God bless you. We will miss you.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Like so many of my colleagues, BILL EMERSON was a personal friend of mine. So many nice things have been said about him on the floor today and rightly so, he deserves all of them. I do have many pleasant memories of BILL EMERSON like my colleagues do.

I remember the last time we were over with Bob Dole over at the Cannon Caucus Room. So many remember Bob Dole took a few minutes to talk about BILL EMERSON in his last speech in the Congress, and I thought that was a wonderful tribute that Bob Dole did.

I noticed every speaker spoke about BILL EMERSON's attitude, and that is the thing that struck me. I do not think I would have had nearly the courage that BILL EMERSON had. I remember the last time I saw him here. I shook hands with him, and I said: ''You have a strong handshake.'' He said: ''I am strong, I just cannot get enough oxygen.'' There was never any doubt that this man just had 100 percent confidence.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] spoke here on the floor. He said that he was in Cape Girardeau, I was at Cape Girardeau with you and some others, and it is true he was really loved and respected.

When I first came to Congress here, we had a Congressman by the name of Bill Steiger. He died just before we were sworn in. Tip O'Neill was the Speaker. And Tip O'Neill summed up Bill Steiger's life in four words. He said: ''This man had respect.'' And that is what I would say about BILL EMERSON, this man had respect. That is the best I think we can say when a man leaves this Congress, a man or woman leaves this Congress.

We also remember when BILL EMERSON was in the chair. No one did a better job in the chair than BILL EMERSON. Not only was he fair, but he had total command of what was going on on the floor. But BILL EMERSON left a legacy to you and to me, and that legacy was courage. I mean real courage. We saw that courage daily here in his wheelchair; his attitude was always 100 percent.

I think the thing that we can remember about him, when we think things are tough here on the floor, let us remember BILL EMERSON, and things will be made easy.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD].

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding me this time.

As it has been said all afternoon BILL EMERSON truly was a remarkable man. I had the opportunity to come to know him just since 1994 when he became involved in my race for the U.S. Congress. My district is right across the river from his. And he came to my district on one occasion to help out my constituents in a matter that they were concerned about.

A couple of weeks ago I was driving through my rural district of western Kentucky. I came across a small church. There was a bulletin board out there and it simply said: You cannot make a success of life without making a gift of it.

Subsequent to that, I thought that that certainly applied to BILL EMERSON. BILL EMERSON was a husband, he was a father, he was a son, he was a politician, and in all of those roles he made a success of those roles because he made a gift of his life.

At this time when there is so much cynicism and apathy around the country about politics, I genuinely wish that people from all across America would have had an opportunity to sit down and talk to BILL EMERSON about government, about a democracy, because he was truly committed to it. He believed in this body, he believed in our democracy and in our process, and all of us will miss him. We will be thinking about his wife Jo Ann and his four children.

I had the opportunity to meet his mother just a couple of days ago, and in looking in her eyes, I saw that twinkling in her eye that all of us saw when we talked and looked into BILL EMERSON's face, and we will all miss him. But he was a gift to us, and I, for one, will always cherish that.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have spoken a great deal about our friend BILL EMERSON this afternoon. I would be remiss if I did not say a word or two about loyalty, loyalty to those about him and those about him were extremely loyal to him.

At this time I would like to say a word of thanks to the D.C. staff and to the district staff of the late BILL EMERSON for the wonderful work that they did for him to help him serve the people of Missouri: Tricia Schade, David LaVallee, Julie Pickett, Pete Jeffries, Glenn Kelly, Lisa Johnson, Julia Kertz, Seaver Sowers, Neil Moseman, Jess Sharp. Those are the ones who composed the staff here in the Rayburn Building.

In the district: Lloyd Smith, Kacky Garner, Pat Pecuat, Greg Branum, Carol Goldsmith, Alan Heath, Mike Chitwood, Iris Bernhardt, and Carlene May.

Each of these staff members served so ably and so well. And on behalf of all of us, we thank them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time to speak on behalf of the loss of his great friend.

It is so sad to be here today and not have BILL here. He has been in this Chamber, I guess, as much as anybody else over the years. His spirit has always been here and hopefully will always be here.

I got to know BILL a little bit differently than some other people. Back when I was the Governor of Delaware, he came to Delaware to look at some programs we were running involving food stamps and nutrition and delivery of services. He liked these programs, and I liked BILL EMERSON. We were not used to having Congressmen come to Delaware, quite frankly, if they were not from Delaware. He took the time to come up there, and when I came to Congress he was my friend. He was one person I knew, and he was one person who spent time with me.

I did not realize he was the friend of 434 of us here in this Congress. We have heard more fascinating stories in these last 2 hours about this wonderful man and the way he reached out to different individuals, be they neighbors or committee members or classmates or whatever it was. But BILL EMERSON was bigger than that. He was almost bigger than anyone else who ever served in this Congress. He was for all humanity.

He was the one who reached out for those who had problems with hunger around this world. He was the one who reached across the aisle to Democrats as well as to Republicans. He was the one who virtually made a friend of everybody he dealt with. He was the one who was so popular in his district that he just won by overwhelming margins there.

He was the one with a wonderful family. He is the one that we are offering our condolences for here today because he meant so very much to so many people in the United States of America.

There may have been finer Members of Congress, but I do not know if I could name who they were or who they might be. I do not know of anyone who has served his fellow man as well as BILL EMERSON did over all of the years that he represented us in this Congress.

So we will miss you, BILL. We will miss your spirit. We will miss all that you stood for, particularly at the end when you were so brave and so courageous.

Frankly, I did not think it would ever end. It just came as a surprise,

even though we all knew that ultimately it had to be fatal. So we will miss you, BILL. God bless you.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

□ 1715

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding me this time.

With regard to all of the comments made about BILL EMERSON, I can only say amen. As a very dear person, a caring person, though, I would like to share an anecdote.

I have my No. 5 daughter suffering from cancer and she has been going through chemotherapy since last October. She was over here visiting on the floor with me and we ran into BILL. He told her that he was going through the same experience. He really lifted her spirits. He told her, ''Hang in there, you're going to beat this,'' and he reassured her. Then he asked me further for her telephone number when she was in the hospital, getting chemo, and when she was home, he called her, just lifting her spirits.

BILL, of course, had that amazing quality for maintaining high spirits even when he knew what the prospects were.

I share this as an anecdote only because it was so personal and meaningful to me. As a father, of course, you anguish over your little ones through that kind of experience, but you cannot help but anguish over those who suffer the loss most, and, that is, his lovely wife Jo Ann and his daughters, his mother.

But remember that the pain and suffering and the anguish of that loss is experienced only by we survivors. BILL is home free and he is looking down smiling upon all of us and he probably feels a little embarrassed at times over some of these revelations of our affections for him.

When my dad passed away last year and we all attended, it was family reunion time, I reassured my brothers, my sister, and the family that, hey, the big reunion time is right up there now, and his parents were waiting for him and all the loved ones that preceded him.

It is time for BILL to enjoy his celebration. He pulled his tour of duty. We can only look forward to the time when we can participate in that joyful experience and recognize that in the interim, though, we are here to try and bolster one another and to carry on the good fight and in the best tradition that BILL did. God bless you, BILL EMERSON.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE].

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding this time to me as we pay tribute to one of the great men of the U.S. Congress.

BILL EMERSON truly was a man of the House. His participation in this body extends far back beyond when he was first elected to the Congress in 1980. In fact, in our Republican cloakroom, we have a picture of BILL dating back to March 1, 1954. It is a fitting tribute in memory to him. He played a part in the history of this Congress, because on that day some terrorists burst into the Chamber through those doors up there to my left in the gallery and sprayed the entire House Chamber with gunfire.

BILL EMERSON was here because at that time he was the chief page on the Democratic side, because in 1954 that was the last time the Republicans were the majority in the Congress, and he was responsible for the pages on the Democratic side. He was over in that corner. I can remember him as vividly as possible telling me this story, just a couple of years ago, explaining that picture to me, back in that corner, he hit the floor, there are bullet holes in the wall back there for anybody who wishes to examine it, bullet holes here in the desks on the Republican side, and the photograph in the back shows BILL EMERSON carrying out Congressman Alvin Bentley, a Republican of Michigan, one of five Members of the House who was wounded that day. So BILL EMERSON's part in the history of this House extends back virtually all of my lifetime.

I had the honor of serving on the Committee on Agriculture with him for the past 3½ years, and serving on the Department Operations and Nutrition Subcommittee with him. He truly was a caring man who cared a great deal about the people that he was serving in his district, about the people who benefited from the Government programs under his auspices, and the taxpayer whose dollar he always looked after as he represented his constituents very wisely.

BILL EMERSON is truly someone we can all be proud of, someone who represented his district and who represents all of us in the Congress as a legacy in the history of this country.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM].

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman very much, and I thank the Speaker for this opportunity to honor a very, very special person in my life, BILL EMERSON.

First of all, I want to extend my most sincere sympathy to Jo Ann, the daughters, and the entire family.

Mr. Speaker, I came here 18 months ago, a freshman. BILL EMERSON took me under his wing and was my mentores here. I was very fortunate to have the unique opportunity to serve with BILL not only on the Ag Committee, the full committee, and Transportation and Infrastructure, but each of the four subcommittees that we served on together. I sincerely cherish the time that I had with BILL here.

BILL was always there to answer what had to seem like my endless questions. He was always there with stories about his experiences in Congress, in this body, and with stories about his beloved Missouri. And he was always there as a true friend. My only regret here is that I only had 18 months to be with BILL and to learn from him.

In the past few months, it seems that BILL wanted to teach me as much as possible as quickly as possible, somehow knowing that maybe his time was running short. I will never forget just 2 weeks ago when we were marking up the food stamp bill in the Ag Committee, that I was honored that he asked me to give his statement because he was too weak and it would be very, very difficult for him to do so.

As BILL continued to battle his illness, he continually asked me to pray for him, and I think he asked many of us here to do that. He kept telling us that the prayers were working and that he could feel our prayers.

I will never forget what BILL EMERSON meant to me. Someday I would hope to be half as food in this body as BILL was.

Also, I will never forget his faith in God. When BILL EMERSON came here, he did take me under his wing, and I know today that BILL EMERSON has been taken under God's wing. Knowing that, I can celebrate both his life and his death today.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the House of Representatives, one of the first people I met was BILL EMERSON. BILL was a gentleman in every sense of the word, and I will never forget it. We took a trip several years ago to Israel. He was such a good will ambassador, not only for this country and for his congressional district and for the great State of Missouri, but for the world. I think all of us know of his emphasis and focus on hunger in the world. It truly is a great, great problem. BILL EMERSON was out there on the front lines.

When we were in Israel, Mickey Leland was killed in that terrible airplane crash in Africa. BILL EMERSON dropped everything to try to find out about Congressman Leland and even tried to get to Africa to see if there was any way he could help. That is the kind of person BILL EMERSON WAS.

Life works in strange ways, but you can have a difference of opinion without having a difference of principle. That is what BILL EMERSON was all about. He did not care whether you were a Democrat or a Republican. He cared whether you cared about America. He always attacked the issue. He did not attack the individual. He did not try in any way to destroy the institution. He did everything he could to build the institution and build faith and confidence in this great country. BILL, you are going to be really missed. To your lovely wife Jo Ann and to your wonderful family, we will never forget you.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding me this time. I want to extend my sympathies to the Emerson family. When I first came to Congress 14 years ago, BILL EMERSON was my neighbor in the Cannon Office Building. He was also my neighbor across the Mississippi River from Illinois in Missouri. We talked a lot about our similar backgrounds and similar districts. Of course we were of different political parties. I am a Democrat, and he was a Republican. We are very proud of our partisan heritage but it never stood in the way of a good friendship. Over the years I came to know BILL and respect him very, very much. He fought some classic battles, both personal and political. In each one of them he showed a level of class which is rare in this institution. It is really unfortunate but true that from time to time we let politics get too personal in this institution and we forget that we are in fact colleagues and all quite honored to have this opportunity to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives. BILL never forgot it. I think it goes back to his experience as a young man serving as a page in the House and then coming back to be a Member of this institution. He loved the House so much.

There were times when the rhetoric around here and the debate would become so partisan and so personal that BILL would take it on himself to go and meet with the Democrats on the other side of the aisle and say, let's start bringing Members together for informal dinners so that people become friends again and realize that we still have so much more in common.

Then the year before last Speaker Tom Foley appointed BILL EMERSON and myself to serve as co-chairs of a bipartisan task force on Federal disaster assistance. It was a great experience, because I literally sat shoulder to shoulder with BILL EMERSON for months as we went through hearings and came up with a joint report that we both agreed on. We completely trusted one another, we worked together closely on a bipartisan basis, and I think did good work for this Nation and for this House of Representatives.

BILL EMERSON is going to be missed but what he brought to this House of Representatives we will remember for a long, long time. It was a certain level of class which we should all aspire to.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

Mr. TANNER. I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, what BOB CLEMENT said earlier I thought was very apropos; that is, that people can disagree without being disagreeable. BILL EMERSON was truly a man of the House, a man of this institution.

I had the privilege of working with BILL a lot, because part of my district is right across the river from the Missouri boot heel. I can tell Members from personal experience, BILL EMERSON was loved in the Missouri boot heel. We did a lot of work together on the Mississippi River. both of us served as president of the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association and had a lot of common interests that we were pursuing to help the folks that lived along the river up and down.

My heart goes out to Jo Ann and the family because BILL EMERSON was truly a gentleman. I never heard him say a harsh remark about someone personally on this floor. It happens all too often, as some of the other speakers have said. That is what I mean about being able to disagree in an agreeable way. That is really what this institution ought to be about. BILL EMERSON lived his life in furtherance of that goal.

I just hope his memory, and I think it will, will permeate this place for many years to come. He was a good man and true gentleman and we will miss him greatly.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

□ 1730

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that the BILL EMERSON that I knew was a very, very special person. BILL loved his God. He loved his country. He loved his family. He loved his district, his State, and he loved this House of Representatives. The last conversation that I had with BILL, he was looking ahead to next year and wanting to be a part of making the constructive changes that he tried all of his life, from, I think, since serving as a page in this institution the first time.

Having sat by BILL every Thursday morning in the House prayer breakfast group, I was blessed many times by having him share his ideas about life and what it meant, and even during these last several weeks when it clearly was becoming more and more of a severe problem for BILL, he never lost his faith.

I would just, too, like to say to Jo Ann and to the family and to all of his many other friends back home, I know everyone will miss him, but so will we. We know now that BILL is in Heaven and I know he is smiling down and appreciating the nice things that many of us have said when perhaps he would say, ''You could have done a little better job when we were here, too, Charlie.'' But BILL, we miss you. God bless you.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in mourning the passing BILL EMERSON, the gentleman from Missouri, truly the gentleman from Missouri. We all talk about when we first got to know Bill, and I did in his work with Mickey LeLand on the Committee On Hunger. I was not a member. I wanted to be. The two of them were so enthusiastic, and is it not sad that we have lost both of them.

Others have reminisced about when Mickey's plane went down and how BILL reacted to that and redoubled his already boundless efforts to end world hunger. We had a few chuckles over the fact that we were working together on disaster relief when of course everyone knows that we are earthquake prone in California and San Francisco, but when Missouri was identified as a potential site, again with all the gusto in the world, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] mentioned he launched into the disaster relief issue.

I want to extend my sympathy to Jo Ann and the Emerson family. I hope it is a comfort to them that BILL is mourned by every single one of his colleagues, that this House that he dearly loved and served so well is diminished by our loss of BILL, and that all who know him pray for the family at this very difficult time.

As has been mentioned, BILL was very concerned about his staff and we all are, too BILL. But I want to say that as has been mentioned, BILL was a person of faith. He was a man of faith. With that faith, he helped all of us here reinforce our own faith and be kinder to each other.

In his work to end world hunger, BILL EMERSON worked on the side of the angels, and now he is with them.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I had spoken yesterday and I was not going to speak again today, but something came up, I wanted to speak. BILL EMERSON and TONY HALL and a few of us are part of a covenant group. We met every Tuesday in the chapel. In fact, as we just broke up, a group of us, the whole meeting was on BILL. Somebody sent flowers that were on the altar today for BILL. Somebody else brought and put on all the chairs a jersey for all of us in the group from BILL.

BILL was a committed Christian. BILL loved Jesus as much as he loved anything else. So I just want people to know, and I can speak personally from having listened to BILL for the last several years, he loved Christ. He knew that when he died, where he was going, that he was going to Heaven to be with the Lord. BILL was somebody whom everyone loved on both sides, and those in our group, TONY HALL and our group, kind of transcend it. In fact, we had greater loyalty in our group to the individuals in the group than we actually had to our parties. We worked together on many issues, and we are going to miss BILL an awful, awful lot.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a tribute to BILL EMERSON that we are here in going on now 2½ hours eulogizing him and remembering him. He was a Member of my class, the 97th class, even though I caught up with him about 7 months later because I came in a special election in 1981. BILL was one of the first people to come over and extend a hand and help me with this great transition from the State legislature to the Congress.

Recently I had an opportunity to participate in a congressional study group on Germany meeting in BILL's district in Cape Girardeau and, unfortunately, BILL was unable to attend because he was having treatment back here at Georgetown. As a result, some of the Members that were out there listened to BILL call in, and we were there with members of the German Bundestag, and it was so evident what pride BILL took in his district and his constituency. He even gave us a book from Mark Twain that had a specific part of the book marked where Mark Twain talks about Cape Girardeau and that area, and the German members of the Bunderstag were so impressed with BILL's commitment and his strong feeling about German-American relationships and the strong number of German-Americans that were in his district.

He was a person who everybody in this House could look up to and yet feel that they were a friend on an equal basis. We will miss his great honesty, his humor. We wish the very best to his family and Jo Ann, his wife, for someone we will miss greatly, a real leader in this House and one who loved this House of Representatives, BILL EMERSON.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not know BILL EMERSON as well as some of my colleagues, but what I did not know of him, when I think of him and remember him, I will think of the words decency, commitment, honesty, collegiality, civility, which is sometimes in this body something that we have lacked.

The last word I ever heard him say was ''good''. I remember seeing him in his wheelchair and I asked him, BILL, how are you doing? And he said, ''I'm good.'' He was fighting till the end. A class guy, an honorable guy, a guy that when individuals think of this Congress, they see somebody in the best traditions of the men and women that serve here.

Sometimes we speak ill of each other and speak ill of this institution. BILL EMERSON loved this institution. He would be upset at those that reviled it, and I will always remember him as a man with class, a bipartisan person who cared deeply, a person who cared deeply by about this country, about hunger, about foreign policy, about his farming district, about where he came from, and I will always have that very good feeling about BILL EMERSON.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I guess the politics of BILL EMERSON and myself were 180 degrees apart. We were diagonally opposite. He is a conservative, I am a liberal. He was for a constitutional amendment against flag burning, I was against that. He was for English only, I was against that. He was pro-life, I am pro-choice. But BILL EMERSON is pro-life in the ultimate sense. Without him, without FRANK, who just spoke, without TONY HALL, a lot of Africans would die this year of starvation. BILL EMERSON interceded, and FRANK WOLF and he went to the leadership and got food aid put back in the budget last year.

He was a close friend, and I personally will miss him.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed this afternoon tributes to a wonderful American, great Missourian, BILL EMERSON. I have not seen such an outpouring in my time here in the Congress of the United States. Habit is a funny thing. Habits sometimes become a ritual. To and from work, driving from McLean, as we did nearly every day, in the morning when he would come by the House, ''Billy,'' ''Mr. Ike,'' then the conversation was off and we would visit all the way down, trying to solve problems, discussing everything from family to friends to work for the people we represented.

Then at night we would drive back and getting ready to get out, the conversation would be, ''What time tomorrow?'' ''7:20.'' ''7:20.'' ''Good night, Bill. 7:20.'' We will always fondly remember that wonderful Missourian, BILL EMERSON.

I also wish to thank the gentleman from St. Louis, MO, [Mr. CLAY], for initiating this resolution. It is certainly thoughtful of him to do so and to allow us to participate.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am pleased to rise to honor the memory of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, the late BILL EMERSON.

For the past 18 months, he has been a friend and periodic advisor. He has generously shared his love of Congress as an institution with me and his deep knowledge and interest in American history, most especially the role of Abraham Lincoln and his family.

BILL EMERSON touched the lives of two generations of Frelinghuysen's in Congress. He was a congressional page in 1954 when my father, Peter H.B. Frelinghuysen was a Member of this body. He was on the floor, as my father was, on the fateful day when Puerto Rican nationalists shot and wounded several Members of Congress from the spectators gallery.

He was a special person and one who had an immediate impact on those he met. Perhaps the greatest indication of his impact on this House and those who work in it is the testament that we've heard today—from Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, men and women, old friends and new who all respected this honorable man.

At a time when it is fashionable to criticize government and Congress, BILL EMERSON was always unabashed in his defense of this institution. He served as an example to us all that quiet leadership, an open mind, and a strong commitment to constituent service is the best way to earn the public trust and the respect of our colleagues.

We can honor his service by practicing these virtues. And through this effort by each and every one of us, the House of Representatives that BILL EMERSON loved so much will bear his grand imprint for many years to come.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great degree of sadness that we, today, mark the passing of a true, distinguished public servant, and a fine human being, Congressman BILL EMERSON of Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, we will always remember BILL for his wonderful sense of institutional history, his championing of the hungry and downtrodden of the world, his tireless work for the agricultural interests of the United States, and his longtime service to his country.

Mr. Speaker, the immense love BILL EMERSON displayed for his family, his friends, his Missouri, his country, and his God should always resonate with us. We were truly blessed to have such a wonderful man serving among us.

To BILL, I say ''So long, good friend. You are going to be missed by a lot of people down here. It was an honor to know you.''

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Representative BILL EMERSON, a distinguished American who served his country with unsurpassed dignity and an inspiring fighting spirit.

Representative EMERSON began his public service as a teenaged House page in 1954. He later served on the staffs of Representative Bob Ellsworth and Senator Charles Mathias.

In 1980, Representative EMERSON sacrificed a lucrative lobbying career to run for Congress. Through his dogged determination and exemplary integrity, BILL EMERSON defeated the Democratic incumbent, becoming the first Republican in 50 years to represent the Cape Girardeau-Bootheel region.

During his 16 years in Congress and throughout his life, BILL EMERSON earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues and the public. He was able to rise above politics and work together with Members on the other side of the aisle to pass legislation benefiting our country. As a compassionate leader on the Agriculture Committee, BILL EMERSON dedicated much of his efforts to food stamps and nutrition programs.

No matter what challenge life threw at him, BILL EMERSON attacked it with every fiber in his body. He fought and defeated alcohol dependency and never gave up his fight against cancer. Since being diagnosed with cancer last November, BILL's spirit and zeal for life never wavered.

This House and our country has lost a great American patriot. I offer my condolences to the family and friends of the Honorable BILL EMERSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in mourning the death of BILL EMERSON.

I was privileged to have worked with BILL on the Agriculture Committee for the 10 years that I have served in the House, including having him as my ranking member on the General Commodities Subcommittee during my time as chairman of that subcommittee. As was the nature of the Agriculture Committee in previous years, we worked on a bipartisan basis to ensure the competitiveness of American agriculture on many occasions.

He was a tireless advocate of those less fortunate in our country, particularly the hungry in this Nation. With the bounty produced by his congressional district, I know it was frustrating for him to think that in this day and age that children still go to bed hungry. We are also aware that this concern spanned the continents as he joined our late colleague Mickey Leland and Congressman HALL in working to stamp out hunger in foreign lands as well.

He served the constituents of his district well on the Public Works and Transportation Committee and on the Agriculture Committee. He, like I, represented a district which has a wide variety of agricultural commodities grown, sometimes with divergent views. He was always an advocate for the farmers in his district above all else and fought relentlessly to ensure that their interests were heard. His work on the Public Works Committee also underscored his understanding of the issues of importance to his district—safe drinking water and adequate transportation systems to allow his rural district to complete on an equal basis with their urban neighbors and enjoy the same quality of life.

Mr. thoughts and prayers are with his family, his staff, and the constituents of the Eighth District of Missouri as they mourn their loss and remember the life and times that they shared with him. His death is a loss for all of us and for this institution that he loved, the U.S. Congress.

Mr. STOKES. Mr Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the distinguished dean of the Missouri congressional delegation, Congressman BILL CLAY, for allowing us this time to pay tribute to our departed colleague, BILL EMERSON. We join the members of the Missouri congressional delegation and, in particular, the people of the Eighth Congressional District in mourning the recent passing of a distinguished lawmaker, a dedicated politician, and a good friend.

I am proud to have served in this legislative Chamber with BILL EMERSON. He came to Washington, DC, with a sense of dedication and the highest level of commitment to public service. Throughout his career, he worked hard and fought for issues which he believed in. Many of us recall that when the Hunger Caucus was abolished, BILL EMERSON joined my colleague from Ohio, TONY HALL, in fasting to bring attention to the issue. On other issues of importance to the Nation, BILL EMERSON was the voice of reason and compassion. He was a courageous lawmaker and a gentleman at all times.

Mr. Speaker, I saw BILL just a few nights ago when he was coming into this Chamber in his wheelchair. I recall that he was in good spirits, and told me at that time than he was still fighting hard and doing all right. BILL EMERSON was that type of champion. The fact that despite his battle, he was here in this Chamber just a few days ago carrying out his legislative duties, is a reflection of his strength of character and commitment to duty. He did his very best and he served with the highest level of integrity and dignity.

I will miss our colleague, BILL EMERSON. I join my colleagues in extending my sympathy to his wife and members of the Emerson family. We have lost a good friend and America has lost a champion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKELTON. 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 459.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1903. An act to designate the bridge, estimated to be completed in the year 2000, that replaces the bridge on Missouri highway 74 spanning from East Cape Girardeau, Illinois, to Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the ''Bill Emerson Memorial Bridge'', and for other purposes.

BILL EMERSON MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1903) to designate the bridge, estimated to be completed in the year 2000, that replaces the bridge on Missouri Highway 74 spanning from East Cape Girardeau, IL, to Cape Girardeau, MO, as the ''Bill Emerson Memorial Bridge'', and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I certainly do not mean to object, but I would yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for the purposes of explaining the bill.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, the bill would designate the bridge to be constructed to replace the Cape Girardeau Bridge in Missouri in honor of our late colleague, BILL EMERSON, who passed away last weekend.

BILL truly was a man of the House. He first came to Washington at the age of 15 when he was appointed to serve as a House page. He returned in 1961 and worked on the staff of several Members. After working in the private sector, Bill was elected to the House in 1980 and has won each election since, serving on both the Agriculture and Transportation and Infrastructure Committees.

I had the honor of serving with BILL on the Transportation Committee and always found him to be hardworking, and dedicated to his beliefs and serving his constituents in Missouri. He was never afraid to state his views or take on an issue, and it was one of many traits that we admired about BILL. I remember well his good humor and straightforward manner, even when the committee was considering controversial or difficult matters. But make no mistake, you always knew exactly how he felt about an issue.

In the end, BILL demonstrated extraordinary courage in the face of his illness this year, and he would not, and did not, let it interfere with his daily responsibilities here and in his district.

We extend our condolences to his wife, Jo Ann, to his children, Elizabeth, Abigail, Victoria, and Katharine, and to his staff who worked with him over the years. The Transportation Committee and this House have suffered a great loss and we will truly miss BILL EMERSON.

I urge passage of S. 1903.

Mr. RAHALL. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his explanation and I join him in supporting this bill.

It is indeed fitting that the least we can do to honor BILL EMERSON is to name the bridge that is to be constructed in Cape Girardeau in his memory.

Sine 1980, BILL EMERSON served with great distinction on the Public Works and Transportation Committee, now known as the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, working on behalf of the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri.

In fact, a particular bridge we are naming in his honor today has been a priority transportation improvement project for him, and funds were earmarked for it in the National Highway System designation bill that I managed in the last Congress when I served as chairman of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee.

As we all know and have heard today, Mr. EMERSON, our dear friend, was a gentleman, a great legislator, a family man and a friend to all of us. His memory will stay with us for many years.

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

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

□ 1745

Mr. VOLKMER. This is something that BILL EMERSON worked on for about 10 years, and working together, he with a bridge in Cape Girardeau, I with a bridge in Hannibal, both across the Mississippi, and also with the Chouteau Bridge in Kansas City. Bill was instrumental in bringing this all about and this is a very appropriate designation in his honor.