United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 22, 1997 No. 104

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mrs. EMERSON].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 22, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable JO ANN EMERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 858) ''an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes,'' agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints from the Select Committee on Intelligence: Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KYL, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. COATS, Mr. KERREY, Mr. GLENN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROBB, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. LEVIN, and from the Committee on Armed Services: Mr. THURMOND, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 21, 1997, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] for 5 minutes.

IMPACT ON INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS IN REVENUE RECONCILIATION ACT

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, the independent contractor provision in the Revenue Reconciliation Act will do great damage to employer relations in our country. Millions of Americans would lose health care coverage and pension benefits.

Working women would suffer the most. For women, being an independent contractor means much lower wages than male employees in similar jobs. What about health care and pensions? Only 2 percent of women independent contractors have health care and pensions paid by their employers. Women also would lose critical employment protections.

Independent contractors are not covered by equal employment opportunity laws. They do not receive family and medical leave. Some employers have misclassified janitors and garment workers to evade minimum wage and overtime laws affecting many low-wage workers who are women.

Working women have fought hard to win equal employment opportunity, fair wages, and economic security. The independent contractor provision would be a disaster for them and their families. That is why a coalition of 130 women's organizations is against this measure.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the bipartisan budget bill is the wrong vehicle to carry this issue. As my colleague from Connecticut, [Mrs. JOHNSON] pointed out in a letter to the Speaker of the House, Congress needs to protect working women and to delete this clause from the budget bill.

THE TRUTH IS IN THE NUMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I will bet most Americans would be surprised to realize that they are rich. To accomplish this amazing feat, the Clinton administration has formulated a new exercise in wordspeak that simply defines a significant portion of all Americans as rich. But, frankly, most Americans probably do not feel rich. Most probably rely on two incomes, have a couple of children, a lot of bills to pay and, in fact, feel very far from being rich.

But, more than anything else, Madam Speaker, they deserve a tax break today. Well, why should the White House have any interest in inventing a new measurement of wealth? Well, it is actually quite simple. In order for the administration to score political points at the expense of hard-working middle-class Americans, they must create millions of wealthy taxpayers where none exist.

For decades, American taxpayers have paid taxes based upon the adjusted gross income, the AGI. The AGI is a rather simple and straightforward calculation of earnings. It is at the bottom of the first page of everyone's tax return.

Perhaps the AGI is too simple for the White House, for they have worked diligently over the recent past to prejudice the AGI and with it the tax package that the President initiated. They have done everything in their power to modify and create a new formula to

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

calculate the supposed wealth of American taxpayers today.

Here is how it works. Instead of using the adjusted gross income in tax computations, the administration uses a complicated formula known as the Family Economic Income, or FEI, which adds to one's income the fringe benefits they receive every year: Keogh deductions, most nontaxable cash transfer payments, the buildup of the IRA, your pension.

Here is the real catch. The FEI even adds something known as imputed rental income, or what a family would earn if they were to rent out their home. What? Yes. If you had to rent out your home, that is part of your family income.

To say the least, this is an unusual and rather inaccurate definition of a family's income. To say the most, the administration is engaging in political gamesmanship, designed solely to demagog an issue that otherwise only serves to assist middle-income Americans.

Madam Speaker, put simply, by employing the imputed income calculation, the administration is able to considerably overstate income levels for most households today, making middle-class taxpayers appear to be much richer than they themselves would ever, ever recognize.

For example, employing the administration's new income formula, 1.7 million union members, 2.4 million teachers, 8.1 million government workers, and 4.2 million mechanics, repairmen, and construction workers are now considered rich by the administration and therefore are undeserving of a tax break.

The problem is that the Clinton administration chooses to employ this odd income calculation to change the idea of who is wealthy. They are working hard to mislead the public and turn a positive situation into a negative political game.

The bottom line is this: The Republican tax plan accurately targets America's middle-income class. In fact, 76 percent of the relief provided in the Republican plan will go to those Americans who make less than $75,000 a year. Although the President has worked hard to distort this fact, it remains difficult for anyone to argue that these Americans are rich and that they are undeserving of a tax break.

Madam Speaker, the Republican Congress has passed real tax relief for all middle-class taxpayers at every stage of their lives, from child tax credits to estate tax reform. We are doing the right thing.

Meanwhile, the President is trying to change the debate with this new ''imputed rental income formula.'' But the truth is in the numbers; and no amount of imagined, imputed income will turn hard-working middle-class Americans into what the President calls the evil rich.

Middle-class Americans deserve a tax break today. The Republican Congress wants to give that to them. For the millions of Americans who do not consider themselves rich, for the two-earner families who struggle to provide a nice home and a good education for their children, for all the middle-class Americans, I implore the President today to put politics aside, stop the distortions, join the Republican Congress in providing some much-needed and much-deserved tax relief to middle-class Americans.

TAX BILL MUST PASS CLEAR TESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, as the press now starts to report and to analyze the Republican tax cut legislation, the reviews are coming in from across the country and from independent journalists. What we now see is a recognition that what the Republican bill does is provide for a forced feeding of tax cuts to the wealthiest people in this country.

As Time magazine's journalist Jonathan Alter noted, the Republican bill showers millions of dollars on the richest 1 percent of Americans.

As the Wall Street Journal noted, it allows the IRA provisions to create opportunities primarily for upper income Americans to shift large chunks of their assets into tax-free accounts, where they would be beyond the reach of Uncle Sam forever.

The Washington Post notes that the Republican tax bill is heavily tilted toward the better off, and the Democrats are right for calling the Republicans on this.

They go on to note that the plain facts are that the bill would not only benefit the better off but would cost the Government revenues it cannot afford.

Yesterday, the Post quoted a number of economists supporting different political parties which reached agreement that the Republicans are relying on numbers that mask the extent of the size of the Republican tax proposals favoring high-income households which would mushroom over the years to come.

What we now see as the conventional economic analysis suggests that the permanent benefits of the tax cut will favor high-income individuals, and it will do so by denying the $500 tax credit to families who pay thousands of dollars in payroll taxes but the Republicans have determined somehow are welfare families and not entitled to the $500 tax credit. Unfortunately, for thousands of working families in America today, they pay more in payroll taxes than they pay in income taxes; and yet the Republican proposal would not share the child care tax credit with them.

What we now see is someone like Gary Bauer, the conservative head of the Family Research Council, saying, ''The family tax credit ought to go to any working families that pay income or payroll taxes. That is not welfare.''

Gary Bauer has it right. The Republicans have it wrong. These families are entitled to share this. But why can't they share in the tax cuts, the family child credit tax cut? They cannot share in that because the Republicans are so busy providing capital gains tax cuts to the wealthiest people in this country, the vast majority of which goes to the top 2, 3, 4 percent of the taxpayers in the United States.

These are not the people who need relief from taxes. The people who need relief from taxes are people who are trying to raise their children, educate their children, provide shelter for their children and are doing it on a few thousand dollars a year. Yet the Republicans say they cannot do that. They cannot do that because they want to get rid of the alternative minimum tax that suggests that corporations ought to pay something for the privilege of doing business in America.

When they get done with all of their deductions, where they can eliminate their obligation to pay taxes, there ought to be something they pay in this country. By giving away capital gains tax, by doing estate tax relief for the wealthiest people in this country, there is no money left. There is no money left for hard-working families in this country that, unfortunately, earn between $15,000 and $30,000 a year; and the Republicans are going to deny them a tax cut.

The bill should be changed in conference, it should be fair, and it should take care of working families. It does not do that now.

A BLOODY SHIRT ON TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I have taken this time to continue with the debate that my very good friend from Martinez, CA, Mr. MILLER, was engaged in; but I have a completely different view. Actually, it was put forward very well by a former adviser to President Clinton.

Yes, he served also in Republican administrations; but he most recently in his public service was an adviser to President Clinton. I am referring to the editor-at-large of U.S. News & World Report, who in this week's U.S. News & World Report on the back page has an editorial, which I would commend to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as this debate proceeds.

The editorial is entitled ''A Bloody Shirt on Taxes: It's time for the left to stop twisting the truth about tax relief.''

Now, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] was referring to many

people who have said that this package that we have put forward is nothing but a sop for the rich. But if we look at the facts, I am very happy to say that many Democrats in this House know full well that this tax package is, in fact, very, very helpful to middle and lower income wage earners in this country.

There are a few points that Mr. Gergen makes in this piece which I would like to share with my colleagues. He says, the central liberal charge is that the bills adopted by the GOP-led Senate and House would give as much tax relief to the top 1 percent as to the bottom 60 percent combined. Sounds horrific, doesn't it? What they ignore, as Jim Glassman of U.S. News & World Report noted, is the top 1 percent also pay more in taxes than the bottom 60 percent combined, a lot more. IRS records show that the top 1 percent shoulder 29 percent of the Nation's total tax bill, while the bottom 60 percent pay some 9 percent.

Recognize that we singled out the top 1 percent for tax hikes in that 1993 bill that the President moved through. It also would not be terribly unfair to include them in at least a modicum of tax relief today.

He goes on to talk about this issue of funny money, which my friend from Florida, [Mr. STEARNS] mentioned earlier, this imputed income whereby if someone paid off their mortgage, they in fact have what would be the rental income included as income to them, and it is actually obviously money they would never see.

Mr. Gergen writes that stripping away the funny money, the Census Bureau shows that the top 20 percent really starts with households earning $65,124 a year. That means that the criticism that has come from the left, Madam Speaker, is they are pretending that families that make $65,124 are categorized as rich.

Then a very important item that needs to be mentioned, one that I have been working on since the opening day of this Congress and, frankly, for a number of years, is this issue of capital gains.

When I mention how Democrats have joined with me in cosponsoring very important legislation, H.R. 14, to bring about an across-the-board reduction in capital gains, it is because they know that the average family of four would see an increase of $1,500 per year over a 7-year period in their take-home pay.

Mr. Gergen says another shell game on the left involves proposed reductions in capital gains and estate taxes. Liberals say it is selfish for people who invest in stocks or save for their children to receive tax relief. But they ignore the fact that these funds have already been taxed, when they were first earned. To tax earnings a second time at rates as high as 55 percent, which is the case with inheritance taxes, borders on confiscation.

Now, Madam Speaker, we know full well that we are in this together, and I think Gergen's closing paragraph is a very telling one.

This country does face serious challenges in addressing the growing income gap between those who are affluent and everyone else. Clearly, we should be working harder to ensure that children of poor and middle-class families have an equal chance at the starting line of life. Just as clearly, those who have the most should give the most back. But the way the left is trying to twist this tax debate, bullyragging successful Americans as a way to score political points trivializes the real issues and divides us as a people. We don't need another bloody shirt.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to read this editorial, and I will send it around to everyone.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT MEDAL OF HONOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHALE. Madam Speaker, for the last 2 nights I have joined millions of Americans in watching the Rough Riders on Turner Broadcasting. When Teddy Roosevelt served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, he argued vigorously that the United States should intervene in Cuba and be prepared for possible war with Spain. In what was for Teddy Roosevelt characteristic language, he said, ''I had deeply felt it was our duty to free Cuba, and I publicly expressed this feeling; and when a man takes such a position, he ought to be willing to make his words good by his deeds. He should pay with his body.''

So, in that spirit, Teddy Roosevelt resigned his office and offered to serve as a lieutenant colonel with the First U.S. Volunteer Cavalry, what history now calls the Rough Riders.

On July 1, 1898, in what Roosevelt would call for the rest of his life his crowded hour, he placed his body on the line. He backed up his words with his courage. Leading two vicious bloody assaults on Kettle Hill and the San Juan Heights, Teddy Roosevelt made history and led his men with extraordinary valor.

The fighting was brutal. Four hundred ninety Rough Riders went into battle that day; 89 were killed or wounded, the heaviest loss suffered by any regiment in the cavalry division.

From the beginning to the very end, Theodore Roosevelt was at the forefront of battle, leading by example, encouraging his men, oblivious to danger, firing his revolver at point-blank range and killing the enemy with his own hand, this future president of the United States displayed extraordinary valor under the most difficult of combat conditions.

Gen. Leonard Wood, Roosevelt's commanding officer, recommended Roosevelt for the Medal of Honor with the following citation: Colonel Roosevelt led a very desperate and extremely gallant charge on San Juan Hill, thereby setting a splendid example to the troops and encouraging them to pass over the open country. In leading this charge, he started off first. He then returned and gathered a few men and led them in the charge, an extremely gallant one, and the example set a most inspiring one to the troops in that part of the line.

Madam Speaker, by universal consensus among the officers and men who witnessed Roosevelt's bravery, he had earned our Nation's highest military decoration. But he never received it.

During the weeks after the battle for San Juan Heights, Roosevelt watched with mounting frustration as his men suffered and died from tropical disease. Angered by Roosevelt's public statements that the Rough Riders should be brought home as quickly as possible, Secretary of War Alger refused to sign Roosevelt's Medal of Honor citation.

As a result, Col. Theodore Roosevelt was denied the recognition he had earned in battle. Edith Roosevelt, after Teddy's death, said that the failure to receive the Medal of Honor was one of the most bitter disappointments of his life.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to tell you that it is not too late to correct that injustice. Later this week I will be introducing legislation with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], authorizing the Medal of Honor for Col. Theodore Roosevelt, First United States Volunteer Cavalry, for extraordinary bravery under enemy fire. Members wishing to be original cosponsors should contact my office.

A century of political retry bugs and injustice can now be corrected by the posthumous recognition of Teddy Roosevelt's courage.

AMERICA'S SPACE PROGRAM: A SOURCE OF PRIDE AND INSPIRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Madam Speaker, let me begin by saying that I would like to be a cosponsor of the legislation being submitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE], and I very much endorse his very eloquent comments. I know Teddy Roosevelt has been an inspiration for me, not so much in my political career, but as well as a young man growing up and seeing how somebody like him could overcome adversity and take the risks that he did. So I congratulate the gentleman and the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], on your endeavor, and I would like to support you in that.

Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon to talk about our Nation's space program. As all Americans know, our Nation's success in the arena of space has

been a source of great pride and inspiration for many Americans, particularly our Nation's youth. Of course, it all got started by the people who were willing to take risks.

There is probably nobody who has taken more of a risk than John Kennedy when he made the commitment to go to the Moon, and he said we go to the Moon not because it is easy, but because it is hard. The way to the Moon was paved by those many men and women who worked on the programs Mercury and Gemini, and then ultimately the successful Apollo program.

Of course, following that we had the tremendous success of our shuttle program. The shuttle has proven its durability and its tremendous versatility, a vehicle that can go up and come back, a vehicle that can go up, retrieve satellites, bring them back to Earth and then launch them again.

Of course, we recently all across the world were spellbound by the tremendous success of the unmanned program to Mars, the Mars Pathfinder, and the rover Sojourner and how that fascinated not only all Americans, but particularly our Nation's youth.

Now we are getting very close to the point where we will be launching and assembling our Nation's space station, a tremendous international cooperative event involving people not only here in the United States, but as well people in Europe and in Japan.

I have with me on my left a diagram of what the orbiting space station would look like. In this particular diagram, you can see the shuttle in the background there docked to the space station, and it is delivering another element.

This will be hopefully becoming a reality in the next 12 to 18 months. We have some ongoing serious problems that we need to work through with the Russians and their failure to fund their components of the space station, but if we are really going to have an ongoing, growing space program, one of the things we need to overcome is the problem of the high cost of getting payloads into orbit.

One of the ways we are hoping to do that is with this vehicle shown here in this poster, the X–33, the next reusable launch vehicle. This a vehicle that is being developed right now by Lockheed-Martin out in California, and this vehicle hopefully will dramatically reduce the cost of getting payloads into orbit.

The goal or desire is to reduce the cost by a factor of 10, because that is one of the most expensive things about us going into space, is the actual cost of getting a pound from the surface up into orbit. This vehicle will be very similar to the shuttle, in that it will go up and come back and go up and come back, but will be using new modern technology that we all hope, all of us here in the House of Representatives, but as well all of those men and women that work in our space program at places like Kennedy Space Center and Johnson Space Center, at the Jet Propulsion Center in Pasadena, CA, we hope it will dramatically lower the cost so we can do more. What do we want to do? What are our hopes and dreams in terms of the future of going up into space, and what would we like to be able to accomplish?

Well, this next poster I have here shows something that I think has some real potential. It shows men and women working on the surface of the moon and doing what? Well, one of the proposals that has been put forward is that we may be able to collect solar energy on the Moon and actually send it by microwave beams. The technology on this has all been worked out. It is not new technology. Send it to the Earth in a way that we could get electricity so we would not have to use nuclear powerplants and use fossil fuels. You are talking about a completely clean way to generate abundant forms of electrical power. If we can develop cheaper, more inexpensive ways to get payloads into orbit, it may be possible for us to reduce the cost of electricity to as little as 3 cents per kilowatt.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all our colleagues to support the Nation's space program and the tremendous promise that it holds.

SUPPORT CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES], is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, today we will continue consideration of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education amendments. I rise this afternoon to support vocational education because of its importance to this country and to my district of El Paso, TX. Carl Perkins provides Federal funding to improve the quality of vocational education and to provide access to quality vocational education to special populations which include disadvantaged students.

My home in El Paso is one of the poorest districts in this country. Many students there cannot afford to attend college. Vocational education, especially as funded through Carl Perkins, provides these students the skills that they need to move immediately into higher paying jobs, and upon graduation for some it provides the skills developed that will set them for a career path in life. For others, vocational education provides job opportunities which will allow individuals to work and to save for college in their future.

Schools in my district are using this funding to teach our kids in innovative ways and to prepare them for the working world or to continue their education and college if they so choose.

I was very disappointed to learn that the bill excludes a requirement to spend vocational education funds for programs for single parents and pregnant women. The Ysleta School System in my district has developed a very important program which could make use of such funds.

This program at Ysleta Academy of Science and Technology helps teenage parents through its Teen Parenting Academy and the Teen Parenting Program, which takes pregnant students out of the regular classroom and provides them academic and vocational education.

The Teen Parenting Academy uses State funds for academics and Carl Perkins funds for vocational education. Within 6 weeks of the child's birth, other schools would send the student back to regular classes. This program, however, allows students to complete their academic career at the Teen Parenting Academy.

Normally teenage parents, male and female, have a very high dropout rate, especially soon after their babies are born. In this program, however, students stay in school, complete their academic education and learn a vocation. The dropout rate for single parents in the Teen Parenting Academy is well below the national and local dropout average.

Continued vocational education funding for single pregnant women and single parents would help this school continue to provide these kids opportunities that they might otherwise miss, and it helps to keep these kids from falling into the vicious cycle of poverty.

The support a bipartisan amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SANCHEZ], and others, which will restore this requirement.

I believe that quality education is the key to helping children and adults in communities like mine to raise their standard of living. We must, therefore, continue to provide Federal support for important educational programs like Carl D. Perkins. The way to make this country a better, more productive society is to increase the educational level of all its residents.

A TRIBUTE TO HENRY SALVATORI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, one of the great opportunities of this job of being a Member of Congress is to officially bid farewell to great people. One such great American recently passed away. He was a teacher, a patriot, and a friend. His name was Henry Salvatori.

Many Americans have no idea who Henry Salvatori was, but to many of us who are politically active and followed behind the scenes what has happened in

America and some of the great developments in the oil industry and some of the great philanthropic works in California, we know very well who Henry Salvatori was. He was a great American, and it is an honor today for us to say a few nice words about him and to recall him for the American people, because he added so much to our way of life.

Henry Salvatori died over the Fourth of July weekend at age 96. That date was fitting, because Henry was a man whose life epitomized what being an American is all about.

He was, like many American patriots, a man who came to the United States from another country. Henry came to us from Italy. He came here when he was 5 years old, and during his lifetime, he enthusiastically embraced the ideals that are at the foundation of our country. Thus, he epitomized what being an American is all about, because we have always said that these American values are not just for the people of the United States and people born here, but being an American means those things that our Founding Fathers fought for and sought after.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I would first like to congratulate him for taking out this time to talk about a great American hero, Henry Salvatori.

I think the last point that my friend has made is really right on target here, because many have said that the very best citizens in this country are those who become American citizens by choice. Henry Salvatori really epitomized that, having been a member of Ronald Reagan's Kitchen Cabinet and having played such a key role in the conservative movement. He established at my alma mater the Salvatori Center, which has done a great deal of research.

So, rather than simply being involved in politics, not a lot of attention has been focused on his tremendous philanthropic involvement and his support of education. He has provided to my friend and to me and many others tremendous inspiration, and a great deal of advice and counsel and support.

I would simply like to join my friend and say Henry Salvatori will be sorely missed by so many of us. It is a great loss for the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, we will be benefiting from his not only generosity, but the standards that he set for us. Henry Salvatori was a man who believed in free enterprise and free speech. He believed in honor, in truth, in decency and hard work and responsibility, and he took these principles to heart and into his hands. With them he built a very successful life, and this success Henry shared with everyone.

Henry Salvatori's motto was ''whoever crosses my path, I will leave them at least as well off, or, if possible, better off than he was before.'' Henry's life is an inspiration, and he tried to follow that formula, not through one career, but through three careers. In each one of those he tried to better people's lives.

Henry's first career was in the oil business, when as a young man he pioneered a new oil exploration technology of charting geological structures by sending shock waves through the ground. Inspired by the spirit of enterprise that he found in America, Henry invested all of his assets into a company based on the seismic method and the company, Western Geophysical, grew into a multibillion dollar corporation and he became its leader. The business remains a leader today even as Henry passes on.

Henry's second career was that of an philanthropist. He believed that the best way to help others is not with Government entitlements, but through the private sector, through caring individuals who are taking the responsibility to help others. In this, he lent a hand to so many people to try to help them get the basics, but at no time trying to make any individual dependent on the Government or someone else's largess.

He demonstrated this belief time and again by bestowing gifts on universities and colleges, hospitals, children's clubs, community groups, and the arts. He also supported civic education organizations which put forth ideas of limited Government and expanded individual opportunity, ideas that guide our society today.

In particular, Henry supported the youth organizations like the Young Americans for Freedom and the Young Republicans and others. This helped a whole generation of young people meet the responsibility of picking up the torch and caring the torch of American freedom as it was passed from one generation to another. I am a beneficiary of that largess, as was Ronald Reagan and many others, as Henry Salvatori engaged himself in the political process in the United States he loved so much, and it was a tribute to all Americans at all times.

It was during his third career—his career in politics—that I was fortunate enough to come to know Henry. He never sought, won or held elected office, but Henry served his fellow Americans honorably by effectively using one of the most powerful rights that the U.S. Constitution bestows upon its citizens: free speech. He engaged in debate on State and national issues, and financially supported candidates who shared his beliefs in freedom. In hindsight, Henry spoke out for some of America's greatest leaders.

Henry became a respected and trusted advisor to Barry Goldwater, Gerald Ford, and Richard Nixon. But he was best known for launching the career of the man who has ignited the political spirit of the modern generation: Ronald Reagan.

Henry enticed Reagan to enter politics with two simple promises that to this day resonate with courage and integrity. He promised to take care of the campaign funding and promised to take nothing in return: no favor, no office, no appointment. Henry supported Reagan from the Governor's Mansion to the White House, and today the history books show he kept both promises.

He remained close to President Reagan as part of a so-called Kitchen Cabinet. Though Reagan entertained all ideas, in the end the President made the decisions. Of course, it was through the support and dedication of patriotic Americans like Henry Salvatori that Ronald Reagan ever had a chance to lead.

Henry did himself, his neighbors and this country many great services. He expanded access to our national energy supply. He funded charities that help people in need. He supported political ideas and candidates who brought our country closer to freedom, and expanded the opportunities available to average people.

In doing so Henry Salvatori crossed all our paths. And rest assured, we are much better off.

As we close this today, I would hope all people on the next Fourth of July will remember the great contributions this man made to our country.

CONGRESS NOT BEING KIND TO SMALL FAMILY FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, this Congress has not been very kind to small family farmers this year as the Agriculture Appropriation bill cuts funding by $3.7 billion over last year's bill. That cut is on top of a $10.3 billion cut last year, and an additional $5.8 billion less than the year before.

In addition, we will face an amendment later that, if it passes, small tobacco farmers could be the sole category of farmers effectively barred from obtaining Federal crop insurance, even though the purchase of crop insurance is mandatory for all farmers through the passage of the Federal Crop Insurance Reform Act of 1994.

Later today, we will also face an amendment that targets peanut farmers. That amendment will help large corporations with moneys earned at the expense of small family farmers.

But inattention to a situation that has plagued small family farmers for more than four decades is one of the biggest acts of omission of this Congress. The farmers and ranchers of America, including minority and limited resource farmers, through their labor and hard work sustain each and every one of us and maintain the lifeblood of our Nation and the world. These people do not discriminate; their products are for all of us. Therefore, it is important that we do all within our powers to ensure that each and every producer is able to farm without the additional burden of institutional racism rearing its ugly head.

Madam Speaker, it has greatly concerned me that in my home State of North Carolina, there has been a 64-percent decline in minority farmers just over the last 15 years, from 6,696 farmers in 1978 to 2,498 farmers in 1992.

There are several reasons as to why the number of minority and limited resource farmers are declining so rapidly, but the one that has been documented time and time again is the discriminatory environment present in the Department of Agriculture, which was the very agency established by the U.S. Government to accommodate and assist the special needs of all farmers and ranchers.

On February 28, 1997, the Civil Rights Action Team [CRAT] report was issued, a report entitled ''Civil Rights at the United States Department of Agriculture.'' It was done by the Civil Rights Implementation Team at USDA under the direction of Secretary Don Glickman, which documents the decades of discrimination against minorities and women within the Department. Ninety-two recommendations for change were made in the report, 13 of which required legislative action.

I have introduced a bill which seeks to implement most of the legislative recommendations within the CRAT report. This is a beginning, not complete.

My bill achieves this goal by first, changing the structure of county committees; second, changing the status of county employees from non-Federal to Federal; third, making sure that socially disadvantaged farmers can obtain credit and other assistance to maintain their farms as other farmers are able to do; and, fourth, making sure USDA has sufficient funds to carry out its loans, technical assistance, and outreach programs. The bill is H.R. 2185 and is entitled the USDA Accountability and Equity Act of 1997. I urge all of my colleagues to join in support of this bill.

Farmers and ranchers are an invaluable resource to all of us. American producers, who now represent less than 3 percent of the population, provide more than enough food and fiber to meet the needs of our Nation and most nations overseas. Twenty-two million Americans are employed in the processing, selling, trading of our national foods and fiber. Seventy-five million Americans are recipients of USDA benefits. Crops are produced, the soil and water are cared for, and the most available, highest quality and the least expensive food supply in the world is provided through agriculture and related programs.

The Food Stamp Program, the School Breakfast and Lunch Program, meat and poultry inspections and the world's greatest quantity of agricultural exports as well as the world's largest donations of foreign food aid also result from agriculture programs.

In rural communities, agriculture programs dispense loans and grants for housing, utilities, and economic development. Forest protection and preservation is another important product of such programs.

And so, Madam Speaker, I would ask my colleagues that, as we consider the Agriculture appropriations bill, think of small farmers, their families, and the communities they serve.

As debate continues on peanuts and tobacco, bear in mind the burden small farmers have carried in recent years in budget matters.

When we vote on the tobacco amendments and peanut amendment, do not be blind to who we are helping and who we are hurting.

And, finally, I urge each of my colleagues to consider cosponsoring H.R. 2185, the USDA Accountability and Equity Act of 1997.

Small family farmers, particularly socially disadvantaged and minority farmers deserve a chance.

This bill, H.R. 2185 begins to give them that chance.

Madam Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2185, the USDA an accountability act, and remember that all of our farmers, minority and disadvantaged farmers, deserve the protection of the U.S. Constitution and of this Congress.

A FRESH LOOK AT THE ANTI-TOBACCO CAMPAIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise to welcome my friends and constituents from the Greater Fall River-Fresh Air Kids Program to Washington, DC and to the U.S. Congress. This community youth group has put the phrase, Think Globally/Act Locally, into action with their efforts to combat environmental tobacco smoke. I continue to support the thousands of youthful volunteers whom the Fresh Air Kids have recruited as they use direct action to combat the tobacco industry's advertising campaign against the young people in America.

Within 25 years, tobacco-related illnesses are expected to overtake infectious disease as the leading threat to human health worldwide. In spite of this fact, tobacco companies continue to produce cigarettes at the rate of 5.5 trillion a year. That is nearly 1,000 cigarettes for every person on the planet, including our young children.

Every day, over 3,000 kids become regular smokers, despite laws in every State that prohibit tobacco use by minors. Every year, 1 million young children start using tobacco, with the average teenage smoker starting at 13 and becoming a daily smoker by 14½.

An estimated 419,000 Americans die each year from diseases caused by smoking. That number is more than die from AIDS, alcohol, illegal drugs, fires, car crashes, suicides, and murder combined. Tobacco use is the No. 1 cause of preventable disease and death in my State of Massachusetts, taking 10,000 lives every year.

Ninety percent of all adult smokers begin smoking before the age of 18. In my own family, I watched my mother-in-law, a lifetime smoker, recently become one of the hundreds of thousands of Americans to die annually from lung cancer. My grandfather continues to suffer daily from emphysema, the product of years of smoking.

In light of these sad but very real statistics, the Fresh Air Kids have made remarkable progress in the 2 years since their organization was founded by Maureen Glisson of Citizens for Citizens of Fall River, Joseph Borges of the Fall River Tobacco Control Program, and Jacqueline Goyette of the Swansea/Somerset Board of Health Tobacco Control Program.

With the encouragement and support of parent groups, educators, community leaders, and members of the media, some 3,000 volunteer youth have fueled the local movement against tobacco in their community.

The Fresh Air Kids have spoken to Massachusetts, and their voices have been heard loud and clear. In a community where 34 percent of residents smoke, these youngsters have pledged never to start, and to work to keep others tobacco-free.

Last October, I had the privilege of joining with the Fresh Air Kids in a march that celebrated their successful campaign to create the first smoke-free mall in southeastern Massachusetts. The kids marched to the mall with placards and petitions from their many supporters in the community. They obtained permission to set up a store front to display signs and collect signatures of support.

At the end of the victory march, I watched with pride as the mall manager stood up and declared this mall is smoke free due to the efforts of the Fresh Air Kids.

Currently the Fresh Air Kids are conducting a billboard campaign encouraging local businesses to buy back billboards which feature tobacco advertising like Joe Camel signs, replacing them with pro-health messages of the Fresh Air Kids. We hope these efforts will encourage Congress to address other such harmful advertising practices, such as tobacco product placement in movies.

The Fresh Air Kids understand and have articulated what I believe is the very foundation of an effective democracy, that informed and active citizens, willing to stand up for causes they care about, really can make a difference.

Here in the U.S. Congress we can try to pass laws that we hope will keep our children healthy, but it is up to the efforts and actions of grass-roots groups in every community across America to take up the fight in keeping our children safe and healthy.

The Fresh Air Kids are a shining example of what citizen action and grass-roots community effort can accomplish. That is one reason why they have been selected as a National Pilot Program by the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids, a national antismoking group that has set the standard for keeping our kids healthy.

I thank the Fresh Air Kids, their parents, their educators, the local media, the local elected officials, and fresh air boosters everywhere for making southeastern Massachusetts a better place to live and a safer place to breathe.

I look forward to many, many years of working with them and, once again, to the Fresh Air Kids, I say welcome to Washington, and I am very proud of you.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) at 2 o'clock p.m.

PRAYER

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

We know, O gracious God, that the pace of living is brisk, and we know too that we need to have time to meditate on Your good gifts to us and to reflect on how we can interpret these gifts in our daily lives.

May we use the gift of faith so our lives develop meaning and purpose; may we use the gift of hope so we can anticipate a new and brighter day; may we use the gift of love so that we know others with trust and affection and share with them our feelings and experiences. May Your gifts of faith and hope and love, O God, that have nourished us along the way be with us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAMPSON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAMPSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

LET US GIVE THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY THE TAX RELIEF THEY DESERVE

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, our liberal colleagues have used every trick in the book to avoid giving the American people a tax break. After failed attempts at scaring welfare recipients and working taxpayers, now they are trying the same on senior citizens. Well, the truth is the Republican Taxpayer Relief Act will greatly benefit seniors in their retirement years because we believe that those who have worked hard, played by the rules, and saved for retirement should be rewarded, not threatened and not penalized.

Opponents of the capital gains tax relief say, ''You're rich if you put money into mutual funds or contributed to a company retirement plan or built a small business with your own sweat and labor.'' But more than half of all taxpayers claiming capital gains have incomes less than $50,000, and many are seniors who are able live a better life by converting their lifelong investments. In fact nearly 80 percent of assets other than homes are owned by the elderly and seniors.

No more excuses, my colleagues on the left. For the first time in 16 years, let us give the people of this country a tax break they deserve.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2003

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name from cosponsorship of H.R. 2003.

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

There was no objection.

WORKING FAMILIES NEED A BREAK

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, in Congress we are working on giving Americans an $85 billion tax cut. The question is who should reap the greatest benefits from these tax cuts? Should it be the wealthiest corporations and the wealthiest Americans? Well, that is what I believe my Republican colleagues suggest. Or should it be the middle-class families who are struggling to obtain their dreams and could greatly benefit from these tax cuts?

The Republican tax plan gives tax breaks to America's most profitable corporations and wealthiest individuals while leaving middle-class families with little help. According to a Treasury Department analysis, 63 percent of the Republican tax cuts will go to the top 20 percent of the wealthiest Americans.

The Democrats' tax plan provides for middle-income families by giving a break to those families making less than $75,000 a year. It also provides a $500-per-child tax credit to middle- and low-income working families.

The Republican plan denies millions of these families such tax breaks. I believe that is wrong. Working families need a break.

PINOCCHI-NOMICS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel like we are surrounded by a bunch of Pinocchios. It appears we have two different groups of Pinocchios. On the one hand we have got some liberals who are calling millions of middle-class families rich by using something called family economic income. Family economic income is a magic formula that some ingenious bureaucrat at the Treasury Department dreamed up that means your income is actually 50 percent or more higher than people think it is. On the other hand we have got some liberals who want, now listen to this one, who want to reduce the income tax burden on people whose income tax burden is already zero. Their ideas of a tax cut is to, and now I am not making this up, is to increase the tax burden on the actual taxpayers to give tax decreases to those who pay no taxes. It is hard to know which group is growing the longest noses.

I do not know how to decide which arguments are more absurd, the family economic income liberals or the tax cut to the welfare crowd. Mr. Speaker, this is Pinocchi-nomics.

NEW DEFINITION OF INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR IS GOP EXTREMISM AT ITS ABSOLUTE WORST

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if there is any doubt about the Republicans' dedication to helping the rich at the expense of the average working American, one need only look at the new definition of independent contractor in the GOP's tax agenda. The definition has been drastically broadened to allow employers to reclassify longtime employees as independent contractors. By so doing, employers would no longer be obligated to provide health and pension coverage as well as a host of other labor protections to millions, and I repeat millions, of Americans who are now entitled to such benefits; and to add insult to injury, individuals reclassified as independent contractors will be hit with a tax increase. They will be forced to pick up the Medicare and Social Security taxes that employers were formerly responsible for paying.

On top of all this, Mr. Speaker, there are reports that Speaker GINGRICH, in an effort to placate the conservative forces that almost brought him down, may once again be gearing up to shut down the Government in the name of tax breaks for the rich.

Mr. Speaker, the GOP just does not get it. The American people are not interested in tax breaks for the rich and Government shutdowns. They are interested in job security and health care. The GOP should let honest people make an honest living and leave the definition of independent contractor alone.

TOO MUCH POWER IN THE HANDS OF GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. RYUN. Mr. Speaker, when our Founding Fathers were debating the Constitution in Philadelphia in 1787, one of the most important subjects they discussed was concerning our freedoms. Some thought too much governmental power was the threat to freedom. Others thought too much power in the hands of the majority would be a threat to the freedom of minorities. Yet others thought that too much power in the hands of factions or what we call today special interest groups was the greatest threat to the general public. Men such as Thomas Jefferson and James Madison wrote extensively about these threats to freedom. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison were right about all three of these threats to freedom.

Today I would like to call special interests or special attention to the threat to freedom that Thomas Jefferson feared the most: Too much power in the hands of Government. When the Government takes between one-fourth and one-half of everyone's income, that is too much power in the hands of Government. Let us heed the words of Thomas Jefferson and reduce the power of Government by passing the first tax package in 16 years, one that guarantees a $500-per-child tax credit, allowing families to keep more of what they earn.

TWO HUANGS DO NOT MAKE A RIGHT

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, John Huang says he never broke the law, he never raised campaign money for the Democrats while he worked for the Commerce Department. The gutless wonder now says, ''My wife did it.'' That is right. John Huang says that Jane Huang was the one that raised the half million dollars from the Indonesian landscaper that ended up having to be returned because the landscaper never filed his taxes. In addition, Jane Huang raised $12,000 from John Huang's old boss at Lippo.

And after all this, John Huang says, ''Hey, behind every good man is a good woman. I did nothing wrong.''

Jane Huang says, ''I did nothing wrong.''

Tell it like it is. Two Huangs do not make a right. If there is any consolation, my colleagues, John Huang could have blamed Jane Doe, not Jane Huang.

I yield back the balance of this Communist intrusion into our political process.

THE TIP OF THE EGG ROLL

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to talk about Chinagate figure John Huang because he had a real tough job. As the president of his holding company, Hip Hing, a subsidiary of Lippo Group, he had to work many, many long hours. See, when one's only asset is a vacant parking lot, we would not believe the pressures they are under. Nevertheless he had the time to get deeply involved in Democrat politics, and when he donated $50,000, no one raised an eye about how a vacant parking lot attendant could afford such largess. Of course they did not know he was reimbursed by his parent company, the one-half Chinese Communist government owned Lippo Group, but now even Democrats admit this was an illegal donation and apparently only the tip of the egg roll.

PROVIDE TAX RELIEF TO THE FAMILIES WHO NEED IT THE MOST

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

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, we need to pass a tax relief package that works for working Americans. By the way, the method of calculating income by the Treasury Department was indeed devised by the Reagan administration.

The tax reconciliation bill denies tax relief to millions of working families who pay Federal taxes but who earn less than $30,000 a year. These folks would be unable to claim the $500-per-child tax credit even though they pay Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about nurses, teachers, junior police officers who are trying to raise their families on limited incomes. We are talking about small business owners, family farmers, hourly wage earners. We are talking about people who put a significant percentage of their salaries toward paying Federal payroll taxes. We are talking about people who need tax relief. We are talking about people who get nothing under this tax plan.

Let us not pass up this golden opportunity to provide tax relief to families that need it most. It is time to restore the full $500-per-child credit to working families.

THE WHITE HOUSE BLAMES IT ON THE SYSTEM

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, if compromise of our national security and corruption of the electoral process itself were not involved, I would find great humor in the attempts to change the subject by the other side. Everyone knows how absolutely brilliant children can be at changing the subject, how inventive our kids can be at shifting responsibility and finding excuses for their behavior.

It is like a child playing with a dog in a way that he is not supposed to, pulling his tail or poking the dog where he hates to be poked, and then when the dog reacts by barking or biting, the child indignantly blames the dog.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what we have is the White House in clear violation of the law and then turning around and blaming the system for making them break the law. The system somehow required the Democrat National Committee to take foreign money. The system somehow required the White House to turn the White House into the mother of all fundraising operations. The system somehow required the DNC to accept drug money from drug traffickers.

Great example for our kids, Mr. Speaker; break the law then blame it all on the system.

BILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN TAX BREAKS FOR MILLIONAIRES AND NOTHING FOR DANIEL

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Republicans continue to try to sell their huge tax break for the rich by promising tax relief for middle-class Americans. But under the Republican plan millions of working Americans get no tax cuts, they only get empty promises. Let us take an example:

Daniel is a police officer. He works hard and supports his wife and four children on his $26,000 salary. He pays thousands of dollars in taxes. What does Daniel get from the Republican tax bill? Nothing, zero, zip. Democrats want to give Daniel and millions of other working families a tax cut.

What do Republicans say about Daniel? Daniel, the police officer? They said Daniel is on welfare. Billions of dollars in tax breaks for millionaires, nothing for Daniel, nothing for millions of hardworking families. That is the Republican tax bill, that is the Republican tax plan.

□ 1415

PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES ON TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a great philosophical divide between we Republicans and the Democrats when it comes to the issue of tax cuts. For the 40 years that the Democrats controlled this Chamber, they ended their regin by giving America the highest tax increase in American history. For 2 years the Republicans have controlled this Chamber, and in each Congress we have offered a tax cut for middle class families. Democrats consistently oppose these tax cuts because the less money that gets to come back to Washington by way of the IRS means there is less money available for them to spend on their favorite projects.

We Republicans believe that those people who go to work each day ought to be able to keep more of their hard-earned money to spend for their families. The choice is simply this: If American taxpayers really believe that they do not have enough common sense to spend the money they earn for their families, then they should support the liberal rhetoric that supports high taxes. If, on the other hand, families believe that they ought to be able to make spending decisions for their families, they should support the Republican plan to cut taxes for the middle class.

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week Democratic and Republican negotiators will decide what sort of tax bill to send to President Clinton. I think the choice is very clear. We can give them the Republican bill, with handouts for the rich, or the Democratic bill, with help for the rest.

As far as I am concerned parents working full time and making $30,000 a year or less need a lot more help than corporate frequent flyers who use company jets for personal use and then want a tax exemption for it.

The Democratic bill, Mr. Speaker, helps hospitals and will send 214,000 more Massachusetts students to college, and it is a far better bill than the Republican bill, that will cut $70,000,000 from Massachusetts hospitals and do very little to help students.

The Republican bill skimps on tax breaks for students. It shortchanges lower income working families, it gives enormous tax breaks to the very rich, and it gives handouts to the people who need a leg up, and for people making less than $93,000. It is a bad idea, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

TUITION CREDIT ASPECTS OF TAX PROPOSALS

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, while the Republican tax bill is loaded with benefits for the rich, it offers little to make higher education affordable for the rest of us. The Democratic tax cut, in contrast, provides a credit of up to $1,500 in tuition for 2 years of community college.

For example, if you go to a college where the tuition is $1,500 you will get a full $1,500 tax credit. Compare that to the Republican plan, where you get only 50 percent of tuition costs up to $3,000. The $1,500 tuition bill will get you only a $750 credit, or half as much.

The Democratic plan would allow employers to continue to deduct tuition expenses. Therefore, millions of workers who are hitting the books to improve their skills through employer-paid plans would be allowed to continue. The Republicans would end the deduction, and put an end to many of those programs.

That is why the Republicans are getting an F for their education plan from student and business groups nationwide. Building opportunity for more Americans by making education affordable is one of the building blocks of the Democratic tax cut. We urge the President to continue to fight for this provision as the negotiations continue.

IN OPPOSITION TO TRADE BARRIERS BETWEEN STATES

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

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the Los Angeles Times ran an insightful article about the cooperative spirit of the California delegation. In the spirit of this bipartisanship, I along with my Republican colleague, the gentleman from California, Mr. FRANK RIGGS, and the California delegation have urged the Governor of Florida to repeal an egregious law which unfairly targets small wineries.

Under this law, if a Florida resident orders a bottle of wine from another State, the vintner, the delivery person, and the unsuspecting consumer are all guilty of felonies, punishable by up to 5 years in prison and a $5,000 fine.

Mr. Speaker, none of us wants trade wars. Florida's own attorney general is against this questionable legislation. Our small wineries are critical to the economy of my district and to the entire State of California. They should not be subject to unfair and extreme trade barriers within this great Nation. Mr. Speaker, we must support the rights of small businesses and interstate commerce.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today

SHACKLEFORD BANKS WILD HORSES PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 765) to ensure maintenance of a herd of wild horses in Cape Lookout National Seashore.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 765

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Shackleford Banks Wild Horses Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. MAINTENANCE OF WILD HORSES IN CAPE LOOKOUT NATIONAL SEASHORE.

Section 5 of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes'', approved March 10, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 459g–4), is amended by inserting ''(a)'' after ''SEC. 5.'', and by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b)(1) The Secretary, in accordance with this subsection, shall allow a herd of free roaming horses in the seashore.

''(2) Within 180 days after enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Foundation for Shackleford Horses (a nonprofit corporation established under the laws of the State of North Carolina) to provide for management of free roaming horses in the seashore. The agreement shall—

''(A) provide for cost-effective management of the horses; and

''(B) allow the Foundation to adopt any of those horses that the Secretary removes from the seashore.

''(3)(A) The Secretary shall accommodate the historic population level of the free roaming horse herd in the seashore, which shall be considered to be not less than 100 horses and not more than 110 horses.

''(B) The Secretary may not remove, or assist in or permit the removal of, any free roaming horses from Federal lands within the boundaries of the seashore unless—

''(i) the number of free roaming horses in the seashore exceeds 110;

''(ii) there is an emergency or a need to protect public health and safety, as defined in the agreement under paragraph (2); or

''(iii) there is concern for the persistence and viability of the horse population that is cited in the most recent findings of annual monitoring of the horses under paragraph (4).

''(4) The Secretary shall annually monitor, assess, and make available to the public findings regarding the population structure and health of the free roaming horses in the national seashore.

''(5) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as creating liability for the United

States for any damages caused by the free roaming horses to property located inside or outside the boundaries of the seashore.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 765 was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] to ensure the maintenance of a herd of wild horses in Cape Lookout National Seashore, North Carolina. This bill is entitled ''The Shackleford Banks Wild Horses Protection Act.'' H.R. 765 would amend section 5 of the establishment act for Cape Lookout National Seashore to require the Secretary of the Interior to manage a herd of free-roaming wild horses on the island under agreement with the Foundation for Shackleford Horses, a nonprofit corporation established under the laws of North Carolina.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, the bill mandates that the National Park Service maintain a population of 100 to 110 wild horses at the seashore. The National Park Service has an inconsistent policy in managing wild horses. This bill assures that a healthy survivable herd will remain at the seashore, which has historically existed at a 100-horse level. These wild horses have been on the Outer Banks of North Carolina for over 300 years, but the National Park Service will not recognize their cultural value.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], for his diligence in moving H.R. 765 to the House floor. He was persuasive in the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, and also in the full Committee on Resources to express the concerns his North Carolina constituents have for the wild horses of the Shackleford Banks.

These wild roaming horses truly are a cultural resource that is important not only to North Carolina but to the entire Nation. H.R. 765 protects the wild roaming horses in Cape Lookout National Seashore. I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to support this worthwhile legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 765 introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], requires the National Park Service to maintain a herd of wild horses on Shackleford Banks in Cape Lookout National Seashore. I recognize and appreciate my good friend's deep personal interest in this matter, as well as the concern this issue has generated in the local community. As such, I am supporting the bill in the House today. I must note for the record that the administration has strong concerns and objections to the bill which are also shared by the National Parks and Conservation Association, a park advocacy group.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 765 has been very specific in management directives for the National Park Service, right down to specifying that the number of wild horses that must be maintained at the National Seashore be no less than 100 and no more than 110. That detailed a number may well cause some significant management problems, I am sure. We do not know the genetic diversity of this herd, nor the carrying capacity of the small barrier island on which they live. In fact, a report on the genetic diversity of the horses is due by sometime next month. We would do well to have better scientific information as we consider this legislation.

Part of the problem here, Mr. Speaker, is that the National Park Service waited for years to develop a management plan to deal with these horses. The National Park Service's handling of this matter has also raised concerns within the local community. I understand that the Foundation for Shackleford Horses, a local group, is currently reviewing a draft memorandum of understanding between the National Park Service and the foundation that will address many of the issues that H.R. 765 now involves. This I hope will be a positive step.

It seems to me that a great deal of time and effort has been spent by the National Park Service and others in this matter. Perhaps from these efforts scientific and management processes could be made to work cooperatively, and before this bill is sent to the President we would have a product that all parties could support. This legislation also has the full support of the Governor of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I support the legislation of the gentleman from North Carolina, with the hope that we will try to iron out some of the difficulties or provisions of the bill before it is sent to the White House.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], the chief sponsor of this piece of legislation, who has done such an outstanding job on it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee for their time and support in helping to secure passage of H.R. 765, the Shackleford Banks Wild Horses Protection Act.

As the chairman mentioned, H.R. 765 simply requires the National Park Service to maintain a representative herd of wild horses on Shackleford Banks, a part of the Cape Lookout National Seashore. These horses have been roaming free for over 300 years, much like their descendents, the Spanish mustangs which swam ashore after Spanish galleons wrecked off the North Carolina coast centuries ago.

As one can imagine, these horses have become a permanent part of North Carolina's heritage. Generation after generation of schoolchildren have been taught about these horses and their unique story. Some time ago the Park Service ignored the cultural importance of these horses and began initiating a management plan to reduce the size of the herd. I was amazed at the arrogance of the Park Service in its inability to work with local citizens for the best interests of the community and the region.

After witnessing the behavior and track record of the Park Service, I introduced H.R. 765 out of a concern for the health and the future of the Shackleford Banks wild horses. This legislation requires the Park Service to maintain a herd of not less than 100 horses and not more than 110 horses, a number determined by sound science, not unelected bureaucrats.

The numbers were reached in consultation with Dr. Dan Rubenstein, a professor of biology at Princeton University who has been studying these horses for more than 14 years. Also, a genetic scientist working in consultation with the Park Service also believes the herd should consist of at least 100 horses. The numbers are consistent with the number of horses that were on the island when the Park Service assumed ownership of the land back in the 1970's.

This legislation, as mentioned before, is strongly supported by North Carolina's Democratic Governor, Jim Hunt, our Democratic secretary of cultural resources, Betty McCain, and numerous local elected officials. I have even received petitions signed by schoolchildren across the State of North Carolina encouraging passage of this legislation.

After being part of the effort to save these horses, I believe this legislation is the only line of protection between the Park Service's intent to manage the vegetation instead of this national treasure.

□ 1430

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support passage of this legislation and the continuation of this historical rich herd, which is so important to the State of North Carolina.

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

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting to note that in the hearings process, maybe the gentleman will for the record, it is my understanding that this issue has been going on now for over 10 years and that very much the National Park Service was properly informed; but yet they sat on this issue for all this time until the gentleman practically was forced

to have to introduce legislation to get them moving. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, yes, sir, I appreciate the gentleman's question. I tried before this legislation was introduced to reach some common ground with the Park Service, and quite frankly I saw no sincere interest on their part, I use the word sincere, until I introduced the bill.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, so now they are more sincere than ever.

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his help, too.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I too appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina for introducing this bill. I think it is very important that we recognize that maybe these horses are not indigenous to the island but they do add and enhance the beauty and the preservation of it. I represent coastal Georgia, and we have Cumberland Island there where there is a herd of wild horses. These horses are also of Spanish descent.

The interesting thing about Cumberland Island is that the environmental community wants to eliminate the horses. Their reasoning is that it is not indigenous. Not all environmentalists feel this way, but many of them do. They come up with very specious reasons for doing so. We were told last year that the Cumberland horse population had been going up 15 percent a year for the last 10 years. Upon researching it within our office we found that the horse population on Cumberland Island had in fact been in the 250 to 260 range for about 10 years, and there was not an increase in the horse population.

We further found this year after another census was done that the horse population had in fact declined. So I think it is very important that we recognize that on wild horse populations, many times we are arguing not necessarily based on science but based on political correctness.

I believe that the gentleman from North Carolina is doing the right thing. Let the folks down there decide. Let them work with the biologists, get the emotion of the Park Service who sometimes gets involved in the politics on the politically correct politics, which says that nonindigenous animals have to go.

I think that this is a great piece of legislation, and I enthusiastically support it. I hope the day does not come when we have to have similar legislation to protect the wild horses on Cumberland Island. Right now they are being protected, but it does take a nudge to the Park Service.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SNOWBARGER]. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 765.

The question was taken.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 765, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

WARNER CANYON SKI HILL LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 1997

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1944) to provide for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon Ski Area and other land in the State of Oregon.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1944

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Warner Canyon Ski Hill Land Exchange Act of 1977''.

SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE INVOLVING WARNER CANYON SKI AREA AND OTHER LAND IN OREGON.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF EXCHANGE.—If title acceptable to the Secretary for non-Federal land described in subsection (b) is conveyed to the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey to Lake County, Oregon, subject to valid existing rights of record, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of Federal land consisting of approximately 295 acres within the Warner Canyon Ski Area of the Freemont National Forest, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Warner Canyon Ski Hill Land Exchange'', dated June 1997.

(b) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The non-Federal land referred to in subsection (a) consists of—

(1) approximately 320 acres within the Hart Mountain National Wildlife Refuge, as generally depicted on the map referred to in subsection (a); and

(2) such other parcels of land owned by Lake County, Oregon, within the Refuge as are necessary to ensure that the values of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under this section are approximately equal in value, as determined by appraisals.

(c) ACCEPTABLE TITLE.—Title to the non-Federal land conveyed to the United States under subsection (a) shall be such title as is acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior, in conformance with title approval standards applicable to Federal land acquisitions.

(d) VALID EXISTING RIGHTS.—The conveyance shall be subject to such valid existing rights of record as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall process the land exchange authorized by this section in the manner provided in subpart 2200 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(f) MAP.—The map referred to in subsection (a) shall be on file and available for inspection in 1 or more local offices of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyances under this section as either Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA], each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

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

H.R. 1944, introduced by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], provides for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon Ski Area and other land in the State of Oregon. I commend Chairman BOB SMITH for bringing this bill before us today.

H.R. 1944 deeds approximately 290 acres of Forest Service land comprising the Warner Canyon Ski Hill to Lake County, Oregon. In exchange, Lake County will deed approximately 320 acres of land that is currently owned by Lake County within the Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The specific acreage offered by Lake County will be dependent upon an appraisal of all the lands to determine what amounts to an equal value trade in this exchange.

The Warner Canyon Ski Hill has been operated by the nonprofit group, the Fremont Highlanders Ski Club, since 1938. It is one of America's last nonprofit ski hills, the kind I learned to ski on, and I love them. The Warner Canyon Ski Hill anticipates many benefits by the trade including the reduction in the cost of liability insurance as well as better management of the ski area. The Forest Service will benefit by reducing the cost of managing this recreational property.

H.R. 1944 is noncontroversial and supported by all interested parties. This legislation is good for national taxpayers as well as the local taxpayers in Oregon. I would urge support for this bill.

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

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the legislation introduced by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH]. H.R. 1944 directs the Forest Service to convey about 295 acres of Federal land within the Warner Canyon Ski Area of Fremont National Forest to Lake County, Oregon. In exchange, the county would convey to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service about 320 acres of inholdings within the Hart Mountain National Wildlife Refuge. Significantly, the bill provides that this exchange would be of equal value, subject to appraisals, and under terms acceptable to both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior.

The administration has support and testified in support of this legislation. The Forest Service property contains a small ski area that costs the Federal Government about $10,000 per year to administer but generates only $400 in ski fees to the U.S. Treasury. The proposed exchange appears to be a good deal, Mr. Speaker, both for the Lake County, which wants the ski area to continue to operate for the benefit of community residents, and for the Federal Government, which would receive additional lands for the wildlife refuge.

Mr. Speaker, I do compliment the gentleman from Oregon on his legislation and urge Members to support this bill.

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

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH].

(Mr. SMITH of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time and my dear friend, the gentleman from American Samoa, for his support. This is, as has been identified, a very small land exchange which can assist in a time of need, a very small county in the southern part of the State of Oregon in the southeast suffering from what we have suffered from in the West in many areas, the problem with the lack of timber receipts because we cannot harvest timber any longer for various reasons, including the spotted owl and other Federal management objections.

Just to give an example, this little county received about $6.5 million in 1993 from forest receipts. Now it is receiving about $1.2 million from forest receipts. And with 75 percent of the county owned by the Federal Government, we can see the pinch that results in how in the world these people can provide for their infrastructure. One opportunity is with a little more tourism. One of those opportunities is with this land exchange, which could in fact expand the ski area.

I thank both of my friends for helping in this effort for a very good group of people and a very small county in America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for allowing this bipartisan, noncontroversial bill to come to the floor today. H.R. 1944 is supported by Oregon Senators RON WYDEN and GORDON SMITH, the Forest Service, and the good people of Lake County, OR. Hopefully, with your assistance, we can move this bill in an expeditious manner so that Lake County will enjoy its benefits when the ski season begins again in the fall.

H.R. 1944 deeds approximately 290 acres of Fremont National Forest land from the U.S. Forest Service, comprising the Warner Canyon Ski Hill, to Lake County. In exchange, the county will deed roughly 320 acres of land within the Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge to the Federal Government. The specific acreage offered by the county will be determined upon appraisal of all lands in order to facilitate an equal trade.

Lake County has been devastated over the last 4 years by this administration's policy of drastically reducing the amount of available timber in the Northwest. In 1993, there was $6.5 million brought into the Lake County treasury from timber receipts. By last year that figure had dropped to $1.2 million. This has had an extremely negative effect on local schools, law enforcement and county services. In addition, mills have been closed and hundreds of good, hard-working people have been forced to relocate and find new jobs causing further erosion of the tax base. This bill will provide a shot in the arm to the local economy by increasing seasonal employment and boosting tourism.

The Warner Canyon Ski Hill has been operated by the nonprofit Fremont Highlanders Ski Club since 1938. It is one of America's last nonprofit ski hills and has 780 vertical feet of skiing and one lift—a T-bar. The ski area is about 5 miles from the town of Lakeview, which has a population of roughly 2,500.

The benefits of transferring this small parcel of Federal land to the county are numerous. First, the Fremont National Forest will save about $2,600 per year. The cost of administering the ski area permit for Warner Canyon is about $3,000 per year, while the revenues generated by the ski area average about $400 annually. The U.S. Treasury is forced to absorb that additional cost. Second, the Fremont Highlanders Ski Club is currently responsible for providing liability insurance for Warner Canyon Ski Hill. Unfortunately, because it is Forest Service land, the Federal Government is forced to be coinsured on the property. This raises the cost of annual liability insurance to about $8,000. If the land were deeded to Lake County, which already has a liability insurance policy, this cost would be negated.

In short, H.R. 1944 is a ''win-win'' proposal that will benefit the U.S. Treasury, Lake County, and the recreationists who have been enjoying Warner Canyon Ski Hill for decades. I urge my colleagues in the House to support the bill.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1944.

The question was taken.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PROVIDING FOR MAINTENANCE OF DAMS IN EMIGRANT WILDERNESS

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1663) to clarify the intent of the Congress in Public Law 93–632 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to provide for the maintenance of 18 concrete dams and weirs that were located in the Emigrant Wilderness at the time the wilderness area was designated as wilderness in that Public Law, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1663

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING DAMS AND WEIRS, EMIGRANT WILDERNESS, STANISLAUS NATIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall enter into an agreement with a non-Federal entity, under which the entity will retain, maintain, and operate at private expense the 18 concrete dams and weirs located within the boundaries of the Emigrant Wilderness in the Stanislaus National Forest, California, as designated by section 2(b) of Public Law 93–632 (88 Stat. 2154; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note). The Secretary shall require the entity to operate and maintain the dams and weirs at the level of operation and maintenance that applied to such dams and weirs before the date of the enactment of such Act, January 3, 1975.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1663, introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], clarifies the intent of Congress in Public Law 93–632 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to provide for the maintenance of 18 concrete and rock impoundment facilities. These structures were located in the Emigrant Wilderness area at the time the wilderness area was designated as wilderness in that public law, and they need to be properly maintained.

Additionally, it should be noted for the record that the maintenance of the dams and weirs will be done in accordance with the Wilderness Act of 1964. It is not the intention of the author nor of the committee to allow for motorized vehicles to be used to maintain these structures.

I would like to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] for his work on bringing this measure to the House. This is a good bill. It protects the interests of the constituents of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] while at the same time it preserves the intent of the original law that created the Emigrant Wilderness area. I urge Members to support this bill.

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

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation sponsored by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

While the concept of dams in the wilderness area may raise concerns, this bill addresses some very unique circumstances. The 18 small dams and weirs at issue were in existence in 1975 at the time Congress designated the Emigrant Wilderness within the Stanislaus National Forest in California. The Forest Service has released a draft management plan that would provide for the continued maintenance of 7 of the 18 structures. The bill, however, directs that all 18 structures be repaired and maintained.

Initially, Mr. Speaker, the Forest Service opposed this legislation primarily because they were concerned about the added costs of repairing and maintaining of these facilities. In response to their testimony, the committee adopted a substitute to clarify that the maintenance and operation of these facilities shall be at private expense.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that we are grandfathering preexisting uses and not providing a blanket exemption from the Wilderness Act in this legislation. This bill is about people with backpacks, not bulldozers, who will be involved in the repair and maintenance of these small structures. The legislation does not contemplate that motorized vehicles of any kind will be allowed in the wilderness area.

The small lakes created by these dams receive heavy use by recreationists, including fishermen. A positive aspect of this bill is that the recreational uses are more widely dispersed, rather than concentrated in fewer areas as would be the case if the dams were allowed to deteriorate.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] for his comments. My colleague is indeed right; the maintenance chores will not be done by bulldozers but rather individuals with backpacks.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1663, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bills just considered, H.R. 1663 and H.R. 1944.

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

There was no objection.

TRADEMARK LAW TREATY IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1661) to implement the provisions of the Trademark Law Treaty, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1661

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Trademark Law Treaty Implementation Act''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCE TO THE TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.

For purposes of this Act, the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes'', approved July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.), shall be referred to as the ''Trademark Act of 1946''.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION; VERIFICATION.

(a) APPLICATION FOR USE OF TRADEMARK.—Section 1(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''SECTION 1. (a)(1) The owner of a trademark used in commerce may request registration of its trademark on the principal register hereby established by paying the prescribed fee and filing in the Patent and Trademark Office an application and a verified statement, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, and such number of specimens or facsimiles of the mark as used as may be required by the Commissioner.

''(2) The application shall include specification of the applicant's domicile and citizenship, the date of the applicant's first use of the mark, the date of the applicant's first use of the mark in commerce, the goods in connection with which the mark is used, and a drawing of the mark.

''(3) The statement shall be verified by the applicant and specify that—

''(A) the person making the verification believes that he or she, or the juristic person in whose behalf he or she makes the verification, to be the owner of the mark sought to be registered;

''(B) to the best of the verifier's knowledge and belief, the facts recited in the application are accurate;

''(C) the mark is in use in commerce; and

''(D) to the best of the verifier's knowledge and belief, no other person has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the goods of such other person, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive, except that, in the case of every application claiming concurrent use, the applicant shall—

''(i) state exceptions to the claim of exclusive use; and

''(ii) shall specify, to the extent of the verifier's knowledge—

''(I) any concurrent use by others;

''(II) the goods on or in connection with which and the areas in which each concurrent use exists;

''(III) the periods of each use; and

''(IV) the goods and area for which the applicant desires registration.

''(4) The applicant shall comply with such rules or regulations as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall promulgate rules prescribing the requirements for the application and for obtaining a filing date herein.''.

(b) APPLICATION FOR BONA FIDE INTENTION TO USE TRADEMARK.—Subsection (b) of section 1 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b)(1) A person who has a bona fide intention, under circumstances showing the good faith of such person, to use a trademark in commerce may request registration of its trademark on the principal register hereby established by paying the prescribed fee and filing in the Patent and Trademark Office an application and a verified statement, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

''(2) The application shall include specification of the applicant's domicile and citizenship, the goods in connection with which the applicant has a bona fide intention to use the mark, and a drawing of the mark.

''(3) The statement shall be verified by the applicant and specify—

''(A) that the person making the verification believes that he or she, or the juristic person in whose behalf he or she makes the verification, to be entitled to use the mark in commerce;

''(B) the applicant's bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce;

''(C) that, to the best of the verifier's knowledge and belief, the facts recited in the application are accurate; and

''(D) that, to the best of the verifier's knowledge and belief, no other person has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the

goods of such other person, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive.

Except for applications filed pursuant to section 44, no mark shall be registered until the applicant has met the requirements of subsections (c) and (d) of this section.

''(4) The applicant shall comply with such rules or regulations as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall promulgate rules prescribing the requirements for the application and for obtaining a filing date herein.''.

(c) CONSEQUENCE OF DELAYS.—Paragraph (4) of section 1(d) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051(d)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) The failure to timely file a verified statement of use under paragraph (1) or an extension request under paragraph (2) shall result in abandonment of the application, unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the delay in responding was unintentional, in which case the time for filing may be extended, but for a period not to exceed the period specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) for filing a statement of use.''.

SEC. 4. REVIVAL OF ABANDONED APPLICATION.

Section 12(b) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1062(b)) is amended in the last sentence by striking ''unavoidable'' and by inserting ''unintentional''.

SEC. 5. DURATION OF REGISTRATION; CANCELLATION; AFFIDAVIT OF CONTINUED USE; NOTICE OF COMMISSIONER'S ACTION.

Section 8 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1058) is amended to read as follows:

''DURATION

''SEC. 8. (a) Each registration shall remain in force for 10 years, except that the registration of any mark shall be canceled by the Commissioner for failure to comply with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, upon the expiration of the following time periods, as applicable:

''(1) For registrations issued pursuant to the provisions of this Act, at the end of 6 years following the date of registration.

''(2) For registrations published under the provisions of section 12(c), at the end of 6 years following the date of publication under such section.

''(3) For all registrations, at the end of each successive 10-year period following the date of registration.

''(b) During the 1-year period immediately preceding the end of the applicable time period set forth in subsection (a), the owner of the registration shall pay the prescribed fee and file in the Patent and Trademark Office—

''(1) an affidavit setting forth those goods or services recited in the registration on or in connection with which the mark is in use in commerce and such number of specimens or facsimiles showing current use of the mark as may be required by the Commissioner; or

''(2) an affidavit setting forth those goods or services recited in the registration on or in connection with which the mark is not in use in commerce and showing that any such nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark.

''(c) The owner of the registration may make the submissions required by this section, or correct any deficiency in a timely filed submission, within a grace period of 6 months after the end of the applicable time period set forth in subsection (a). Such submission must be accompanied by a surcharge prescribed therefor. If any submission required by this section filed during the grace period is deficient, the deficiency may be corrected within the time prescribed after notification of the deficiency. Such submission must be accompanied by a surcharge prescribed therefor.

''(d) Special notice of the requirement for affidavits under this section shall be attached to each certificate of registration and notice of publication under section 12(c).

''(e) The Commissioner shall notify any owner who files 1 of the affidavits required by this section of the Commissioner's acceptance or refusal thereof and, in the case of a refusal, the reasons therefor.

''(f) If the registrant is not domiciled in the United States, the registrant shall designate by a written document filed in the Patent and Trademark Office the name and address of some person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with that person or mailing to that person a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.''.

SEC. 6. RENEWAL OF REGISTRATION.

Section 9 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1059) is amended to read as follows:

''RENEWAL OF REGISTRATION

''SEC. 9. (a) Subject to the provisions of section 8, each registration may be renewed for periods of 10 years at the end of each successive 10-year period following the date of registration upon payment of the prescribed fee and the filing of a written application, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such application may be made at any time within 1 year before the end of each successive 10-year period for which the registration was issued or renewed, or it may be made within a grace period of 6 months after the end of each successive 10-year period, upon payment of a fee and surcharge prescribed therefor. If any application filed during the grace period is deficient, the deficiency may be corrected within the time prescribed after notification of the deficiency, upon payment of a surcharge prescribed therefor.

''(b) If the Commissioner refuses to renew the registration, the Commissioner shall notify the registrant of the Commissioner's refusal and the reasons therefor.

''(c) If the registrant is not domiciled in the United States, the registrant shall designate by a written document filed in the Patent and Trademark Office the name and address of some person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with that person or mailing to that person a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.''.

SEC. 7. RECORDING ASSIGNMENT OF MARK.

Section 10 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1060) is amended to read as follows:

''ASSIGNMENT

''SEC. 10. (a) A registered mark or a mark for which an application to register has been filed shall be assignable with the good will of the business in which the mark is used, or with that part of the good will of the business connected with the use of and symbolized by the mark. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, no application to register a mark under section 1(b) shall be assignable prior to the filing of an amendment under section 1(c) to bring the application into conformity with section 1(a) or the filing of the verified statement of use under section 1(d), except for an assignment to a successor to the business of the applicant, or portion thereof, to which the mark pertains, if that business is ongoing and existing. In any assignment authorized by this section, it shall not be necessary to include the good will of the business connected with the use of and symbolized by any other mark used in the business or by the name or style under which the business is conducted. Assignments shall be by instruments in writing duly executed. Acknowledgment shall be prima facie evidence of the execution of an assignment, and when the prescribed information reporting the assignment is recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office, the record shall be prima facie evidence of execution. An assignment shall be void against any subsequent purchaser for valuable consideration without notice, unless the prescribed information reporting the assignment is recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office within 3 months after the date of the subsequent purchase or prior to the subsequent purchase. The Patent and Trademark Office shall maintain a record of information on assignments, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

''(b) An assignee not domiciled in the United States shall designate by a written document filed in the Patent and Trademark Office the name and address of some person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with that person or mailing to that person a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.''.

SEC. 8. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS; COPY OF FOREIGN REGISTRATION.

Section 44 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1126) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking ''23, or 44(e) of this Act'' and inserting ''or 23 of this Act or under subsection (e) of this section''; and

(B) in paragraphs (3) and (4), by striking ''this subsection (d)'' and inserting ''this subsection''; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: ''Such applicant shall submit, within such time period as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, a certification or a certified copy of the registration in the country of origin of the applicant.''.

SEC. 9. MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS.

(a) CANCELLATION OF FUNCTIONAL MARKS.—Section 14(3) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1064(3)) is amended by inserting ''or is functional,'' before ''or has been abandoned''.

(b) INCONTESTABILITY DEFENSES.—Section 33(b) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1115(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) That the mark is functional; or''.

(c) REMEDIES IN CASES OF DILUTION OF FAMOUS MARKS.—

(1) INJUNCTIONS.—(A) Section 34(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1116(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''section 43(a)'' and inserting ''subsection (a) or (c) of section 43''.

(B) Section 43(c)(2) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1125(c)(2)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting ''as set forth in section 34'' after ''relief''.

(2) DAMAGES.—Section 35(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1117(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''or a violation under section 43(a),'' and inserting ''a violation under section 43(a), or a willful violation under section 43(c),''.

(3) DESTRUCTION OF ARTICLES.—Section 36 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1118) is amended in the first sentence—

(A) by striking ''or a violation under section 43(a),'' and inserting ''a violation under section 43(a), or a willful violation under section 43(c),''; and

(B) by inserting after ''in the case of a violation of section 43(a)'' the following: ''or a willful violation under section 43(c)''.

SEC. 10. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect—

(1) on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(2) upon the entry into force of the Trademark Law Treaty with respect to the United States,

whichever occurs first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1661, the Trademark Law Treaty Implementation Act. The Trademark Law Treaty Implementation Act, popularly known as TLT, sets a ceiling on certain filing and renewal requirements which its member nations may not exceed. Here in the United States, it removes some of the procedural hurdles to processing trademark applications and renewals thereby streamlining the process for the users.

Additionally, the bill we are considering today contains a minor housekeeping amendment which seeks to harmonize the remedy provisions passed last year as part of the trademark dilution statute, with the other remedy provisions of the Latham Act. There is no opposition to the bill as amended, and it is supported by the International Trademark Association and the American Intellectual Property Law Association.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bipartisan bill.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] and include his statement for the RECORD.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1661, the Trademark Law Treaty Implementation Act, a measure recently passed out of the House Judiciary Committee with unanimous support.

This act, a long awaited implementation of a treaty entered into previously, is supported without objection. The import of this measure is that it would put the United States squarely behind the important goal of international uniformity of trademark registration requirements, a goal which, when achieved, will redound to the overwhelming benefit of Americans, who are by far lead producers of trademarks in the world.

I and the other Democrats on the Judiciary Committee strongly support this measure. I commend Chairman COBLE, ranking member BARNEY FRANK, and the other members and staff of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee for moving this legislation forward, and I urge its adoption today under suspension of the rules.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA], and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1661, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

CALLING FOR UNITED STATES INITIATIVE SEEKING JUST AND PEACEFUL RESOLUTION OF SITUATION ON CYPRUS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 81) calling for a United States initiative seeking a just and peaceful resolution of the situation on Cyprus, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 81

Whereas the Republic of Cyprus has been divided and occupied by foreign forces since 1974 in violation of United Nations resolutions;

Whereas the international community, the Congress, and United States administrations have called for an end to the status quo on Cyprus, considering that it perpetuates an unacceptable violation of international law and fundamental human rights affecting all the people of Cyprus, and undermines significant United States interests in the Eastern Mediterranean region;

Whereas the international community and the United States Government have repeatedly called for the speedy withdrawal of all foreign forces from the territory of Cyprus;

Whereas there are internationally acceptable means, including the demilitarization of Cyprus and the establishment of a multinational force, to ensure the security of both communities in Cyprus;

Whereas the House of Representatives has endorsed the objective of the total demilitarization of Cyprus;

Whereas during the past year tensions on Cyprus have dramatically increased, with violent incidents occurring along ceasefire lines at a level not reached since 1974;

Whereas recent events in Cyprus have heightened the potential for armed conflict in the region involving two North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, Greece and Turkey, which would threaten vital United States interests in the already volatile Eastern Mediterranean area and beyond;

Whereas a peaceful, just, and lasting solution to the Cyprus problem would greatly benefit the security, and the political, economic, and social well-being of all Cypriots, as well as contribute to improved relations between Greece and Turkey;

Whereas a lasting solution to the Cyprus problem would also strengthen peace and stability in the Eastern Mediterranean and serve important interests of the United States;

Whereas the United Nations has repeatedly stated the parameters for such a solution, most recently in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1092, adopted on December 23, 1996, with United States support;

Whereas the prospect of the accession by Cyprus to the European Union, which the United States has actively supported, could serve as a catalyst for a solution to the Cyprus problem:

Whereas President Bill Clinton has pledged that in 1997 the United States will ''play a heightened role in promoting a resolution in Cyprus''; and

Whereas united States leadership will be a crucial factor in achieving a solution to the Cyprus problem, and increased United States involvement in the search for this solution will contribute to a reduction of tensions on Cyprus; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) reaffirms its view that the status quo on Cyprus is unacceptable and detrimental to the interests of the United States in the Eastern Mediterranean and beyond;

(2) considers lasting peace and stability on Cyprus could be best secured by a process of complete demilitarization leading to the withdrawal of all foreign occupation forces, the cessation of foreign arms transfer to Cyprus, and providing for alternative internationally acceptable and effective security arrangements as negotiated by the parties;

(3) welcomes and supports the commitment by President Clinton to give increased attention to Cyprus and make the search for a solution a priority of United States foreign policy;

(4) encourages the President to launch an early substantive initiative, in close coordination with the United Nations, the European Union, and interested governments to promote a speedy resolution of the Cyprus problem on the basis of international law, the provisions of relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions, democratic principles, including respect for human rights, and in accordance with the norms and requirements for accession to the European Union;

(5) calls upon the parties to lend their full support and cooperation to such an initiative; and

(6) requests the President to report actions taken to give effect to the objectives set forth in paragraph (4) in the bimonthly report on Cyprus transmitted to the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr.

FALEOMAVAEGA] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, we marked the 23d anniversary of the invasion and occupation of Cyprus. The Cyprus problem is a situation that cries out for just redress and an end to the occupation of Cyprus by foreign troops. Although the world has dramatically changed for the better during this decade, Cyprus remains as a pressing international problem. Indeed, Cyprus has almost become a code word for intractability in the realm of diplomacy.

I have been encouraged, nevertheless, by recent statements from high-level officials of the Clinton administration, including the President himself, that indicate that there may be new willingness on the part of our Government to exert its leadership in promoting a solution to the Cyprus problem.

Indeed, the President's appointment of Ambassador Richard Holbrooke as special envoy for Cyprus is a sign of a renewed commitment to finding a solution on the part of the administration. I strongly believe that our Government should invest some of our prestige in such an effort, because Americans have always supported justice and because we have significant interests that can be affected by instability in Cyprus. It is for these reasons that I introduced this resolution that is now before the House.

Over the past year, there have been a number of events and incidents that have increased tensions in Cyprus and in the eastern Mediterranean region. There is a distressing trend of increased militarization of the island, already one of the most highly militarized parts of the globe.

There are, however, also positive developments that could have the ability to catalyze a peaceful and just solution. One of these is the pending negotiation on Cyprus' accession to the European Union that may begin by the end of the year.

The Foreign Ministers in Greece and Turkey recently agreed on resolving disputes between them through peaceful means. There has been increased diplomatic activity in Europe and in the United Nations to bring the two sides together. In short, the risks of inaction far outweigh those of taking the initiative on Cyprus now.

This resolution points out the interests and developments regarding the Cyprus situation and urges the President to keep his pledge to give increased attention to Cyprus. I am pleased to be joined by a group of distinguished cosponsors, including the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], and in excess of 50 other distinguished Members of the House who have shared an interest in Cyprus and their concern over what may arise from a continued stalemate on the island.

It is our hope that this resolution will help spur the resolve of the Clinton administration to indeed make 1997 the year of Cyprus. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to help us send a signal of our commitment to resolving the Cyprus problem by adopting House Concurrent Resolution 81.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 81, calling for a United States initiative in seeking a just and peaceful resolution of the situation in Cyprus.

I am pleased to announce that the ranking Democratic member of the full Committee on International Relations is an original cosponsor of this important and timely resolution. I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], our distinguished chairman, for his foresight and leadership in moving this legislation forward.

Earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration announced that it intends to give high priority this year to move a settlement of Cyprus forward, easing Greek-Turkish relations. I agree with the administration that now is the time to try to move the peace process in Cyprus forward. That is why the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and the chairman are original cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 81, which puts the Congress firmly behind an energetic United States leadership role in seeking a realistic solution to the Cyprus situation.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the emphasis in the resolutions is on the key role for United States' leadership on Cyprus and calls for an early substantive initiative by the administration to promote a Cyprus settlement. This tracks with longstanding congressional concerns that have been expressed to a series of administrations.

The violence in Cyprus last summer, and the problems this year as a result of arms acquisitions, have underscored the long-held view of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] that progress in Cyprus is long overdue and should be a high United States priority. It remains our hope and expectation that a firm, fair, and lasting settlement of the Cyprus dispute can be reached in the coming months.

I also want to applaud the Clinton administration's recent appointment of Richard Holbrooke as United States special envoy for Cyprus. His appointment is the best signal yet that the Clinton administration intends to give high priority this year to a settlement on Cyprus and moving Greek-Turkish relations forward.

It has always been my firm belief, Mr. Speaker, that only high level sustained United States attention will convince all parties, and particularly the people of Turkey, to resolve the Cyprus issue. Substantively, Mr. Speaker, the outlines of a settlement have been on the table for some time, with the United Nations plan for a bicommunal, bizonal federation.

The floor consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is coming at a time of positive developments in the eastern Mediterranean region in Cyprus. Earlier this month, direct talks between Cyprus President Clerides and Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash, under the auspices of the U.N. Secretary General Annan, were held in New York. These were the first face-to-face talks in more than 2 years. A followup round of talks will hopefully be held in Geneva next month.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, in a recent NATO summit in Madrid, the Greek and Turkish Foreign Ministers at a meeting with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright undertook an explicit commitment to settle disputes by peaceful means without further use of force. Turkey remains the key to further progress, Mr. Speaker. Only Turkey can push Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash toward a settlement.

We must hope that a new government in Turkey under Prime Minister Yilmaz will be prepared to play a pivotal role in the process that other Turkish leaders have promised in the past. In the final analysis, it is in U.S. interests, as well as for the people in the region, that we find a just and lasting solution to treat these problems.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that House Concurrent Resolution 81 will make a helpful contribution to this process. I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support this resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York, Mr. GILMAN, for yielding to me. And of course I also wanted to commend the chairman, the gentleman from New York, Mr. GILMAN, for all the work that he has done on this important issue for many, many years. Mr. Speaker, we live in a world where regional conflicts of one sort or another are still prevalent. However, time and time again, we have seen the concepts of freedom and democracy triumph over tyranny and oppression.

Nowhere was this more profoundly demonstrated than with the change of

the Berlin Wall in late 1989 and with the withering of communism that followed. A divided city was reunited, families separated for decades enjoyed emotional unions. In the West, we congratulated ourselves because our persistence and way of life had finally prevailed. But Berlin was not the only divided city in the world, nor was Germany the only divided country. It is our sad duty to once again bring the plight of Cyprus to the attention of the American people.

□ 1500

In 1974, Turkey invaded the Island of Cyprus. Some 6,000 Turkish troops and over 100 tanks forcibly seized approximately 40 percent of the island, including half of the capital city, Nicosia. In the process, they displaced and divided thousands of Greek Cypriot families. To this day 1,619 people are still missing, including five U.S. citizens.

Today I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 81, which calls for a United States initiative seeking a just and peaceful resolution of the situation in Cyprus. For 23 years, the United Nations has stationed troops on the island to prevent the spread of violence, and yet the violence has not abated. Therefore, I do not believe that a lasting peace settlement can be negotiated without U.S. leadership.

Some wonder why we should involve ourselves in the problems of nations as distant as Cyprus. To them I would point out Cyprus is a vital strategic and economic importance to the United States. During the Persian Gulf war, Cyprus served as a major staging point for our military operations. In peacetime it serves as a critical listening post in the Middle East.

Cyprus is also close to the shipping lanes of the Aegean Sea and the Suez Canal, which is the gateway for oil and other materials. These shipping lanes are essential to the stability of the entire region and the rest of the world.

In the national archives here in Washington, DC, there is a piece of the Berlin Wall on display which was sent to former President Ronald Reagan by a young American. It is my sincere hope that someday in the near future we might be able to display a peace of the wall that marks the green line which divides Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me and the gentleman from New York, Chairman GILMAN, in demonstrating our intentions with regards to Cyprus by unequivocally supporting this concurrent resolution. We must send a signal to the world that the division of a nation and the suppression of fundamental human rights are not to be tolerated. A just and peaceful resolution to the issue is a real possibility, but only with the leadership of the United States.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for his support and his remarks. He has been a longtime proponent of Cyprus and bringing peace to the region.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this concurrent resolution. I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the committee, and also the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member, as well as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], and others, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], other Members of the Congressional Caucus on Helenic Issues that have been keeping this issue in the spotlight.

For almost a quarter of a century now the people of Cyprus have lived on a divided, militarized, and occupied island. On July 9 of this year high level negotiations between some of the key principals involved once again got underway, and we are very happy with that development. At the invitation of the Secretary General of the United Nations, the President of Cyprus and the Turkish Cypriot leader met face to face for the first time in 3 years. This is certainly a very positive development, as was the joint statement released by Greece and Turkey the day before the talks in New York began, in which the two countries vowed to ''settle their disputes by peaceful means, based on mutual consent and without use of force or threat of force.''

As everyone is aware by now, I know it has been mentioned that President Clinton recently signaled his commitment to resolving the problem in Cyprus by appointing Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, the architect of the Dayton peace accords, as the Special Emissary to Cyprus, and I want to congratulate the President for signaling his serious interest in the Cyprus issue through the appointment of Ambassador Holbrooke.

Because the Cyprus problem is clearly one of illegal invasion and occupation, there are a number of conditions I have mentioned before, and I want to stress again, that I believe the United States must pressure the Turkish Government to accept. The first of these concerns the issue of sovereignty. Any solution reached must be consistent with U.N. Resolution 750 of 1992, which states,

> A Cyprus settlement must be based on a State of Cyprus with a single sovereignty and international personality and a single citizenship, with its independence and territorial integrity safeguarded.

To facilitate the goal of a State of Cyprus with a single sovereignty, I believe the United States should push for the establishment of a federation, with two federated states, one Greek Cypriot and one Turkish Cypriot, administered by a federal government. This would be much like the constitutional democracy of the United States, where the states receive their powers from a federal government. What I am saying is a rotating Presidency and/or separate sovereignties for the Greek and Turkish communities should be viewed as completely unacceptable proposals.

Second, Mr. Speaker, any solution to the Cyprus problem must be based on internationally accepted standards of human rights. Simply stated, all Cypriots must be guaranteed three basic freedoms, freedom of movement, property and settlement.

Third, all foreign troops should be withdrawn from the island. In 1994, President Clerides proposed the demilitarization of the island as a precursor to meaningful negotiations. In 1995, this House went on record in support of this peaceful gesture when it passed the Cyprus Demilitarization Act.

The United States must use its influence with the Turkish government to facilitate the removal of the Turkish occupying force and the introduction of NATO or U.N. peacekeeping forces, if necessary, so negotiations can begin in earnest.

Last, I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, that other matters, such as Cypriot accession to the European Union, must also be pursued. I know some of my colleagues have mentioned this. Integrating Cyprus into the framework of the European Union would demonstrate unequivocally to Turkey that its only real option is to accept a sovereign, independent Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, the United States should embrace the opportunity to make progress, but we must not reach an agreement just for the sake of reaching an agreement. It is tragic that Cyprus has been divided for 23 years now. We will, however, wait as long as we must to bring true and lasting freedom to the Cypriot people.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. WEYGAND].

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to echo the comments of my fellow colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], who spoke so eloquently about the situation.

Mr. Speaker, in July 1974 Turkish troops advanced into the Republic of Cyprus, and since then Cyprus has been divided. Over the past 23 years, there have been several instances where actions have led to increased tensions resulting in little progress toward resolving the conflict over Cyprus.

Cyprus remains divided today, at a time when we have seen significant progress in the proliferation of democracy throughout this great world. In the last 10 years we have seen the fall of the Berlin Wall, the lifting of the Iron Curtain, the advancement of the peace process in the Middle East, yet, as has been mentioned just recently, the green line still remains across the Island of Cyprus.

It is my hope that the green line will soon be erased and Cyprus will be added to the list of places where the conflict has been resolved and democracy flourishes. In light of the anticipated accession of Cyprus into the European Union, the appointment of

Richard Holbrooke as special envoy and renewed peace talks, I think the opportunity for progress has presented itself clearly before us now.

It is my hope that both sides will realize the economic and political importance of resolving their differences. With the cooperation of Ambassador Holbrooke, the United Nations and our President, I believe that the peace talks can reunify the Island of Cyprus. However, the agreement must abide by applicable international law, should include provisions for strengthening democracy, should protect human rights, and take into account the relevant United Nations security resolutions.

A unified Cyprus will result in economic and political stability. In the Middle East we have seen that kind of work be very fruitful. Here in Cyprus we want it to be the same.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues and applaud this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on International Relations for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of this resolution and urge its passage.

Twenty-three years ago Turkish troops invaded Cyprus and divided a nation and community. Today, 1,619 people remain missing, including 5 Americans. A barbed-wire fence divides the northern part of Cyprus from its southern portion, separating communities and families that had lived together in peace and harmony for generations. The longer the world waits, the harder it will be to reconcile these communities in the future. The time to act is now, the status quo is simply unacceptable.

In order to make progress, we will need to have willingness on all sides of this issue. The Republic of Cyprus has announced its willingness to delay the purchase of defensive missile systems pending advances in negotiations. I am hopeful that Turkey will also act in this manner and can begin by withdrawing its troops and by stopping the unhealthy rhetoric by its leaders toward Cyprus.

There are many players in the complicated issue of Cyprus. I am hopeful that this resolution being debated today will put pressure on all parties to roll up their sleeves and return stability to that part of the world.

The recent decision of the European Union to admit Cyprus to its ranks demonstrates the strength of its economy and democratic form of government and should be used to show Turkey that its occupation of the northern part of Cyprus is simply counterproductive to its own stated goal of joining the European Union. As such, the European Union, NATO, the United States, Cyprus, Turkey, Greece, and the United Nations all must actively search for common ground and create ways to restore the proud communities of Cyprus, to possibly demilitarize the island, and take down the last wall in the world.

I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member, are to be commended for their efforts for years to raise awareness of this issue, and I urge support and I urge a strong United States role in justly resolving the issue with Cyprus and our NATO partners, Turkey and Greece. Through this resolution and through this debate we are able to show the world that America still stands against armed aggression and supports peaceful resolutions of dispute.

As a new Member of Congress, it has been my honor to work with these gentlemen, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], and many others on issues relating to southeastern Europe. As a freshman, I am optimistic that we can produce results now if the rest of the world community joins with this Congress in insisting on a just and peaceful resolution for the people of the Republic of Cyprus.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Twenty-three years of an armed occupation of Cyprus is too long. This should have been ended long ago. This resolution is reaffirmation that the status quo in Cyprus is unacceptable, that it is detrimental to the security interests of the United States, and it emphasizes that we can only get a true and just and lasting peace and stability in Cyprus through a process of demilitarization.

In view of the recent beginning of talks between Turkey and Greece, and in view of the administration's initiative, this is a good time to reemphasize these points and to encourage the President to launch the kind of initiative that has met with some success in other parts of the Middle East.

So I commend the sponsor of this resolution and I urge its strong support. And, Mr. Speaker, I wish to join as a sponsor of this resolution also.

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those of my colleagues who have today so eloquently spoken in support of House Concurrent Resolution 81.

For Cyprus, this proud island nation, the cause of peace, the cause of freedom, the pursuit of unity is more than sloganeering. For the people of Cyprus and the Cypriot Americans I am proud and honored to represent in Congress, when we talk about freedom, we talk about an important element of that nation's identity that was robbed from them in 1974. For the people of Cyprus and the Cypriot Americans in my district, when we talk about justice, we talk about an ideal unseen since the de facto partition of that island nation in 1974. For the people of Cyprus and all those in America who believe in and cherish the value of peace, when we talk about Cyprus, we talk of an island where peace has been absent for 23 years. And that has been, in my estimation, 23 years too long.

So today I stand here as a Member of Congress, as a member of the House Committee on International Relations, as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 81 to say that I believe strongly in the following: I believe in freedom for Cyprus, I believe in a united Cyprus, and I believe that we must support the efforts of the parties to negotiate and secure a long-lasting and genuine peace for Cyprus.

As my colleagues know, in 1974 Cyprus was invaded by Turkey. It was an illegal invasion, illegal and against all international norms recognized then or now. And most important, we must recognize that this invasion cannot stand, just as we took that same position with regard to the invasion of Kuwait.

Some might argue that freedom for Cyprus might not be in the national interest of the United States. I wholeheartedly and emphatically disagree. Part of our makeup, part of our national history is founded on the simple belief that we are a people who believe in justice.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, the little nation of Cyprus has a big dream, to be free. It is a dream I support, it is a dream I will continue to fight for, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 81.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. First, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his leadership for peace and justice on Cyprus. This weekend we remembered the 23d anniversary of the illegal invasion of Cyprus and the horrible complications that have cost lives and stolen freedoms.

When one thinks of a people or a country as a whole, it is easy to gloss over the real tragedies. So I would like to remember two people who lost their lives 1 year ago this August. A 24-year-old protester, Tassos Isaac, was savagely beaten to death on August 11, 1996, by Turks, using rocks and iron poles. Three days later a group of mourners, people who were not even armed, became the targets of Turkish troop gunfire. The 26-year-old cousin of Tassos was gunned down, 11 others were injured.

Additionally, just 2 months after that, 58-year-old Petros Kakoullis was

out snail gathering with his son-in-law when he was gunned down as he assumed a position of surrender. Petros' only mistake was that he had wandered across the green line into the occupied area.

Our country must take an active role in stopping these abuses. The illegal occupation of Cyprus must end. The island must be demilitarized. Turkish troops must be forced off the island. The island must be unified, justice must be served, and the President of the United States must make it a foreign policy priority. I urge a vote in support of this resolution and in support of this island in crisis.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support as cosponsor for this resolution and commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for their leadership in bringing it before the House.

On Sunday we commemorated the unhappy anniversary and tragic circumstances of 23 years of division on the island of Cyprus, which has been artificially divided following an invasion by Turkish troops on July 20, 1974. On that date, over 200,000 Greek Cypriots became refugees in their own country and to this date are denied return to their homes. Today, a full 37 percent of the island remains under occupation by Turkish troops which in defiance of United Nations resolutions, now number 35,000, making Cyprus one of the most militarized places in the world.

After 23 years, the people of Cyprus in both communities deserve a solution which will reunite the island, its communities, and its people. As Secretary of State Albright recently pointed out, ''U.S.-Cyprus relations extend far beyond the so-called Cyprus problem. * * * Cyprus is a valued partner against new global threats.'' A resolution would strengthen peace and stability in the volatile eastern Mediterranean and significantly advance U.S. national security interests in the region and beyond.

I recently sent a letter to President Clinton with 67 of my colleagues in the House. The letter outlines what we believe should be the parameters of any Cyprus solution. They are that Cyprus should be reunited with a strong federal government in which the federated states derive their powers from the federal constitution, a democratic constitution which would ensure the rights of all of its citizens and communities and which would guarantee the right to private property and free travel to all parts of the country. If Turkey is serious about its commitment to a permanent solution, then it must bring its views into conformity with the United Nations framework on issues of sovereignty and political equality which they have refused to do.

Cyprus should not be a prisoner to Turkey's objections or threats. This is an opportunity for us to make a difference and the swift passage of this resolution sends a message of Congress' deep desire to see a settlement and the reunification of Cyprus for all of its people.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 81 to express my strong support for this resolution and to thank my friend from New York, the chairman of the International Relations Committee, for his leadership in bringing this important issue before the House.

For too long, the beautiful Mediterranean country of Cyprus has been politically and physically divided. Last week, a number of my colleagues, led by my good friend Mr. BILIRAKIS, marked the 23d anniversary of the division of Cyprus with a special order. The remarks which were delivered last Thursday clearly showed the commitment and interest that this body has in bringing an end to this deplorable situation. While we welcome the recent efforts undertaken by the Clinton administration, including the appointment of Richard Holbrooke as special envoy, we hope that this will not be just the latest in a long line of failed efforts which lacked the political will to find a just solution to the Cyprus problem. Over the past 20 years, there have been almost continual efforts by the United States and the international community, none of which has achieved the result we hope for.

In our efforts to resolve this problem, we must not forget the history of this issue and the strong feelings that it evokes. By the same token, we must realize that the world has changed dramatically in the past 23 years and the situation that created this division simply no longer exists. The legitimate Government of Cyprus is a thriving democracy with a robust economy and growing international prestige. Cyprus is a candidate to join the European Union in the near future.

Yet this prosperous, democratic country remains, in the north, occupied by 35,000 Turkish troops and divided by U.N. peacekeepers. In the past year, there have been tragic episodes of violence along the Green Line that divides Cyprus, resulting in needless loss of life and heightening of tensions. As you walk the streets of Nicosia, just steps from the pleasant pedestrian square filled with quaint shops and happy tourists you are confronted with U.N. peacekeepers, and beyond them, the forlorn-looking abandoned section of the city located in the buffer zone. This situation seems absurd on its face, and this should be the year that it ends. I hope that this resolution and the attention of the House to the matter will prompt a complete and far-reaching effort by the United States and the international community to demilitarize Cyprus and bring peace to this island once again.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for House Concurrent Resolution 81, a resolution calling for an early initiative to resolve the longstanding conflict on Cyprus.

Twenty-two years ago, Turkey invaded the sovereign Republic of Cyprus, capturing almost 40 percent of the island and driving more than 200,000 Cypriots from their land. Today, in one of the most heavily armed areas on Earth, more than 30,000 Turkish troops continue to occupy the northern part of the island.

Congress, further, still awaits a report by the President on the fate of 5 Americans and more than 1,500 others missing in the wake of the Turkish invasion. The Presidential investigation and upcoming report are being prepared pursuant to a bill I authored in the 103d Congress. Clearly, the status quo on Cyprus is unacceptable.

In 1995, the House of Representatives took an important step in the effort to promote a resolution of the long-standing Cypriot conflict. By passing a resolution which I sponsored calling for the demilitarization of Cyprus, Congress presented an option which would reduce tensions and help remove the oppressive Turkish troops.

Today, Congress is again taking a leading role. In the important resolution now under consideration, Congress urges the President to launch an initiative, in coordination with the United Nations, the European Union, and interested governments to promote a speedy resolution of the Cyprus problem.

President Clinton has already taken the first steps in this regard. By appointing former Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke, who negotiated the Dayton Accord on Bosnia, to the post of Special Envoy for Cyprus, the President has selected one of the most able negotiators to handle one of the world's most difficult disputes. With the hopeful entry of Cyprus into the European Union and the recent meeting in New York between Republic of Cyprus President Glafcos Clerides and Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash, it is my hope that a new, sustained effort to solve the Cyprus dispute will now help to bring this sad conflict to a just resolution.

I commend Chairman BEN GILMAN and Ranking Minority Member LEE HAMILTON of the International Relations Committee for their fine work on House Concurrent Resolution 81 and urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SNOWBARGER]. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 81, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

CONGRATULATING EL SALVADOR ON SUCCESSFUL ELECTIONS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 88) congratulating the Government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador on successfully completing free

and democratic elections on March 16, 1997.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 88

Whereas on March 16, 1997, the Republic of El Salvador successfully completed democratic, multiparty elections for 84 national legislative assembly seats and 262 mayoral and municipal council posts;

Whereas the elections were deemed by international and domestic observers to be free and fair and a legitimate non-violent expression of the will of the people of the Republic of El Salvador;

Whereas the United States has consistently supported the efforts of the people of El Salvador to consolidate their democracy and to implement the provisions of the 1992 peace accords;

Whereas these elections demonstrate the strength and diversity of El Salvador's democratic expression and promotes confidence that all political parties can work cooperatively in the new assembly and at the municipal level; and

Whereas these open, fair, and democratic elections of the new assembly and at the municipal level should be broadly commended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) congratulates the Government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador for the successful completion of democratic, multiparty elections held on March 16, 1997, for 84 national legislative assembly seats and 262 mayoral and municipal council posts;

(2) congratulates El Salvadoran President Armando Calderón Sol for his personal commitment to democracy, which has helped in the building of national unity in the Republic of El Salvador;

(3) commends all Salvadorans for their efforts to work together to take risks for democracy and to willfully pursue national reconciliation in order to cement a lasting peace and democratic traditions in El Salvador;

(4) supports Salvadoran attempts to continue their cooperation in order to ensure democracy, national reconciliation, and economic prosperity; and

(5) reaffirms that the United States is unequivocally committed to encouraging democracy and peaceful development throughout Central America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] for this bipartisan resolution commending the people of El Salvador. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] is a senior member of our Committee on International Relations and we consider him our leading expert on events in Central America. His long-term commitment to that important region gives him unique insight that is a valuable resource to our committee's work.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 88 congratulates the people and the Government of El Salvador for taking yet another step on the path to democracy. As a result of the peaceful and fair elections of March 1997, a broader cross section of Salvadoran society has a voice in local government and the national assembly. Because of the March 1997 elections, people who may have felt shut out of the democratic process now have a stake in making democratic government work for them. That is the essence of democracy, which the American people have supported for decades in El Salvador.

Some observers may be disappointed that participation in these elections was down sharply from the 1994 elections, around 37 percent, down from 54 percent 3 years ago. We hope that the more vigorous policy debates taking place today in the more pluralistic national assembly will restore the interest of more Salvadorans in the democratic process.

I would like to especially commend all of the political leaders across the political spectrum who took part in these elections and who have respected the results. We also congratulate President Armando Calderon and all of the officials of his government who conducted these transparent and honest elections.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has supported the cause of representative democracy for several decades in El Salvador. I am pleased to stand with my colleagues today to applaud the people of that great country for showing the world that democracy does work. Once again, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] for bringing this bipartisan resolution before us. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 88.

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

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] for introducing this resolution and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the committee, for pursuing this resolution.

As all of us know, Central America has come a long way in the last several years. Until recently, the region was beset by civil wars and insurgencies. The peace accords were signed just 5 years ago in El Salvador after a very bloody civil war. Today we are commending that country for an election wherein the opposition party, the FMLN, freely and fairly won the second most powerful position in the country, the mayorship of San Salvador.

All sides in El Salvador can now see that change occurs most effectively through the ballot box. That is a clear triumph for democracy, and it is also a remarkable transformation for El Salvador. I am pleased that the U.S. Congress through this resolution is now congratulating the Salvadoran people for making such a transformation.

Yet Central America has a long way to go. The region still struggles with devastating poverty, corruption, common crime, and weak educational institutions. I think, therefore, it is highly appropriate for the United States through this resolution to also pledge our continued commitment to help El Salvador overcome those challenges. I therefore urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] who, as we all know, has a long-standing and very distinguished history of involvement on this and other Central America issues.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, today I am very proud to rise in support of this resolution to recognize El Salvador for its fair and free elections. The people and the leaders of that nation have made a commitment toward peace and justice that just a few years ago seemed impossible. On behalf of the people in this country who feel a great affinity for El Salvador, I rise to thank and also to congratulate them.

As many Members know, I have been in El Salvador many times. Unfortunately, it was not always under the best set of circumstances. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN] and I went down to try to solve the murders of the six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper, and her daughter. During those times we met Salvadorans from all walks of life. We met the military leaders, guerrillas, and the everyday working people. I have looked into the scared and often sad faces of the Salvadoran people during their brutal civil war. But I have also seen them since. I have been to El Salvador during peacetime and seen their fear replaced by hope.

Over the last few years, I have developed a great fondness and a great respect for the Salvadoran people, and their most recent democratic election is cause for great celebration.

Mr. Speaker, the results of the March 16 elections literally changed the face of the government in El Salvador. In this very historic election, the Salvadoran people went out and voted without fear of persecution. That may not sound like much here but, believe me, in El Salvador, that is a big, big change.

After the Salvadorans voted, their votes were collected and calculated without widespread claims of fraud, and the once-feared military did not play any role in the elections. In fact, the military is now doing its job of protecting the people, and that, Mr. Speaker, is great cause for hope.

The results of these elections have created the pluralism in El Salvador that we have never seen before. Several opposition parties now control many of

the municipal governments, including several of the most populous municipalities. Opposition party candidates also have made many gains in the assembly. Now the challenge is in the hands of the various parties to work together, build coalitions, and do what is best for all of the people of El Salvador.

Mr. Speaker, they have their work cut out for them. As the country takes on the tremendous challenges of a struggling economy, horrible poverty, a frighteningly high crime rate, and the need for widespread judicial reform, we have to encourage Salvadoran leaders to continue to work together for what is best for all of its citizens. The difference is that today there is hope and political room for positive change.

□ 1550

Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure getting to know the people of El Salvador, and I am very honored to have been given that opportunity, and I want to congratulate my friends for their tremendous accomplishment. Today's democratic elections means tomorrow's prosperity.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, in 1962, 35 years ago, my wife and I went to El Salvador to help in developing their economy. It was peaceful and quiet then, the war had not started, and we have been working ever since to continue that growth and the growth in the democracy.

On June 25, 1997, the Committee on International Relations unanimously passed a resolution that I introduced, House Concurrent Resolution 88, congratulating the government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador on successfully completing free and democratic elections for the fourth time. On March 16, 1997, El Salvador held free and fair elections for 84 national legislative assembly seats, 262 mayoral and municipal council posts. This was yet another milestone in the normalization of the democratic process in El Salvador, and I wish to commend that nation for its efforts.

El Salvador has come a long way since the 1980's when the nation was in the midst of a terrible civil war. Many of my colleagues will recall that that war cost the lives of tens of thousands of El Salvadorans and left the country in shambles. Now the Salvadorans have replaced bullets with ballots. It was a strong leadership and guidance coupled with the courage demonstrated by former President Alfredo Cristiani that rescued the country and paved the way for El Savador's future. He continued to seek peace in spite of the fact that the war continued. His successor, the new President Armando Calderon Sol, elected in a free and fair contest, had the same commitment to democracy and will strive to keep this nation moving forward in the next century. The stark contrast between war-torn El Salvador and the El Salvador of today is a tribute to its people and its leaders.

In addition to holding successful elections, we see the Salvadoran Government's effort to foster free-market enterprise and privatization of certain industries as part of its move toward a free and fair society. Most importantly, we continue to witness the successful implementation of the 1992 peace accords. I believe the Americans must continue to show support for our Salvadoran neighbors through this long and fragile process, and I hope my colleagues will join me and congratulate El Salvador in this latest and most remarkable accomplishment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] for his outstanding leadership on this issue and certainly want to thank him on behalf of the minority caucus for his outstanding leadership and for his understanding of the speakers here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have had the opportunity to work with my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], to introduce this resolution. El Salvador means ''the Savior'' in Spanish, and I believe that El Salvador represents hope and salvation for all of Central America.

During the civil war in the 1980's, about 75,000 Salvadorans lost their lives in this country, a small country of 5 million people, but they have managed to find peace, democracy, and a market economy, and today El Salvador leads the region economically with an average annual growth rate of 6 percent in this decade.

This resolution is an expression of good will toward the people of El Salvador and toward President Armando Calderon del Sol who was just recently here, and we have had discussions with him and as he faces the challenges that are still present before El Salvador. But we are confident that El Salvador, as has been mentioned here, will continue to progress, building democratic institutions and improving the lives of the Salvadoran people.

We can do our part by making sure that the seeds of democracy which are taking root in El Salvador are fully cemented, and that is why I want to hail the Attorney General's decision not to deport, not to deport Salvadorans who came to the United States, fleeing from civil war, as a result of our foreign policy in part, and now would have made a dramatic economic impact on El Salvador if, in fact, they were massively deported. These are people who I believe had rights under the law which were eviscerated under the Immigration Reform Act of last year, and whose rights retroactively should never have been abolished in that manner. In essence, by preserving their opportunity to go ahead and make their case before the Immigration Court of Appeals, this provides an opportunity for El Salvador also to flourish in the process.

So I want to commend all of those and also the Congressional Hispanic Caucus who worked very hard on this with the administration. For our part we want to make sure that the United States Congress and administration provide El Salvador with the necessary resources and the type of policy that continues stability and growth, stability which is clearly in the national interests of the United States in a region that is so close to our borders.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 88.

The question was taken.

Mr. LUTHER. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE CONGO

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 175) expressing concern over the outbreak of violence in the Republic of Congo and the resulting threat to scheduled elections and constitutional government in that country, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 175

Whereas President Pascal Lissouba defeated former President Denis Sassou-Nguesso in a 1992 election that was determined to be free and fair;

Whereas losing candidates raised questions concerning the results of the 1993 legislative election and used those concerns to cast doubt on the entire democratic process in the Republic of Congo and as the rationale for creating private militias;

Whereas thousands of citizens of the Republic of Congo have been killed in intermittent fighting between Government soldiers and private militiamen since 1993;

Whereas there are concerns about the unfinished census and resulting electoral list to be used in the scheduled July 27 election;

Whereas the recent fighting resulted from the Government's attempt to disarm former

President Sassou-Nguesso's ''Cobra'' militia in advance of the scheduled July 27 election;

Whereas the fighting and uneasy peace has caused serious loss of life and diminished ability to care for those who are without access to adequate medical care or food and water;

Whereas the fighting between Government troops and militiamen have forced the evacuation from the country of foreign nationals and endangered refugees from both Rwanda and the former Zaire; and

Whereas African governments have attempted to bring about a negotiated settlement to the current crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the current fighting and urges the warring parties to reach a lasting ceasefire that will allow for humanitarian needs to be addressed as soon as possible;

(2) calls on all private militia to disarm and disband immediately to end the continuing threat to peace and stability in the Republic of Congo;

(3) commends African leaders from Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, Cameroon, Benin, Central African Republic, Senegal, and Chad for their efforts to negotiate a peaceful settlement and encourages their continuing efforts to find a sustainable political settlement in this matter;

(4) supports the deployment of an African peacekeeping force to the Republic of Congo if deemed necessary;

(5) urges the Government of the Republic of Congo, in cooperation with all legal political parties, to resolve in a transparent manner questions concerning the scheduled elections and to prepare for open and transparent elections at the earliest feasible time; and

(6) encourages the United States government to provide technical assistance on election related matters if requested by the Government of the Republic of Congo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us was introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Africa. This resolution expresses our grave concern about the violence and chaos that have taken hold in the Republic of Congo. This is Congo Brazzaville, Mr. Speaker, not the Democratic Republic of Congo which was formerly known as Zaire.

The Republic of Congo is a small nation with only 2½ million people, but over the past few years it has been a beacon of hope in a troubled region. Congo held democratic elections in 1992. Recent oil discoveries have given hope for a better life for the Congolese people. Although Congo has always been troubled by ethnic difficulties, many people believe that there was a new opportunity for reconciliation and democracy. Regrettably, those hopes have now been dashed by the recent violence in Congo which has taken thousands of lives in the capital of Brazzaville and other areas.

Mr. Speaker, there are no good guys in this latest violence. Neither the elected government nor its opponents have demonstrated an ability to restrain their worst impulses. This resolution firmly puts the Congress on the side of the Congolese people, urging an end to the fighting and supporting the work of those who seek reconciliation between the warring factions.

Accordingly I urge the House to adopt this resolution.

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

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa, I and a cosponsor of this resolution, and I want to thank the chairman of the committee for his diligence in putting it forth and for working with us on its language; we are very concerned about the ongoing violence in the Republic of Congo, and although a truce was called between President Lissouba and former President Denis Sassou Nguesso on June 17, reports of gunfire and shellings still continue to this date, and it has been estimated that between 1,000 and 3,000 people have died as a result of the fighting.

President Lissouba won his seat in 1992 in an election that was determined to be free and fair and, as in Sierra Leone, we cannot tolerate violence as a format for change. The Congo was scheduled to hold elections on July 27. Elections are the appropriate format for change, if so decided by the people of the Congo. It is crucial that the two parties come together to negotiate a real truce and to reschedule elections, and certainly it is not too late to get things back on track.

The draft declaration issued by the Foreign Ministers of the West African Economic and Monetary Union in which they stated that they are prepared to join a peacekeeping force to restore peace in the Congo is demonstrative of a growing consensus among African nations for a proactive and African response to the outbreak of violence on the continent, and I think we should welcome their declaration.

Again I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] for responding quickly in drafting the resolution. It is important that the Congress clearly condemn the fighting, place its support behind democracy, negotiation, elections, peace, and ultimately behind the will of the people of the Republic of the Congo.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], our chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, since violence in the Congo escalated several weeks ago, an estimated 3,000 lives have been lost. What started as an effort by Congo President Pascal Lissouba to safeguard the upcoming election by neutralizing the so-called cobra militia which is operated by a political rival, this situation has degenerated into ethnic cleansing and into political wrangling.

All this has developed beneath the media's radar. As the world watched the unraveling of the Mobutu regime in the neighboring country then known as Zaire, now the Congo, the Congo itself was seen as a safe haven for refugees from the collapsing nation. Western nations sent military forces to Congo to evacuate their citizens from Zaire. So it was shocking to find several weeks later that foreign nationals had to be evacuated from Congo Brazzaville and that refugees from that nation were running for safety to what is now sometimes called Congo-Kinshasa.

Today nearly a quarter of the population of the capital city of Brazzaville has left town to avoid being caught in the fighting. Unfortunately, these refugees have found themselves stopped along the way, and if they belong to the wrong ethnic group, militia men do what is called there making them travel, and to make someone travel means being taken away and killed. More than 2,500 Congolese were killed in ethnic fighting after the disputed 1993 election, and now ethnic tensions in the central African nation has dramatically worsened.

It is too late for elections to be held as planned on July 27. A dispute between President Lissouba and former President Denis Sassou Nguesso on the elections now threatens the future of Congo's developing democracy. President Lissouba has called for a 3-month postponement of elections and for his ruling mandate which expires next month. However, Mr. Sassou Nguesso wants the President to leave office next month and be replaced by a transitional government for 2 years. This resolution is a reinforcement of our Government's commitment to the democratic process in Congo-Brazzaville.

The threat to elected government and rule of law in Congo must be dealt with now, and a lasting solution to this ethnic and political crisis must be found. African nations and African leaders have been trying to broker a peace. There have been several cease-fires since the fighting began in June, but none of them have held longer than a few days. We are in the midst of yet another cease-fire as we speak. Meanwhile, a peacekeeping force is being gathered, but it will not be deployed until both factions agree to stand down. U.S. encouragement of the ongoing peace process as expressed in this resolution would bolster the peace process at this point.

This resolution I am offering calls for a halt to the fighting and a lasting

peace that will allow for considerable humanitarian needs of the Congolese people to be met and for the holding of elections at the earliest agreeable time.

□ 1545

Moreover, we call for the disarming and disbandment of the private militias, which are a continuing threat to peace and stability. And, finally, we call upon the parties involved in the elections to address and resolve questions concerning the election process so that there can be fair and free elections in the Congo.

Over the past several years nations caught in seemingly intractable conflict have managed to successfully complete a democratic transition: South Africa, Malawi, and Mozambique are but three examples of this process, and Liberia, we will see if that will be a new example.

There is no reason to expect any less from the Congo. Although these developments are halfway around the world, they matter. America has a great deal to gain from a healthy democratic Africa, and a stable Congo is a part of that. We have discussed this measure with the administration, which supports the approach taken on the resolution to the current crisis in the Congo. I urge the House to approve this resolution and to address the worsening crisis in the Republic of Congo.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution because I believe this draws attention to an explosive situation in Central Africa. I commend the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, for introducing it and for working with the chairman of the committee to move it forward.

By reflecting the views of the U.S. Congress on this important issue, I hope this resolution will encourage the parties to maintain the question and reach a political solution in their ongoing talks. I urge adoption of the resolution.

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

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege, along with Chairman ARCHER of the Committee on Ways and Means, to travel to Brazzaville and then to the Ndoke Forest in the Republic of Congo. While there we spent considerable time with President Lissouba and got to know him quite well, as well as his daughter, who is a medical doctor.

President Lissouba by background is a college professor. He is a very gentle man who believes in the democratic process, and believes deeply in the future of his country, and believes deeply in the welfare of the people that he serves.

The Republic of Congo is an emerging country in Africa that does have a number of important natural resources. The American investors are finding a friendly reception in Brazzaville as they are investing not only in the oil but also in many of the other assets and resources in the Republic of Congo.

I am very concerned, as I am sure other Members are, of the virus of revolution which seems to be spreading across Africa. It is important that we show our resolve to put forth and help enforce and hold in place democratic principles. The election that was scheduled for just next week has been postponed, not because of any fault of the present administration under President Lissouba but because of the revolt that is going on in that country today. Never did I think when we were there just a few months ago that the democratic process would be interfered with as it is today.

I would like to speak briefly of another interest that the United States has in the Republic of Congo. The Republic of Congo has been very cooperative with us in looking at and supporting a United States AID project in the Ndoke Forest which goes toward the preservation not only of the rain forest but also of the rain forest elephants that are present there, as well as the rain forest gorillas. These are species that are very much endangered. We have found great cooperation from the Republic of Congo in cooperating with the United States' interest in the preservation of these wonderful creatures.

We have also found the need and concern that we have to do more for the preservation of the rain forest, and the great concern that we have as to some of the logging operations which are not only devastating these rain forests, but also because of the use of the gorillas and other wildlife in the area, using them as camp meat.

The rain forest does have a very definite effect on our weather. Being from Florida, this is right in the area where hurricanes are created. We do have a very, very large stake in seeing that there is a friendly government that we can work with for the preservation of these great natural resources.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] for his supporting comments.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 175, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. LUTHER. 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. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of order of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER RECENT EVENTS IN SIERRA LEONE IN WAKE OF RECENT MILITARY COUP D'ETAT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) expressing concern over recent events in the Republic of Sierra Leone in the wake of the recent military coup d'etat of that country's first democratically elected president.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 99

Whereas for the first time in almost 30 years, the Republic of Sierra Leone held their first truly democratic multiparty elections to elect a president and parliament and put an end to military rule;

Whereas the elections held on February 26, 1996, and the subsequent runoff election held on March 15, 1996, were deemed by international and domestic observers to be free and fair and legitimate expressions of the will of the people of the Republic of Sierra Leone;

Whereas on May 25, 1997, a military coup d'etat against the democratically elected Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone, including President Ahmed Tejan Kabbah, took place;

Whereas the coup d'etat, led by Major Johnny Paul Koroma and the Armed Forces Ruling Council (AFRC) on May 25, 1997, signifies a giant step backward for freedom and democracy in the Republic of Sierra Leone;

Whereas there has been fighting, killing, looting and a disruption of relief supplies in the Republic of Sierra Leone since the coup d'etat; and

Whereas the best solution to this crisis would be a peaceful solution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) condemns the leaders and members of the rebellious Armed Forces Ruling Council (AFRC) for ousting the democratically elected Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone, including President Ahmed Tejan Kabbah;

(2) urges an immediate end to all violence in the Republic of Sierra Leone;

(3) encourages the members of the AFRC to negotiate a hand-over of power back to the democratically elected Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone in order to restore order and democracy in the country;

(4) encourages all citizens of the Republic of Sierra Leone to work together to bring about a peaceful solution to the current conflict;

(5) reaffirms the United States support of the democratically elected Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone led by President Ahmed Tejan Kabbah;

(6) urges the members of the AFRC and all armed elements involved in the conflict to ensure the protection and safety of international aid agencies and personnel serving in the country, and allow them unobstructed access to affected areas to deliver emergency humanitarian relief to people in need; and

(7) commends the Organization of African Unity for calling on all African countries, and the international community at large, to refrain from recognizing the new regime or lending support in any form whatsoever to the perpetrators of the coup d'etat, the AFRC.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us expresses the grave concerns of the Congress over the recent coup in Sierra Leone. This resolution was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS], who have followed the crisis in Sierra Leone very closely over the years.

Like the Republic of Congo which we considered earlier, Sierra Leone has had a period of hope dashed by renewed violence and chaos. Last year democratic elections were held, bringing to a close years of instability and fighting between the government and rebel forces. Regrettably, the peace did not hold, and a combination of government forces and rebel soldiers overthrew the elected government of President Kabbah.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in Sierra Leone is so desperate that the best hope for the restoration of democratic rule lies with the hundreds of Nigerian troops who have blockaded the capital and are supporting the reinstatement of Kabbah's administration. Mr. Speaker, this resolution will put the Congress firmly on the side of democracy in Sierra Leone, and accordingly, I urge the House to adopt this measure.

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

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

I rise in support of the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 99, which condemns the recent military coup d'etat in Sierra Leone staged by Johnny Paul Koromah and the Armed Forces Ruling Council. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], for introducing the resolution, which passed both our Subcommittee on Africa and the Committee on International Relations unanimously.

In 1996 Sierra Leone held free, fair, and democratic elections. Those elections and the people's choice of President Ahmad Tejan Kabbah to lead Sierra Leone were not dissolved by the coup d'etat. They cannot be erased or suspended by undemocratic or violate means.

While the coup is certainly disturbing, as we continue to see some of these actions in other places, I think what is encouraging is that many African nations and the Organization of African Unity were swift in their condemnation and asking that governments refrain from recognizing or supporting the new regime.

With this resolution, the United States Congress joins the chorus of voices which have spoken out against the coup, and calls upon Mr. Koromah and the AFRC to return power to the true and democratically-elected government, the government that was chosen by the people of Sierra Leone.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], the sponsor of this resolution, who is a member of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to speak on behalf of House Concurrent Resolution 99.

I also would like to, before I begin my brief remarks, thank very much the original cosponsors, the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS], and the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. TONY HALL], and also I want to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, the gentleman from California, [Mr. ED ROYCE] and the entire membership of that committee; also the former head of that committee, the gentlewoman from Florida, [Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN], and our chairman, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. BEN GILMAN].

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad resolution in a way because it was barely a year ago that we stood here and talked about the great strides toward a free and democratic government which the people of Sierra Leone had made. This really was the first time in over 30 years that they had had any elections. But now the whole world has changed, and they have been taken over by a band of thugs. It is sad. It happened this year on May 25.

What we are trying to do is to sponsor a resolution which really signifies not only to the people of Sierra Leone but the other nations around the world who believe in the great strides they have made prior to May, that it is important to end violence, to restore the democratically-elected government led by President Kabbah, and also make sure the protection and safety of international aid workers are ensured.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and members on the other side. I want to also put in a special word of appreciation to Ambassador John Hirsch and Ambassador George Moose.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, [Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS], who is an original cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], which I find very poignant. In addition thereto, I appreciate him so very much for originally being a cosponsor of this effort. Assuredly, I thank the chair of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. BEN GILMAN], the subcommittee chair, the gentleman from California, [Mr. ED ROYCE], and the ranking member, the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. ROBERT MENENDEZ], who have produced not only in this instance but in several a plethora of activity dealing with the continent of Africa in a very positive way.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my continued support for this resolution that was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] and myself to condemn the coup d'etat in Sierra Leone. We certainly must stop the violence in Sierra Leone now.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this necessary and timely legislation which, first, condemns the Armed Forces Ruling Council members for ousting the democratically-elected government of the Republic of Sierra Leone, and second, orders an immediate cessation to the violence in this nation, and encourages the AFRC to negotiate a return to power of the elected leadership.

The military coup led by Johnny Paul Koromah in Sierra Leone on May 25, 1997, was a savage assault on an emerging democracy in this African nation. Just 15 months prior to the coup democratic elections were held and President Kabbah was chosen to lead his country into a new era, one which promised liberty and constitutional order for Sierra Leonians.

International election observers were there and the citizenry declared this election to be free and fair. The people of Sierra Leone signified their determination to vote, even if it cost them their lives, and they were successful. But this country's march towards democratic government was suddenly stopped by those who wanted to end its forward strides by undertaking violence. With their coup came chaos marked by fighting, and killing, and looting.

We must speak out forcefully with one voice against the travesty and tragedy being played out in Sierra Leone. If we do not, we are sanctioning the blatant robbery of the freedoms of the people of Sierra Leone.

This legislation is especially timely. In response to events in Sierra Leone, ECOMOG has imposed an air, land, and sea blockade in response to an ECOWAS decision to impose economic sanctions on this military junta.

□ 1600

These interventions have given way to negotiations. According to the Embassy of Sierra Leone in Washington,

negotiations between four foreign ministers of ECOWAS and representatives of the AFRC are now taking place in Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire. A strong message by the U.S. Congress at this point then could be helpful in restoring power to the democratically elected government. I urge adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 99.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] and also the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS], coauthors of this resolution, as well as members of the Subcommittee on Africa for their support. They unanimously endorsed this resolution.

When democratic government was restored through elections in Sierra Leone last year, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] reminded us, it was counted as a great achievement for the people of west African nations. This country had suffered two coups and 4 years of military rule. It was the scene of a ferocious civil war as we have heard today. The military tried its best to extend its rule, but the people were so eager for democracy that they demanded that elections be delayed no longer, despite threats of reprisal. I remember the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] telling me that some had their hands cut off in reprisal for casting ballots by rebels trying to frustrate a democratic transition in this country. Yet, they had the bravery to go to the polls and cast those votes.

Imagine now how the citizens of Sierra Leone must feel when on May 24 a group of military officers staged another coup. That coup, of course, sent the President into exile. Since then, this group of thugs in uniform have looted the country, virtually holding the nation hostage to their shifting demands.

The long-suffering citizens of Sierra Leone have responded by resisting the coup leaders. They have staged strikes. Labor unions, professional associations, and civic groups have opposed the coup. The Kabbah government is broadcasting to the nation on a secret transmitter to bolster the people's resolve to resist this illegal power grab.

There is a positive trend in Africa today toward political and economic reform. The transition in Sierra Leone often was cited as part of that positive trend. Their very worthy efforts are made meaningless if we accept the undoing of reform in a nation in which the people have supported the democratic process. In many cases they supported it with their lives.

Let us join the Organization of African Unity in supporting a west African diplomatic and military initiative to free Sierra Leone from its unelected leaders. I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. SNYDER], an outstanding new Member of Congress.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, Sierra Leone is a small country. My guess is that many Members of Congress and many folks in America would not be able to find it on a map. I can say that, being from Arkansas, I know that many people cannot find Arkansas on a map. And it was my pleasure to have lived and worked at a mission hospital in Sierra Leone for 6 months a number of years ago.

At that time it was a dictatorship. It was corrupt. We would actually have to bribe the postman to get the mail. Life expectancy was 42 years old. As one of those folks who had lived there, like many Members here would have been overseas, one follows a country closely after that.

I was very excited a year ago when these elections occurred. I have been in that town of Bo where those people had their hands cut off trying to vote. We went there in search of the elusive American cheeseburger when we were trying to find recreation. I know how much that democracy would have meant to those people. It is a terrible tragedy what happened during those elections, but it shows democracy does not come cheap in certain parts of the world. Some of us who have worked in Africa, and I have been there a couple of times to work, were concerned that perhaps with the end of the cold war that we would ignore Africa with our trade policy, with our failure to support an adequate foreign operations budget for Africa, with our failure to support an adequate military to military relationship with Africa, student exchanges. That is our responsibility, to do what we can to nourish democracy. But the responsibility for this coup is those folks in Sierra Leone that did this bloody and brutal act. It is wrong. This body knows who is responsible for it. I commend the folks that put this resolution together and ask every Member to support it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I merely want to conclude by commending the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], also the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] for their sponsorship of the resolution. I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. SNYDER] for bringing his personal experiences to bear on this particular issue. I think it is just outstanding for him to provide us with that kind of insight on this issue.

The Congress by this resolution should send a clear message that this coup against the democratically elected President must not stand and that the United States will work with the international community to restore the legitimate democratic government in Sierra Leone to power. This resolution supports that policy and I am pleased that the President of the United States supports this resolution. I urge its adoption.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SNOWBARGER]. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 99.

The question was taken.

Mr. LUTHER. 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. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

REGARDING INTERFERENCE OF EUROPEAN COMMISSION IN MERGER OF BOEING CO. AND McDONNELL DOUGLAS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 191) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the interference of the European Commission in the merger of the Boeing Co. and McDonnell Douglas.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 191

Whereas the Boeing Company and McDonnell Douglas have announced their merger;

Whereas the Department of Defense has approved the merger as consistent with the national security of the United States;

Whereas the Federal Trade Commission has found that the merger does not violate the antitrust laws of the United States;

Whereas the European Commission has been highly critical of the merger in its consideration of the facts;

Whereas the European Commission is apparently determined to disapprove the merger to gain an unfair competitive advantage for Airbus Industries, a government-owned aircraft manufacturer; and

Whereas this dispute could threaten to disrupt the overall relationship between the European Union and the United States which had a two-way trade in goods and services of approximately $366,000,000,000 in 1996: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) any disapproval by the European Commission of the merger of the Boeing Company and McDonnell Douglas would constitute an unwarranted and unprecedented interference in a United States business transaction that would directly threaten thousands of American aerospace jobs and potentially put many more jobs at risk on both sides of the Atlantic; and

(2) the President should take such actions as he considers to be appropriate to protect United States interests in connection with this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and gentleman from

Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] each will control on 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before yielding time to the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], I want to commend him for introducing this resolution and working for its early consideration on the floor and in a very timely manner as the European Union is meeting on this same matter.

I strongly support this resolution. It is the height of irony for the European Union, which has hounded our Nation unmercifully for so-called extraterritorial legislation such as the Helms-Burton Act or the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act, which are not extraterritorial and which were drafted to avoid any extraterritoriality, to attack a merger between two United States-headquartered corporations which do not manufacture in Europe.

It is true that the welfare of the flying public, the price the airlines have to pay for the aircraft and the need for competition in aircraft manufacturing, ought to be considered as mergers are judged by antitrust authorities.

But who is better equipped than the independent U.S. Federal Trade Commission to make that determination? Obviously the United States flying public is most directly affected by this than any other because Boeing and the combined Boeing-McDonnell Douglas Corp. will be so strong in the domestic marketplace.

The European Commission's attitude gives rise to a strong belief, set out in this resolution, that the commission is primarily motivated by questions of industrial policy, the welfare of Airbus Industries, rather than consumer welfare. In other words, the European Commission is apparently using its competition policy hat to threaten to impose barriers to U.S. competition. That is obviously wrong.

I am also concerned that the Commission of the European Union may be taking action at this time in an attempt to establish certain political credentials or make political points in intra-EU disputes. That could be disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, I am known as a friend of warm relations between our Nation and the European Union. The United States and the European Union are one another's largest trading partners. Moreover, we are very close allies on a large range of political, security and other global issues. I am frankly concerned that the EU is going to take an ill-considered step that could lead to a trade war. Too much is at stake for this to occur. I appeal for cooler heads to prevail before the European Commission takes an irrevocable step.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], sponsor of this resolution.

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member, for their support in allowing this legislation to come up under suspension. I am pleased that they agree that this is an urgent issue facing Congress and requires immediate action. Their indulgence in allowing a vote today without a markup is appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the European Commission is scheduled to vote on the merger of the Boeing Co. and McDonnell Douglas. It is anticipated that they will vote to disapprove the merger.

Mr. Speaker, any disapproval by the European Commission would constitute an unwarranted and unprecedented interference in a U.S. business transaction. The review by the European Commission has been dominated by Airbus Industries from the outset. It is unfortunate that the European Union would allow their process to be dominated by a government owned and subsidized company.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that my colleagues understand that this is a merger between two wholly owned U.S. defense contractors, consistent with DOD directives issued to downsize our military-industrial complex in the post-cold war era, and it was ratified by the Federal Trade Commission. Any attempt to block this is nothing short of a foreign government trying to dictate America's vital national security policy. As such, it is an assault on our national sovereignty.

The objections raised by the European Commission revolve around the signing of sole provider contracts by Boeing. However, Airbus was an eligible competitor for these contracts. In fact, Airbus signed the first long-term contract with a U.S. carrier. That action started these exclusive type agreements. Throughout the entire bidding process, neither Airbus nor the European Commission raised any objections whatsoever to the bidding on exclusive agreements until they lost out to Boeing.

Another argument used by the European Commission is that the merged company will dominate the commercial airline business. Quite frankly, Boeing's share of the commercial aviation market has remained relatively stable at 60 percent or so for the last decade. It is the heavily subsidized Airbus that has taken market share from McDonnell Douglas. The only antitrust violation in the commercial aviation industry is by Airbus and its European government partners.

While we all agree that more companies in the market would be optimal, the truth is that there are only two viable companies today, even before the merger. Last year, McDonnell Douglas was responsible for less than 5 percent of the total orders in the world.

The Europeans are using this opportunity to obtain a competitive advantage against an American company, which could cost over 14,000 jobs in the near term and many more in the long term. It is vital that the House take this opportunity to send a clear message to the Europeans that this act will not be tolerated.

My legislation provides the President with leverage if it becomes necessary to intervene. He can be confident that he has the support of both the Senate, which passed a similar resolution last week, and the House of Representatives.

The European Community believes that it should have veto authority over U.S. business decisions. The Europeans have stated that they may fine the merged company over $4.5 billion and potentially seize aircraft built by American workers here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is truly an issue of national significance. We must draw a clear line in the sand now to prevent any further infringements by foreign governments on U.S. business decisions.

□ 1615

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I thank the chairman and ranking member again for their support.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Minnesota for yielding me this time, and I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] for their outstanding effort on this resolution which I rise in strong support of.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to be able to tell the House that there may have been a breakthrough today between the parties. We were very concerned, my colleagues and I from Washington State, about what would happen if the European Commission turned down the Boeing, McDonnell-Douglas merger. We are hopeful now that, after further negotiating between the Boeing Company and the European Commission, that there may be a prospect for a favorable outcome.

I think all of us have learned a lesson here, and that is I think both sides have to be careful in reviewing agreements, especially when we have two U.S. corporations that have no manufacturing facilities at all in Europe. The idea that the European Commission can exert jurisdiction and say that these two companies cannot merge, especially after this has been approved by the Department of Defense, it has been approved by the Federal Trade Commission, and under our process here in the United States, is wrong.

The Federal Trade Commission does not go out and look and see what the

impact is going to be on Airbus. It goes out and looks at the airlines and says will this merger, in fact, have an anti-competitive impact. What they found was that it would not; that, in fact, McDonnell-Douglas today is declining in terms of its ability to produce and manufacture commercial aircraft. They just do not have the orders.

The real competition out there is between Boeing and Airbus, and it is a healthy competition that will continue into the future. This is what the airlines in Europe should be concerned about; this is what the airlines in the United States should be concerned about.

So what we have here is a situation in which the European Commission used this opportunity to leverage Boeing, to try to realign the competitive field to the benefit of Airbus, not to look at this in terms of anti-competitive behavior but to try to get things from Boeing to help Airbus in its ongoing competition. I think that is wrong.

I am saddened to hear that there may have had to have been some compromise reached. I am always for compromise, but I think in this case forcing Boeing to give up on what we call exclusive, although it is not really exclusive, but exclusion agreements with American, Delta and Continental, after they were competed for, after Airbus and Boeing competed and Boeing won, and now in this process they are making Boeing give those exclusives back, I do not think that is fair. I think that goes beyond what this process should be about.

I hope American companies in the future will be a little more cautious about agreeing in the first instance that the European Commission should have a right to review these mergers, especially when there are no facilities in Europe.

As someone who has served on defense appropriations for 19 years, I would also like to point out that another area of attack came on the question of whether there is indirect subsidy because Boeing or McDonnell-Douglas have contracts with the Defense Department. Well, we have these aerospace companies go out and they bid and compete to do the C–17, the F–18, the F–22, the Joint Strike fighter. And, yes, they may learn some things from that about how to build better airplanes and, in fact, they may even bring their commercial experience to the defense arena and help bring down the cost of our defense products. But to assert that there is somehow an indirect subsidy here is really almost laughable.

So, I think that area of concern is one also that should have been dismissed. I think we have shown that there is no indirect subsidy. Of course, the companies over there, the four companies that comprise Airbus, also receive defense contracts from their various countries, and there has been a record, a historic record of subsidy up to 1992 for Airbus.

So I am glad that the House and my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], have worked together on this. We have taken the floor and made our speeches. I think because of that and because of the good work of this administration, and I want to compliment President Clinton, Stuart Eizenstat, Dan Turallo, the people in the administration who have been working on this for the last several weeks. They stayed with it, they talked to the top officials in the governments of the various countries.

And I am glad to see today in the newspaper, in the press accounts, that Reuters says that the British now see this would have been a mistake and the Germans see that this would have been a mistake. The bottom line is that they recognize, and I am just pleased that the administration said that there will be a major trade problem controversy with the United States if we do not reach agreement, and that has, I think, helped us break the ice here.

So it has been a good combination of congressional support and support from the administration, and again I want to thank the chairman for bringing this out promptly and giving us his help and support, and my colleagues on the Democratic side for cooperating on this. This means a lot.

It is not just in Washington State. If this had gone down, the jobs that would have been lost first are in Long Beach, CA. Fifteen thousand jobs at McDonnell-Douglas in Long Beach, CA would have been on the line. So it is not just Washington State and St. Louis, it is California that have a real stake in this decision.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. LINDA SMITH].

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a special thanks to the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

This is very, very important because it says something more than is before us today. It does not just talk about another country intervening in American politics, it talks about them dictating how we deal in commerce.

Boeing and McDonnell-Douglas are both American corporations. They are not international corporations, they are not other countries. We do not even manufacture in the European market or the Community, and yet they had decided that they are going to protect one of their own, who is already subsidized, and try to change competition.

Well, we believe in competition in America but we also believe in sovereignty. So if this is to go through, and if the President were to roll on this one, as someone said earlier, then we would set a precedent for the future, and that would be a precedent of other countries deciding to direct how we deal with our business in America.

McDonnell-Douglas and Boeing have come together in an honest merger that has been OK in America, is fair, honest and competitive. We should not have another country come in and tell us to do something different.

I think it has been said that this particular merger not going through would jeopardize jobs in California, but I think that it would jeopardize other American jobs, again as we see other countries, including this European Community, making a decision to do this in the future.

Again I want to commend the sponsor of this, he has taken the time to bring it forward, and the committee chair, who has given us this time to make this statement but also to reaffirm the sovereignty of America.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT].

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, for the opportunity to speak on this very important issue not only to our State but to our entire country.

I support the resolution offered by the gentleman from Everett, WA [Mr. METCALF]. Tomorrow, as we know, the European Commission will rule on the merger of Boeing and McDonnell-Douglas. Several news stories today have noted that the President has spoken with a number of European leaders about the Wednesday decision but, according to Reuters, ''There was virtually no chance that Boeing could produce an offer acceptable to the Commission by then.''

Unfortunately, I think this has characterized the European bargaining position to date. Each time Boeing nears agreement, the Commission escalates its demands, claiming the merger would hurt fair competition in Europe.

The current hang-up involves the so-called exclusive agreements between Boeing and three American carriers. These agreements are wholly unrelated to the merger, and the Federal Trade Commission definitively ruled that no basis exists to challenge them under U.S. law. Yet the European Commission is holding the merger hostage to extort concessions from Boeing on this issue.

The German Economics Minister is reported to have said that current concessions offered by Boeing were clearly not enough, while last week President Chirac of France simply noted the merger could be extremely dangerous to Europeans.

I had the opportunity to visit the Boeing facility in Everett just this last weekend, and I can report to my colleagues that this company represents the best in what the U.S. economy can expect from free trade. It has gained a global reputation by building the best airplanes in the world. The Europeans are not seeking to block the merger because of honest concerns about free trade. In my judgment, they are doing so because they fear their state-subsidized firm cannot hope to compete.

I urge my colleagues to join in disapproving this potentially unprecedented interference by the European Commission and passing this resolution.

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

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. It is vitally important for this body to express our outrage at the European Union's interference in an issue already settled by our Federal Trade Commission. I commend the strong support and actions taken by President Clinton and his staff to protect American jobs by resisting this European pressure.

The approved merger of McDonnell-Douglas and Boeing will provide thousands of solid, high-paying, high-skilled jobs throughout the United States. This new company will not threaten the European Union or Airbus, a company largely subsidized by that consortium's member nations. The Federal Trade Commission has heard the arguments; it has approved the merger.

In its attack upon the merger, the European Union has explicitly targeted more than 11,000 workers at Douglas Aircraft, which is headquartered in the district I have the honor to represent. The European Union is attempting to blackmail the United States into accepting its position. I do not believe we can allow our aviation industry to be shaped by our competitors overseas.

To his credit, the President has stood firm. We all want him to remain so. No one wants a trade war with Europe, but we should not be afraid of that risk if that is what is needed to guarantee American control of our key industries and to protect American jobs.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from California for his statement. He recognizes, as I recognize, that the problem we have here is that this merger is absolutely essential for the commercial part of the McDonnell-Douglas Company which exists down in the gentleman's district, and to protect those jobs there is absolutely crucial. That would be the first casualty if somehow this agreement could not go forward.

I think the gentleman from Washington pointed out one of the things I did not realize, that the European Commission claims it could fine Boeing $4.5 billion if they went ahead with this merger, if the EC turned it down. So this takes on very serious implications. Also, that they can seize Boeing aircraft in Europe and demand payment from the various airlines in Europe. So, hopefully, we can avoid this.

And I appreciate the gentleman's comments regarding the administration, because we have been working with them. We have been talking to Stuart Eizenstat at the State Department and Dan Turallo at the White House and with the President and his immediate staff. They have been there working hard on this, and I think quietly and diplomatically, and we have taken a little higher profile up here in the Congress. But I think together it has worked effectively, and I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

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

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. It is good we are on the same team from now on. It is sort of sad that the European Community is talking about fines when their countries have subsidized Airbus to the tune of $34 billion or more dollars over the last decade.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is absolutely correct. Let us hope now, maybe, that they are coming to an agreement and then, after that, the two companies can come together, and the stockholders can meet and approve this merger here in the United States.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I believe it absolutely will be good for the country and good for Washington and California.

Mr. DICKS. And a few other States, too.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAM SMITH], another outstanding new Member of Congress.

□ 1630

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of this resolution and in opposition to European interference with the Boeing-McDonnell Douglas merger.

What this should be about is competition. I think to the extent we move toward global competition rewarding the best competitor, the most efficient participator in a given market, then that is good and we are moving forward.

The problem that the European Union and Airbus seem to have is that that best competitor right now has been Boeing for the last several years. They have consistently won the better contracts through fair and efficient competition. And we should reward that, not punish it.

If the European Union raised an argument that Boeing was doing something improper, unfair competition on some levels, they would have a point and it would be appropriate. But they do not, and it is not. The type of things that they are raising is basic competition. It is almost like Airbus is negotiating this deal, not the European Union, and that is totally inappropriate.

Airbus should compete on the economic field, in the marketplace with Boeing, not through the use of their government, as has been mentioned. Airbus is subsidized itself. Their complaints in this ring very, very hollow.

The last point that I want to make is that our Government and our country must stand strong on behalf of Boeing, McDonnell Douglas and the entire country and not let the European Union unfairly use trade agreements to push us around and stop our economic advancement. It is in the best interest of the whole marketplace of the world in addition to the United States, and we must do it.

I strongly urge the President to stand strong and stand behind Boeing for fairness, and I support this resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution offered by Mr. METCALF. This resolution simply expresses the view that the merger of two American companies should be the concern of regulatory agencies of the U.S. Government, not the European Union. Despite the approval of the Federal Trade Commission, bureaucrats in Brussels have threatened to impose fines on Boeing and McDonnell-Douglas, or even seize their planes in Europe, in order to protect a government-subsidized European manufacturer.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have recognized the actions of the European Union as unjustified and based on obvious self interest. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this resolution, and protect these American companies and their employees from Europe's efforts to prevent fair competition.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, recently, the European Union objected to the merger of McDonnell Douglas and the Boeing Co. I find this decision extremely troubling and rise in strong support of House Resolution 191 as introduced by my colleague from Washington State, Mr. METCALF. These two wholly owned American companies should be allowed to merge without fear of reprisal from a foreign government. The sole reason for the European Union criticism and imminent disapproval of the merger is to gain an unfair competitive advantage for Airbus, a government-owned aircraft manufacturer. It is ridiculous to allow a foreign government to block this merger because they cannot compete with our workers in a fair market.

European Union's opposition to this merger is unacceptable for several reasons. First, there are sovereignty concerns about foreign intervention in an American merger. Second, the parties involved are both wholly owned U.S. companies with an international customer base. Third, this merger between two U.S. companies has already been approved by our Government. Fourth, the objections raised by the European Union regarding the abandonment of exclusive contracts awarded to Boeing is inappropriate. The Boeing Co. should not be punished because it obtains more contracts than Airbus Industries in a competitive market. Airbus has never objected to carrier requests to make the contracts exclusive in return for reduced prices. In fact, the European Commission objected only after the agreements were concluded. It is both irresponsible and inappropriate to risk U.S. jobs because the free market worked its will. Contracts that establish fixed purchase prices are directly related to the number of aircraft the customer agrees to purchase. Any abdication of these contracts is contrary to good commercial practices.

The proposal by the European Union to require Boeing to divest their interest in McDonnell Douglas commercial aircraft business is

unacceptable as well. After the U.S. Federal Trade Commission [FTC] conducted a thorough review of the proposed merger, the FTC concluded that McDonnell Douglas is no longer able to sell enough aircraft to raise significant concerns about the loss of its competitive ability. Last year, McDonnell Douglas was responsible for only 4 percent of the international commercial aircraft business. The divestiture by Boeing of the McDonnell Douglas commercial aircraft business would have severe ramifications worldwide. First, it threatens American jobs that are tied into the continued support of McDonnell Douglas aircraft by the Boeing Co. Further, McDonnell Douglas' commercial aviation division cannot maintain itself as an independent company and previous efforts to sell the commercial aviation division have been unsuccessful. Therefore, any divestiture would threaten the safety of McDonnell Douglas commercial aircraft already in service if the commercial division were to close.

Finally, it is vital to the health of the United States to downsize, through mergers, the military industrial base as we celebrate the end of the cold war period and adjust military budgets accordingly. Due to the large defense business that will be conducted by the Boeing Co., any action by the European Community is an infringement on the sovereign rights of the United States to provide for U.S. national security.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a trend we as Americans should allow to continue. We declared our independence from European rule in 1776 and should not revert to those days in conducting the business of today.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 191 and call upon the President to take all necessary steps to protect American sovereignty and the jobs of hard working Americans.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 191 because the prospect of the European Union ruling against this merger and effectively cutting an American corporation out of an entire market greatly disturbs me. I am absolutely appalled that leaders of other nations feel bold enough to tell America how to run.

The EU will vote on the $14 billion merger Wednesday morning and comments by leaders from across the Atlantic strongly suggest that a vote of disapproval is imminent. I believe that disapproval would be an unmistakable shot across the bow of American business interests. We know our products can compete and succeed in a fair market. But if the EU would rather play hardball, I won't hesitate to say that we can too. We are heading toward a situation that is bad for American workers, and potentially devastating for States like California that depend on a strong American interest in this industry.

Mr. Speaker, critics of the EU stance on the merger have pointed to the sagging performance of Europe's Airbus, a key competitor to American aerospace interests, as the true cause for EU opposition. European officials insist that the merger would simply create an unfair playing field for all interested parties. This is nothing more than a red herring to mask the fact that these nations have pumped over $26 billion in government subsidies into Airbus and they still don't have a competitive product. They are literally holding this merger hostage for a sweeter deal which allows more government subsidies to keep Airbus afloat. They are not fooling anyone.

The bottom line is, the Federal Trade Commission reviewed over 5 million documents in their approval of this merger and they found no cause for concern. This has nothing to do with fair global markets. It is all about gaining an unfair competitive advantage for a government-owned aircraft manufacturer. We simply cannot afford to let that happen. I encourage all of my colleagues to support House Resolution 191.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 191.

The question was taken.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

STAMP OUT BREAST CANCER ACT

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1585) to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast-cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued U.S. postage stamps, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1585

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act''.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 414. Special postage stamps

''(a) In order to afford the public a convenient way to contribute to funding for breast cancer research, the Postal Service shall establish a special rate of postage for first-class mail under this section.

''(b) The rate of postage established under this section—

''(1) shall be equal to the regular first-class rate of postage, plus a differential of not to exceed 25 percent;

''(2) shall be set by the Governors in accordance with such procedures as the Governors shall by regulations prescribe (in lieu of the procedures under chapter 36); and

''(3) shall be offered as an alternative to the regular first-class rate of postage.

The use of the special rate of postage established under this section shall be voluntary on the part of postal patrons.

''(c)(1) Of the amounts becoming available for breast cancer research pursuant to this section, the Postal Service shall pay—

''(A) 70 percent to the National Institutes of Health, and

''(B) the remainder to the Department of Defense.

Payments under this paragraph to an agency shall be made under such arrangements as the Postal Service shall by mutual agreement with such agency establish in order to carry out the purposes of this section, except that, under those arrangements, payments to such agency shall be made at least twice a year.

''(2) For purposes of this section, the term 'amounts becoming available for breast cancer research pursuant to this section' means—

''(A) the total amounts received by the Postal Service that it would not have received but for the enactment of this section, reduced by

''(B) an amount sufficient to cover reasonable costs incurred by the Postal Service in carrying out this section, including those attributable to the printing, sale, and distribution of stamps under this section,

as determined by the Postal Service under regulations that it shall prescribe.

''(d) It is the sense of the Congress that nothing in this section should—

''(1) directly or indirectly cause a net decrease in total funds received by the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Defense, or any other agency of the Government (or any component or program thereof) below the level that would otherwise have been received but for the enactment of this section; or

''(2) affect regular first-class rates of postage or any other regular rates of postage.

''(e) Special postage stamps under this section shall be made available to the public beginning on such date as the Postal Service shall by regulation prescribe, but in no event later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this section.

''(f) The Postmaster General shall include in each report rendered under section 2402 with respect to any period during any portion of which this section is in effect information concerning the operation of this section, except that, at a minimum, each shall include—

''(1) the total amount described in subsection (c)(2)(A) which was received by the Postal Service during the period covered by such report; and

''(2) of the amount under paragraph (1), how much (in the aggregate and by category) was required for the purposes described in subsection (c)(2)(B).

''(g) This section shall cease to be effective at the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which special postage stamps under this section are first made available to the public.''.

(b) REPORT BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—No later than 3 months (but no earlier than 6 months) before the end of the 2-year period referred to in section 414(g) of title 39, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Congress a report on the operation of such section. Such report shall include—

(1) an evaluation of the effectiveness and the appropriateness of the authority provided by such section as a means of fundraising; and

(2) a description of the monetary and other resources required of the Postal Service in carrying out such section.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''414. Special postage stamps.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1585 was introduced by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], our distinguished colleague, on May 13. She was joined at that time by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] in cosponsoring the bill at introduction.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the work done by these Members in promoting the need for the additional funds hopefully provided under this bill for breast cancer research and for bringing the measure to the floor. I think they have all done a very, very admirable piece of legislating.

Mr. Speaker, I would, however, also like to particularly sing loud the efforts of the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], whose efforts here in this session of Congress I really think generated the support amongst the leadership that was necessary to bring this measure to the floor at this time, and also the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for his early work in helping develop a former bill.

Also, Mr. Speaker, a tip of the hat to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], chairman of the full committee, for his leadership in assisting us through the subcommittee and to the floor, and of course to the entire House leadership for their understanding.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, as introduced, allows postal patrons, for the first time in this country, to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued U.S. postal stamps.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill represents an innovative way to generate money for breast cancer research and is similar to a measure that was passed in the other body as an amendment to this year's Treasury appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware that some concerns regarding the bill as originally written have been expressed. Therefore, the manager's amendment at the desk, I believe, will improve the legislation even further and, hopefully, will address many of those concerns.

The idea of this kind of postage stamp, semipostal, as it is known in the industry, is indeed innovative in the United States. As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time this approach has been taken here in America, but the concept is not new. Semipostals have been discussed and the proposals for such have been floated over the years for various causes, but they have not had in the past the support that this proposal has garnered.

It may interest the body to know, Mr. Speaker, that Canada, the largest geographic nation in our hemisphere, but with less population and less mail than the mail stream in the United States, has been issuing these kinds of postal stamps since 1990. Canada Post Corporation adopted a literacy awareness as its cause of choice in 1989 and has been issuing these kinds of stamps without governmental and parliamentary intervention ever since.

Mr. Speaker, these special postage stamps will be made available to the public no later than 1 year after the date of enactment. The amount designated for breast cancer research due to this bill will be the total amount of revenue received by the Postal Service because of the enactment minus the reasonable cost incurred by the Postal Service attributed to the printing, sale, and distribution of these stamps.

Under this legislation, Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster General would be required to include this program in the annual report of the Postal Service and transmit its findings to the Congress. At a minimum, the report would include the amount of funds received as a result of this legislation and the reasonable cost claimed to be incurred in establishing the volunteer program.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller of the United States, through the offices of the GAO, will be required to complete an evaluation to judge the effectiveness and the appropriateness of the authority to raise funds in this manner in a description of the cost to the Postal Service incurred for the administration of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that a good deal of thought has gone into this base bill, a great deal of additional work on the part of all the cosponsors has gone into the compromise that is entailed in the amended version in the manager's amendment. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I know this proposal represents a necessary, thoughtful, and ultimately productive way to assist this Nation's scientific community in the vitally important quest for a cure of this deadly killer.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, most people in the United States have in some way been impacted by this terrible disease. Today, through the adoption of this bill, the House has its opportunity to make a stand against this disease, and in the process, give every woman and including those who know, love, and care for them, new hope.

Again, I thank the sponsors of this legislation for their hard work and concerns, and as a final note again, to particularly the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] for once again being the conscience of this House.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, which will allow postal patrons to continue funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of newly created specially issued U.S. postage stamps.

As a cosponsor of a similar bill, H.R. 407, introduced in the Congress by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], my friend, I am pleased to join the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], the chairman, in bringing this piece of legislation to the floor of the House.

The idea of creating a breast cancer research stamp originally surfaced in the 104th Congress, when the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], at the suggestion of his constituent, Dr. Ernie Bodai, introduced this legislation.

H.R. 3401 will provide additional funding for breast cancer research through the sale of a semipostal stamp. The term ''semipostal'' means stamps with a surtax on the regular postal rate with the extra revenue earmarked for a designated charity.

An identical measure was introduced by Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN in the other body. At the opening of this session of Congress, Senator FEINSTEIN joined the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], following his leadership, and reintroduced her breast cancer research stamp bill, S. 726, in the Senate. In May, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] adopted the idea by introducing her version of the special breast cancer postage stamp.

The incidence of breast cancer continues to far outstrip available resources and funds, and the statistics are as sobering as they are rising. Breast cancer kills almost 50,000 women every year. Every 12 minutes an American woman succumbs to breast cancer. It is the leading cause of death for women between the ages of 35 and 62, and it is the second leading cause of death for all women.

More than 1.8 million women in America have been diagnosed with breast cancer, and an additional million more are unaware that they have breast cancer. It affects our wives, our sisters, our mothers, our daughters, all American women.

The financial resources to fight breast cancer are just not enough. That is why the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act is before us today. It provides a vehicle for those of us who are concerned about breast cancer research and the funding to buy a semipostal stamp.

The language of this legislation has now been changed. The price of the semipostal breast cancer stamp can be anywhere from 1 to 8 cents more than the regular postage stamp. And we have an opportunity of funneling significant funds to the National Institutes of Health for breast cancer research. The program is entirely voluntary. It does not affect the regular rate of the postal stamp. It will allow the U.S. Postal Service to cover its administrative costs prior to directing the funds to cancer research. And, of course, this experiment will run only 2 years, after which it will be evaluated.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, the other body overwhelmingly adopted by a vote of 83 to 17 this same legislation. I strongly urge all of my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to join us in approving this legislation. I want to commend the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], my friend, for her leadership on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the original author of this legislation.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1585, sponsored by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] and myself.

We come to the floor today with the idea of an experiment whereby the American people would contribute to public health causes through the voluntary purchase of a U.S. postage stamp, or a semipostal, as it is known around the world.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] said, in May 1996, Dr. Ernie Bodai, one of my constituents and chief of surgery at the Kaiser Permanente Medical Center in Sacramento, CA, came to my office with what I thought was an innovative proposal. Dr. Bodai's idea involved a bill to establish a special first class postage stamp priced at 1 cent above normal first class postage, with the additional penny going toward breast cancer research.

As a result of Dr. Bodai's unflagging personal effort, I was pleased to introduce the Breast Cancer Research Stamp Act in the 104th Congress. That piece of legislation gained the support of 86 Members of the House of Representatives and thousands and thousands of people across the country who strongly advocated its cosponsorship.

This year, I reintroduced this bill in the 105th Congress, and H.R. 407 has now the support of 125 of my colleagues.

□ 1645

Thanks to some energetic and tireless efforts by several compassionate groups within the breast cancer advocacy community and a special thank you to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], we are considering today H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act of 1997.

H.R. 1585 remains true to the idea of the American public participating in the search for a cure for breast cancer. It also ensures that money raised by the breast cancer research stamp will not replace current Federal funding levels at NIH or the Department of Defense. It will only add to it. It provides a workable and realistic framework for a cooperative effort between the Postal Service and the American public to take place.

I know questions have been raised, how much money could be raised by the sale of a stamp priced above the normal first class postage rate and how much would such an endeavor cost the Postal Service to administer. This bill, H.R. 1585, sets up a demonstration project to answer those and other questions. After 2 years, the General Accounting Office will provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of this project and after 2 years perhaps there will be additional money from the stamp going toward breast cancer research at both NIH and at the very innovative programs at DOD.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Service for working out the details of this bill so that we may finally put this project into place, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], chairman of the full committee, for helping to assure this bill could come to the floor. I particularly want to thank again the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] for her effort and commitment to seeing that this bill and this cause moves forward in the House of Representatives. I am so pleased it could be accomplished at least in this House while she remains a Member.

We have made tremendous progress in raising money, in raising awareness, and in raising the spirits of so many in the battle against a disease that has devastated the lives of millions of loved ones, but we all know we still have a long way to go. I know that we will get there through the support of legislators in Congress and the grassroots support throughout our communities.

By passing H.R. 1585, we will be enabling the people of the United States to demonstrate a spirit of volunteerism to advance our successes in finding a cure for breast cancer. I think now the ball is passed to those people who have made it so important that this Congress consider this legislation. They will be able to prove the degree to which their voluntary spirit and community commitment can produce the results we all seek.

I urge my colleagues to vote to suspend the rules and to pass this important piece of legislation and then find a way to take the legislation that is somewhat different, that has passed the Senate by an overwhelming margin, meld them together and produce a piece of legislation that will cause this experiment to take life.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California again for his work and for his kind comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], whose important efforts on this bill have already been amply described.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my unequivocal support for the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank from the bottom of my heart the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for their support, their guidance, their attention and all their important contributions in developing this stronger bill. Finally, I would like to thank and salute the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for his assistance in leading the fight to craft a bipartisan bill on an issue so close to all of us.

For the first time in our Nation's history, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act will give Americans, every American, the opportunity to become more personally involved in funding breast cancer research. This legislation will allow all of us to contribute to the effort to put an end to what is now an incurable disease by giving us all the option of purchasing a specifically issued first class stamp.

That is one of the beauties of this bill. It is a completely voluntary method of raising money for a worthwhile cause. I envision if we do this right an opportunity for people when it comes time for Christmas shopping, when it comes time for birthday presents, alongside with the little gift, you buy them a roll of stamps so that that individual knows that you might have spent an extra $5 or $10 to give your friend a present that also went toward reducing the risk of dying from breast cancer in this country. I envision companies having the impact of their employees coming to them purchasing stamps that have the stamp out breast cancer insignia on it, companies having contests amongst each other. I believe the American people will rise to the challenge of saying if we make it easy for you, if we make it an opportunity in your daily life of completing chores to donate to breast cancer, they will all absolutely rise to that challenge and help us conquer this disease.

I also believe that it will take us all a little less pain when we pay our bills if we know that while we are paying those bills, sending off those credit card company payments that we may also be contributing to finding a cure for cancer. Husbands, daughters, brothers and sisters will all have an opportunity to buy a stamp toward saving a life.

As has been said, the voluntary purchase of this stamp will direct funds to the noble research efforts led by the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense.

Over 9 years ago I lost my best friend to breast cancer. My grandmother, Susan, battled breast cancer and was not the only life forever shattered by this terrible disease. In fact, my husband's mother too has fought a breast cancer fight for years. It is now my hope that my daughter, Susan Paxon, named after my grandmother, will never have to know the fear that I go through every year, the sweaty palms the night before a mammography, the inability to concentrate until you hear from the doctor that says it is all clear again for the next year. I want to make sure that her generation of young women will not know the fright that our generation has known because we have lost an entire generation of women to breast cancer way too early. I, like so many other women and men, would appreciate knowing that I helped make a difference in the fight against breast cancer just by spending a few extra pennies for a stamp I needed anyway.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close by saying that if the Postal Service can issue a stamp in honor of Bugs Bunny or Elvis Presley, surely we can ensure

that the lives and legacies of women who have suffered the ravaging effects of breast cancer will not go unnoticed. In closing, let me thank Dr. Ernest Bodai for developing this mechanism, my staff assistant Jennifer Prazmark for believing so clearly, and my colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] for giving me an opportunity to leave this Congress with my head held extremely high, believing that we may have passed a very, if not one of the most important pieces of legislation in a bipartisan fashion that may save some women's lives sooner than we thought, hoped and prayed.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], who has been a champion of all issues relating to women.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words and for yielding me this time. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] for their leadership on the floor on this bill, and I particularly thank the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for their overall leadership in this important bill. I know I speak for the Women's Caucus, which I cochair, when I embrace this bill in their behalf.

The Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act has two purposes as far as I am concerned. The very fact of the stamp will help to raise the consciousness of women to go for a mammogram, and the voluntary funding mechanism is most important. We have already gotten some considerable distance on breast cancer simply by raising the consciousness of women to go and get a mammogram. We now see rates falling, including rates for African-American women which were rising steadily before.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have got to move on to the next important plateaus, and those are prevention and research. We have a whole set of notions about how we may go at prevention, but none of them has been proven. We are told about lifestyle and environmental factors. We are told to do aerobics. We are told that diet has an effect, that alcohol consumption, that obesity, that chemical hazards and radiation have an effect, but nobody knows because the research is yet to be done. With this research at the National Institutes of Health and in the Department of Defense, we would look to such areas as the contribution to breast cancer made by the environment, by hormones, by genes. We would look at areas still to be uncovered, such as the role of accessibility and delivery of medical care to underserved populations. We would look at gene therapy and vaccines and chemotherapeutics. We would look at the susceptibility of various groups of women and why. Until we do that, we will not be able to conquer this disease. We have gone very far with cervical cancer because of research. We need to go the rest of the distance, and this stamp will make that possible.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the chairman of the full committee and, as we have heard here today, one of the instrumental players in this victory here today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] for yielding me this time. I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] and the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], especially for their leadership in getting this bill to the floor and passed.

I have had a personal experience in my family with breast cancer, and I do not think people realize the impact that it has until they see somebody that they care about lose their hair. They come home one day and there are tears and they say my hair is falling out because they are under chemotherapy. Then they have to cut the hair off and buy a wig. Then they go through the problems of sickness because of chemotherapy and the radiation. It is something that people cannot imagine unless they have had it happen in their own family or to somebody that they care about.

That is why it is so important for us in this body and across this country to do everything we can to wipe out the last vestiges of cancer, all kinds of cancer, but especially breast cancer. One in eight women are going to get breast cancer in their lifetime. That is a statistic that we just simply cannot live with. The mammograms that we talk about women getting annually when they get above 40 years old many times misses the cancer, and so sometimes women carry that cancer in their body for 4 or 5 years before it manifests itself and many times it is too late for them to be saved. So anything that we can do, anything we can do to help bring about an end to breast cancer is something that this body ought to be working very hard to accomplish.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to add my support for this bill. It may not raise a lot of money but if it does not raise lot of money, at least it will raise a lot of awareness and people will realize that we have to make this a No. 1 priority in this country. I hope that one day everybody in this body who is sponsoring this bill and everybody who is supporting it will live to see cancer eradicated once and for all and women not having to wake up every day of their lives fearing a lump in their breast may be the end of their lives.

I rise in support of H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act.

I would like to commend the gentlewoman from New York, Representative MOLINARI, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Service, Representative MCHUGH, for the good work they have done on this important piece of legislation.

Breast cancer is the most common type of cancer in women. In 1996, an estimated 184,000 women were diagnosed with breast cancer and 46,000 died of the disease. Women continue to face a one in eight chance of developing breast cancer during their lifetime. Breast cancer is the leading cause of cancer death for all women aged 35–44.

Congress has made much progress in the past few years in providing funding for breast cancer research. During the 104th Congress we increased breast cancer research by increasing funding to the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense's Peer-Reviewed Breast Cancer Research Program by 25 percent

For fiscal year 1998, the House Appropriations Committee has approved a 9-percent funding increase to the NIH—$704 million over last year's appropriation.

However, in spite of the significant research advances that have been made in regard to breast cancer, there is still much more to be done. We still do not know what causes breast cancer, how to prevent it, or how to cure it.

We must continue to remain committed to investment in breast cancer research until we find out these answers. The more we invest in breast cancer research, the more we will be able to offer hope to women and their families.

For these reasons, I would like to voice my strong support for the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. This bill would provide another funding stream for breast cancer research.

I would like to point out that this is an experimental program that seeks to determine whether or not this is an effective way to raise money for breast cancer research. Under this bill, the program will sunset after 2 years and GAO is required to do a study to evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of this type of fundraising.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. Hopefully, through passage of this bill, the funding raised from this stamp will help bring us closer to eradicating breast cancer once and for all.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], who in the very short time that she has been with us has made a remarkable impact on the work of this body.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from California both for his words and also for the commitment that he has made to so many causes improving the quality of life for humankind.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that this is the best of the U.S. Congress. This act today, this exhibition of unity is really what this Congress is all about. Might I add my applause and congratulations to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], certainly the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], and the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], and certainly the words of the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS]. This is a coming together in a recognition that we need to fight a problem and pay tribute at the same time.

I would like to offer a tribute to all of the women who have lived with and maybe later died because of breast cancer, to all of the survivors and fighters day after day after day. I would like to further say to them that we are going to join this race with them, we are going to do it by passing this legislation, H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, which would direct the U.S. Postal Service to establish a special postage rate for first class mail.

Breast cancer is the most common form of cancer in American women; 2.6 million women in the United States are living with breast cancer, 1.6 million who have been diagnosed and an estimated 1 million who do not yet know they have the disease. That is the most frightening part of this disease, as was noted earlier. It is a disease that can be in the body of women over a period of time without their knowing it: young women, women with children, women with promise, women with a future in front of them, women who are dynamic and yes, day-to-day women who are nurturers and workers every day keeping this country going.

In 1997, approximately 184,300 new cases of breast cancer will be diagnosed and 44,300 women will die from this disease. Thirty-eight percent of African-American women with breast cancer will not live more than 5 years. Of course this disease affects our families, mothers, daughters, neighbors, sisters. It is a disease that all of us want to put on our boxing gloves and fight fair, but we want to win this victory.

□ 1700

It is important to know that it impacts women who have not had a child before the age of 30. Most breast cancer, over 70 percent, however, occurs in women who have no identifiable risk factors, maybe other than knowing that women and their families have likewise had breast cancer.

And so we see this is a hidden disease, this is a frightening disease, this is a disease that is sometimes whispered around family members when they hear that Aunt Mary or Cousin Susan or their mom has breast cancer. We want to stamp out breast cancer, and we want to pay tribute to those who work so hard.

As someone who has participated year after year in the Susan Coleman Race for the Cure, so many people around the country have shown themselves proud by every fall coming together in sisterhood, along with our brothers, to fight against breast cancer. Let me say that this stamp to help us stamp out breast cancer, Mr. Speaker, is the right way for this Congress to go. Thanks to all of those who had the fortitude to do this, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting and passing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, to express my support for H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. This bill would direct the U.S. Postal Service to establish a special postage designation for first-class mail that will contribute a set amount to breast cancer research and education. This plan allows patrons to voluntarily choose to contribute to this funding effort. The effort cannot be minimized in any way, the crisis of breast cancer for women in the United States is claiming hundreds of thousands of lives. Experts estimate that over 2.6 million women in the U.S. are living with breast cancer, 1.6 million women who have been diagnosed, and another 1 million women who do not yet know that they have the disease. The best hope that these women have who have not yet been diagnosed is the continuing education of the public about the importance of regular examinations for the early detection of a malignancy and tireless cancer research in search for a cure. The frightening numbers go on and on, 1 out of 8 women in the United States will develop breast cancer in her lifetime. this year, a new case of breast cancer will be diagnosed every 3 minutes, and we lose a women to breast cancer in this country, every 12 minutes.

The scientific community apparently has no new answers; we know no more about breast cancer and how to cure it in 1997 as we did in 1937. The same basic treatment methods from three score ago, are unfortunately still being used today, surgery, chemotherapy, and radiation. We must find the answers, we must resolve among ourselves today, to make the difference. For too long, the diagnosis of breast cancer for America's women has been a likely death sentence, particularly for African-American women. In all, 38 percent of African-American women with breast cancer live no more than 5 years after diagnosis and 25 percent of White American women. Both of these figures are entirely too high, too many of our grandmothers, mothers, aunts, sisters, daughters, and friends have fallen to this cruel disease.

Every woman is at risk to develop breast cancer, a likelihood that increases as a women ages. Unbelievably, over 70 percent of breast cancer cases occur in women who have had no identifiable risk factors. But only 40 percent of women follow the recommended guidelines for screening mammography. It is so easy for us to think that it will never be us, it will always be someone else, but who among us is really willing to take that chance? We would say none of us, but millions of American women do so everyday. I hope that the Stamp Our Breast Cancer Act can start its efforts by educating American women that they are the most effective weapon that we have to combat the encroaching effects of breast cancer. The importance of this effort cannot be minimized because most irregularities that are found to be malignant are actually found by aware and educated women as to the obvious dangers of breast cancer.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1585, because if this option to give to the effort to end this unfortunate crisis saves one life, it has done more than enough. For our families, for our daughters and granddaughters, we must act now, so that their world is a much safer and better place than our own.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] a woman who has always been at the forefront of health issues, and particularly women's health issues, and an original cosponsor of the first Fazio bill on this initiative.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank the gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee that had this legislation, not only for yielding the time, but for the work and leadership that he has provided.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. It enhances the quality of life, it enhances and keeps families together.

This bill, which was sponsored by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is built on legislation offered in this Congress and in the laws by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. I am a cosponsor of both bills, and I am really pleased that my two colleagues have worked with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] to develop a bill that we hope will open up a new avenue for biomedical research funding. I also want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for their cooperation in bringing this bill to the floor.

H.R. 1585 authorizes a 2-year demonstration program establishing a special postal rate for first class mail for those who wish to contribute to breast cancer research. After administrative expenses have been covered, 70 percent of the funds raised will go to the National Institutes for Health for breast cancer research, 30 percent will go to the Department of Defense for its peer-reviewed breast cancer research program. At the end of the 2-year demonstration, the General Accounting Office will be required to report to Congress on the effectiveness of this fundraising strategy. The bill includes provisions to ensure adequate oversight and payment for administrative costs incurred by the postal service; in other words, a very well-crafted bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides a potential source of additional funding for breast cancer and other public health priorities. Despite the progress that has been made, we still know very little about breast cancer treatment and prevention. Last year approximately 182,000 women were diagnosed with breast cancer, and 46,000 died from the disease. Women have a 1 in 8 chance of breast cancer during their lifetimes. Establishing a new source of research dollars is particularly important at a time when Federal resources are being squeezed as a result of our efforts to balance the budget. We must be more creative in our efforts to increase our investment in biomedical research, and this bill does it.

Again I commend the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for their work on this innovative approach. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I too have no further requests for time. Let me just briefly, in closing, again thank all of those who have been involved in this initiative.

I want to pay, too, a tribute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], my colleague, for his leadership here today. I think it very clearly emphasizes the bipartisan nature of this bill and certainly recognizes the bipartisan tragedy that this disease can bring, and I urge all my colleagues to support this initiative.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act.

Over the past 3 years, I have had the honor of leading many Members of this House in the fight to promote breast cancer awareness. Last year my efforts culminated in the creation of the breast cancer stamp. The stamp is a tribute to those who have survived breast cancer and those who have not. More likely than not, each one of us, if we haven't already, will come face to face with the tragedy of breast cancer—through a mother, daughter, wife, grandmother, niece, aunt, or neighbor. Every time a book of stamps is purchased at the post office, people will be reminded of the urgency for early detection of breast cancer in order to save millions of women's lives.

Unfortunately, increasing public awareness and educating women about the importance of early detection and diagnosis is not enough. We must do more.

According to the National Cancer Institute, Nassau and Suffolk Counties rank first and fourth respectively, in breast cancer mortality rates among the 116 largest counties in the United States. Research is a valuable and indispensable instrument in trying to understand this devastating disease. Right now on Long Island, the National Cancer Institute is conducting a $15 million study examining the environmental effects that may be factors in breast cancer in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Yet, we must do more.

H.R. 1585 builds upon the success of the Breast Cancer Awareness Stamp, by authorizing a 2-year demonstration project to offer the public a new way to fund research for breast cancer by raising money through specially designed U.S. postage stamps. The stamps will be offered for purchase as an alternative to regular first-class postage. Seventy percent of the funds raised by this bill will be directed to the National Institute of Health and the remainder to the Department of Defense solely for the purpose of breast cancer research. Mr. Speaker, too many of our mothers, daughters, and sisters have been afflicted with this destructive disease. We must do more, and I urge my colleagues to vote today to stamp out breast cancer forever.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in supporting H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. Breast cancer is an especially horrific disease that attacks one out of eight women in the United States. With these numbers, almost no family in the United States is immune from this disease that kills thousands each year. Too many of our mothers, sisters, and daughters each year suffer from the ravages of this disease. Nearly 45,000 women will die this year from breast cancer alone, with more than 180,000 new cases diagnosed. In Texas, 2,800 women will die, and we will add 11,500 new breast cancer cases to the rolls.

We have made progress in recent years, in early detection, diagnosis, and treatment. But we are too far from adequate treatment and too far from a cure. We need to make cancer research, and breast cancer research in particular, a priority.

This bill would provide an innovative, new source of badly needed funding for breast cancer research for a 2-year demonstration period. The Postal Service would create a new postage rate for first-class mail as an alternative to the regular rate, and customers would have the choice of buying either. The Postal Service would distribute 70 percent of the revenues raised to the National Institutes of Health and 30 percent to the Department of Defense breast cancer research program. These moneys will not displace any other funding.

I support this effort and urge passage of the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. My hometown of San Antonio is a growing cancer research center, where doctors and researchers work with brave, valiant women to improve treatment and further our understanding of breast cancer. I am confident that with perseverance and proper funding, we will find ways to conquer breast cancer. This legislation is a step in the right direction.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Snowbarger). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHugh) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1585, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. LANTOS. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1585, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

POSTPONING VOTES DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1853, CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1853, pursuant to House Resolution 187, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may, first, postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment, and, second, reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes.

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

Mr. CLAY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, there is no agreement to rolling the vote on this side after five. Who did the gentleman from Pennsylvania negotiate that with?

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 187 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1853.

□ 1707

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1853) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, with Mr. Ewing in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 17, 1997, pending was the amendment by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do that so that I can call to the attention of the Members and anyone who may be watching the proceeding exactly what legislation we are dealing with today. My colleagues will hear more emotional comments made, but in many instances not too relevant to what we are doing.

H.R. 1853 authorizes funding for vocational-technical education. I repeat: H.R. 1853 authorizes funding for vocational-technical education. For the first time in this legislation we deal with access to excellence instead of access to mediocrity. The most difficult thing to do around here over the years, has been to get people to think beyond access, because in so many instances it was access to mediocrity.

But here we are talking about authorizing funding for vocational-technical education in 43 of the 50 States, that funding goes primarily to vocational-technical education at the secondary level, vocational-technical education at the secondary level, area vocational-technical schools at the secondary level. That is primarily what we are talking about in this legislation.

Now if we have a one-size-fits-all, and we decide this one-size-fits-all set-aside is good, then we have to keep in mind that the money must come from somewhere. And under this proposal we would take it from the secondary education programs for which 43 of the States use the money that we are talking about today. So it is extremely important that we understand what we are doing today. We are talking primarily about secondary vocational-technical education.

Now, I do not take a back seat to anybody when we talk about the importance of special populations. And so, I remind my colleagues again, that in this legislation section 114 on the State application asks the State to describe, (A) how to provide vocational technical education programs that lead to high-skill, high-wage careers for members of special populations, including displaced homemakers, single parents, single pregnant women, and (B) ensure that members of special populations meet State benchmarks, because again we are talking about excellence now, not access to mediocrity.

In section 115, on accountability, each State that receives an allotment under section 102 shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on how the State is performing on State benchmarks that relate to vocational-technical education programs. In preparing the report, the State may include information about technical education benchmarks that the State may establish; and (B), Special Populations—the report submitted by the State in accordance with subparagraph (A) shall include a description of how special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents and single pregnant women have performed on meeting these benchmarks established by the State.

Then we talk in section 201 about State uses of funds, and again we talk about special populations, and the State must tell in an assessment how the needs of special populations are being met.

So I want to make very sure that everyone understands that we have one, two, three, four, five, six different statements, six different sections dealing with special populations. But more importantly when we talk about special populations, as I indicated, here we are talking primarily about taking money away from secondary vocational education programs in 43 of those States.

But we have other programs, one that just came from our Committee back in May. We passed the Employment Training and Literacy Enhancement Act that significantly expands services, for displaced homemakers. The bill includes displaced homemakers in the definition of dislocated workers, making them eligible for $1.3 billion in employment and training services. In addition, displaced homemakers are eligible to receive services under the Disadvantaged Adult Employment Training Program, another billion dollars, and then another $3 billion for welfare-to-work in the Balanced Budget Act.

So we have not done anything other than increase the opportunity for special populations, not just to get access, but to get access to quality.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, for the past 10 years, the Perkins Act has contained strong provisions to address the needs of displaced homemakers and to encourage advancement of women in nontraditional employment. Unfortunately, this bill repeals the act's emphasis on gender equity, and I think that is a shame, Mr. Chairman.

□ 1715

I think that the amendment of the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] will put that back into the bill, and I rise in support of that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the House that we cut off debate and consideration of this amendment on Thursday last, and we were not able to bring it to a vote. There was a very large number of Members who were here on the floor to speak about the amendment, but just to refresh our memories on the pending amendment, what it seeks to do is simply to say, hold harmless the amounts of monies and numbers of programs that are in existence today specifically to deal with vocational education and training for displaced homemakers, single parents, pregnant women, and to particularly allocate funding for a gender equity coordinator for this program. The reason for the amendment is that the bill we are considering eliminates the targeted program that has been in place and established for over 13 years.

If it were simply a matter of eliminating this set-aside of funding, and the program directives and direction and so forth are the same, perhaps this is an overly sensitive concern. But bear in mind that this program has been totally rewritten, overhauled. We have a new approach which has been now set down by the majority. If we do not hold harmless this program, I fear that the program will just simply be lost in the confusion.

We saw how difficult it was for the States to accommodate to the new rules under welfare. They had to completely revamp their programs, and in the process there was much confusion, and many of the people were left out in the process. This group of individuals, the single parents and displaced homemakers, is too critical a group of individuals to cause this confusion because we are rewriting this legislation.

It seems to me absolutely critical that we hold harmless this program. We are not adding any more money. We are not even keeping the 10 percent set-aside. We are simply saying that those programs that exist now should continue to exist, and the program emphasis, to deal with the special problems of displaced homemakers and single parents, ought to have the consideration of this Congress.

In view of the fact that the welfare legislation has now put a very high premium on jobs for those on welfare, the single parents we are so concerned about, that they find work and get off of welfare and become self-sufficient, in the language of the bill we have specifically said that work activity includes vocational education and training and they may have this benefit for 12 months. So the Congress has recognized the importance of vocational education and training and directed work activity as including the definition of vocational education.

So with that as a mandate by this Congress in the welfare reform act, it seems extremely urgent that we continue this program in order that these individuals now, under the demand of the Congress that they find work, not find empty spaces, nonexistent programs, when they are looking for vocational training in order to better their skills and get employment that can put them into the position of supporting their families and being self-sufficient. That is what this Congress said: Get out and work, get trained if you do not have the skills, support your own families, and become part of the contributing part of our society.

So it seems to me absolutely parallel that we support this amendment, continue the vocational education programs, and target this program to this special needs community. So I urge this House to support this amendment and continue the program with a hold harmless provision.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I just want to echo the

comments of my friend, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], and support this amendment. What we are talking about here is a program that has worked, that has a proven track record of improving the lives of women and girls.

Let me just say that if Members are in doubt of that, all they need to do is look at the 1996 GAO study entitled ''Employment Training: Successful Projects, Shared and Common Strategy.'' The single parent displaced homemaker program funded through the Florida set-aside was cited as one of the most successful training programs. Most of the 1,300 single parent displaced homemakers programs that we have follow this Florida model.

A study of Oregon's displaced homemaker, single parent program documented the long-term success of this program in increased employment rates from 28 to 71 percent of the participants, 28 to 71 percent; increased median wage rates from $6 an hour to $7.45 an hour, and a reduction of the AFDC dependency from 29 percent to 15 percent.

In Arizona, participants in these programs averaged higher median wages and worked more hours than they did prior to their participation. Women in nontraditional jobs have increased in Arizona from 7 to 17 percent. And in Georgia, participant salaries increased from an average of $11,000 prior to participation to about $16,500.

So these programs are important. They are important to women, they are important to girls, they are important to raising the standard of living of people who are in a situation who are trying to move from work. They are terribly important to our society.

Here we have a program with a proven track record. It has had bipartisan support. As I understand it, this was Senator HATCH's idea in the Senate. It has had great support here in Republicans and Democrats in the past. I hope that we will continue with this program. It is a set-aside of a reasonable percent. It is not a huge percent. It is a reasonable percent of programs that work. If we are trying to move people from welfare to work, we ought to stick with this program that has had a proven track record.

I commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], and all those who are working in support of this program.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Mink amendment because the distinction the amendment makes is vital. It is a distinction that this body makes all the time in favor of the most vulnerable and the least likely to take advantage of Federal fund opportunities. These are the women who are most likely to have been tracked into low-wage jobs. We can untrack them and undo that discrimination by allotting a very small portion of these funds for them.

Why go to that trouble? Why not use what is already in the bill? The reason is that there is no question but that these funds, like most Federal funds, are likely to go disproportionately to the best-educated and the most conscious; those who understand their rights and the availability of funds. Those happen not to be displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, or single parents.

This body has a vested interest in the Mink amendment because these are the women most likely to cost the government the most, because these are the women most likely to be dependent and the women least armed with education and experience. We make distinctions of this kind all the time, and ought to continue to make them.

Constantly, Mr. Chairman, I see Federal opportunities getting to people who would get them anyway. We need to make it impossible to spend a certain amount of this money, this small amount, except for the most vulnerable. Nothing guarantees that except the Mink amendment. What it means is that the funders, the States and cities, are going to have to do outreach rather than simply report to us that they tried to do outreach.

The Mink amendment encompasses a long, bipartisan tradition. This is not the year to break that tradition. I thank the gentlewoman for indeed striving to continue this important tradition.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mink amendment. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has a duty to provide political leadership in our Nation. We hear a lot of talk these days about States' rights. I was a State Senator in Ohio, and I know about the importance of State government action. But I also know that State officials look very carefully at the policies put forward by the Federal Government. We shirk our duties if we do not convey to the States the issues and the approaches which Congress considers to be important for the unity and economic security of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the Mink amendment provides an excellent example of the importance of Federal leadership. I have watched the progress of the vocational education bill carefully. I have seen my colleagues insert a special set-aside for rural areas, a provision that has been expanded to rural and urban areas. At the same time, I have seen a set-aside for gender equity programs eliminated from the bill.

Need I point out the inconsistency here? Are people somehow more important because they live in a particular rural or urban area? What about the importance of women and girls having the opportunity to enter any and all occupations so they can make the maximum contribution to our economy?

Mr. Chairman, for 13 years the Congress has felt that programs for displaced homemakers, for single parents, gender equity programs, were so important in vocational education that we required States to spend a certain percentage of the Federal funds that they received. Is the Congress now saying that this policy was wrong?

Mr. Chairman, the Mink amendment is a reasonable and moderate measure to continue Federal Government policy. It would restore the vocational education equity coordinator. It would require that localities that now have gender equity programs continue those programs.

If this amendment is defeated, it will send a clear signal to the States. It will signal that the rights of women and girls are not important when it comes to vocational education programs. It will lead to the elimination of dozens of very successful programs that have helped thousands of single parents and displaced homemakers. It will harm the ability of women to move into nontraditional jobs, the sort of high skill-high wage jobs that allow them to move out of the pink collar ghetto.

I commend my colleagues who have exercised the commitment and determination to keep these programs alive for the benefit of all students, and I ask my colleagues to join with me in supporting the Mink amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

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

Let me remind Members that training women for a livable wage for jobs that are nontraditional, for the same jobs their counterparts trained for, the men that earn a livable wage, by training these women for those jobs, we prevent welfare. In fact, we get people off of welfare.

With welfare reform in our face, we now have the challenge to help women support their families, to help women who have children move from welfare to work. We must help these women by supporting them through vocational education programs that will get them into jobs that pay a livable wage, the same jobs the males in their lives have that can and will support a family.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not train women for nontraditional jobs we are saying to those women, women, stay behind the typewriter, stay as a service worker, stay as a nurse's aide, but do not compete with the men, because the men have the jobs that pay a livable wage. We want to prevent welfare. We want to get families off of welfare. We must, we must, and we must give women a chance by supporting them in vocational education. Please support the Mink amendment.

□ 1730

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the very distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding to me, the gentleman from New York.

I say that because I know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has been concerned about questions of set-aside programs and certainly special populations, and most explicitly I know of his extraordinary interest in vocational education per se. I want to explain not only to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] but to others here, because there is a misperception, particularly a misperception of the last speaker based on his own experience in the State legislature that somehow we are leaving the special populations, particularly women, out there in this legislation without any protection that the Federal Government or this legislation is going to have some sort of control or monitoring of the State programs.

I wanted to tell my colleagues that that is a wrong understanding of what we are trying to do here. The Mink amendment would set up a set-aside, and some would even say quotas, actually, but precise set-aside for only those populations. However, the bill is reformed to provide grants to the States for all special populations and to have, and I must stress this, to have enforcement mechanisms in there to ensure that the States do their jobs. That is why I wanted to address this.

For example, the concerns of the special populations under this bill are accommodated under page 29, which I specifically referenced the other day when we were talking about this and debating this. This statement on page 29 refers to how the State has to take certain actions in accordance with the legislation that include all populations in specifically displaced homemakers, single parents and pregnant women.

Further, the legislation does include the necessary enforcement mechanisms and penalties. If the State application fails to show where the State will ensure that the special populations meet or exceed the benchmarks, then the Secretary can disapprove the State application; that is, the Secretary of Education. In addition, the Secretary and the Department could also sanction the State by withholding all or part of the grant.

I think also we must turn to section 115 on accountability, which mentions in section B, and I am reading now, quoting from the legislation, B, special populations, the report submitted by the State in accordance with paragraph (a) shall include, not may, shall include a description of how special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents and single pregnant women participating in vocational technical programs have performed in meeting the vocational technical education benchmarks established by the State.

Then it goes on to tell how they are required in terms of the funding to comply with the requirement.

I appreciate the gentleman from New York yielding to me. I hope this satisfies his questions on the subject.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, it most certainly does. I thank the gentlewoman for a wonderful explanation.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Mink-Morella-Sanchez amendment to ensure gender equity in vocational technical education. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, immediately prior to my election to this body, I served for 8 years, or two terms, as the elected State superintendent of the schools of the State of North Carolina. As a former State school chief, I know firsthand how important gender equity is in vocational education. According to the 1990 census data, there were more than 15.6 million homemakers in this Nation that were displaced, and a half a million of those homemakers live in North Carolina. In North Carolina single mothers care for more than 130,000 children. In my State an estimated 128,000 families with children live in poverty, and 81,000 or 63.6 percent of those families are headed by women. We must empower these women to succeed in today's economy.

Mr. Chairman, gender equity has produced significant and positive results in female enrollment and work force development in North Carolina. In 1986, there were 140,000 women enrolled in vocational education. Today in North Carolina that number is 190,000. These students have a 98 percent completion rate; 84 percent go on to post-high school education or training at our technical schools or in the job market.

Female participation in the apprenticeships have an 87 percent completion rate in their efforts to prepare workers for the work force.

Finally, in North Carolina our gender equity is linked, or maybe I should say partnered, with our local community groups and with business groups to match their skills when they come out of the public school. This arrangement provides for effective use of our resources and effectively and efficiently expands opportunities.

This amendment would protect efforts serving these displaced homemakers, single parents and pregnant women. The amendment would simply require that localities maintain funding at the same level as they did in 1997 and restore current law with respect to the vocational education equity coordinators that oversee, coordinate and make sure that equity is there.

Mr. Chairman, public education is the great equalizer in our society. By equipping people with the tools they need to make the most of their God-given talents, we must empower them to achieve the American dream and to succeed. Every American citizen deserves no less.

Not a guaranteed result, but a guaranteed opportunity. That is what this Congress ought to do. Sadly, without gender equity, women and girls will be shortchanged. If we are going to keep raising the bar, we better make sure that people can jump.

Equity access to education initiatives help women become self-sufficient and stay off welfare. Gender equity helps women attain higher skills, higher technical training that is necessary to land the best jobs in today's economy and will be essential to America's economic prospects in the 21st century. Without this amendment to H.R. 1853, it would fundamentally change our vocational education policy and threaten to roll back the clock against gains women have made in the workplace.

The effect of this change would be to reward localities that have lagged behind the effort to expand educational opportunity to girls and women. It would send a signal that this Congress no longer believes that efforts for girls and women, for displaced homemakers and single parents should be a priority. That is exactly the wrong signal that we should be sending in 1997.

Under H.R. 1853, a State can serve no displaced homemakers, no single parents, no single pregnant women and no individual training for nontraditional employment and under this bill it would be OK. That is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, during the previous Congress, Members of this House launched an all-out attack on public education that was devastating to the morale of the people who worked in the public schools. I stood with them shoulder to shoulder. I am here to tell my colleagues today, that is not going to happen in 1997. We need to stand up for girls and women and pass this amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mink-Morella amendment. I do so for the following reasons: First of all, in this body we all tend to talk in bumper sticker solutions. We all say, families first agenda. We all say, fix welfare now.

Well, this Mink-Morella amendment is the vehicle that these bumper stickers are attached to because this is the car that actually solves some of these problems. The solution does not fit on a bumper sticker. It is much more complicated than that. It is about getting education and fairness and equity to some of the people that have the most difficult time in America getting that education and equity and justice and fairness.

The Mink-Morella legislation would restore the 10.5 percent set-aside and also make sure that we have the equity coordinator. We have heard some speakers get up and say, well, there is no reason for this legislation. There is no reason to do this.

Prior to the Perkins law in 1984, less than 1 percent, less than 1 percent of all basic State grant money was spent

for displaced homemakers, and only 0.2 percent of all State and local matching funds went for these activities. So if we just assume that these problems are going to be fixed by leaving it up to some magic wand theory or bumper sticker, then they are not going to get fixed.

Previous speakers have also said that 63 percent of those welfare families are headed by females. This program is completely oriented toward helping those people get off of welfare and not tracking them into low wage, low pay jobs but giving them some of the necessary skills so that they can work up the ladder and get higher skills and higher pay down the ladder.

I know that a lot of Members in this body, particularly on the other side, are concerned about costs. What about costs? Well, I am a strong advocate of balancing the budget, and costs are certainly one of the most compelling reasons to vote for the Mink-Morella legislation.

In 1996, sex equity reserves were documented in several States to reduce welfare expenditures. Let me say that again. In 1996, sex equity reserves were documented in several States to reduce the welfare expenditure costs. So making sure that we spend money on education and training and equity reduces the costs later on on welfare expenditures.

In States like Missouri, they have saved more than $1.4 million in welfare payments. In Georgia's New Connections to Work Program, they saved $13 million over 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, if Members want to help some of the most vulnerable people in America, if they truly want to put families first, if they want to help us fix welfare and not just put bumper sticker solutions out there, if we want to do real things to help people, to help single parents, to help pregnant women, to help displaced homemakers, then they will vote for the Mink-Morella amendment. They will help put a vehicle, a car, fueled with gas, with answers, with strength, with solutions to propel that bumper sticker slogan that wants to put families first, to fix welfare, they will vote for that vehicle that will help us solve some of these problems in America.

Vote for the displaced homeworker. Vote for the single parent. Vote for the pregnant woman. Vote to fix welfare and put our families first. Vote for the Mink-Morella amendment.

□ 1745

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to speak in support of the Mink-Morella amendment to the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act. This amendment is essential in preserving an existing program that effectively serves the needs of girls and women in our vocational education system.

This amendment provides the programs serving displaced homemakers, single parents, pregnant women and those that promote gender equity in vocational education should be held harmless. The whole notion of set-aside is the same way of saying we hold harmless at the same rates that we had already, 10.5 percent for these programs.

These programs have proven themselves effective. For instance, in 1996, there was a GAO study entitled ''Employment Training: Successful Projects Share Common Strategy,'' stating that these programs are very effective indeed in moving people from welfare to work. Again, a similar program evaluated in the State of Oregon showed their displaced homemaker, single parent program, documenting its long-term success in increasing the number of people who were earning beyond the minimum wage, from $6.00 per hour to $7.45.

Mr. Chairman, this program indeed is effective. It has indeed proven what other programs promise to do, and for that reason I am delighted indeed to support this program.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Much has been said about the effect of provisions in the legislation that we are considering today that call for benchmarks and for the preparation of a State plan which include language for consideration for displaced homemakers, single parents and pregnant women. I acknowledged that in the earlier debate last week. But what we are concerned about is that once submitting a State plan, once acceding to the idea that there would be benchmarks, there is no enforcement mechanism.

Under the provisions of this bill, the State could serve not a single displaced homemaker because there is no way in which there can be any sort of enforcement, and that is the consequence that we fear.

Most people on both sides of the aisle acknowledge that the funding that was created 13 years ago, setting aside 10 percent of this program for the displaced homemaker, for the single parents, was an extremely worthwhile program. Why create a bill now that is totally different in its mechanism and risk the chance that some of these programs will fall by the wayside at the very time when we are enforcing the welfare reform bill and saying that people on welfare or single parents must find work activity?

Work activity is vocational training, and they need to have a place that can give them special attention, recognizing the fact that they are on welfare and want to make the 12 months that they are entitled to have of vocational training produce the kind of skills that can guarantee them a job which can support their family.

That is the whole idea of this, to get women into a position where they can qualify for nontraditional jobs, make enough money so that they can support their families.

In the brief time I have left, I wanted to also note that in the debate on Thursday there was mention that no one has come forth discussing the needs of this special program for the single parents, for the pregnant women, displaced homemakers, and for the sex equity coordinator. Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, many of the people who wrote to the committee also sent copies to the minority side and we have here a whole pile of letters that came in.

They are dated early June, mid-June, June 6, June 12, June 8, and so forth, from people all across the country addressing their concerns to the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], who is the chair of the subcommittee. And I am sure that if the staff will look in their files, they will find many of these letters.

Not only that, there was a witness that testified in the subcommittee that brought forth the importance of this program and urged the subcommittee continue the funding of this special emphasis program. So I am startled that there was reference to the fact that there were no letters.

At an appropriate time I will ask the House to allow me to insert these letters in the RECORD for the benefit of the House.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise not just as a woman, but also as a single parent in opposition to the Mink amendment.

H.R. 1853 authorizes funding for vocational-technical education. This bill benefits women already because it directs funds to local vo-tech programs giving women the opportunity to receive a quality education.

The bill also requires States to establish benchmarks and show how these vo-tech programs prepare special students groups: Specifically, displaced homemakers, single parents, and single pregnant women for postsecondary education or entry into high-skilled, high-wage jobs. In this way, Mr. Chairman, this bill actually protects the funds going into programs for women.

The Mink amendment, however, would mandate that States set aside funds for local areas to maintain gender-based programs even where they might not be needed. For example, Washington State is due to receive more than $19 million for vocational educational spending under title II and title III of the Carl D. Perkins Act, 90 percent of which will go directly to the local level.

Under the Mink amendment, more than $2 million of the $19 million would be reserved, set aside, for gender-based programs that are already adequately addressed and protected in H.R. 1853.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the Mink amendment and support the thoughtful, pro-woman bill reported by the committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DUNN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. This has been an interesting debate to listen to. I support the goals of the Mink amendment, I support the gentleman from Indiana and what his goals are, and the gentleman from Cleveland and the gentlewomen from the different parts of this country. But what we are really doing with the Mink amendment is we are going to be putting a lot more money in bureaucracy and less money in the classroom. It is a bureaucracy builder.

Historically, we set aside at the State level. The Mink amendment says that each and every school district must spend no less than it did in the previous year. That means we have to have a Federal bureaucracy and a State bureaucracy that will monitor every district in this country, every vocational school in this country to make sure that they spend the exact dollar amount that they spent last year. Do we need this kind of oversight from the Federal Government?

My colleagues keep talking about the welfare-to-work bill. I helped write Pennsylvania's welfare bill. Every State is targeting the population of displaced homemakers, single pregnant women and sex equity program because that is the majority of the welfare population. They are using Federal and State welfare-to-work moneys to do that. We have expanded the ability to use the job training moneys in a bill we recently passed. Many States have promoted and expanded their homemaker training programs. And any State that wants to meet the Federal mandate is going to target this population.

The bill, in four different areas, talks about this population, that it must be part of the plan, it must be a benchmark, we must meet those goals or they do not get the money. To put a mandate on every vocational training program in America, that they must spend the exact same amount as last year, does nothing but create a bureaucracy that will waste millions of dollars that will train nobody.

I think the Mink amendment, Mr. Chairman, has laudable goals, but I think it misses the mark. What the gentlewoman is talking about is happening. Any State that is not making it happen is not going to be able to implement the welfare reform bill.

It is an unneeded amendment, it is an amendment that will waste dollars in bureaucracy at the national and at the State level. It will force every State to hire a $60,000 sex equity coordinator, whether needed or not. Let us leave that up to the States.

Every State has a built-in incentive to make this happen. This amendment will only put money into the hands of bureaucrats and not train displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, or bring sex equity.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the last dialog indicates that we really do need a mandate to affirmatively ensure that there is a reality in this bill, and that is that we do have vocational training for women, and as well that we remedy the equity disparity that comes across in many instances.

A 1993 CRS report on the educational status of women confirms that public high school girls participating in vocational educational programs tend to be clustered in traditionally female occupations and, as well, an analysis reported in an American Association of University Women Report, ''How Schools Shortchange Girls'' concluded that the problem of sex segregation in vocational education programs continues to exist both at the secondary and postsecondary level.

This particular amendment, does not add amount of moneys for women vocational programs, homemakers, single parents, pregnant women but rather it requires States to maintain fiscal year 1997 funding as well as it provides for an equity gender specialist for each State to make sure women are treated fairly in vocational training programs.

Let me just simply say, Why do we not have women airplane mechanics, and there may be some; why are there not more computer technicians, and there may be some; why are there not more women specializing in the building trades, and there may be some? The reason is because we need someone who oversees the programs in the State who says, ''I do not want to give an incentive, I want to see the job done.''

We want the job done. This is a good amendment to get the job done, to ensure that women have equal access along with men in training in unusual vocational trades that traditionally are geared toward men.

In this time when Republicans are pushing welfare to work—let us give women, single parents, displaced homemakers, pregnant, a fighting chance to get good high-paying jobs with the right kind of vocational training.

I clearly think we must pass this amendment, the Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey-Millender-McDonald amendment that fairly says to women, ''You, too, can do it.''

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment and thank Congresswomen MINK, MORELLA, SANCHEZ, and WOOLSEY for their leadership in protecting vocational and educational programs for women and girls.

This amendment to H.R. 1853 will preserve existing programs serving the needs of girls and women in our vocational education system. The amendment will accomplish this by requiring that local recipients of vocational education funds spend at least as much as they spent in fiscal year 1997 on programs for displaced homemakers, single parents, single pregnant women, and programs which promote gender equity.

This amendment is critical to remedy the cuts that have been made in H.R. 1853. The vocational education reauthorization bill in its current form eliminates a 10.5-percent set-aside of State moneys required under current law for these programs. The bill also eliminates the equity coordinator required in every State to oversee, coordinate, and evaluate equity initiatives in vocational education.

My colleagues, it is critical that we pass this amendment for while we have made significant progress in the area of educational equity, to end our emphasis on these areas now would result in serious setbacks as illustrated by a 1993 CRS report on the educational status of women. This study confirms that public high school girls participating in vocational educational programs tend to be clustered in traditionally female occupations. Additionally, analysis reported in the American Association of University Women report, ''How Schools Shortchange Girls,'' concluded that the problem of sex segregation in vocational education programs continues to exist at both the secondary and postsecondary level.

For these reasons I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to pass this important amendment and in so doing to protect these important programs. Thank you.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from California, who happens to be a cosponsor of this very good and positive legislation.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, the gracious gentlewoman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard the old adage, I have been there, done that. As the former director of a gender equity program, I can tell my colleagues firsthand how successful these programs are. It is not by happenstance, it is because there was a gender equity coordinator at the State level that ensured that we followed an accountability trail of these programs.

I cannot imagine that we are trying to argue with success or even challenge it. These are successful programs that were done by this person, who was the director of gender equity programs for the second largest unified school district in America, the Los Angeles one, and we simply ensured that those women who were most vulnerable received the type of access to the vocational programs that gender equity ensured.

What is missing here is the whole notion that one thinks that we can put this money in vocational programs and those vulnerable groups would be serviced. Let me just say that these are women who need not only the vocational training and the skills, but they need the self-esteem, the self-worth. That is what comes when the gender equity coordinator at the helm, at the State level, ensures that those of us directors throughout the Nation and throughout the States provide for these women.

This amendment, our amendment, is a hold harmless amendment which does not restore the set-aside that has been

articulated numerous times, much to my chagrin. The main purpose of the Perkins Act is to improve the quality of vocational education and to provide access to quality vocational education for special populations.

I have seen 80 percent of the participants with children, 80 percent of participants on some form of public assistance be enhanced and enriched by this Perkins equity program. I say to my colleagues that those who do not see the need to service those who are most vulnerable, those who are moving from welfare to work to get gender equity programs, I feel are short-sighted.

□ 1800

So I say to my colleague, a person who has been there and done that, do know the success of this program, gender equity programs, Mr. Chairman, do work for those women, those pregnant women, the displaced homemakers, and those who are in need of this program.

I would say to all of my colleagues to support the Mink, et al. amendment, of which I am one of the cosponsors.

The amendment: This is a hold-harmless amendment which does not restore the 10.5 percent set-aside, at the State level but rather, assures that these valuable services to an often overlooked population continue. The Mink - Morella - Woolsey - Sanchez - Millender- McDonald amendment would require that localities currently funding such programs continue to provide funding for these purposes at, at least, the same level as fiscal year 1997. This amendment would also restore the requirement that a vocational education equity coordinator exist in every State.

The main purpose of the Perkins Act is to improve the quality of vocational education and to provide access to quality vocational education for special populations such as women who are single mothers and displaced homemakers. We need this amendment to ensure that we continue to meet this purpose.

In the Los Angeles Unified School District, where I served as the director of gender equity programs, the preliminary statistics for the 1996–97 year: 1,642 adult women completed programs offered through the Perkins grants—several more attended classes but did not complete the courses; 2,600 teen mothers benefiting from these programs—5,000 total teen mothers in Los Angeles city school district, 10,000 in Los Angeles country; ages range from 14 to 62, median age is 30's; 80 percent of participants have children; 80 percent of participants on some form of public assistance; 68 percent of participants are Hispanic; 14–16 percent of participants are African-American; and 4–6 percent of participants are Asian-Americans.

Results of the Los Angeles Unified School District's gender equity programs: 50 percent of participants are employed after completing these programs which directly results in reducing the number of people receiving public assistance.

State of California—98 percent of the Perkins Act funding in 1996 was distributed to local districts in the State of California

These programs help over 1,000 school districts and 107 community colleges in California regardless of whether they receive the Perkins funding

Throughout the country the long-term success rate of these single and displaced homemaker programs is very impressive. in the neighboring State of Oregon in 1996: Employment rates soared from 28 to 71 percent; median wage rates increased from $6 per hour to $7.45 per hour; and dependence on AFDC of the program participants fell from 29 to 15 percent.

In Arizona, women in nontraditional jobs have increased from 7 to 17 percent.

In Georgia, participants' annual salaries increased from an average of $11,000 prior to participation to an average of $16,500, and the New Connections to Work Program saved the State $13 million in welfare savings over 10 years.

In Pennsylvania, these programs saved the State $2.3 million in welfare savings in the 1994 program year.

MR. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, did you hear objection when previous speakers who spoke on this subject at some length in earlier days sought to address the House?

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, no one on this side has spoken more than once. We have yielded to everybody who spoke. Someone has yielded, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Members who spoke on this amendment last week, have been allowed to speak again this week with unanimous consent.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, we have not had a single speaker today who spoke on his or her own time last week. The ones who spoke last week were yielded time by other speakers. My colleague cannot name one person who has spoken twice.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] for his courtesy in yielding and would just note to him, I must marvel at our colleagues' selective memory in terms of how this debate has unfolded on the floor.

But my point in seeking to be recognized, Mr. Chairman, is to let our colleagues know that our bill, as reported out of committee, is a vast improvement upon current law. It reduces bureaucracy at the Federal and State government levels, it caps State administrative expenses so that more dollars can actually reach students, and it decreases mandates on States and local school districts so that they may create vocational programs that reflect their own needs and priorities.

The Mink amendment would undercut each of the improvements I have just mentioned. Rather than allowing States and localities to set their own priorities based on their own local vocational needs, and I know that is a radical thought to our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, sex equity programs would be mandated. And we have heard several speakers on this side of the aisle refer to it as just what it is, and that is a mandate.

All we are doing in this amendment is talking about transferring a State set-aside down to the local level so a State set-aside becomes a local set-aside, and we replace a State mandate with a local mandate. I would love to hear any speaker on the other side of the aisle stand up and deny that as the case.

This does not make sense. The gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] made reference to testimony before the subcommittee. May I remind her that Paul Cole, the vice president of the American Federation of Teachers, testified in front our Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families in support of eliminating set-asides. My colleagues heard me correct. Paul Cole, vice president of the American Federation of Teachers.

In fact, I quote from his testimony now. ''Federal legislation should eliminate set-asides at State and local levels. Funding formulas for special populations are harmful when they provide an incentive for schools to retain students in these categories because funding depends on it.''

Mr. Cole is not alone. He was simply referencing the National Assessment of Vocational Education, Final Report to Congress, Volume 1, prepared by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement at the U.S. Department of Education. I quoted from this report last week, and I quote again.

> There are two major risks in broad-brush efforts to include more and more special population students in vocational educational, including the special populations that are intended to be served by this 10½ percent set-aside, 10½ percent of the funding that is taken right off the top. The first is that factors other than the student's best interest will become more prominent in placement decisions. For example, recruiting special needs students in order to keep vocational enrollments up and thus maintain staff positions is a familiar practice, and it often complements a desire in comprehensive schools to get hard-to-educate students out of regular classes. In situations such as this, some students will benefit for participation in vocational programs, but others will not.
>
> The second risk with this practice is that vocational programs, especially those in regional schools, will increasingly become special needs programs, separated from the mainstream of secondary education, an outcome that is opposite to the very intent, the original intent behind the Perkins Act.

This is clearly dumping. It is a problem. I go on to quote from the report.

Special population students are an ever-increasing proportion of all vocational students, and the Perkins emphasis on recruiting special population students to vocational education may be among the factors contributing to this tendency.

We have tried to rectify that. We have come up with, I think, a good compromise. We have said in our bill that States and local communities should be allowed to continue to fund these programs at their choice. That is perfectly in keeping with the longstanding American tradition of local control and decentralized decision-making in public education.

Our bill already includes, but it does not mandate, and there is the difference, support for displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, and single parents at all levels of State and local vocational educational programs. We have to take a firm stand against more mandates on local schools. It is time to practice what you preach if in fact you do believe that decisionmaking should be vested at the local level.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against the Mink amendment and to say no to more mandates for local schools.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, as a longtime supporter of programs designed to assist displaced homemakers, I support the intent of the Mink amendment. However, I do have some concerns about the mandate it would impose upon States.

Since coming to Congress, I have supported transferring more authority to State and local governments. Too many times, we have adopted a one size fits all approach when we are establishing new programs or policies. In many instances, the very people that we are trying to assist could have been better served if States had been given the flexibility to create programs designed to address their specific needs.

While I believe that displaced homemakers should have access to vocational training, I want to make sure that we are serving their needs in the most effective way. I believe one way that we can assist displaced homemakers is by providing a tax credit to employers who hire and train these individuals. For over 10 years, I have sponsored such tax credit legislation, and in the 105th Congress, I have reintroduced this legislation as H.R. 402.

Displaced homemakers are primarily women who have been full-time homemakers for a number of years, but who have lost their source of economic support due to divorce, separation, abandonment, or the death or disability of a spouse. Many displaced homemakers are living at or near the poverty level, are younger than 35 and have children.

One of every six American women is a displaced homemaker. In 1990, there were 17.8 million displaced homemakers in the United States. In my own State of Florida, there were over 1.1 million displaced homemakers in 1990—a 55-percent increase since 1980.

My bill, H.R. 402, would allow employers a tax credit for hiring displaced homemakers by establishing them as a targeted group under the Work Opportunity Tax Credit [WOTC] Program. The WOTC Program is intended to combat and lessen the problem of structural unemployment among certain hard-to-employ individuals.

My bill would extend the WOTC to include displaced homemakers. Under the proposal, employers could apply for a tax credit if they hire these individuals who are having difficulty reentering the job market.

I see this approach as cost-effective. By providing prospective employers with the incentive to hire displaced homemakers, we avoid the much more costly alternative of publicly supporting these homemakers and their families.

Mr. Chairman, these are people who are in financial need and want to work. I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 402.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mink amendment.

I often say the 104th Congress was the most antiwoman Congress I can remember.

Well, the 105th is catching up.

For 13 years the Perkins Vocational Technical Education Act has provided funds to ensure that America's women do not miss out on opportunities to better their lives.

For 13 years these programs have worked.

Displaced home-makers, single parents, pregnant women, and some girls in vocational schools have been able to count on help from their government, not to bail them out, but to help them bail themselves out.

It's a fact that vocational education keeps women off welfare.

In Oregon, a recent study documented its long-term success in increasing employment rates from 28 to 71 percent. Wages increased. Fourteen percent of the women on welfare got off.

In Arizona, not only did wages increase, but the number of women in nontraditional jobs increased from 7 to 17 percent.

In Georgia, women benefited from the programs by increasing their salaries from $11,000 to $16,500.

Now, it's not as if the government handed those people $1,500 raises. What it did was allow them to earn those raises in the private sector themselves.

Isn't this why we're here?

Are we not in the business of helping people help themselves?

Is that not what we're trying to do in reforming the Nation's welfare program?

Many States are reporting that higher wages—achieved through the vocational program—are keeping women off welfare.

In Pennsylvania, in 1994, the setaside program saved the State $2.3 million in welfare payments.

In Missouri, $1.4 million in welfare payments were recovered.

If this Congress is truly working to get women and children off welfare, why would it cut a program that helps them do just that?

As my colleagues, Representatives MINK, MORELLA, SANCHEZ, and WOOLSEY point out, this amendment does not ask for an increase.

It only asks that the 10-percent setaside be preserved.

It restores the vocational education equity coordinator position.

And it keeps the Federal policy on track and consistent.

It shows that our effort to achieve gender equity and to help at-risk groups such as displaced homemakers and single parents stay off welfare, get an education, and keep well-paying jobs a priority.

The original intent of this legislation was to make the United States more competitive by developing more fully the academic and occupational skills of our citizens.

Our citizens who most need that help are on the verge of being cut out of the deal.

I urge a vote in support of the Mink amendment.

Mr. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mink amendment. This proposal will encourage young and middle-aged women to receive valuable skills training in occupations that have traditionally been filled by men. It will allow them to get jobs with better pay and better benefits, and make it easier for women to support their families. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this important amendment.

The Mink amendment will do all this by protecting the funds that States currently use for programs that ensure gender equity in vocational education. Make no mistake—without this protection, these programs will disappear. The evidence is clear—before 1984, when State grants were reserved for gender equity programs, only 1 percent of these grants were actually used for gender equity.

Last year, Republicans passed a bill based on a twisted premise—that if you push people off the boat, they will somehow learn to swim. The Republican bill assumed that by shredding the vital social safety net, jobs would magically appear for people. This strategy is not only cruel, it is wrong—without help in learning to swim, many people will drown.

If Congress is really serious about encouraging women to achieve financial independence, then Congress should make sure all women have the opportunity to obtain the tools they need to find a good job and support their families. The Mink amendment would provide these opportunities. I urge all of you to vote yes on the Mink amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, 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 CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KLINK

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. KLINK: Page 30 strike lines 5 through 9, and insert the following:

''(2) INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.—

''(A) STATE REQUIREMENTS.—Each State shall make the information contained in reports described under paragraph (1) available to the general public through publication and other appropriate methods which may include electronic communication.

''(B) SECRETARY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall make the information contained

in such reports available to the general public through publication and other appropriate methods which may include electronic communication.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I will not take all the 5 minutes. My understanding is that the majority has agreed to accept this amendment. I am pleased that we are here today to work on this bill reauthorizing the Perkins Vocational Technical Education Act.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the chairmen, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking member, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] are to be commended for maintaining our country's commitment to vocational education.

This amendment is really quite simple. It will require each State to make the report required in the accountability section of this bill available to the public. The bill requires the Secretary of Education to make these reports available to the public. Local grant recipients are required to make the performance information available to the public.

My amendment would ensure that each State will make its report to the Secretary available in that State in the same manner that this legislation requires the Secretary to make these reports available on a national basis. What we are talking about is a bipartisan strive toward openness. That way, information about vocational-technical education program performance will be disseminated in the widest manner possible.

This amendment will provide for further accountability in vocational education. I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment. The amendment would require States to make the information contained in their report on how the State is performing in regard to their State benchmarks available to the public. This is consistent with the provisions of the bill which require the Secretary and local districts to make the information available to the public. We do accept the amendment.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. We have no objection to the amendment, and we accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

Page 52, after line 15, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

''(8) providing an on-site workforce development coordinator who will coordinate activities described in this section with an emphasis on developing additional curricula in cooperation with local area businesses;''.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment really gets to the heart of whether or not we are serious about reforming our voc education and really the general practice of whether or not we are going to be encouraging our young people in this country to go on and continue their education.

We hear statistics across America today that tell us if we are really interested in the education of our young people, we ought to recognize that we ought to look at them in terms of the 25 percentile. The top 25 percent of all American children go on to college or even higher education beyond college. They do very very well for themselves.

The next 25 percent struggles to get through high school but gets some sort of additional education. The third 25 percent in fact struggles to just get through high school. And the bottom 25 percent never even finishes high school.

The truth of the matter is, if we are serious about encouraging that bottom 50 percent to do anything more than they are currently doing, and as I just came from a hearing in the Committee on Banking, where chairman Alan Greenspan condemned all of the efforts dealing with job training in this country, it seems to me that it is critically important that we, in fact, take a look at what is really working around America.

What we find is, and I think even the chairman of the committee would agree, that there are a number of innovative and creative programs. For instance, the BIC in the city of Boston that works hand in glove with the local business community to help assist to develop a curriculum with the high schools to make certain that—in fact where I come from, the city of Boston, we have an important high-technology industry—that going to a high school where you are learning reading, arithmetic, and basic languages might be helpful but it might be very discouraging for a poor child from the inner city who does not know what in fact those courses are going to actually have to do with their ability to be able to handle or deal with the real crises and the real issues that they face in their day-to-day lives.

What we found is that by getting a coordinator who actually works with the business community and the high schools to begin to set a curriculum where in fact the high school student knows that if he completes a set of courses outside of the curriculum that the high school itself would set working with the school committee, but works on additional courses that are set by the business community, the business community then agrees to in fact provide after-school opportunities, summer youth jobs, that in fact the kids have an enormously high success rate. We have been able to see children move directly from high schools into jobs after high school and from those particular instances their rate of actually going back and continuing their education, going on to community college and in many instances 4-year schools, have been much, much higher than the population in general.

What this amendment would do is allow for the use of a coordinator, a work force coordinator to work with the business community at the level across our country, using voc educational funds to work with that business community to help set a curriculum with the high schools and through that curriculum to then ask our business community to then provide after-school programs and summer youth jobs for our kids.

It, in fact, is a program that works. And I am surprised that there would be any opposition to the simple use of a coordinator to work with the business communities and the local high schools in order to accomplish what seems to me to be a fairly reasonable and easy goal to deal with.

However, in negotiations with the other side of the aisle, it has come out that in fact the use of the word coordinator somehow gets a yellow flag on the field of the Congress of the United States. If you use anything involving the word coordinator, somehow or another there is a group of people in this country that are going to scream that we are somehow setting the agenda of our high school students and somehow we are going to be teaching them about sex or some other thing that has absolutely nothing do with what this amendment is all about.

What we are trying to accomplish here is dealing with the real needs of real people, the young people of America that are the future of this country. This is not about any kind of ideology. This is just straightforward talk about what works in America today. If we want to stand here and pass a voc-ed bill that continues programs that will not work, we just heard them talking and yacking about the fact that there are going to be mandates.

□ 1815

We mandate that we are not going to hurt women, but we do not do anything to make certain that women, young girls, are going to be encouraged to continue and get better jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is that what we are trying to accomplish here is a straightforward approach to actually getting our young people of this country educated in the kinds of jobs, not just the kind of jobs that would be good in Boston but the kind

of jobs that would be good in Missouri, the kind of jobs that would be good in Pennsylvania, the kind of jobs that would be good in California or Hawaii or Virginia or any other State. Let the local people decide exactly what kind of jobs that is appropriate for their local high schools to set up. But encourage those young people. If one goes into high schools today and tells all those kids in high schools in the inner city that they can go on to a 4-year college or to community college and then ask them whether or not they intend to go, what they will find is 50 percent or more of the kids say they have no intention of going to college. Ask them why, and they say they do not think they can afford it, they do not think they can attain college. What this program will do is set up a track where these kids will get the kind of job training, get the kind of encouragement from the local business community that I think will make them a success in life.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have to make sure that we understand that this amendment would add support for a work force development coordinator at schools as an allowable use of funds under this bill. As the gentleman from Massachusetts recalled, we had a discussion regarding this issue during the debate on the job training bill earlier this year, at which time I said I would be happy to work with the gentleman when we considered the vocational education bill, and I think that our bill accommodates his concerns without specifically allowing for funding of a work force coordinator.

I understand the gentleman's concern that he is trying to get at it through his amendment, but our bill does not currently list support for any specific staff. The Federal Government should not outline what staff may or may not be hired by a school. However, what this bill does is list a number of activities as allowable uses of funds for vocational technical education programs at the local level that allow for the types of activities that I believe his amendment is trying to achieve.

Under this bill, local school districts and postsecondary institutions may use funds for involving parents, businesses, and representatives of employers in the design and implementation of vocational technical education programs. That is already an allowable use of funds. Allowable use of funds, providing guidance and counseling. Allowable use of funds, providing work-related experience, and business and education partnerships. All of this is in the present bill.

I believe that coordination activities with employers are implicitly included in these allowable activities, but again without specifically mentioning any support personnel that would be employed at local schools. In fact, this legislation does not specifically spell out support for any staff, not teachers, administrators, counselors, or coordinators.

If the gentleman had had the experience, as many of us had, during the last 3 years trying to put together a job training bill, he would understand how those 2 words in a piece of legislation, would as a matter of fact take, I would imagine, 80 votes from his side and 150 votes from my side. We carefully made sure that we did not get caught in the trap that we were caught in for a couple of years on the job training bill and had to work our way through it. If we say that we will have a work force coordinator, that just raises all sorts of problems for both sides of the aisle. I would hope that the gentleman would either withdraw the amendment or I would hope we could defeat the amendment because if we do not, in my estimation we cannot pass the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in the gentleman's opinion a few minutes ago, I thought the number was we were going to lose 40 Democrats, and now I understand the gentleman feels we would lose 80 Democrats, but setting that aside, if we were not going to lose any Democrats, does the gentleman feel substantively that this is the proper way of handling this particular piece of legislation?

Mr. GOODLING. I believe in this legislation we now do much of what the gentleman is trying to do without specifically authorizing a work force development coordinator in a high school or a secondary tech school.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I just would point out that while I recognize and I think that the gentleman has attempted to cover many of the activities that the coordinator would in fact be responsible for, I think that the gentleman has also voiced great concern over mandates without providing the resources that are necessary in order to fulfill those mandates. So by standing there and saying or suggesting that we are going to ask these schools to accomplish all of these goals but then not giving them any staff to actually be able to follow through on those promises, I am very concerned that we end up with simply a hollow bill, and I think that the gentleman and others on his side would voice the same concern, that we are simply sending out signals but we are doing nothing to actually follow through and give people the tools that are necessary to fulfill those goals.

Mr. GOODLING. Again, let me repeat, that when the gentleman mentions a work force development coordinator at schools, the gentleman is asking for the bill, in my estimation, to be defeated. I can only tell the gentleman from 3 years' experience trying to put together a job training bill, it is this kind of language and that will get us in trouble again.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me first say that I appreciate the comments of the chairman of the committee making it clear that he does not have substantive opposition to what this amendment intends to do. He does have concerns apparently with semantics and with the politics of certain code words and all, and I appreciate that. I am not surprised, though, to see him behind what such an important amendment attempts to do.

Maybe we can call it something other than a work force coordinator, but that is exactly what our schools need. I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] offering the amendment, because it is time we stopped just talking and started doing something about this issue.

In the Washington metropolitan area, we have 19,000 jobs related to computers that we cannot fill. The average salary is $47,000. Thousands of these jobs do not require any kind of college education. And what are we doing? We are going to India, we are going to Pakistan, we are going to Ireland—some people might not object to that—but nevertheless we are going every place we can find to find people to fill these jobs at very low wages. Yet they do not require any skills that our high school graduates cannot acquire, it is just that our high school graduates have not acquired those skills because they did not have the benefit of a vocational education curriculum.

We have thousands of young people in this Washington area who are desperate to find jobs. What a disservice that we have done to them. They get out of high school and they have virtually nothing to take with them when they go looking for a job. No skills, minimal education, little work preparation. Why? Because our schools are not geared up in many ways to create a match between the jobs that are available and the kids that can fill them. What a crying shame to have thousands of kids desperate for jobs, desperate for employment, desperate to find a way to support their family and yet also to have thousands of jobs unfilled.

That is what this amendment is all about. It is about trying to get someone who is going to make that match, who is going to work for the kids by working between the schools and the businesses, to consult with businesses, bring them in, tell the kids what jobs are available, what they pay, and then to help put together the kind of curricula that is going to be relevant for the jobs that are available. Unfortunately, what has happened is that many of our vocational education schools have become a dumping ground. In many ways voc ed means a dumping ground, primarily for disruptive students. This is the attitude that this amendment can help change.

In the District of Columbia we have a voc ed school, and it could have become

a good one. What happened was that the other schools started putting their most disruptive students in that school, and now it is virtually a reform school. They are not going to like me to say that, so I will not give the specific name of the school. But it is not serving their needs. What a crying shame. Yet if we had this kind of liaison between the business community and the school system, we could serve a lot of their needs. We desperately need their talents and their skills. We need to develop vocational education as an immediate step to getting a good job, to being able to go to an employer with the kind of skills and basic education and attitude that they are looking for.

So our school system is disserving these kids. Are we really going to pass this kind of bill, the Perkins bill here without addressing this most critical need? I would hope not. I would hope that we would pass this amendment, that we would underscore the need to bring the business community in for its own self-interest, in influencing the curricula, in giving the real opportunity, the real access to the jobs that are available to these kids who desperately need them.

This is an important amendment. I would urge my colleagues' strong support for it. I appreciate the support of the chairman of the committee. I know that the ranking member of the full committee from Missouri is very strongly in support of vocational education. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for introducing it. I would certainly expect and hope that this body would pass it overwhelmingly.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out to the gentleman from Virginia that we had a field hearing just across the Potomac River at Thomas Jefferson High School, which I believe is close to his congressional district, in fact he was good enough to stop in at the hearing briefly. And we saw that at Thomas Jefferson High School—which is one of the most outstanding academic high schools in the country with a long record of national merit semifinalists and a tremendous history of sending kids to the top 4-year colleges and universities in the country—they are doing this already. They are working closely with the private sector. They have extensive private sector involvement in the design of their curriculum. They have the private sector involved in any number of internships, job shadowing opportunities, and mentoring types of activities. This is all done without the need for an on-site work force development coordinator—which is a classic example of how we micromanage Federal legislation.

I do not quarrel that the gentleman is well-intentioned. But I do point out that his amendment does represent micromanagement. It is in fact not necessary because under the bill, if we look at the section of the bill dealing with permissible activities, we will see that we allow and encourage local school districts and postsecondary institutions to use funding for involving parents, businesses and representatives of employers in the design and implementation of vocational-technical education programs, to provide career guidance and academic counseling, to provide work-related experience, as I just mentioned, and to help form business-education partnerships in the local communities.

□ 1830

So the Kennedy amendment is a classic example of overkill and micromanagement.

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

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Did the gentleman say that the outstanding Thomas Jefferson School near our colleague from Virginia's district, is already doing all of these things and the Federal Government did not have to mandate it and did not tell them they had to do that?

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is so right. In fact we learned from the example of Thomas Jefferson High School. We acted upon the testimony that we heard at our hearing. In our bill, we have said under the section dealing with the permissible uses of funds, that the funding can be used by local institutions—a high school or regional vocational school—to provide, and I quote now from the bill, work-related experience such as internships, cooperative education, school-based enterprises—like we also saw up in Delaware where the kids are running a bank at Wilmington High School—entrepreneurship and job shadowing. They are all related to vocational-technical education programs.

What we do *not* do again is attempt to micromanage, we do not dictate, we do not spell out that local schools should use any of the funding to pay for the salaries and benefits of local personnel. We do not, anywhere in the legislation, talk about support for any staff; not teachers, administrators, counselors, or coordinators.

So I join the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] in urging the gentleman to withdraw his amendment with the understanding that the type of coordination activities that he wants to see, that we all want to see take place between local secondary schools and local employers, are already allowed under our bill for vocational-technical education programs.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], my friend and colleague.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I just want to deal with a couple of the arguments that have been made. As my colleagues know, the idea that there are not innovative and creative vocational educational programs, that there are not young people that are attending those schools that are not going on to do tremendous things has nothing to do with what we are trying to suggest in this amendment. Of course there are, and we should recognize and encourage those activities, and where they are accomplished without the assistance of a coordinator is terrific.

But the vast majority of the kids that we are designing programs to help and assist are the kids that are falling through the cracks. We do not need to have programs for kids that are A students and are doing terrifically. The reason why we are having these programs is to make certain that the kids that are currently not achieving everything they can in this country can have an opportunity to go out and become all they can be.

That is what this is about, and it is trying to suggest that we give them opportunity, if we get them to work with their local businesses and get the businesses to recognize that the young people that are in their communities have all the future of this country in front of them.

As my colleagues know, the fact of the matter is I come from the State of Massachusetts. The State of Massachusetts has more college graduates per capita than any other State in the Nation. That is something we are extremely proud of. I have 60 colleges in my own congressional district, more than 26 other States in one congressional district.

The fact of the matter is that we have a first-rate education system, but within that there are still so many of the kids that end up falling through the cracks. In my district I have some of the poorest Hispanic kids in the United States. I have the minority influence district. Go into the poorer high schools and find out whether they think they can go to Harvard University or whether they can go to MIT. They do not think they can. None of those kids feel that they are going to be participants in the so-called greatness of America's education.

These are the kids that we need to reach out to. They can; in fact 50 percent, despite the fact that Massachusetts is No. 1 in terms of higher education, 50 percent of all the adults in the State of Massachusetts have nothing more than a high school education. Fifty percent of them. We still have dropout rates of 25, 35, and 40 percent in many of our major cities and urban areas of our country. Those are the kids that we need to reach out to. They are not bad kids. We need to reach out and let them know that they count and that they are important and that our businesses will value them because those businesses will one day be employing them. And if we can establish that relationship early on in their lives and make certain that they know that

those companies, those high-technology companies, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] talked about 19,000 here in the Washington area.

The fact is that there are HVAC companies, there are diesel engine companies, there are all sorts of technical skills that our young people are simply not learning, and the companies do not have the access to those local high schools to know and be able to set the kind of curriculum that is going to allow them to learn those skills. Let them have that opportunity. Do not deny them because there is a few Members of either party that are sitting there saying that this is going to be sex education. Do not do that. Do not buckle to that.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues should stand up and say what is right. What is right is that we provide that coordinator. Let them in fact. Do not buckle to some right wing or left wing or anybody else's wing. Stand up for the kids; that is what this bill is supposed to be about. Stand up for the kids, pass this amendment.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make sure that we think this the whole way through. Where do we stop if we want every child to reach their potential? Would it not be a good idea to mandate that we have a military coordinator in every school? It seems to me there is great potential by joining the armed services, even to get a college degree, but certainly to get all sorts of training. So where do we stop? Where do we decide that the Federal Government no longer should mandate?

And I think we make a big mistake when we go down the line of determining for local school districts who it is they should hire.

The program is working well at the present time with the coordination that is available. The activity is allowable in the legislation but we do not mandate any personnel. It does not matter whether it is an administrator or a teacher—we do not mandate personnel. We allow the local level to make that decision.

Again, we need to remember that when we start down this slippery slope, I can see all sorts of wonderful things that a military coordinator could do to help young people reach their potential, but I certainly would not mandate it.

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

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have to tell my colleagues I am now perplexed a little bit about the Kennedy amendment because I am looking at the gentleman's Dear Colleague, and I quote:

> This person, referring to the work force development coordinator, would help develop courses in addition to the core curriculum, and I always thought that the design of that curriculum, that local curriculum, was the responsibility of the locally elected school board. That is certainly in keeping with the longstanding American tradition.
>
> And second, the gentleman talks about this individual again helping familiarize young people with college opportunities or college possibilities and maybe encouraging them to set their sights high and to apply to attend a 4-year institution.

Yet again I read from his Dear Colleague. He says:

> This person would educate our students about career possibilities in their own hometown and help students obtain jobs in the local economy. This acts as a local job placement service run at a local high school, and that is contrary to the idea of encouraging more young people to go to college.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] yield?

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. First of all, as my colleagues know, we have heard a lot of talk about mandates. I just like to point out that all this is is a permissible activity. There is no mandate. I mean I think it should be a mandate, but I did not write it because I did not think we could get enough votes if we wrote it as an absolute mandate. So it is just a permissible activity.

And I would just say to the gentleman, through the gentleman from Wisconsin to the gentleman from California, that all we are trying to suggest here is that of course the core curriculum is going to be set by the local school committee. We want to involve the local school committee and everyone else in this activity. But unless we provide them a coordinator who can work with the business community in order to accomplish this, you will get our top tier, the top 10 or 20 or 30 percent that will take care of this anyway. We are talking about the kind of high schools that maybe do not exist in my colleague's district but certainly exist in mine, the kind of high schools that are really struggling, that are having a very hard time. Go to those high schools' principals and ask them whether or not they would like to have a coordinator that can work with the local community and work with their businesses.

Mr. PETRI. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, colleagues, let us apply the commonsense test here for a moment. Will one work force development coordinator, paid through Federal taxpayer funds, be able to do what the locally elected school board cannot?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It can help.

Mr. RIGGS. And a locally elected school board, it seems to me, is accountable to and responsive, we hope responsive, to the local community, not a federally funded work force development coordinator who is not an elected official and therefore really not accountable to the community at all.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I find this debate interesting. I would like to ask the Members here today how many of them would like to have a partner in their business that provides 7 percent of the capital and wants to run the business? We provide about 7 percent of the money in this country for vocational education, and here we sit in Washington and we want to say how it is best to do it in all 50 States, and we provide 7 percent.

We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. If there is one message that I have received from educators as a local leader, as a State house member and a State senator, was get Washington out of our school districts. We get a little bit of money from them, and most of our people are spending the bulk of their time trying to deal with Federal bureaucracies and Federal rules.

And then we get down to this issue, and on page 52 of the bill it says providing career guidance counseling, almost providing work-related experience such as internships, cooperative education, school-based enterprises, entrepreneurship, job shadowing that are related to vocational technical education programs, programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, local education and business partnerships, vocational student organizations, mentoring and support services.

Now we do not tell them who they have to hire. We just gave some guidelines of directions that the programs ought to cover, and that is all we should do. At the Federal level, we are wrong when we provide. If we were doing 70 percent of the money, I might agree with my colleague. Seven percent of the money, and we want to run the voc-tech schools, and that is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have an amendment?

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a moment before I go to that if I could.

Mr. Chairman, as I have reviewed the goings on here, I first want to compliment the chairman and the ranking

member for the things that they have done to try to bring some sense to it and some of the amendments; I appreciate that.

Some of my colleagues may not know, but I come from a State that has a lot of diverse situations. I have got some rural area and some urban area, got some rural area that is very sparse, very poor, and I am very concerned about does this really cover the things that are needed, does this really provide those much-needed things?

Some of my colleagues may not be familiar with what we term as the farm crisis that took place in the 1980's, but I can tell my colleagues that a lot of the small schools are very poor but are trying to offer equal opportunity in a State that is known for its education, particularly the K–12. In fact, all of its education.

And so I have some concerns that we look out for these folks. So I have offered an amendment that would in fact add some resources to the process we are doing here today.

□ 1845

But I am told after I have dropped it that maybe this is all being taken care of. I understand that the 10 percent has been divided 5 and 5. What I was trying to do, Mr. Chairman, was to say in a permissive manner that the States could add another 5 percent if they chose to do so. I am informed that this is provided for in the process.

I wonder if I could engage the honorable gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] in a short, wing-it colloquy, if I could.

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

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, as opposed to our normally very carefully scripted colloquies, I would be happy to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman.

First of all, let me point out to him that under the chairman's manager's amendment we were able to reach a bipartisan agreement on probably the most sensitive and delicate issue of all, and that is the intrastate or substate funding formula change.

Under that amendment, States will be allowed to reserve up to 5 percent of their allotment for a rural reserve and up to 5 percent additional for grants to urban areas, or an urban reserve. I have to tell the gentleman that the amendment he intended to offer was perfectly consistent with the creation of the 10-percent reserve under the bill and under the manager's amendment of both a 5-percent rural reserve and a 5-percent urban reserve.

Furthermore, I want to point out to the gentleman that under the bill, the Secretary of Education may grant a waiver to States that can demonstrate they have a better way of distributing funds. In other words, the Secretary can grant a waiver to any State, and I quote now from the bill, ''* * *that demonstrates that a proposed alternative formula more effectively targets funds on the basis of poverty.'' That is virtually verbatim language to the gentleman's amendment, using the definition of poverty as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673, subparagraph 2 of the Community Services Block Grant Act.

So I am glad I have an opportunity to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman, to thank him on his well-intentioned amendment, but also to point out because of the changes that already are incorporated in the bill, I feel that his amendment is not necessary. I hope this colloquy does in fact strengthen those sections of the bill that are compatible with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BOSWELL. I think it has. Mr. Chairman, I just want to want the gentleman, by nodding or even commenting, to assure me that the flexibility is there in what is being offered for the States to do the very thing that I was suggesting in this amendment that is in place, and if they choose to have need to put more into it, they can go through this process the gentleman has outlined and have that opportunity.

Mr. RIGGS. That is correct. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the language in the bill allows, and again, I believe encourages, the States to use up to 10 percent of the money to drive those funds to the areas of greatest economic need and highest poverty, and again, that is very consistent with what the gentleman is proposing.

Mr. BOSWELL. They can add to that, the vehicle that is in place, they can add to that if they go through the process the gentleman has described.

Mr. RIGGS. Under the alternative secondary formula, they can drive all of their money to areas of greatest economic need and high poverty areas, if in fact they can demonstrate that the formula will do just that to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Education.

Mr. BOSWELL. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BOSWELL] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOSWELL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, the last comment made by the chairman of the committee, the alternative formula, the gentleman understands that in a State like his, where his State can prove that the formula difference they come up with is targeted to a higher poverty area than the original formula, in other words, that they are really addressing the population with the greatest need, then that waiver will be given. So the percentage, rather than 5 or 10, or it could be 15, 20, whatever the State would determine its greatest need is.

Mr. BOSWELL. I thank both gentlemen from California for their hard, conscientious work. I think they have met my concern. Therefore, I will not offer the amendment. I thank them for this exchange.

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, just so I can reinforce the point just made by my good friend and the ranking member of the subcommittee, he is absolutely correct that we have provided in the bill for a waiver in that situation, where the State demonstrates that, and again I quote from the bill, now, ''A proposed alternative formula more effectively targets funds on the basis of poverty.''

So again, the language that is already in the bill would seem to do pretty much what the gentleman would like to do with his amendment. Therefore his amendment, I believe, is unnecessary, but hopefully this colloquy will now not only underscore the gentleman's concerns, but strengthen the intent of the language already included in the bill.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank both Members for their response. I feel reassured, and I will not offer the amendment. I look forward to us pressing on.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no other amendments, pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment No. 5 offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK]; and amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. MINK OF HAWAII

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

Page 21, line 4, strike ''(b)'' and insert ''(c)''.

Page 21, line 6, strike ''(b)'' and insert ''(c)''.

Page 21, line 10, strike the periods and end quotation marks and insert a semicolon.

Page 21, after line 10, insert the following:

(5) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''section 221'' and inserting ''paragraph (3) of section 201(c)''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 222'' and inserting ''paragraph (4) of section 201(c)''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (J).

Page 33, after line 12, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

''(4) sex equity programs;''.

Page 34, after line 5, insert the following:

''(e) HOLD HARMLESS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of this part or section 102(a), to carry out programs described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (c), each eligible recipient shall reserve from funds allocated under section 102(a)(1), an amount that is not less than the amount such eligible recipient received in fiscal year 1997 for carrying out programs under sections 221 and 222 of this Act as such sections were in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997''.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 214, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

AYES—207

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—214

Aderholt
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Archer
Dingell
Fattah
Frost
Gonzalez
Kennedy (RI)
McDade
McIntyre
Mollohan
Ney
Schiff
Stabenow
Young (AK)

□ 1911

Mr. GANSKE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the additional amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 230, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—230

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Packard
Archer	Gillmor	Pappas
Armey	Gilman	Paul
Bachus	Goode	Paxon
Baker	Goodlatte	Pease
Ballenger	Goodling	Peterson (PA)
Barr	Goss	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Pickering
Bartlett	Granger	Pickett
Barton	Greenwood	Pitts
Bass	Gutknecht	Pombo
Bateman	Hansen	Porter
Bereuter	Hastert	Portman
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Quinn
Bliley	Hefley	Radanovich
Blunt	Herger	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hill	Redmond
Boehner	Hilleary	Regula
Bonilla	Hobson	Riggs
Bono	Hoekstra	Riley
Boyd	Horn	Rogan
Brady	Hostettler	Rogers
Bryant	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Hulshof	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	Hunter	Roukema
Burton	Hutchinson	Royce
Buyer	Hyde	Ryun
Callahan	Inglis	Salmon
Calvert	Istook	Sanford
Camp	Jenkins	Saxton
Campbell	Johnson (CT)	Scarborough
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer, Dan
Cannon	Jones	Schaffer, Bob
Castle	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kelly	Sessions
Chambliss	Kim	Shadegg
Chenoweth	King (NY)	Shaw
Christensen	Kingston	Shays
Coble	Kleczka	Shimkus
Coburn	Klug	Shuster
Collins	Knollenberg	Sisisky
Combest	Kolbe	Skeen
Condit	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Cook	Largent	Smith (NJ)
Cooksey	Latham	Smith (OR)
Crane	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Lazio	Smith, Linda
Cubin	Leach	Snowbarger
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Solomon
Davis (VA)	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Deal	Linder	Spence
DeFazio	Lipinski	Stearns
DeLay	Livingston	Stenholm
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Stump
Dickey	Lucas	Sununu
Dingell	Manzullo	Talent
Doolittle	McCollum	Tauzin
Dreier	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	McHugh	Thornberry
Dunn	McInnis	Thune
Ehlers	McIntosh	Tiahrt
Ehrlich	McIntyre	Traficant
Emerson	McKeon	Upton
English	Metcalf	Walsh
Everett	Mica	Wamp
Ewing	Miller (FL)	Watkins
Fawell	Molinari	Watts (OK)
Foley	Moran (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Morella	Weldon (PA)
Fowler	Murtha	Weller
Franks (NJ)	Myrick	White
Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Gallegly	Neumann	Wicker
Ganske	Northup	Wolf
Gekas	Norwood	Young (FL)
Gibbons	Nussle	

NOT VOTING—15

Cox	Maloney (CT)	Parker
Frost	McDade	Schiff
Gephardt	Mollohan	Stabenow
Jefferson	Oberstar	Thomas
Kennedy (RI)	Oxley	Young (AK)

□ 1921

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall Nos. 286, and 287, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on recorded vote 286, the Mink amendment and ''no'' on recorded vote 287, the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, over the past 35 years, Congress has constructed a centralized system of vocational education, wasting millions of taxpayer dollars on a system that all-too-often serves more as a ''dumping ground'' for special-needs students than as an effective means of providing noncollege bound students with the knowledge and skills they need to become productive citizens.

Congress is considering prolonging the life of large parts of this system by reauthorizing the Carl Perkins Vocational Education and Applied Technology Act (H.R. 1853). While 1853 does eliminate several Federal programs and State mandates contained in current law, if further legitimizes the unconstitutional notion that the Federal Government has a legitimate role to play in education.

Furthermore, certain language in H.R. 1853 suggests that the purpose of education is to train students to serve the larger needs of society, as determined by Government and business, not to serve the individual.

During the discussion of this bill, the case has been made that constitutionalists should support H.R. 1853 because it reduces the number of Federal mandates on the States; however the 10th amendment does not quantify the extent to which the Federal Government can interfere in areas such as education. Instead, the 10th amendment forbids any and all Federal interference in education, no matter how much flexibility the programs provide the States.

H.R. 1853 represents mandate federalism, where the Federal Government allows States limited flexibility as to the means of complying with Congress mandates. Under this bill, States must submit a vocational education plan to the Department of Education for approval. States must then demonstrate yearly compliance with benchmarks that measure a series of federally set goals. The Secretary of Education has the authority to sanction the States for failure to reach those benchmarks, as if the States were the disobedient children of the Federal Government, not entities whose sovereignty must be constitutionally respected.

Congress has, so far, resisted pressure from the administration to give the Department of Education explicit statutory authority to create model benchmarks, which would then be adopted by every State. However, certain provisions of H.R. 1853 may provide the Department of Education with the opportunity to impose a uniform system of vocational education on every State in the Nation.

Particularly troublesome in this regard is the provision requiring every State to submit their vocational education plan to the Secretary for approval. The Secretary may withhold approval if the application is in violation of the provisions of this act. Ambitious bureaucrats may stretch this language to mean that the Department can reject a State plan if the Department does not feel the plan will be effective in meeting the goals of the bill. For example, a Department of Education official may feel that a State's plan does not adequately prepare vocational-technical education students for opportunities in postsecondary education or entry into high skill, high wage jobs, because the plan fails to adopt the specifications favored by the Education Department. The State plan may thus be rejected unless the State adopts the academic provisions favored by the administration.

H.R. 1853 further opens the door for the establishment of national standards for vocational education through provisions allowing the Secretary to develop a single plan for evaluation and assessment, with regard to the vocational-technical education and provide for an independent evaluation, of vocational-technical education programs, including examining how States and localities have developed, implemented, or improved State and local vocational-technical education programs. Education bureaucrats could very easily use the results of the studies to establish de facto model benchmarks that States would have to follow.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Education may impose national standards on State vocational education programs by requiring that States improve the academic component of vocational education. Integrating academics with vocational education is a noble goal, but Federal education bureaucrats may use this requirement to force vocational education programs to adopt national academic standards, upon pain of having their State plans denied as inconsistent with the provisions of the act mandating instead that States integrate academics into their vocational education programs.

States are also required to distribute their Federal funds according to a predetermined formula that dictates the percentage of funds States must spend on certain federally approved activities without regard for differences between the States. For example, H.R. 1853 singles out certain populations, such as displaced homemakers and single parents, and requires the States to certify to the Federal Government that their programs are serving these groups. These provisions stem from the offensive idea that without orders from the Federal Government, States will systematically deny certain segments of the population access to job training services.

Another Federal mandate contained in this so-called decentralization plan, is one requiring States to spend a certain percentage on updating the technology used in vocational education programs. Technological training can be a useful and necessary part of vocational education, however, under the Constitution it is not the business of the Federal Government to ensure vocational education students receive up-to-date technological training.

The States and the people are quite capable of ensuring that vocational education students receive up-to-date technological training—if the Federal Government stops usurping their legitimate authority to run vocational education programs and if the Government stops draining taxpayers of the resources necessary to run those programs.

H.R. 1853 provides businesses with taxpayer-provided labor in the form of vocational education students engaging in cooperative education. Since businesses benefit by having a trained work force, they should not burden the taxpayers with the costs of training their future employees. Furthermore, the provision allowing students to spend alternating weeks at work rather than in the classroom seems inconsistent with the bill's goals of strengthening the academic component of vocational education.

Work experience can be valuable for students, especially when that experience involves an occupation the student may choose as a future career. However, there is no reason for taxpayers to subsidize the job training of another. Furthermore, if it wasn't for Federal minimum wage and other laws that make hiring inexperienced workers cost prohibitive,

many businesses would gladly provide work apprenticeships to young people out of their own pockets instead of forcing the costs onto the U.S. taxpayer.

Today, employers can be assessed huge fines if they allow their part-time adolescent employees to work, with pay, for 15 minutes beyond the Department of Labor regulations. Yet, those same businesses can receive free, full-time labor from those same adolescents as part of a cooperative education program. Clearly, common sense has been tossed out the window and replaced by the arbitrary and conflicting whims of a Congress attempting to do good.

Further evidence of catering to well-established businesses can be found within the provision of H.R. 1853 wherein teachers are instructed not to meet the needs and expectations of students, but rather the needs, expectations, and methods of industry. All education, including vocational education, should explicitly be tailored to the wishes of the parent or those already funding the costs of education.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1853 continues the Federal education policy of dragooning parents into education as partners in the education process. Parents should control the education process, but they should never be placed in a subordinate role and made to help carry out the agenda of Government bureaucrats.

Concerns have been raised that vocational education programs may be used as a means to force all students into a career track not of their own choosing, and thus change the American education system into one of preparation for a career determined for the students by the Government. Such a system more closely resembles something depicted in a George Orwell novel than the type of education system compatible with a free society. H.R. 1853 attempts to assuage those fears through a section forbidding the use of Federal funds to force an individual into a career path that the individual would not otherwise choose or require any individual to obtain so-called skilled certificates.

However, States and localities that violate this portion of the act are not subject to any loss of Federal funds. Of course, even if the act did contain sanctions for violating an individual's freedom to determine their own career path, those sanctions would have to rely on the willingness of the very Federal bureaucracy which helped originate many of the education reforms which diminish student freedom to enforce this statutory provision.

Mr. Chairman, the Carl D. Perkins Act reauthorization may appear to provide for greater State and individual control over vocational education. However, H.R. 1853 is really another example of mandate federalism, where States, localities, and individuals are given limited autonomy in how they fulfill Federal mandates. As H.R. 1853 places mandates on the States and individuals to perform certain functions in the area of education, an area where Congress has no constitutional authority. It is also in violation of the ninth and tenth amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

Furthermore, H.R. 1853 forces Federal taxpayers to underwrite the wages of students working part-time in the name of cooperative education, another form of corporate welfare. Businesses who benefit from the labor of students should not have the costs of that labor subsidized by the taxpayers.

Certain language in H.R. 1853 suggests that parent's authority to raise their children as they see fit may be undermined by the Government in order to make parents partners in training their children according to Government specifications.

Congress should, therefore, reject H.R. 1853 and instead eliminate all Federal vocational education programs in order to restore authority for those programs to the States, localities, and individual citizens.

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act. The Perkins program provides much-needed vocational and technical education to students around the country.

Federal investment in vocational-technical education is vital for assuring a well-trained work force for the upcoming century. The Perkins Act distributes vocational education funds to the local level to ensure that our students are taught the necessary skills to be productive citizens. Investing more in education and training our work force to better compete is a sensible and farsighted way to spend our Federal funds.

Just last month, I visited Chief Leschi School in Puyallup, WA. My office helped them apply for their first Perkins grant. They won the grant, and they will receive over $370,000 to put toward vocational and technology programs. The grant money will fund computers and equipment for the vocational department, such as the auto, wood, and print shops and the photography lab. When I toured Chief Leschi, I saw how important these grants could be. I met motivated administrators, high-quality teachers and students who were eager to learn. It's critical to provide them with the equipment and facilities they need to be successful, and because of the Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act, Chief Leschi will soon have even stronger vocational and technical programs.

Again, I urge my colleagues' support to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act. The Perkins grant has made an important difference in the quality to our Nation's vocational and technical education, and we should reauthorize the program to ensure it is maintained for the students of tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no other amendments, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUINN) having assumed the chair, Mr. EWING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1853) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, pursuant to House Resolution 187, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MRS. MINK OF HAWAII

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 1853) to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith, with the following amendments:

Page 21, line 4, strike ''(b)'' and insert ''(c)''.

Page 21, line 6, strike ''(b)'' and insert ''(c)''.

Page 21, line 10, strike the periods and end quotation marks and insert a semicolon.

Page 21, after line 10, insert the following:

(5) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''section 221'' and inserting ''paragraph (3) of section 201(c); and

(ii) by striking ''section 222'' and inserting ''paragraph (4) of section 201(c)''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (J).

Page 33, after line 12, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

''(4) sex equity programs;''.

Page 34, after line 5, insert the following:

''(e) HOLD HARMLESS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of this part or section 102(a), to carry out programs described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (c), each eligible recipient shall reserve from funds allocated under section 102(a)(1), an amount that is not less than the amount such eligible recipient received in fiscal year 1997 for carrying out programs under sections 221 and 222 of this Act as such sections were in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I take this extraordinary measure in order to emphasize the importance of the amendment that was just defeated.

My effort in offering the amendment was simply to hold harmless, to continue a vital program that has been in existence for the past 13 years because Congress recognizes that unless we set aside 10 percent of the funding in the vocational education program, that these individuals, the displaced homemakers, the single parents, the pregnant women, others in that category would simply not be provided for under

the traditional vocational education concepts.

□ 1930

And, so, the Congress agreed and put forth a 10-percent set-aside for these individuals. I understand that the new majority has a new way of looking at funding these education programs. They prefer to allocate the monies to the States, and through guidance called in the bill as benchmarks, attempt to try to suggest that these programs ought to be continued.

My amendment would say dismiss the 10-percent set-aside, we are at a new point, all right, let us dismiss that, forget the targeting; but let us not forget the program. And, so, all I do, under my amendment, is to hold harmless the current programs that are in existence at the current level of funding. That is all that we do. We do not ask for an extra dollar to be allocated to this program, nor do we set aside any particular mandates for new programs. And the reason why this is so important, my colleagues of the House, is that just a year ago, just a few months ago, in August of last year, we passed the welfare reform bill; and in it we mandate that all of the women, single parents be required to go to work as soon as 2 months after getting on welfare.

The justification for this requirement to work was that there would be abundant funds and abundant programs in existence to help these individuals get job training, get an education in order to get a decent job. It was not intended that they should just get a job and earn minimum wage, which we all know is insufficient to sustain a family.

So education is the key. Everyone who got up to speak for the welfare reform bill made reference to education and training. This is our one opportunity to link the two together, the welfare reform, go back to work, get education, together with the job training programs that are implicit in the vocational education concept.

So I ask my colleagues, especially those who voted for the Welfare Reform Act, do not destroy a program that is in existence today that is providing probably the only single effort that this Nation makes to recognize the hardships of single parents. It is very difficult for them. We cannot throw them to the masses.

Before this Congress earmarked 10 percent, let me tell my colleagues that only 0.2 percent of the program money under vocational education went to this target group. And, so, it is extremely important today that we not cut this off. There will be, of course, turmoil in the restructuring of the vocational education program as it is. We do not disagree with the changes that are being made. But we say, at the same time that the changes are made, do not create a turmoil in this program that is so essential, not just for the particular women that are in it, but in order to have a transition into the welfare reform program, which is saying to all single mothers under welfare that they must work and if they must work they need training, because in order to get a good skilled job, in order to earn a decent living, they recognize that they have to have further education. So I plead to this House to accept my motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] insist on his point of order?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, no, I do not insist on my point of order. I rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that everybody understands that H.R. 1853 authorizes funding for vocational technical education. It is not a welfare program. It is an education bill. And in this bill, anytime we set aside money for something else, we are taking that money from our local school, our secondary school, their vocational program; we are taking it from the vocational technical school in our area, the secondary vocational technical school.

Now this is a different time. My colleague is talking about ancient history. Why is it different? It is different because we passed several pieces of legislation that take care of special populations. We provide over $2 billion in our Federal job training program that may be used to serve displaced homemakers and other special populations. Most of these programs are geared toward special populations. We have over $3 billion in our welfare-to-work program, again geared to special populations. It is a different time we are talking about. Do not mandate things to local school districts. Let them determine what is in the best interest of their local area.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] to say what we do in this legislation already, to protect special populations, over and over and over again. We protect them without mandating anything.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and must say that I know my colleagues are saying that it is not often that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] stands up on something that is a woman's issue and says a no vote.

But I have got to say that we have put every enforcement mechanism here in this legislation. This is plain and simply a set-aside proposal that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] has advanced. It goes contradictory to the whole reform effort that we had on a bipartisan basis in the committee, the reform effort, which was to give authority back to the local schools so that they can make their decision based on the local population needs.

I want to assure my colleagues who are as concerned as I am about the special needs of populations such as displaced homemakers, single parents, and single pregnant women that the enforcement mechanisms are here. They are very explicit throughout the legislation and put the authority on both the Department of Education and Health and Human Services to monitor and require compliance.

I do not have time to go through all of this, but page 29 and the accountability standards of section 115 and section 201 amply protect those special populations. I would simply urge that we not take 10 steps backward when we are trying to reform this most essential program.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to close by merely saying do not take money from your local school districts, do not take money from your area vocational technical school, do not take money for your vocational programs in your secondary schools in your district in order to feed a State bureaucracy and a Federal bureaucracy. Let them make those decisions at the local level.

All the special populations are well protected in this legislation. And as I indicated in other legislation that we passed this year, we have emphasized those special populations, particularly displaced homemakers, in programs where it should be done. This is an education bill that we are dealing with today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDed vote

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces he may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 220, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

AYES—207

Abercrombie	Borski	Costello
Ackerman	Boswell	Coyne
Allen	Boucher	Cramer
Andrews	Boyd	Cummings
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Danner
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Davis (FL)
Barcia	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Barrett (WI)	Capps	DeFazio
Becerra	Cardin	DeGette
Bentsen	Carson	Delahunt
Berman	Clay	DeLauro
Berry	Clayton	Dellums
Bishop	Clement	Deutsch
Blagojevich	Clyburn	Dicks
Blumenauer	Condit	Dingell
Bonior	Conyers	Dixon

Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—220

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Frost
Gephardt
Kennedy (RI)
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Schiff
Young (AK)

□ 1957

Mr. CAMP changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 12, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney

Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)

NAYS—12

Bonior
Campbell
Dickey
McDermott
Mink
Olver
Owens
Paul
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sensenbrenner
Stark

NOT VOTING—8

Frost
Gephardt
Kennedy (RI)
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Schiff
Young (AK)

□ 2006

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1853.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1853, CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1853, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2003, BALANCED BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1997

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–195) on the resolution (H. Res. 192) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2003) to reform the budget process and enforce the bipartisan balanced budget agreement of 1997, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 765, de novo;, H.R. 1944, do novo; H.R. 1663, de novo; H.R. 1661, de novo; House Concurrent Resolution 81, de novo; House Concurrent Resolution 88, de novo; House Resolution 175, de novo; House Concurrent Resolution 99, de novo; House Resolution 191, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 1585, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

SHACKLEFORD BANKS WILD HORSES PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 765.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 765.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 416, noes 6, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—6

Campbell
Carson
Paul
Sanford
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—12

Cubin	Kennedy (RI)	Schiff
Frost	McDade	Thornberry
Gephardt	Mollohan	Yates
John	Parker	Young (AK)

□ 2027

Mr. SCARBOROUGH changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 290, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my home State of Rhode Island today and missed the following votes:

On rollcall No. 286, the Mink amendment to H.R. 1853 Vocational-Technical Education Act, I would have voted ''yea''; on rollcall No. 287, the Kennedy of Massachusetts amendment, I would have voted ''yea''; on rollcall No. 288, Mrs. MINK's motion to recommit H.R. 1853 with instructions, I would have voted ''yea''; on rollcall No. 289, final passage on H.R. 1853, I would have voted ''yea''; and on rollcall No. 290, H.R. 765 the Shakelford Banks Wild Horses Protection Act, I would have voted ''yea.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

WARNER CANYON SKI HILL LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1944.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1944.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 423, noes 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

AYES—423

Abercrombie	Deutsch	John
Ackerman	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (CT)
Aderholt	Dickey	Johnson (WI)
Allen	Dicks	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews	Dingell	Johnson, Sam
Archer	Dixon	Jones
Armey	Doggett	Kanjorski
Bachus	Dooley	Kaptur
Baesler	Doolittle	Kasich
Baker	Doyle	Kelly
Baldacci	Dreier	Kennedy (MA)
Ballenger	Duncan	Kennedy (RI)
Barcia	Dunn	Kennelly
Barr	Edwards	Kildee
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	Kilpatrick
Barrett (WI)	Ehrlich	Kim
Bartlett	Emerson	Kind (WI)
Barton	Engel	King (NY)
Bass	English	Kingston
Bateman	Ensign	Kleczka
Becerra	Eshoo	Klink
Bentsen	Etheridge	Klug
Bereuter	Evans	Knollenberg
Berman	Everett	Kolbe
Berry	Ewing	Kucinich
Bilbray	Farr	LaFalce
Bilirakis	Fattah	LaHood
Bishop	Fawell	Lampson
Blagojevich	Fazio	Lantos
Bliley	Filner	Largent
Blumenauer	Flake	Latham
Blunt	Foley	LaTourette
Boehlert	Forbes	Lazio
Boehner	Ford	Leach
Bonilla	Fowler	Levin
Bonior	Fox	Lewis (CA)
Bono	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Borski	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (KY)
Boswell	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Boucher	Furse	Lipinski
Boyd	Gallegly	Livingston
Brady	Ganske	LoBiondo
Brown (CA)	Gejdenson	Lofgren
Brown (FL)	Gekas	Lowey
Brown (OH)	Gibbons	Lucas
Bryant	Gilchrest	Luther
Bunning	Gillmor	Maloney (CT)
Burr	Gilman	Maloney (NY)
Burton	Gonzalez	Manton
Buyer	Goode	Manzullo
Callahan	Goodlatte	Markey
Calvert	Goodling	Martinez
Camp	Gordon	Mascara
Campbell	Goss	Matsui
Canady	Graham	McCarthy (MO)
Cannon	Granger	McCarthy (NY)
Capps	Green	McCollum
Cardin	Greenwood	McCrery
Carson	Gutierrez	McDermott
Castle	Gutknecht	McGovern
Chabot	Hall (OH)	McHale
Chambliss	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Chenoweth	Hamilton	McInnis
Christensen	Hansen	McIntosh
Clay	Harman	McIntyre
Clayton	Hastert	McKeon
Clement	Hastings (FL)	McNulty
Clyburn	Hastings (WA)	Meehan
Coble	Hayworth	Meek
Coburn	Hefley	Menendez
Collins	Hefner	Metcalf
Combest	Herger	Mica
Condit	Hill	Millender-McDonald
Conyers	Hilleary	Miller (CA)
Cook	Hilliard	Miller (FL)
Cooksey	Hinchey	Minge
Costello	Hinojosa	Mink
Cox	Hobson	Moakley
Coyne	Hoekstra	Molinari
Cramer	Holden	Moran (KS)
Crane	Hooley	Moran (VA)
Crapo	Horn	Morella
Cubin	Hostettler	Murtha
Cummings	Houghton	Myrick
Cunningham	Hoyer	Nadler
Danner	Hulshof	Neal
Davis (FL)	Hunter	Nethercutt
Davis (IL)	Hutchinson	Neumann
Davis (VA)	Hyde	Ney
Deal	Inglis	Northup
DeFazio	Istook	Norwood
DeGette	Jackson (IL)	Nussle
Delahunt	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Oberstar
DeLauro	Jefferson	Obey
DeLay	Jenkins	Olver
Dellums		

Ortiz	Royce	Strickland
Owens	Ryun	Stump
Oxley	Sabo	Stupak
Packard	Salmon	Sununu
Pallone	Sanchez	Talent
Pappas	Sanders	Tanner
Pascrell	Sandlin	Tauscher
Pastor	Sanford	Tauzin
Paul	Sawyer	Taylor (MS)
Paxon	Saxton	Taylor (NC)
Payne	Scarborough	Thomas
Pease	Schaefer, Dan	Thompson
Pelosi	Schaffer, Bob	Thornberry
Peterson (MN)	Schumer	Thune
Peterson (PA)	Scott	Thurman
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Tiahrt
Pickering	Serrano	Tierney
Pickett	Sessions	Torres
Pitts	Shadegg	Towns
Pombo	Shaw	Traficant
Pomeroy	Shays	Turner
Porter	Sherman	Upton
Portman	Shimkus	Velazquez
Poshard	Shuster	Vento
Price (NC)	Sisisky	Visclosky
Pryce (OH)	Skaggs	Walsh
Quinn	Skeen	Wamp
Radanovich	Skelton	Waters
Rahall	Slaughter	Watkins
Ramstad	Smith (MI)	Watt (NC)
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Watts (OK)
Redmond	Smith (OR)	Waxman
Regula	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Reyes	Smith, Adam	Weldon (PA)
Riggs	Smith, Linda	Weller
Riley	Snowbarger	Wexler
Rivers	Snyder	Weygand
Rodriguez	Solomon	White
Roemer	Souder	Whitfield
Rogan	Spence	Wicker
Rogers	Spratt	Wise
Rohrabacher	Stabenow	Wolf
Ros-Lehtinen	Stark	Woolsey
Rothman	Stearns	Wynn
Roukema	Stenholm	Young (FL)
Roybal-Allard	Stokes	

NOT VOTING—11

Foglietta	McKinney	Schiff
Frost	Mollohan	Yates
Gephardt	Parker	Young (AK)
McDade	Rush	

□ 2036

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2209, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–196) on the bill (H.R. 2209) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

PROVIDING FOR MAINTENANCE OF DAMS IN EMIGRANT WILDERNESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1663, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs.

CHENOWETH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1633, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 2, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—424

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—2

Paul
Stump

NOT VOTING—8

Foglietta
Gephardt
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Schiff
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2045

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRADEMARK LAW TREATY IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1661, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1661, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 425, noes 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—425

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)

Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Foglietta
Gephardt
Johnson (WI)
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Schiff
Yates
Young (AK)

☐ 2054

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING FOR UNITED STATES INITIATIVE SEEKING JUST AND PEACEFUL RESOLUTION OF SITUATION ON CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 81, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 81, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 417, noes 4, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—417

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—4

Barr
Collins
Deal
Paul

NOT VOTING—13

Emerson
Foglietta
Gephardt
Goodling
Hutchinson
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Schiff
Waters
Waxman
Yates
Young (AK)

☐ 2102

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

CONGRATULATING EL SALVADOR ON SUCCESSFUL ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 88.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 88.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 419, noes 3, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—419

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—3

Bryant
Kucinich
Paul

NOT VOTING—12

Foglietta
Hutchinson
Johnson, Sam
McCollum
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Roukema
Schiff
Waters
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2111

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 295, I strongly supported the resolution praising El Salvador, but inadvertantly missed the vote. There is no country in Central America more representative of democracy and an inspiration to others than El Salvador. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE CONGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 175, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 175, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 279, noes 147, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

AYES—279

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Calvert
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)

Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Solomon
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
White
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—147

Aderholt
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Boswell
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Lewis (KY)
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
Moran (KS)
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Packard
Pappas
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Pickering
Ramstad
Redmond
Rogers
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Snowbarger
Souder
Spence
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Foglietta
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Roukema
Schiff
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2128

Messrs. GUTKNECHT, SALMON, HILLEARY, GOODLING, BURTON of Indiana, SHUSTER, BUYER, COBURN, GRAHAM, LAHOOD, PICKERING, and DUNCAN, Mrs. EMERSON, and Messrs. TIAHRT, ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, PEASE, JONES, HERGER, PAXON, TAYLOR of North Carolina, WICKER, CAMP, BACHUS, LIVINGSTON, LATHAM, LOBIONDO, ISTOOK, DICKEY, WELLER, MCCOLLUM, MCKEON, WAMP, PAPPAS, RYUN, MORAN of Kansas, KOLBE, GREENWOOD, FOX of Pennsylvania, and WELDON of Florida, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GOSS, Ms. GRANGER, and Messrs. GANSKE, CUNNINGHAM, ADERHOLT, NUSSLE, KASICH, WATKINS, and GALLEGLY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 2130

EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER RECENT EVENTS IN SIERRA LEONE IN WAKE OF RECENT MILITARY COUP D'ETAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 99.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 99.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 1, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

AYES—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)

Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—1

Paul

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Barr

NOT VOTING—14

Armey
Berman
Foglietta
Hefner
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Roukema
Royce
Schiff
Slaughter
Solomon
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2136

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGARDING INTERFERENCE OF EUROPEAN COMMISSION IN MERGER OF BOEING CO. AND McDONNELL DOUGLAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 191.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 191, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 2, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Oberstar
Stark

NOT VOTING—16

Ballenger
Berman
Foglietta
Hefner
Hunter
McDade
Mollohan
Nethercutt
Parker
Portman
Roukema
Royce
Schiff
Weldon (PA)
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2144

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAMP OUT BREAST CANCER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The pending business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1585, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1585, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 422, noes 3, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

AYES—422

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)

Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—3

Paul
Sanford
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—9

Ballenger
Berman
Foglietta
McDade
Mollohan
Royce
Schiff
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2200

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2003

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2003.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2160, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2160), making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. Skeen).

The motion was agreed to.

□ 2202

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2160, with Mr. PEASE, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Thursday, July 17, 1997, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 13, line 24.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

For establishment of a Native American institutions endowment fund, as authorized by Public Law 103–382 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), $4,600,000.

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

Payments to States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa: For payments for cooperative extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, to be distributed under sections 3(b) and 3(c) of said Act, and under section 208(c) of Public Law 93–471, for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents and for costs of penalty mail for cooperative extension agents and State extension directors, $268,493,000; payments for extension work at the 1994 Institutions under the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(b)(3)), $2,000,000; payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Act, $58,695,000; payments for the pest management program under section 3(d) of the Act, $10,783,000; payments for the farm safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, $2,855,000; payments for the pesticide impact assessment program under section 3(d) of the Act, $3,214,000; payments to upgrade 1890 land-grant college research, extension, and teaching facilities as authorized by section 1447 of Public Law 95–113, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3222b), $7,549,000, to remain available until expended; payments for the rural development centers under section 3(d) of the Act, $908,000; payments for a groundwater quality program under section 3(d) of the Act, $9,061,000; payments for youth-at-risk programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $9,554,000; payments for a food safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, $2,365,000; payments for carrying out the provisions of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978, $3,192,000; payments for Indian reservation agents under section 3(d) of the Act, $1,672,000; payments for sustainable agriculture programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $3,309,000; payments for cooperative extension work by the colleges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 321–326, 328) and Tuskegee University, $25,090,000; and for Federal administration and coordination including administration of

the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, and the Act of September 29, 1977 (7 U.S.C. 341–349), as amended, and section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), and to coordinate and provide program leadership for the extension work of the Department and the several States and insular possessions, $6,370,000; in all, $415,110,000: *Provided,* That funds hereby appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) of the Act of June 26, 1953, and section 506 of the Act of June 23, 1972, as amended, shall not be paid to any State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa prior to availability of an equal sum from non-Federal sources for expenditure during the current fiscal year.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, $618,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, including those pursuant to the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended (21 U.S.C. 114b–c), necessary to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases; to carry out inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities; to discharge the authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1468; 7 U.S.C. 426–426b); and to protect the environment, as authorized by law, $424,244,000, of which $4,443,000 shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases and for control of pest animals and birds to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions: *Provided,* That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 percent: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for replacement only: *Provided further,* That, in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, and section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944, as amended, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided further,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the repair and alteration of leased buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

In fiscal year 1998 the agency is authorized to collect fees to cover the total costs of providing technical assistance, goods, or services requested by States, other political subdivisions, domestic and international organizations, foreign governments, or individuals, provided that such fees are structured such that any entity's liability for such fees is reasonably based on the technical assistance, goods, or services provided to the entity by the agency, and such fees shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, without further appropriation, for providing such assistance, goods, or services.

Of the total amount available under this heading in fiscal year 1998, $88,000,000 shall be derived from user fees deposited in the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection User Fee Account.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, preventive maintenance, environmental support, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 428a, $3,200,000, to remain available until expended.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

MARKETING SERVICES

For necessary expenses to carry on services related to consumer protection, agricultural marketing and distribution, transportation, and regulatory programs, as authorized by law, and for administration and coordination of payments to States; including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $90,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $45,592,000, including funds for the wholesale market development program for the design and development of wholesale and farmer market facilities for the major metropolitan areas of the country: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

Fees may be collected for the cost of standardization activities, as established by regulation pursuant to law (31 U.S.C. 9701).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $59,521,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses: *Provided,* That if crop size is understated and/or other uncontrollable events occur, the agency may exceed this limitation by up to 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY (SECTION 32)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) shall be used only for commodity program expenses as authorized therein, and other related operating expenses, except for: (1) transfers to the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 8, 1956; (2) transfers otherwise provided in this Act; and (3) not more than $10,690,000 for formulation and administration of marketing agreements and orders pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

For payments to departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, and similar agencies for marketing activities under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623(b)), $1,200,000.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended, for the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, for certifying procedures used to protect purchasers of farm products, and the standardization activities related to grain under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended, including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $23,928,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES

LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $43,092,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for inspection and weighing services: *Provided,* That if grain export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur, this limitation may be exceeded by up to 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, $446,000.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry on services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, and the Egg Products Inspection Act, as amended, $589,263,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be available for obligation only after a final rule to implement the provisions of subsection (e) of section 5 of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1034(e)), as amended, is implemented, and in addition, $1,000,000 may be credited to this account from fees collected for the cost of laboratory accreditation as authorized by section 1017 of Public Law 102–237: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be available for shell egg surveillance under section 5(d) of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1034(d)): *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services to administer the laws enacted by Congress for the Farm Service Agency, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Risk Management Agency, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, $572,000.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for carrying out the administration and implementation of programs administered by the Farm Service Agency, $702,203,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities (but not the funds) of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make program payments for all programs administered by the Agency: *Provided further,* That other funds made available to the Agency for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this account: *Provided further,* That these funds shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5101–5106), $2,000,000.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses involved in making indemnity payments to dairy farmers for milk or cows producing such milk and manufacturers of dairy products who have been directed to remove their milk or dairy products from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government, and in making indemnity payments for milk, or cows producing such milk, at a fair market value to any dairy farmer who is directed to remove his milk from commercial markets because of (1) the presence of products of nuclear radiation or fallout if such contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, or (2) residues of chemicals or toxic substances not included under the first sentence of the Act of August 13, 1968, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450j), if such chemicals or toxic substances were not used in a manner contrary to applicable regulations or labeling instructions provided at the time of use and the contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, $350,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided,* That none of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to make indemnity payments to any farmer whose milk was removed from commercial markets as a result of his willful failure to follow procedures prescribed by the Federal Government: *Provided further,* That this amount shall be transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making dairy indemnity disbursements.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928–1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: farm ownership loans, $430,828,000 of which $400,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, $2,341,701,000 of which $1,700,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $191,701,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $500,000; for emergency insured loans, $25,000,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; for boll weevil eradication program loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1989, $34,653,000; and for credit sales of acquired property, $19,432,000.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: farm ownership loans, $19,460,000 of which $15,440,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, $67,255,000 of which $19,210,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $18,480,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $66,000; for emergency insured loans, $6,008,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; for boll weevil eradication program loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1989, $500,000; and for credit sales of acquired property, $2,530,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $218,446,000 of which $208,446,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses'' account.

RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

For administrative and operating expenses, as authorized by the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 6933), $65,000,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $700 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i). In addition, for sales commissions of agents, as authorized by section 516 (7 U.S.C. 1516) $188,571,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

On page 27, line 23, strike ''$188,571,000'' and insert ''$152,571,000''.

On page 48, line 11, strike ''$3,924,000,000'' insert ''(increased by $23,700,000'').

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does any Member raise a point of order under clause 2(f) of rule XXI against provisions of the bill addressed by the amendment but not yet reached in the reading (to wit: page 48, line 6, through page 49, line 18)?

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago this Congress had a major fight because the majority wanted to cut school lunches. Last year the majority tried to cut the WIC program, which is a nutrition program for infants and young mothers. In this bill they are again falling some $30 million short in the WIC Program of what would be required to maintain our existing case load.

What happens in this bill is that the committee is attempting to bring the carryover funds down to around 3 percent or less. That creates a problem because this program needs a certain amount of carryover funds in order to pay the reimbursements that come in after the end of the fiscal year.

OMB and USDA both estimate that without this amendment that I am offering tonight that we run the risk of seeing 55,000 women, children, and infants bounced out of the WIC Program. Basically what we do is to restore that funding and pay for it by reducing the increase in this bill, which the committee provided above the administration request for commissions for crop insurance.

Before anybody has a heart attack and says, oh, do not hurt our farmers, I want to make quite clear, this amendment will in no way hurt farmers. The GAO reported that under the crop insurance program we had a number of fiscal failures. The General Accounting Office said that they found in the crop insurance program expenses for above average commissions paid to agents by one large company, corporate aircraft and excessive automobile charges, country club memberships and various entertainment activities for agents and employees such as skybox rentals at professional sporting events. The GAO went on to indicate that the problem could best be addressed by reducing the commission that is provided to insurance agents under the program.

Now, we have some scare tactics being followed by some people who would like to see this amendment not passed. Members are being told, for instance, in a letter circulated by the American Association of Crop Insurers that this is going to hurt farmers. That is absolutely not true. There are four separate assertions in this letter which are dead wrong.

First of all, they say that the cuts that I am proposing will occur in addition to the Meehan amendment. That is in fact wrong. If my amendment is passed, the Meehan amendment cannot even be offered on the House floor.

Second, they say that a 10.5-percent commission is insufficient and would cause cancellation of policies. We are not talking about a 10-percent commission. We are talking about limiting these commissions to 24.5 percent rather than the 28 percent in the bill.

Third, they claim that the Obey amendment is an attack on farmers. That is absolute nonsense. What is an attack on farmers is the ridiculous farm policy that we have had under both Democratic and Republican administrations for the past 12 years which have driven prices down and driven many farmers off the farm. This proposal or this assertion that this cut in insurance rates or insurance commissions will hurt farmers is, as Mo Udall used to say, straight gumwah, absolute gumwah. All this does is to say that we want farmers and taxpayers to get the best possible deal for the money. This proposal does absolutely nothing to change the crop insurance program. It does absolutely nothing to raise the cost of this program for farmers. What it does do is to stop the rip-off that this program has had to endure from some of the people who have been trying to sell this insurance to farmers, and so it is a simple choice. If you want to continue to support the kind of rip-offs that some of these agents had provided, then you vote against the amendment.

If you want to, on the other hand, ensure that we do not knock 55,000 to 60,000 women and infants and children off the WIC Program, then vote for the amendment. That is the sound thing to do.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a fair and balanced bill. It takes care of the needs of farmers and ranchers, research related to agriculture, nutrition and food safety, rural development and housing for low-income people, the safety of our food, drugs, and medical devices, and the stoppage of gumwah. We have worked very hard to present the House with a well-balanced bill. The bill includes $3.924 billion for WIC, an increase of $118 million above last year, so no one is taking anybody off of WIC. I ask to defeat this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment. As I recall what happened in the committee, when we were working through this issue, it was quite well discussed in the committee; the administration had asked for $154 million for the actual sales commissions. This is money, $154 million, that goes to agents who are brokering crop insurance in our country and their commissions.

□ 2215

It is $154 million. It is not an insignificant amount of money. And, in fact, at that level we estimated every sales agent would receive a 24.5 percent commission. Now, that is a pretty healthy commission, even at 24.5 percent.

What happened once the bill came out of the subcommittee and moved to the full committee, at that point in the manager's amendment the proposal was to increase the sales commissions to $188 million, which would raise the amount of commission back to the level of about 27 percent. So we are really talking about whether somebody who is selling insurance out there is making a 27-percent commission or if they are making a 24.5-percent commission.

And if the GAO study had not been so clear on abuses in the program, I think that people who hold my opinion on this would not feel so strongly. We really do not believe, and we have taken the advice of the Department of Agriculture on this, we do not believe this is going to in any way diminish the amount of crop insurance available to farmers but, in fact, will put in the kind of regimen that we need in that program to make sure we counter abuses.

Mr. Chairman, I do not really know why the proponents of the higher level of commission were able to prevail at the full committee level, but it seems to me we are being responsible in this amendment. We are trying to cut back on the abuses that the GAO identified.

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

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman talked about a 27.5-percent commission, and I think in all due fairness to the insurance agents, the average commission for Federal crop insurance is about 10 percent to the agent. The other money goes to cover the administrative costs of running this program through the private sector.

Now, if we do not pay those costs and all of that falls back on the Government, we will spend a lot more than that in beefing up our personnel at all the farm service agencies to handle this thing. We should be fair with the insurance agent. They are not getting 24.5 percent, they are not getting 27.5 percent. The average is about 10 percent.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if I might reclaim my time, I think the GAO was very clear in the analysis that they did on an objective basis, and there are serious questions about who is making money.

I think the taxpayers of our country would be pretty upset if they knew that they were paying for commissions to the private sector. That is not quite the way they think it is supposed to work. They do not understand a lot of the details about what crop insurance is all about, but the point is that it is not a program that has a terrific reputation and, therefore, we were trying to be fair.

We did meet the requirements of the Department of Agriculture. They asked for $154 million. We passed that at the subcommittee level. When it went to the full committee, all of a sudden some of the powers that be, the ones that like making those bigger commissions, made their weight felt.

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has a responsible amendment. He represents a very agricultural State, as do I. We have seen abuses in this program, and this is a way of sending a very strong message that we are not going to overly reward those who are performing this service.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, she mentioned two things: No. 1 that they are getting this large commission, which is not the case; and, No. 2, the public does not think that people who sell Federal crop insurance earn a commission? That is what I understood the gentlewoman to say. I would think that they would not do it for nothing.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman understands my point that the taxpayers, if they really understood this, would be outraged that they are paying commissions to private sector insurance agents to sell this insurance.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin. It is understandable that he would attempt to move money to the WIC Program, but I want to point out to my colleagues why this is irresponsible to do it at this point and at this time.

As has been mentioned, the WIC Program is already a $3.9 billion program. It has been increased this year $118 million, and this is an attempt to put $23 million, a dribble compared to the total, by decimating the crop insurance program in this country. The $23 million transfer amounts to a 20-percent reduction in crop insurance.

Now, if we want to debate the question of crop insurance and should those insurers receive 24.5 percent or 27 percent, or 34 percent which they received last year, down to 28 percent, the bill funds it at 27 percent, why do we not follow what is going on right now?

The Department of Agriculture, as we speak, is negotiating with the crop insurers to determine at what level crop insurance will be funded. Now, if we eliminate the opportunity for crop insurance insurers to negotiate with the Department of Agriculture by passing this bill, we have already ended the negotiation. Now, that is foolishness. That is irresponsible.

We are trusting the Secretary of Agriculture and the crop insurers to enter into a negotiation, which has always been the case. They will determine at what level crop insurers will be paid for. I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture will protect the taxpayers, as he has in the past, when they have negotiated.

I add again, in the past crop insurers have received 34 percent. We are now down, if the gentleman's amendment is passed, down to 24 percent. That is to cover 54 agricultural programs in America. I suggest there will not be crop insurance available for 54 commodities across the United States.

And for someone to say this does not hurt farmers is preposterous. For someone to say this does not change crop insurance is preposterous. Of course it affects farmers, because it eliminates crop insurance. If we do not want to eliminate crop insurance, defeat this amendment and allow the Secretary to negotiate properly.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would just take a second to point out that we are taking the Secretary's advice in the original mark of the committee, which was at $154 million, and we agree that there should be negotiations. In fact, the proposal was the administration's Department of Agriculture's request. So I do not think we need to add to it.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, that was the Secretary's offer. That was before the negotiation ever started. The negotiation has not been completed or culminated. The Secretary makes an offer, the crop insurers make an offer. That is the way negotiations are supposed to be conducted.

So again I say to my colleagues, this hurts farmers across the country. Defeat this amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that this does not reduce crop insurance but it reduces crop insurance commissions. Let us be clear about that.

I rise in strong support of the Obey amendment to increase funding for the Women, Infants, and Children Program, a program which provides nutrition assistance to pregnant women and to young children. Last year the congressional majority went after the school lunch program; earlier this year it was the milk and cereal for women and infants.

If my colleagues recall, it was not long ago this year that the Congress debated the merits of the WIC Program during the disaster relief bill. Threats of reduction in the program. It was wrong then and it is wrong now.

These reductions in the WIC Program, I might add, were met with an outcry across the country and, in fact, in a number of places we already saw people who were being thrown off of the program, women and children who were being let go from the program. But I will say that Congress rightly responded by providing the dollars that WIC needed to continue helping to provide nutritious food to women who are expecting children, to infants, and to young children.

Fact is, is that our experience with the WIC Program shows that it is a wise investment. Each dollar invested in WIC saves more than $3 in other Government spending on programs such as Medicaid. It is a wise investment in the health and development of our youngest children, and each day we learn more and more about the critical elements of early childhood development. So supporting WIC helps kids get off on the right foot.

For years we have been steadily progressing toward the goal of providing nutrition assistance to 7.5 million people through the WIC Program. At the very least, we need to hold the line and continue helping 7.4 million women and children as WIC now does.

The funding level in this bill threatens to backtrack on WIC, help fewer people who depend on it. It includes unrealistic assumptions that could end up costing our kids plenty. It is important to note that WIC is funded at $180 million below what the President's request is.

The Obey amendment will address the danger that women and children who need help will be left without healthy food. The Obey amendment will add $23.7 million, enough to provide WIC benefits for 45,000 people, and the amendment prevents knocking off the 55,000 people off of the WIC Program.

The Obey amendment offsets this amount by reducing the $36 million in excessive payments to crop insurance agents contained in the bill. One more time: It is crop insurance commissions and not crop insurance. The Secretary of Agriculture said the insurance agents do not need this extra money.

The GAO has revealed that the taxpayer money is used for outrageous, unreasonable expenses, such as sky boxes at athletic events, country club membership fees, and corporate aircraft. This does not hurt farmers.

The choice before us is to fund efforts to provide healthy food to pregnant women, to young children; or to pay insurance agents to buy sky boxes and to join country clubs. I urge my colleagues, really, to make the choice that is right; to deal with our values and priorities in this country. Let us help those who need the funds, women, infants, and children, and I urge my colleagues to support the Obey amendment.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that we are not even asking that we meet the administration's request for funding level for WIC. This bill funds WIC at $184 million below the President's request. We are adding only a tiny portion back. That is hardly excessive.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure where to start here, because I think everyone should be informed, I guess, in their statements. And the fact of the matter is, on the WIC Program the administration says we need about a 2½ percent carryover. The bill, with the current funding, has over 3 percent carryover funds. There is more than enough money in the WIC Program to take care of any needs, any emergencies at all.

I think the real debate here is what we are doing to farmers. And I can tell my colleagues, as a farmer myself, that the idea of tying the hands of farmers trying to protect their risk, and agriculture is probably the most volatile business one can be in. A farmer takes more risk than any other business on a year-to-year basis, and they are at the mercy of Mother Nature for hail, wind, rain. We flooded out at home this year.

But the idea of taking away this tool from farmers, insurance, and under the farm bill last year, Mr. Chairman, we made a commitment to farmers out there. We said that they would have the freedom to make choices themselves but they would have with that freedom the responsibility to take care of the risks they have in agriculture. We assured them that there would be insurance available for them; that there would be revenue insurance plans, new innovative plans out there.

Farmers are in the middle of a transition today, of going from the old 60 years of Government control, which has caused the demise of the small family farmer, now to the opportunity to finally make decisions for themselves, to insure their own risk, to create opportunities, to keep their family farms together.

□ 2230

This gutting amendment to crop insurance cuts at the heart of opportunity for farmers and anyone involved in agriculture today.

We are not asking for much. We are asking for the opportunity to work inside the system. And a reduction like that, a 6, almost 7 percent reduction in the current bill from what insurance was last year, is harmful enough, let alone to take it down to a level where we are going to have insurance companies no longer offering crop insurance to real farmers out there.

I am surprised that people who are from farm States would be offering this type of amendment, which is going to decimate the insurance business, going to hurt farmers out there, take away the opportunities to protect their own risk.

Apparently, what we want to do is go back to a system where the Government comes in and helps out with disaster payments. And if we want to look at the trend in agriculture in farm bills, 10 years ago we were spending about $26 billion a year directly to farmers. This year it is about $5 billion. We are at 20 percent where we were 10 years ago support for agriculture and for farmers. And I think it is really a low blow to anyone who cares about agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Agriculture, for 7 of the last 11 years, has taken the biggest hit on reductions. I would like to convince my colleagues over on the left that we have now stopped and are phasing out subsidies for agriculture. I helped write the risk management language in the farm bill. They now have to pay for this insurance. No more disaster relief for agriculture.

If we cannot phase in this kind of risk management insurance for farmers, we are going to be very hard-pressed. As we phase out the subsidy programs and do not pay the farmers that direct payment anymore, now we are simply saying farmers have to dig into their own pocket to start covering their risk, no more disaster insurance, no more subsidy payments. I think it is very important that we not cut way down on the phasing in of this risk management and insurance.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me say in closing, anyone who likes to eat, who likes to eat food, good quality food, at a reasonable price, produced by family farms who care about agriculture should oppose this amendment, understanding there is way more money than necessary in the WIC program already, but you are cutting the heart out of the family farmers when you do this, and anyone who votes for this amendment is cutting out the family

farmer; and let them all remember that.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

For those of my colleagues who are prolife, as I am, I urge them to vote yes on the Obey amendment. This is one of the most positive prolife votes my colleagues will be called upon to cast. This program, we all know, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] knows, and the gentleman votes for WIC, this program helps pregnant women and nursing women and their children, their children both born and unborn.

If one is truly prolife, it is not enough to be only anti-abortion. Prolife is a very positive position and not just a negative position. I am anti-abortion, but I am prolife. And there is a fundamental distinction in that.

Many of my colleagues were elected to this Congress on a prolife platform. They campaigned on a prolife platform. They asked the National Right to Life for their endorsement. They asked their own State Right to Life for endorsement. They ran on a prolife platform, and many of them got elected because they ran on that prolife platform.

I do not think any of them ran on a crop insurance commission platform. Now this is a chance for them to stand on that prolife platform. This is an essential vote for prolife. Be positive. Be for life. Vote for this amendment. My colleagues talk about food, feeding people. Pregnant women are hungry. Remember those words uttered about 2,000 years ago: ''I was hungry, and you gave me to eat.'' Prolife, vote for this amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I am prolife, and I certainly agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] that one of the strongest things one can do as a Member of the Congress who is prolife is to support people who are hungry. And that is why I am going to vote against the WIC bureaucrat increase and vote for the farmers.

The farmers are the ones who produce foods, not Washington bureaucrats. It appears that our well-intended friends on the other side of the aisle are once again feeding bureaucrats, and this time they are taking the food away from the families by hitting the farmers right between the eyes on it.

Mr. Speaker, the agriculture bill is always kind of a convoluted maze of price supports, import-export quotas, allotments, all kinds of different jargon that is unique to the ag committees and ag laws. But the results of it are spectacular. Two percent of the American population feeds 100 percent of the population plus millions of people throughout the world.

Americans, on an average, pay 11 cents on a dollar earned for food. That is less than what they pay for recreation, on an average. That is why we have so many of these farm programs. Some of them are very hard to explain. But the results, when you are paying 11 cents on the dollar for food and 2 percent of the population is feeding 100 percent, it works.

In this bill of $49 billion, $37 billion goes to food and nutrition programs. Just in May, 2 months ago, we increased WIC $76 million. And I quote from the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], my friend, May 1, 1997, ''the $76 million figure is based on numbers submitted from the States to the U.S. Department of Agriculture in early April of this year. These numbers are, in fact, only a few weeks old.''

We increased in response to that $76 million. Now we have increased it again a mere 2 months later $118 million. Now, it is always nice to say, hey, we have got starving women. But according to the numbers of our colleagues on the left, that $76 million increase was full funded. Now we are going another 118. According to our figures, USDA figures, this is full participation of WIC at 7.4 million people.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to note that WIC, as we speak, has a $200 million carry-over. That is a surplus in the WIC fund. We are not talking about children versus commission agents. We are talking about farmers versus bureaucrats. I know there are a lot of people who like bureaucrats and a lot of people who want to see government grow. But as for me, I am going to go with the farmers. Because it is the farmers who grow the food, it is the farmers who feed the children, it is the farmers who feed the families, it is the farmers who feed the babies. It is not Washington bureaucrats. The only thing that this thing does is take money away from farmers and give it to the bureaucrats. I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I think that what happens is we are taking the taxpayers' money and giving the sales commissions to the insurance agents. That is who is getting the money.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, it would be great if we were privately funding the whole bill. But, unfortunately, the taxpayers are paying all $49 billion of this bill; $37 billion of it is going into food and nutrition programs for children, but that is not enough.

What appears to be happening is that some folks want to take more away from the farmers and give more to Washington bureaucrats. The farmers are the ones feeding the families.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I agree with the gentleman. We had a freedom to farm bill and we said to the farmers of America, compete in the global marketplace. Why do we not say the same to the insurance agents?

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, I know there are a lot of people who do not like the private sector, and I know the private sector is anathema to many Members on my colleague's side. But the fact is the private sector is delivering the insurance program cheaper than some of his friends over at USDA. It is saving taxpayer dollars. It is shrinking the size of Government. And it is more efficiently penetrating the marketplace so we do not have to have these disaster relief bills that are a big government expenditure year after year.

I think, finally, the USDA has moved in a very smart, efficient, commonsense direction. But now again, Mr. Speaker, people want to take money away from the farmers and give it to the bureaucrats. Their amendment is bureaucrat and it is anti-food and anti-farmers. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

I would like to get a little more direct in the conversation and try to have a little less demagoguery back and forth on either side here. Frankly, this is no way the type of bill it can be construed to be, the farmers versus the bureaucrats. We are talking about commissions here.

Farmers, as far as I know, do not make insurance commissions. But we are talking about a WIC program that is generally perceived to be probably one of the most successful programs we have had in the social programs of this country. We are talking about a program that deals with low birth weights, deals with infant mortality, deals with child anemia, saves money in Medicaid in the future, and reduces the number of infants that need costly medical care in the future.

Basically, what we are trying to do, as I think the Members on that side of the aisle well know, is make sure that we forward fund enough so that there is not a lapse going from one year to the next year and that we do not leave some 45 to 55 thousand women, infants, and children without the kind of nutritional work and without the kind of food that they need to be sustained in this successful program. And we are pitting that against, I guess you would say, the insurance people, the ones that are earning that commission, not against the farmers.

Certainly, nobody has the intention of harming the farmers here. And few people in my district or many other districts, I would suggest, are going to believe that this is a thing against farmers and bureaucrats. It is commissions being earned by insurance people, and it is people that are women, children, and infants receiving nutrition that they need to make sure that they do not fall between the cracks as we go from one year to another.

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

Mr. TIERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIERNEY] for yielding.

I simply want to say that I find a couple of the last statements bordering on jokes. Just because one repeats a mistake 50 times does not make it a fact. And the fact is that this does not do anything to cut crop insurance. It cuts crop insurance commissions.

Now when they passed a freedom to farm act, I would say to our friends on the other side of the aisle, they did not pass a freedom to milk the farmers act. And neither did they pass a bill that allowed salesmen to milk the taxpayers.

What we are trying to do is to simply meet our primary responsibility to farmers to see to it that programs which we have on the books for their assistance are defensible so that demagogs do not rip them up. And the fact is that when insurance agents are going around charging skyboxes at baseball and football stadiums to the taxpayer, that discredits the entire program. And that kind of nonsense has to stop, and that is what we are attempting to do.

It so happens to be that the USDA and the OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Agriculture Department both agree with the Obey amendment because they know that in the long run nothing protects farmers more than protecting the integrity of programs that are supposed to serve farmers. When we have insurance agents ripping this program off, it does not do diddly for farmers, despite the propaganda mantra that is being repeated this evening, and it certainly does not do diddly for the taxpayers.

If my colleagues are on the side of farmers and not on the side of women and infants and children who need WIC funding, they support this amendment; they do not listen to the propaganda of the insurance agents who are ripping off the country in this case.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I obviously associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and I close by saying that we have to take a chance, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to take a chance that 45 to 55 thousand women, infants, and children are going to be at risk at the end of this year. I will take the chance that some insurance agency does not make all of the commission that they might otherwise be entitled to under this bill.

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

□ 2245

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman when he says let us not demagog this. Let us be perfectly up front of what is happening. We did away with subsidies for farmers in the freedom to farm bill last year. Risk management is a new type of insurance. It is insurance that not only is sunshine insurance on the weather, but it is also insurance on what happens to those crop prices in the new revolution of world trade where other countries can affect now the price as much as production in this country.

So we are moving into a new area of insurance called risk management insurance. The amount of money that we call commissions is a subsidy to farmers, because if that commission is not paid by taxpayers in this transition to this new type of insurance program, then it is going to be paid by the farmers. That money is going to be charged to somebody.

Right now the Secretary of Agriculture is negotiating to the best of his ability to get those commissions as low as possible. So I would suggest with great respect for the people that made this amendment's feeling of need for the WIC Program is that it is not a good policy judgment to take it out of a new risk management program as we try to move farmers into their decisionmaking of deciding how much of what crop to plant instead of Government doing it, as we put the burden on farmers for the risk of disaster and the risk of their success in farming, as we take away the deficiency programs that taxpayers have paid to farmers for the last 50 years.

So in an effort to make this transition, I think it is very important that we move farmers into reaching into their own pocket, which they are doing with this insurance program, and satisfying their risk management needs. But it is a new area. Let us not cut down or cut back on the transition to this new era where agriculture and farmers and ranchers are moving into the private sector and the real marketplace.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment. I would like to address it from two basic areas. One is the credibility and the importance of the WIC Program. The second will be about the difference between our argument over here about insurance commissions versus the good will and the kind of product that we get out of the WIC Program.

Members will hear me on this floor talk many times about early childhood development. Let me give my colleagues some statistics about what early childhood development really means to us as taxpayers on both sides of the aisle.

It is estimated by national nonpartisan groups that we as taxpayers pay approximately $800,000 per child where we have to pay for nutrition programs, remedial education, sometimes incarceration and all kinds of other social programs later on in life. We pay that. Instead of investing merely 10 percent of that money early on, we can prevent those kinds of problems. In the age group 0 to 6, which is where the WIC Program really focuses its effort, if we put our money into that area, we will save taxpayers on both sides of the aisle a great deal of money.

In my State of Rhode Island just recently, a pregnant woman on the WIC Program gave birth to a daughter, Mindy, but after only 27 weeks of pregnancy. When Mindy was born, she was merely 1 pound 5 ounces, with her head barely the size of a small peach. But thanks to special formula and the follow-up visits because of the WIC Program we have put into place, nutritionists helped Mindy and her mother, and now after a year and a half she is as active as any toddler that we would know.

Mindy's mom could never have afforded her continual visits and the nutrition she received as a result of WIC. The assistance WIC has given to her is exactly how we can save taxpayers money later on. Medical research has found that WIC reduces infant mortality, improves diet and has been linked to improving development among children. For every dollar that we put into the WIC Program, we save $3.50 later on in Medicaid and other costs.

The validity and the importance of WIC is undeniable. So the real question is why would we take $23.7 million out of the crop insurance fund for this? Let me tell my colleagues, if they were on this side and arguing this, they would say any program that has overhead and commission of 27 percent should be looked at and changed. They would say privatization is the cure to that. And if any company was operating on an overhead and a commission of 27 percent, they should be looked into as a part of the Government. We are saying, quite frankly, that overhead and commission is far too much. To knock it down to 24.5 percent is barely reasonable, to knock it down even more than that is more than reasonable for the taxpayers. What we are saying is do not hurt the farmers, but do not hurt the women, infants and children. Realize that there should be a reduction in this overhead and this commission and it should go to helping women, infants and children.

If Members are for insurance rates and are for paying that outrageous fee for overhead and commission, do not vote for the Obey amendment. But if Members truly are concerned about saving taxpayers money and helping women, infants and children, vote for the Obey amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the Obey amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill. This amendment, as my colleagues have

heard, is going to add $23.7 million for the special supplemental food program for women, infants and children. Under that amendment, $23.7 million would be taken from funding for crop insurance sales commissions. The Committee on Appropriations raised the funding for crop insurance sales commissions above the level that was approved by the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations. The Department of Agriculture has indicated that the level approved by the subcommittee is sufficient for the crop insurance sales commissions. The offset appears to be appropriate and reasonable.

The Committee on Appropriations funding level for WIC is $30 million short of what is needed to maintain the current caseload in fiscal year 1998, and it would result in a reduction in participation of 55,000 to 60,000 women, infants and children next year.

Mr. Chairman, WIC is an effective prevention program that saves on future health care costs. WIC provides food, education, and child care to poor women, infants and children. It is estimated that 1 in 5 children in our country is living in poverty and 5 million children under the age of 12 go to bed hungry each month. No child in our country should go to bed hungry. Only well-nourished children reach their potential and become productive contributing members of society.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, the pain and violence of hunger can be reduced by appropriating additional money to the WIC Program. This increase would provide supplemental food and nutrition education for at least 45,000 women, infants and children per month in the coming fiscal year. Without this additional money, these eligible participants will be part of the growing childhood hunger epidemic that plagues us.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a yes vote on the amendment.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment that I was going to offer, but I am going to withdraw that amendment and rise in support of the Obey amendment. The one difference in my amendment and his amendment is he is asking for $23 million and I was asking for $184 million for the 1998 fiscal year. Actually I was asking to bring WIC up to the request that the President had asked for. Again, another difference is rather than take it from the crop insurance, I had asked for a cut across the board which would represent 37 percent of all discretionary accounts in that program.

The choice between whether we ask for the crop insurance or ask for WIC, that is a hard issue obviously. But in the final analysis, it is really not a hard issue if we are going to raise children. If the difference is between having kids to eat, having kids to be healthy, that is no question at all. My preference is that we do not take it from the crop insurance, because I personally know the crop insurance is needed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for that amendment if she puts it in, but let us not take it out of crop insurance that farmers are going to suffer from.

Mrs. CLAYTON. The gentleman will vote for $184 million for WIC?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the gentlewoman takes it out as a pro rata reduction across the board. But do not take it out of crop insurance that is so important in the transition of the Freedom to Farm bill.

Mrs. CLAYTON. The gentleman has concurrence on his side that he will vote for the $185 million?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will vote for it.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Did the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] say that he would be willing to move from $23 million to $184 million that I had offered? I was just wondering and that seemed like a bargain to me, but I do not know if he has concurrence on his side of the aisle.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentlewoman will yield, with all due respect, I think we have the proper amendment before us. The gentleman is suggesting that he would add what?

Mrs. CLAYTON. That he would raise it from $23 million to $184 million.

Mr. OBEY. Where does the money come from?

Mrs. CLAYTON. My amendment would have it coming from across the board.

Mr. OBEY. I understand the gentlewoman's would, but where is he suggesting?

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, where is the gentleman from Michigan suggesting?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Pro rata across the board like she is suggesting.

Mr. OBEY. I do not think that is the proper way to do business.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, the point is that trying to raise the level of children to be healthy indeed is not a hard decision.

I think the preferable way would be across the board. That is what my amendment would do. But if we are not going to raise it $23 million, I can ill expect that we are going to raise it $184 million, what the President asked for.

We have a bill before Congress called Hunger Has a Cure. It simply means that those of us who care about children and care about starving people or care about their health, we feel it ought to be raised to an issue. I personally have a preference that it should come across the board. But if I am not going to get that opportunity, I am going to withdraw that amendment. If the Obey amendment goes down, maybe I will offer it, but if it does not go down, we will indeed be supportive of it.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think there has been a healthy debate here. I certainly have not agreed with all of the theories put out, particularly on the other side, but I think there are some points that need to be made.

No. 1, the Federal crop insurance program costs are being reduced. It is a fact that if we expect USDA to carry this program all on their own without the private sector, the Government would cost 147 percent more than the private sector. So it is not a good investment for us to be cutting a program that is cost effective.

There has been a lot of talk over here about skyboxes. But let me tell my colleagues that the Federal Crop Insurance Program makes a contract with the insurers and at a set rate reimburses them. If an insurance company or anyone else chooses to have a skybox, that is something else and it is not charged to the Federal Government. They enter into a contract, the Federal Government, with the crop insurance agency.

Let me also say that farmers will suffer because of the Obey amendment. Under this amendment, service will be cut, farmers will have to wait longer for an adjuster to come, they will wait longer to get a claim settled, and the range of products which are offered to America's farmers will very likely change.

□ 2300

So it does have a detrimental effect.

Finally, all the criticism about the Federal crop insurance program and how it operates and all the talk about WIC. Well, while WIC is a fine program, I am sure, there are many who claim that there is waste and fraud in the WIC Program, and I believe that is substantiated by GAO, and yet we hear nothing about that as if there were no problems in that. There are problems in probably every Federal program, so throwing more money at it is certainly not the answer.

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

Mr. EWING. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, and the gentleman is on the Specialty Commodities Committee. Now on these programs, to make sure, is WIC fully funded?

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding.

Mr. KINGSTON. According to our calculations it is funded at 7.4 million participants and that it is fully funded.

Now does WIC have any leftover money, or are they scraping the bottom right now?

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I think they had $200 million, was it left in their account?

Mr. KINGSTON. They have a $200 million carryover, and so the discussion of saying that there are children starving and because of this we have got to give the benefit of the doubt is totally specious, totally emotional, total demagoguery. The children are not starving. The only thing we are going to do here is increase the bureaucracy on the backs of the American farmer. That is what we are talking about.

Mr. EWING. Did we not just increase WIC funding a couple months ago?

Mr. KINGSTON. We increased it in May by $76 million. We increase it in this bill $118 million.

Mr. EWING. That is almost $200 million.

Mr. KINGSTON. Exactly. And 2 months ago we were told the $76 million increase would bring us up to the full participation level, and we did not have a dialog or a debate about this in committee. It was everybody was happy.

Mr. EWING. In the appropriation process, has the gentleman found that just large expenditures and new money make a program better?

Mr. KINGSTON. No; I have not.

That is a very good point because there seems to be something here that WIC is good, pay more money into it. It can be good at adequately funded levels right now, and I am not sure why people are trying to run away from that. It is possible that the program is good as is. I think, and the gentleman has already suggested, we should try to increase the efficiency of it. I think that there is some waste in it. Twenty-five percent of the money goes to administration. I think we could do a better job and feed more children from that, and less bureaucrats. But to add money to a program that has a $200 million carryover, a $200 million surplus, if the gentleman will, and a program that is already completely fully funded is ridiculous, and to take it away from American farmers is even worse.

Mr. EWING. Reclaiming the balance of my time, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Georgia, I appreciate the hard work he has done on this bill, and I think we should defeat this amendment.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my very strong support for the Obey amendment. We all experienced the debate that we had to restore the $76 million just a few months ago when there was reported to be a shortfall that would severely impact on all of our districts, and so here again we are now confronted by a committee deliberation, which, as I understand it, will be shortfalling again a full funding as recommended by the Department of Agriculture, some $30 million short. The Obey amendment will provide $23.7 million of this shortfall.

The issue is we have to base our funding upon reliable statistics from either OMB or the Department of Agriculture. It makes no sense for us to discuss what the estimated number of participants will be in this program. We have to trust the estimates provided us by the Department, and by their statistics and their analysis there will be some 50,000 individuals left out if this additional money were not provided.

So I support that. It seems to me that if we could support this program with a sense that if there are eligible people that meet the criteria that we have set by our legislation, then they ought not to be left without support under the program. It should be as simple as that. If my colleagues do not like the eligibility standards or because they think too many people are being allowed in, then change the standards. But as long as we have the standards there that say 185 percent of poverty, they qualify; if they have children younger than 1 year of age and so forth, if they meet these qualifications, it seems to me it is perfectly right that the Government appropriate the moneys necessary to meet this obligation. I consider this an obligation.

The program has provided tremendous benefits to all of us, not only the children and the mothers involved, but because with the early support and the early nutritional information and the foods that are supplied, we have been able to cut down the costs of Medicaid and other health benefits which they might have an entitlement to receive. So it is a very, very cost-benefit, cost-efficient program.

So it seems to me that it is very logical that if my colleagues support the women, infants children program, that they would do everything they can to fully fund it to make sure that every child that is eligible, every expectant mother who is eligible would have the necessary program support.

Now we have heard tonight about this $200 million, moneys that have not been called for. I had the opportunity to attend a WIC conference in San Francisco not too long ago, and there was a discussion there as to why this additional moneys seem to have a carryover at the end of the year. The reason is simple. All of us run our offices. We incur obligations, we pay bills, we send our vouchers to the finance office here for payment. But the payments are not forthcoming. It may take a month, it may take 2 months to have our bills paid. But that does not mean because we have these funds on reserve in our committee account that they are not obligated. That $200 million is obligated.

The people who I talked to from the WIC Program tell me these are unpaid vouchers that have been submitted but have not been paid to that. This is not extra money that we can use to balance the budget or reduce the deficit. These are moneys that have been committed to the program up to the end of the fiscal year. They have been vouchers submitted to the Government but not paid. Let us not steal from this money just because it seems to be a carryover balance. These are moneys that are committed.

If we are going to budget for the next fiscal year, let us be real, let us count the number of families, number of women and children that we believe are going to be eligible, estimate what the costs are going to be; costs are rising, the price of the commodities is going up; and let us appropriate sufficient amounts of money so that we do not have to come here in the spring next year and worry about a supplemental allocation. It seems to me that that is the least we can do to support this program which so many people say is so beneficial to our families.

We all run on a family first kind of agenda. This is truly a family first amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] answered the very important question about any suggestions of a $200 million slush fund for the WIC Program. It is very obvious accounting principles that those are attributable to unpaid invoices that have to be paid.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think the real question to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is whether or not they will opt for luxury skyboxes or whether or not they will opt to feed women, infants and children. I think it is appalling that even though we are $184 million short, we cannot find enough humanity to allow a mere $23 million increase.

I join the honorable gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] in supporting the $184 million increase. Recognizing that the amendment on the floor is the amendment by the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], I support the $23 million because I want to ensure that we get some relief for the 55,000 women who would not be covered but for this amendment.

It just, if my colleagues will, causes me great consternation that the Republicans cannot see the logic in this particular amendment. No one is talking about crop insurance per se as much as they are talking about the commissions attributable to such.

Let me give my colleagues just a few statistics. One, it is interesting that this country, one of the most developed and sophisticated countries in the world, has a high infant mortality rate. We can go to any place in this Nation, urban centers, rural communities, and find a high infant mortality rate. In fact, we will go to various WIC centers around the Nation and find that at the certification process some 43 percent of the women who come in that are pregnant have three or more nutrition risk factors. That means that women who come into the WIC centers to secure the kind of nutritious treatment that they should get in order to ensure that

they have a long-term pregnancy, they go to full term, that they do not have premature birth, those women, if they were not in the program, would suffer through three nutrition risks, and that means they would be subject to the very tragic potential of infant mortality, sometimes a premature birth, low birth rate in their babies.

It seems to be without any sort of real thinking that one would have to dwell on whether I choose luxury skyboxes or whether I choose the program that feeds women, infants and children.

Interestingly enough, if we just take the statistics in my own community in Harris County, we will find that there are at least 12,000 women who are on the WIC Program during the month. There are more that need to be on the program. Five thousand breast-feeding women receive WIC services per month. There are more that need to be on the program. Nine thousand postpartum women receive WIC services per month. More need to be on the program. Twenty-nine thousand infants benefited from WIC services per month. More need to be on the program. And 51,000 preschool children benefited by the WIC Program. More need to be on the program.

This $23 million, a mere drop in the bucket, will help 55,000 women across this Nation, women, infants and children to be served as they should be served. The question is what are the services? Well, it is what we take for granted. How many of us in this Congress take for granted eggs, peanut butter, cheese, juices, beans? And how many of us take for granted that those that we know, our family members and friends, have a ready access to infant formula? Do my colleagues realize there are Americans in this country, there are people living in this Nation, that do not have access to eggs and peanut butter, cheese, juices, infant formula? It seems incredulous, but it seems incredulous to me again that we can stand on this floor and talk about skyboxes and talk about golfing trips and various other substitutes while $23 million that would help the children, would help the women and would help the infants.

Again it is interesting. As my colleagues stood on the floor, I am delighted that this is a combination of those of us who have come together who believe in the quality of life. I heard my colleague mentioning his pro-life posture. He rises. I happen to believe in another aspect of choice. I rise. It would seem that if we can come together around this very important issue, I do not see why this is not a bipartisan amendment, I do not see why there are not more voices rising and saying that we can support a $23 million addition that will help children, will help women, and will help our infants and decrease infant mortality in this Nation.

I support the Obey amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Obey amendment because it increases funding for the WIC Program by $23.7 million.

I have been told that we measure the humaneness of a society by how well it treats its young, how well it treats its old, and how well it treats those who cannot take care of themselves, and so when we increase funding for this program, we are looking out for those who have the most difficulty in looking out for themselves. And even the $23.7 million is still less than the $30 million that is really needed.

Now I have heard those argue that we really do not need the additional money because there may be some shortfall that can be overcome by surpluses. The reality is that when we look at those projections, we are taking a gamble. I do not want to gamble with the lives of 45 to 50,000 women and children who could, in fact, benefit for certain.

□ 2315

There has been a great deal of talk about family values, about the development of people. Yet, when there is an opportunity to put our monies where the conversations are, we find that providing insurance protection, providing commissions is more important than providing milk and butter and eggs and cheese.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the little bit of money we are talking about right now for WIC, in my area in Chicago and Cook County there are well over 100,000 women and children who benefit from this program. As a matter of fact, many of the large urban centers throughout the country could have solved the 45,000 to 50,000 alone, by themselves; when we really go into the crevices and cracks of our society, we find those who are untouchable and unreachable.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for giving this House an opportunity to demonstrate its humaneness. I urge support for the Obey amendment.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will try to be brief. I think it is safe to say I have a long history in support of the women and children program, that program and others of that nature, in my other life, in another place.

I also would like to take the Members for a little walk, if I could, about some of the things I think we ought to be thinking about. I wonder if we have forgotten that in many places of the world, in the modern world, that nearly all of disposable income is spent for the food and fiber we subsist on. In this Nation we enjoy like 14 percent or 15 percent of our disposable income being used for that purpose.

I have no quarrel with the WIC program. I support it. But I do suggest to the Members that to take it from this area is wrong. The spin on that is not something that we would anticipate. We do not want to do this. Yes, a bill was passed before I got here, the Family Farm Act. I would have supported it if I had been here. I think the time had come. But for that to work we have to have the opportunity for them to have some coverage, some insurance to stay in business.

I come from a farm community. That is what I do. I have been known to have had a lot of dirt under my fingernails, as some of the other Members. But I can tell the Members, why, I know of nobody, I never been invited to any sky box, and I do not know anybody who has. I do not think that is the issue. I think that horse has been ridden to death this evening.

I think it is OK to try to increase the WIC program, but not from this source. I would guess in this great House of Representatives here, that if we really care about those things that have been talked about, that we can bring our minds together and do something to enhance that. I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], I do not think this is the place to get it.

I regret to have to go against the gentleman on this, but I must do that, because I feel that at least I come from the sense that we have to work together if we are going to produce the food and fiber that this country needs, and not be dependent on it from somewhere else. So I oppose it, and I hope that we can find some other source to address this problem.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, we are hearing limits on debates on this matter and other matters. I was wondering if the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations could shed some light on this.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, Mr. Chairman. Let me simply say that as the gentleman knows, trying to figure out what is happening at any point in this House on any subject, the way it is being run these days, is extremely difficult, to say the least.

Let me simply say that for the last 2 days this House has been at a procedural impasse because the majority party in the Committee on Rules arrogantly disregarded the rights of minority managers of the bills. It arbitrarily denied the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] the right to offer a major amendment on the foreign operations bill, a bill which she is supposed to manage on this side of the aisle. It did the same thing to the gentlewoman

from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] several weeks ago on a previous bill. It did the same thing to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] on the Interior appropriations bill.

The majority party determined to bring the agriculture bill to the floor without a rule. The procedural protest which this side has been engaging in on the other problems is apparently now being responded to by attempts to go to the Committee on Rules and draft what we understand is going to be a draconian rule which will allow virtually a meaningless 5 minutes of debate on serious amendments, which will apparently eliminate the right to strike items in this bill, which goes to the heart of the congressional prerogative to protect the power of the purse.

I would simply say that if that is indeed the case, then it makes the debate which we are having on this amendment at this point tonight useless, because it apparently is simply a time-filler until the majority party responds in exactly the wrong way to our concerns.

Mr. Chairman, this is exactly opposite the actions which would be taken by a party that wanted to promote bipartisanship, that wanted to promote collegiality. And in my view, if they do intend to proceed down that road, it will certainly lead to more acrimonious days on the floor of the House.

It apparently is not enough that they are cannibalizing themselves in their own caucus. Apparently the legislative process itself is to be cannibalized. I would simply urge the majority party, if they are planning to do that, that they think about it overnight, because that would be a most destructive way to proceed. It would not be a fair outcome. It would be a total misreading of their responsibilities, given the already acrimonious feelings in this House. I would hope that in their own interests, as well as the interests of this House, they would reconsider their apparent plans.

Mr. MEEHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, what is of concern to me is not only the discussion that we have had tonight that would basically be a discussion that would be wasted, but I have an amendment that is a fundamentally important amendment to the future of this country regarding tobacco use in America and protecting America's children from tobacco.

What I am hearing is we are going to have a rule that is going to limit debate on that amendment to a mere 5 minutes per side, which I find an absolute outrage. At 11:25 in the evening, I am getting word that a bill that fundamentally affects the ability of this country to regulate tobacco use among children is going to be limited to 5 minutes, an absolute outrage. If that is what is going on at the Committee on Rules right now, I would suggest that the Members of the majority party get their act together.

Because if we have a 5-minute debate on a rule that would limit debate on amendments that affect tobacco use specifically, an amendment that I have that would allow the FDA to enforce rules and regulations that are on the books all over this country, if we are going to limit debate after waiting all day for this amendment to be offered, then I think the majority party better think and act very, very cautiously. Because I as one Member would be outraged if we get a rule and this Congress is asked to pass that rule tomorrow and limit debate on fundamentally important issues of tobacco use.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in strongly protesting the proposed rule, and I have not seen the rule as yet, but I would hope that this misguided rule is just a rumor, and not reality.

I have an amendment with the gentlewoman from Colorado [Ms. DEGETTE] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and many other Members join us in support of this amendment, that would also deal with the tobacco subsidy and would try to bring some consistency to this policy, to make sure that our health policy is consistent with our subsidy policy. It just does not make any sense at all.

And to think that we are going to limit this debate on this very important issue to 15 minutes a side, and we hear about this at 11:25 at night when we have been waiting all day and all night to debate this issue, this just does not make any sense at all.

I would appeal to my colleagues, our distinguished chairman on the other side of the aisle, to protest this rule, because limiting this important discussion to either 5 minutes a side on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] or 15 minutes a side on our amendment just does not make any sense at all.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would also add to the words of my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York, to point out that our tobacco policy in this country is inconsistent. Last year we spent nearly $200 million to prevent tobacco use, and we spent $80 million on tobacco crop insurance subsidies. That is why the Lowey-DeGette-Hansen-Meehan amendment enjoys broad bipartisan support on both sides of the aisle. That is why it would be a real crime if we limited the debate on this issue to just a few minutes per side.

There are many voices on both sides of the aisle that have a lot to say about the tobacco policy in this country, about a policy that is killing millions of Americans and causing millions of young people to begin smoking every year. That is why I would hope that this rule would not be limited, and I would also join my colleagues in urging the Committee on Rules to rethink any such proposed rule.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MEEHAN. What is really concerning about this, Mr. Chairman, is if we look at the fact that 44 attorneys general from all across America have spent months and months negotiating on this issue of tobacco and FDA regulations, when we look at the fact that there have been literally millions of pages of newspapers all across America debating the issue of tobacco in America and what we are going to do about it, to think that we are going to limit, in the people's House, we are going to limit the debate on this major, fundamentally important issue to 5 minutes here or 15 minutes here is an outrage. America is waiting for a discussion about how we are going to protect the next generation of Americans from the leading preventable cause of death in America.

We are saying that we do not want to debate this, we are going to limit debate, because it is 11:30 at night and some Members may be tired. It makes us wonder how the tobacco companies really work and when they are working and where they are working.

We ought to have a substantive discussion, it seems to me, about tobacco in this country, and it seems that the majority has been running away from this discussion. Let us have this discussion and have a rule, maintain the rule, and let us get up and debate this. I just want to say that I, too, am outraged that they, the majority party, could even contemplate such a ridiculous move.

Mrs. LOWEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, consistent with the arguments of my colleague, it just does not make sense at all to know that we are spending $200 million to prevent our youngsters from using tobacco, and yet we are going to limit our debate to make our policy on crop insurance consistent with our health policy to 15 minutes a side.

And we are not talking about the billions of dollars that are being spent in Medicaid and Medicare. Many of my colleagues have a lot to say on this issue. Tobacco is on the minds of thousands and thousands of our constituents.

I would ask my colleagues, and I know I am joined by colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to reconsider any rule that would limit the discussion to 10 minutes on either side, or even 15 minutes on either side. This is an important issue and we should give it fair time.

□ 2330

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe what I am hearing, honestly. We worked in a

bipartisan way on this agriculture bill. We brought it to the floor without a rule so that we could have unlimited debate on these issues. And what we find when we come to the floor is everybody wants to talk about everything but agriculture.

And the fact is, when we brought this bill up last week, the dilatory tactics that were undertaken by the minority precluded any substantive debate on agriculture. It was all about, we got one after another after another, motion to rise, motion to rise, motion to rise.

We could have been debating the gentleman from Massachusetts's amendment. We could have been debating the gentlewoman from Ohio's amendment and the gentlewoman from New York's and the gentleman from Wisconsin's, but we could not get a vote. We could not have any debate because of the dilatory tactics.

Now we come in today. We are prepared to debate the agriculture bill again, and we have a series of suspension votes, which normally means that we just voice vote them because everyone basically agrees to them. We are forced to vote on every single issue, rollcall votes that tie everybody up in knots, that preclude us from doing our committee work, that preclude us from having a substantive debate on agriculture. And now we propose, if we cannot have a substantive debate, we will have to limit the rule so that we can get back to the issues at hand and the minority complains.

You reap what you sow on the agriculture bill and every other bill. If we cannot work in a bipartisan way, then we have to have a rule.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield to the gentleman. He has had all night.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful that the Appropriations Committee has reported continued funding for the Agricultural Development in the American Pacific [ADAP] project and the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs, both conducted by the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service within the USDA.

With committee provisions reporting ADAP funding at $564,000, as in previous years, the American Government demonstrates its continuing commitment to provide funds and grants to its communities in the Asia-Pacific region. These include not only Guam, but also Hawaii, the Northern Marianas Islands, American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Freely Associated States.

ADAP funds a number of activities for the Asia-Pacific communities. These include financing research of regional agricultural problems common to members of the five land-grant institutions in the American-affiliated Pacific, strengthening market information systems, producing instructional materials development and distribution, and providing scholarships for land-grant faculty and staff.

I commend the committee's continued support for ADAP, however, I am disappointed with the decreased funding it has reported for the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs. Not only does this program impact Guam, it also affects Hawaii, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. For the people of Guam, the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs fund numerous activities. These include financing research contributing to the establishment of energy and labor efficient irrigation and fertigator systems, watermelon disease control, modeling crop production systems, market surveys, and the biological control of pests in order to increase productivity.

Although I have stressed the benefits Guam receives from these programs, I also point to the implications the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs have on the neighboring regions. Knowledge and expertise culled from these studies not only improve Guam's local agricultural industry, they are disseminated throughout Micronesia, Asia, and Africa.

American tropical and subtropical regions face agricultural needs unique to other areas. Continued support for the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs are necessary steps to improving not only the livelihood of the people of Guam, but also other tropical regions of the world.

I will continue to actively support funding for ADAP and the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs. These programs are fundamental vehicles for improving standards of living not only on Guam, but also other tropical regions of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

A DOUBLE STANDARD

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk recently in Washington about the influence of foreign money on Members of Congress and on the administration. The most recent media reports indicate that there may have been complicity between the government of the People's Republic of China and Mr. John Huang to influence our elections and certain Federal officials of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may have missed a recent report in The Hill newspaper which reported that as much as $86 million was spent by foreign governments to lobby and conduct public relations with both private and public officials of our Government. It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that it is perfectly legal for foreign governments to spend over $86 million to lobby the Congress and the White House, but no one ever questions the ethical aspects of the process.

So while we are pointing fingers at China for alleged misconduct to lobby and influence our policymakers, there appears to be a standard that is confusing to me and I am sure to the American people. I call it a double standard.

[From The Hill, June 25, 1997]

FOREIGN STATES SPENT $86 M TO LOBBY U.S.

(By Robert Schlesinger)

Foreign governments, led by Japan, reported spending in excess of $86 million on activities including lobbying and public relations in the United States during the first six months of 1996, according to filings made to the Department of Justice under the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA).

Overall, foreign interests, working through more than 330 separate registered entities, reported $430,867,734 in activities reportable under the FARA in the first half of last year, according to an analysis by The Hill of the attorney general's report to Congress on FARA filings.

Individuals or groups must register as foreign agents if they perform certain activities, ranging from lobbying to trade promotion, on behalf of a foreign entity, such as a government or corporation.

''The U.S. is definitely uniquely open and user friendly to official foreign lobbyists from all over the world,'' said Alan Tonelson of the U.S. Business and Industrial Council Educational Foundation (USBICEF). ''This situation is not even close to being reciprocated anywhere.''

The government of Japan, mostly through entities like the Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO), reported spending at least $17,840,878—more than twice as much as any other government.

JETRO reported $14,117,208 during the first six months of 1996. Their activities are typically along the lines of ''research in matters concerning foreign trade between Japan and the U.S.,'' as a filing for JETRO states.

Other countries spent their resources on lobbying or ''monitoring and analysis'' of issues of interest to them. Mexico, the sixth-largest spending government at $3,576,368, paid Burson-Marsteller $563,000 for public relations on the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which will be up for expansion in the near future. Mexico, which has been wracked recently by charges of corruption and narcotics problems, also spent a great deal of money on broader PR efforts to burnish its suffering image.

Burson, which made slightly over $1.2 million over all from foreign entities, ranked only 11th in line in the 13 law/lobby/PR firms to gross more than $1 million from foreign clients.

Most of the other top-spending governments devoted at least some of their expenditures to tourism-related activities. For example, the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands, the second and third largest spending governments at roughly $8 million each, spent virtually all of their money promoting tourism, as did Ireland, the number four country.

New York City-based advertising agency DDB Needham Worldwide pulled in more than $18 million, most of it from the National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia, which paid them $13,965,723.68.

New York ad firms O'Leary Clarke & Partners and FCB/Leber Katz Partners Inc. were second and third respectively, making slightly over $5 million each from the Cayman Islands (O'Leary) and Jamaica and the British Virgin Islands (FCB).

Washington law/lobbying firms also fared well. Patton Boggs, home of super lobbyist and name-partner Hale ''Tommy'' Boggs, pulled in more than $3.5 million from such clients as Oman, Qatar, the Philippines and Pakistan. Other Patton Boggs clients who did not pay them during the six month time period include Hong Kong, Italy, the United Arab Emirates, France, Germany and Taiwan.

Other law/lobby/PR firms grossing over $1 million with numerous active foreign clients were Fleishman-Hillard (including clients from Canada, France, Angola, Turkey, Northern Ireland and Japan), Cassidy & Associates (France, Australia, Japan, Saudi Arabia and Taiwan), the Bozell Sawyer Miller Group (Canada, the Bahamas, Bolivia, Japan and Indonesia), Arnold & Porter (Canada, Israel, Panama, Turkey and Venezuela), Burson-Marsteller (Hong Kong, Great Britain, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Turkey and Portugal), Washington & Christian (Antigua & Barbuda, Gabon, Guinea and Nigeria) and Hogan & Hartson (Canada, France, Panama, Russia, the Bahamas, Haiti, Japan, Great Britain and Taiwan).

Registerable activities include engaging in lobbying, ''political activities,'' or public relations in the United States. A foreign agent must also register if he or she ''solicits, collects, disburses or dispenses contributions, loans, money or other things of value . . .'' This includes the promotion of trade and tourism.

Furthermore, ostensibly domestic entities don't have to register with the Department of Justice.

USBICEF's Tonelson noted that many domestic companies have become almost proxy foreign agents. ''The China trade debate is a perfect example . . . ''said Tonelson.

He added that, ''the positions that they're lobbying for hard have become almost indistinguishable from the Chinese government, and in fact they've become the most effective voice for the Chinese government.''

So, for example, while the Chinese Embassy paid a paltry $18,750 to the law and lobbying firm of Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue for keeping up on issues like Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) trade status, groups like the U.S.-China Business Council and large multinational corporations lobby the U.S. government in favor of the MFN renewal.

As of June 30, 1996, 595 active registrants (totaling 2,825 individuals) were registered to represent 871 foreign principals.

Lobbying, law and P.R. firms grossing over $1 million from foreign clients

DDB Needham Worldwide	$18,343,333
O'Leary & Clarke & Partners	5,139,405
FCB/Leber Katz Partners	5,131,928
International Registries Inc	4,709,640
Merkley Newman Harty	3,670,489
Patton Boggs	3,574,939
Fleishman-Hillard Inc	2,619,152
Cassidy & Associates	2,060,465
Bozell Sawyer Miller Group	1,786,831
Arnold & Porter	1,614,937

Foreign governments spending over $1 million

Japan	$17,840,878.31
Bahamas	8,722,043.54
Cayman Islands	8,212,662.99
Ireland	5,546,970.00
Marshall Islands	4,376,538.87
Mexico	3,576,368.31

Foreign governments spending over $1 million—Continued

Canada	2,716,742.50
Hong Kong	2,569,187.99
Bermuda	2,473,473.71
India	2,273,449.09

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

CHAOS IN MAJORITY AFFECTS FLOOR SCHEDULE

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to take this time to correct the impression left by the previous speaker, the gentleman from New York, about what happened on the House floor tonight.

The fact is, the votes on suspensions which occurred tonight, to which the gentleman from New York objected, occurred at the insistence of the majority party, not at our insistence. In fact, we suggested five different propositions which would have enabled the Republican leadership of this House to close debate on measures in an orderly manner and at a reasonable hour tonight, and all five of those suggestions were rejected by the majority party leadership.

We, in fact, specifically asked and our party leadership specifically asked that the majority party consider not having the votes on suspension until tomorrow, and that was also turned down by the majority party leadership.

So lest the gentleman from New York be under the impression that this protracted session tonight occurred at the wish of the minority party in the House, that is specifically not the case. My staff tried. The staff of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] tried. The staff of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] tried suggestions which would have avoided this meaningless extension of debate tonight. All of them were turned down by the majority party leadership.

I regret the chaos which has afflicted the House on the latter part of this day. It seems to be simply an extension of the chaos which is occurring within the majority party caucus.

I would note that I find it strange indeed that the Committee on Appropriations seems to be able to do its work in committee on an almost totally bipartisan basis on bill after bill after bill. But then when those bills come to the House floor, they are in fact first taken to the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Rules establishes a set of rules under which the bills can be debated which systematically denies to the minority member who has the responsibility for carrying the bill the right to participate in any meaningful way in the debate on the House floor.

As the gentlewoman from California said the other night in discussing this, almost without exception the amendments that were allowed the minority party by the Committee on Rules on appropriation bill after appropriation bill are only those amendments which everyone understands will lose. Any time there appears to be an amendment that we want to offer that has a chance of winning, the Committee on Rules rules it out. That is what has caused the problems around here.

I would suggest if you want the House to work, the majority party and the Committee on Rules needs to work out the same kind of working relationship with the minority that we have been able to work out on the Committee on Appropriations between the majority and minority.

We manage within our committee to get our work done. And then every time it is frustrated by the overt and undue partisanship that permeates the way the Committee on Rules handles its business. That is the reason why I was told by a member of the majority party in the Committee on Appropriations that the reason the agriculture appropriation subcommittee came to the floor without a rule was to avoid the chaos in the Committee on Rules.

I would suggest we have a fundamental problem with the leadership of the majority party in this House which is apparently in chaos. That chaos is spilling over into an incredible exhibition of arrogance on the part of the majority party in the Committee on Rules. Until that chaos is eliminated, until that arrogance is eliminated, we are not going to be able to proceed apparently in any orderly fashion to deal with the House's business. I regret that, but that is in fact the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

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

As ranking member on the agriculture subcommittee, I have to say what a true tragedy it is that a subcommittee that has labored hard to bring a bill to the floor that can pass has now been handcuffed under this rule, and tomorrow it is almost laughable that key amendments will be limited to 5 minutes on each side, not even enough time to explain to our colleagues what the content of these amendments are and to fully appreciate the debate on both sides.

Whether we are talking about crop insurance, peanuts, whether we are talking about the WIC Program, our Members will be handcuffed and it is wrong. It is wrong for the Committee on Rules to do this to the Committee on Appropriations.

FAIRNESS TO DAIRY FARMERS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to also address an issue of agriculture, one that I think is of utmost importance to dairy farmers not only in northeast Wisconsin where I come from but all across this country, an agriculture issue that we are familiar with from some innovative television and prints ads that promote milk and dairy products, not only from Wisconsin but across this great land of ours.

One ad campaign asks, Got milk? Well, we have got milk in Wisconsin. And the question is, have we got fairness? It is another issue.

Right now the dairy farmers in northeast Wisconsin, indeed across the country, every one of them hard working farm families, pay 15 cents for every 100 pounds of milk that they sell. It goes into a fund. It promotes and advertises milk and dairy products. All of these ads are a great boost for dairy products in general. The program is helping dairy farmers everywhere, everywhere sell their milk.

However, there are some dairy producers who benefit from these ads but they do not pay into this promotion fund. They are not farmers from my home district in Wisconsin. They are not farmers in the Northeast or in California.

They are foreign dairy producers, places like Australia and New Zealand, and they in fact reap the rewards of dairy promotion. I think dairy farmers think it is time we shared the cost with all dairy farmers.

I have introduced a bill, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, my first bill to try and level the playing field between American dairy farmers and foreign dairy producers when it comes to promotion, which benefits everybody who looks to advertise their product. It is the Dairy Promotion Fairness Act. I urge my colleagues to sign onto the measure and support it in this Congress.

I think this issue of fairness goes beyond the fact that dairy importers are not paying the same fees as dairy farmers. The importers of other commodities, beef, pork, and cotton, are currently paying into their respective promotion programs, yet dairy importers in America do not.

Also our dairy farmers are required to pay into dairy promotion programs in other countries where we do sell our milk. We are exporters. But those agreements unfortunately at this point are not reciprocal.

This past weekend I had a chance to meet with Reuel Robertson, a dairy producer from Oneida, Wisconsin. He pays as much as $450 a month from his monthly dairy check into a dairy promotion fund to help the industry sell, in effect, milk, cheese, ice cream and other products to Americans. It is for Reuel Robertson and for farmers everywhere, not just in northeast Wisconsin, but everywhere in this land that I am working to require foreign dairy producers to pay for dairy promotion. We will not be establishing a new program. We are already marketing milk.

□ 2345

We will be sharing the cost with every producer that sells dairy products in this country. Assessing importers, we will add approximately $10 million to the resources that pay for milk promotion. That is $10 million that promotes dairy products all across the country. It is no added extra revenue to dairy farmers in this country, and yet it is added revenue to help promote a product that we do best. Dairy products.

Mr. Speaker, when we ask the question, got milk? The answer should be yes. Got fairness? Unfortunately, for now, the answer is no, but I hope we can change that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE TOBACCO LOBBY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. LINDA SMITH, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I feel like I am running a rerun. Three years in a row, this is my third year in Congress, I have come to the floor and discussed what seems to be a subsidy that makes no sense.

At first, when I saw that we were subsidizing insurance for tobacco, I thought it was a mistake, because I had arrived with a group of people saying they were going to balance the budget and get rid of things that were not important, not only were not important but unnecessary, and that we were going to clean house.

So I was assured that when we brought that amendment to the floor, a bipartisan group from the oldest Members to the newest Members, that surely it would be gone by the end of the day. The bill was stalled, took a while, seemed to take a few days. I thought it would be one day and it moved to the next. Lost by 13 votes. It seemed a little intriguing until the next year we found the tobacco lobby had cut 165 checks within 48 hours of that vote. Unfortunately, some of them had been passed out here, very close to the vote, very close to where we were voting.

The next year, I thought, well, surely people with the disgust at what the tobacco industry is doing, marketing to our children, we will win this vote on a crop subsidy, targeted to children, intended to harm. But no, lost by two votes, just two votes, as even people did not vote, walking from the floor.

Why is that happening? I could not quite understand it. And I still do not understand it. But today, actually now later in the day, or I guess tomorrow now, we will have the vote again and some will say, as we are voting, well, the small tobacco companies need it, or the farmers. The reality is they are not the ones passing out checks here to keep that. It is the large tobacco companies wanting to keep a hold on what they believe is their position here in Congress, making sure that they still have their insurance subsidized.

I heard the argument that, well, it is only right, they are a crop. Then I realized that we have thousands of crops. Only a few dozen have subsidies, and only a few are insured by the Federal Government. Now, I can understand sugar, although I do not understand why we are subsidizing that. I could maybe understand peanuts, because like sugar, at least it feeds children. But tobacco? Subsidizing the insurance? Charging it to those same children that it is aimed to harm?

No, tomorrow I think this Congress is going to have a chance to show whether we believe in balancing the budget and whether we believe in going to those things that are unnecessary first, and also it will show a little bit about what happens here when money flows from large corporations to campaigns and to parties.

Earlier today it was disclosed that hundreds of thousands of dollars in the last few days had been given to both parties from the tobacco industry in what is called soft money, the soft money being given to the party because, see, if that was given to a candidate or used against a candidate in a TV ad, how would taxpayers feel about seeing that R.J. Reynolds paid for this ad at the bottom of the ad, which is the law. They have to show who pays for the ad, so, instead, they give it to the parties. They launder it through and it

comes out as paid for by the Republican or Democratic Party. Soft money.

See, the tobacco companies are smart. They know they are not popular, but they still want to control. So they give their money, as one of the most lucrative groups in the Nation, to keep their control, to keep their hands around our political system by giving it to the two major parties. The same soft money system that funneled the money that went through the White House to the Democrat Party from mainland China.

Tonight we can surmise, or I will surmise two things: Tomorrow we will see just how much power money has over American politics. Even that power that has to be hidden. And tomorrow we will see whether or not we can say no to those that give the hundreds of thousands, no, actually the millions of dollars to this political system, for something that costs billions. The American people only get 30 minutes because we do not want them to watch law, but they can see tomorrow.

CONGRATULATIONS ON PASSAGE OF STAMP OUT BREAST CANCER ACT; AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF FORMATION OF WASHINGTON WASTE WATCH CAUCUS

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to address my colleagues on two subjects. First, to congratulate the bipartisan fashion the passage of H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, which will authorize a 2-year demonstration project to offer the public a new way to fund research for breast cancer by raising money through especially designed U.S. postage stamps.

This is an idea whose time has certainly arrived, Mr. Speaker. With the increased funding needs at NIH, and working with the important breast cancer groups across this country, we need all we can put together when it comes to detection, treatment, and cure for breast cancer in this country. I congratulate all the groups that were a part of moving this legislation forward. I know that the Senate is also moving forward on the bill and I look forward to the President's signature.

I also want to announce a formation of the Washington Waste Watch Caucus, one that will zero in on the waste, fraud and abuse here in the Federal Government. I worked today with Thomas Schatz, the president of the Citizens Against Government Waste, which is an outgrowth of the Grace Commission, and together with Tom and other taxpayers groups and chamber groups we will work in a bipartisan fashion here in the House and in the Senate to make sure we identify those kinds of projects which are wasteful, which duplicate what States already do or local governments already do, and that cost too much for the Federal Government and costing, more importantly, too much for the taxpayers.

We want to make sure the taxpayers get their moneys worth, and that is why I am pleased to be working with those who want to see the sugar and peanut subsidies eliminated. Artificially inflated prices for our consumers is not the right way to move America forward.

Certainly as the gentlewoman from Washington, [Mrs. LINDA SMITH] just discussed, to move forward with again adding a tobacco subsidy when in this country we already have a policy that says the surgeon general has determined that smoking can be dangerous to our health, causes lung cancer, emphysema, we should certainly not have the same government saying from a health care point of view that we should though be smoking yet we have tobacco subsidies. Certainly this is the kind of project when it comes to the Washington Waste Watch we will be looking forward to seeing some positive changes in.

We also have legislation calling for sunset review of Federal agencies, to make sure that where we should privatize, downsize, consolidate or eliminate, we will be looking at each agency over a time period to make sure we report back to Congress with our findings.

So for my colleagues who are here tonight and those who may be looking from their offices, at their monitor, I would ask that they get in touch with me through the Washington Waste Watch Caucus, 435 Cannon Building, Washington, DC, with their suggestions, or call me at 202–225–6111.

I am looking forward to making sure that we make the government more responsive and that Congress leads the way working with the American people to make sure that we save money, spend wisely and make sure we look to the future in a fiscally responsible manner.

□ 2355

THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are going to have before the floor of the House of Representatives an historic piece of legislation, H.R. 2003, which is the Bipartisan Budget Enforcement Act of 1997. This piece of legislation is dedicated to the premise that whatever the budget agreement ultimately turns out to be, it has to have enforcement to actually result in a balanced budget by the year 2002.

If we look back 25 years ago to 1975, we can see that the blue area in this pie chart shows that well over 55 percent of the Federal budget was discretionary. That means that it was controlled by the Congress on an annual basis by the appropriators in both the House and Senate. We had about 7 percent interest on the debt, which was the red part of this pie chart. And then mandatory or entitlement spending was the balance, which was about 38 percent.

If we fast forward to the year that we are in now, fiscal year 1997, we can see that 51 percent is entitlement spending, we have 15 percent that is interest on the debt, and the discretionary part of the budget is now down to around 34 percent. If we go to the last year of the budget agreement, which is 5 years from now, fiscal year 2002, the picture is even worse. The interest on the debt is up to 14 percent. Entitlement spending is at 58 percent. So we are at 74 percent uncontrollable spending.

We cannot have a budget agreement that actually results in a balanced budget if three-fourths of the budget is uncontrollable. So what we have done on a bipartisan basis is come up with a piece of legislation that says let us take the numbers that are agreed to by the President and the Congress and enforce them on the spending.

On the spending side, every program would have a cap. Under current law, only discretionary spending has a cap. So we apply the caps to the entitlement portion of the budget. On the revenue side, we take the revenue numbers that are in the budget for tax revenues and make those goals. After the first year of the agreement, in fiscal year 1998, if the revenue numbers are not up to what they are supposed to be, under the agreement we would delay on a contingent basis next year's tax cut.

If spending goes beyond caps, we give the President and Congress three options. They can vote to waive the cap. They can vote to change the program so that it actually comes within the cap. Or if they vote to do nothing; instead of the deficit going up, there is sequestration by program that brings the spending back under control.

If you look at the ratio in the current budget agreement, entitlement spending, which is the blue bar, versus the tax cuts in the bill, which is the red bar, it is a ratio of about 50-to-1. About $900 billion in entitlement spending the first year of the agreement, and we have about $10 billion in tax cuts. We can see each year the tax cuts get marginally larger, $12 million, $15 billion, $20 billion. But the entitlement spending continues to go up. So it is over a trillion dollars fiscal year 2001.

So by putting $85 billion over 5 years on a net basis in tax cuts on the table, we get entitlement caps on $5 trillion of entitlement spending. That is a 50-to-1 trade-off. We think that is a tremendous agreement. If we look at what the entitlement programs are, these are the top 11 entitlement programs, they have grown at an average of over 9 percent in the last 6 years. Some of

them, like the Medicaid program, has grown 16 percent. In the budget agreement, they grow at an average of over 7 percent. Medicaid continues to grow at over 9 percent.

So we are letting the entitlement programs grow. We are talking the numbers that the President and congressional leadership have agreed but we simply say those are caps and you cannot go over those numbers unless the Congress votes to waive the cap.

So I would hope that tomorrow, on a bipartisan basis, with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER] on the Democratic side leading the effort, myself, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] on the Republican side, that we would vote to include enforcement in the budget agreement that is pending before the House and the Senate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0021

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SOLOMON] at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2160, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–197) on the resolution (H. Res. 193) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KILDEE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JEFFERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEJDENSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THUNE) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, on July 23.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes each day, on July 23 and 24.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THUNE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. BARR of Georgia.

Mr. MANZULLO.

Mr. OXLEY, in two instances.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. COBLE.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Ms. DUNN.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. HANSEN.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KILDEE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PASCRELL.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. ETHERIDGE.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, July 23, 1997, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4254. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Limited Ports; Dayton, OH [Docket No. 96–094–2] received July 22, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4255. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the FY 1998 appropriations requests for the Department of Labor, the Department of State, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(b); (H. Doc. No. 105–109); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4256. A letter from the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled ''Alternative Live Fire Test and Evaluation Plan for the F/A–18E/F Aircraft''; to the Committee on National Security.

4257. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Certification of Requests for Equitable Adjustment [DFARS Case 97–D302] received July 9, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4258. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Designation of Hong Kong [DFARS Case 97–D023] received July 9, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4259. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report entitled, ''FINANCIAL AUDIT: Federal Family Education Loan Program's Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 1996 and 1995'' (GAO/AIMD–97–111), pursuant to Public Law 101–576, section 305 (104 Stat. 2853); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4260. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to extend the Act, authorize appropriations, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4261. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Disclosure of Premium-Related Information (RIN: 1212–AA66) received July 22, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4262. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of the Subscriber Carrier Selection Changes Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Policies and Rules Concerning Unauthorized Changes of Consumers' Long Distance Carriers [CC Docket No. 94–129] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4263. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Thorndale, Texas) [MM Docket No. 97–5, RM–8954] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4264. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Midwest, Wyoming) [MM Docket No. 97–24, RM–8973] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4265. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Cordele, Dawson, Montezuma, Nashville, Hawkinsville, Cusseta, Cuthbert, and Leary, Georgia) [MM Docket No. 93–270, RM–8323, RM–8339, RM–8428, RM–8429, RM–8430] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4266. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Beatty, Nevada) [MM Docket No. 97–6, RM–8944] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4267. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Riley, Kansas) [MM Docket No. 97–108, RM–9024] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4268. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Hope, North Dakota) [MM Docket No. 97–57, RM–9016] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4269. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Hardinsburg, Indiana) [MM Docket No. 97–93, RM–9013] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4270. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Mendota, California) [MM Docket No. 97–36, RM–8991] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4271. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Weston, Idaho) [MM Docket No. 97–38, RM–8971] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4272. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Orofino, Idaho) [MM Docket No. 97–62, RM–9008] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4273. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Williams, California) [MM Docket No. 97–19, RM–8978] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4274. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Snow Hill, Maryland, and Chincoteague, Virginia) [MM Docket No. 97–73, RM–9012, RM–9063] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4275. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Portsmouth, Ohio) [MM Docket No. 96–216, RM–8895] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4276. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Bend, Oregon) [MM Docket No. 97–3, RM–8945] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4277. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Durango and Dolores, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 97–18, RM–8943, RM–9053] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4278. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Glendo, Wyoming) [MM Docket No. 97–23, RM–8972] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4279. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Manistique, Michigan) [MM Docket No. 97–89, RM–9029] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4280. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Huntsville, Utah) [MM Docket No. 97–4, RM–8923] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4281. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Randolph, Utah) [MM Docket No. 97–58, RM–8998] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4282. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Steamboat Springs, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 97–17, RM–8942] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4283. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Lexington, Illinois) [MM Docket No. 97–64, RM–9001] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4284. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Greenwood, Arkansas) [MM Docket No. 97–63, RM–9000] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4285. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Kingfisher, Oklahoma) [MM Docket No. 96–251, RM–8956] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4286. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Gillette, Wyoming) [MM Docket No. 96–252, RM–8959] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4287. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Superior, Montana) [MM Docket No. 97–61, RM–9010] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4288. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Cooperstown, Pennsylvania) [MM Docket No. 97–49, RM–8993] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4289. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Mahnomen, Minnesota) [MM Docket No. 97–101, RM–9051] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4290. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Medical Devices; Humanitarian Use Devices; Lift of Stay of Effective Date [Docket No. 91N–0404] (RIN: 0910–AA09) received July 22, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4291. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Portable Gauge Licenses [NUREG–1556, Vol. 1] received July 8, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4292. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No.

97–25), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4293. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 97–27), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4294. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC–96–97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

4295. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of a report entitled ''Certification of the Fiscal Year 1997 Revised General Fund Revenue Estimates in Support of the District of Columbia General Obligation Bonds (Series 1997A),'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 47–117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4296. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of a report entitled ''Certification of the Water and Sewer Authority's Fiscal Year 1997 Revenue Estimate in Support of a $25,000,000 Revolving Line of Credit,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 47–117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4297. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's fiscal year 1996 financial report on the Treasury Forfeiture Fund, pursuant to Public Law 102–393, section 638(b)(1) (106 Stat. 1783); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4298. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a list of all reports issued or released in June 1997, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4299. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1996, through March 31, 1997, and the Secretary's semiannual report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4300. A letter from the Congressional Affairs Officer, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, ''Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 on the Administration of Elections for Federal Office, 1995–1996,'' pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1973gg–7; to the Committee on House Oversight.

4301. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a report on the hurricane and storm damage reduction, and environmental restoration project for the Santa Monica Pier, Santa Monica, California; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4302. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions to Digital Flight Data Recorder Rules (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28109; Amdt. No. 121–266, 125–30, 129–27, 135–69] (RIN: 2120–AF76) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4303. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757 and 767 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–122–AD; Amdt. 39–10083; AD 97–15–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4304. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 and 200) Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–136–AD; Amdt. 39–10082; AD 97–14–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4305. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor Incorporated Models AT–301, AT–302, AT–400, AT–400A, AT–401, AT–402, AT–501, and AT–502 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–CE–47–AD; Amdt. 39–10063; AD 97–14–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4306. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737, 747, 757, and 767 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–123–AD; Amdt. 39–10079; AD 97–15–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4307. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 214B, 214B–1, and 214ST Helicopters (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 94–SW–26–AD; Amdt. 39–10077; AD 97–15–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4308. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–131–AD; Amdt. 39–10078; AD 97–15–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4309. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aerospatiale Model ATR42 and ATR72 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 95–NM–84–AD; Amdt 39–10075, AD 97–15–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4310. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of the Legal Description of the Dallas/Fort Worth Class B Airspace Area; TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–11] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4311. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Brinkley, AR (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 96–ASW–25] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4312. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Longview, TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 96–ASW–26] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4313. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Athens, TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 96–ASW–27] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4314. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Chesapeake Bay Offshore Powerboat Challenge, Chesapeake Bay, Kent Island, Maryland (Coast Guard) [CGD 05–97–055] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4315. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone Regulation; Elliott Bay, Seattle, WA (Coast Guard) [CGD13–97–015] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4316. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Isle of Wight, Bay Ocean City, Maryland (Coast Guard) [CGD05–97–013] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4317. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Seattle Seafair Unlimited Hydroplane Race, Lake Washington, Seattle, WA (Coast Guard) [CGD13–97–016] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4318. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Delaware Bay, Delaware River (Coast Guard) [CGD 05–97–058] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4319. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone Regulations; St. Andrew Bay, Panama City Florida, Hathaway Landing Marina (Coast Guard) [COTP Mobile, AL 97–16] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4320. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Miscellaneous Sections Affected by the Taxpayer Bill of Rights 2 and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 [TD 8725] (RIN: 1545–AU64) received July 22, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 192. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2003) to reform

the budget process and enforce the bipartisan balanced budget agreement of 1997 (Rept. 105–195). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALSH: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2209. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105–196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 193. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes. (Rept. 105–197). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 2205. A bill to reform the statutes relating to Amtrak, to authorize appropriations for Amtrak, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 2206. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs for homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2207. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act concerning a proposal to construct a deep ocean outfall off the coast of Mayaguez, Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FROST, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 2208. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize food claims which relate a nutrient to a disease or health-related condition; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 2209. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 2210. A bill for the relief of certain aliens residing at 37–54 93d Street, Jackson Heights, NY and 104–15 34th Avenue, Corona, NY; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONIOR (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 2211. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 2212. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a program regarding sterile hypodermic needles in order to reduce the incidence of the transmission of HIV; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mrs. KELLY):

H.R. 2213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish incentives to increase the demand for and supply of quality child care, to provide incentives to States that improve the quality of child care, to expand clearinghouses and electronic networks for the distribution of child care information, to improve the quality of child care provided through Federal facilities and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, House Oversight, the Judiciary, Education and the Workforce, and Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

H.R. 2214. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to ensure that certain information regarding prisoners is reported to the Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2215. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to restrict employers in obtaining, disclosing, and using of genetic information; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

H.R. 2216. A bill to establish limitation with respect to the disclosure and use of genetic information by life and disability insurers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 2217. A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of FERC Project No. 9248 in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NORWOOD:

H.R. 2218. A bill to redesignate the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center located in Augusta, GA, as the A. James Dyess Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. SANDLIN:

H.R. 2219. A bill to prevent Members of Congress from receiving the 1998 pay adjustment; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 2220. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reinstate eligibility for dependency and indemnity compensation for certain surviving spouses of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2221. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to take no further action on a proposed regulation relating to the use of chlorofluorocarbons in metered-dose inhalers; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. HARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding proliferation of missile technology from Russia to Iran; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

154. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 34 urging Congress to ensure that the core principles outlined in the resolution are implemented in any restructuring of workforce programs, whether through legislation or regulatory and administrative modifications; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

155. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Indiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 30 urging the President of the United States and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to evaluate both the potential incremental health effects and economic consequences of the proposed revisions to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards; to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 23: Mrs. MALONEY of New York and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 51: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 96: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 146: Mr. LAZIO of New York.

H.R. 192: Mr. TORRES and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 198: Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 228: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 230: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 301: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 306: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. COOK, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 414: Mr. TORRES and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 521: Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 553: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 611: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 633: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 695: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 712: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 754: Mr. BAESLER and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 755: Mr. VENTO and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 789: Mr. TURNER and Mr. REDMOND.

H.R. 815: Mr. MINGE and Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 925: Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 952: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 961: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 979: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 983: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1026: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1051: Mr. REDMOND.

H.R. 1114: Mr. SABO and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1126: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STARK, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1147: Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 1156: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1159: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1173: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MINGE, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1178: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1189: Mr. HAYWORTH and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 1194: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1195: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1232: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1260: Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. COBURN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1300: Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 1323: Mr. LUTHER.
H.R. 1371: Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1382: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1398: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H.R. 1401: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1415: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BERRY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CRAPO.
H.R. 1426: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 1450: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 1456: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1492: Mr. WICKER.
H.R. 1519: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
H.R. 1521: Mr. METCALF, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 1534: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. COX of California, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. CHENOWETH.
H.R. 1542: Mr. BLILEY.
H.R. 1585: Mr. WELLER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. KELLY, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 1670: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1679: Mr. MCCOLLUM and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1689: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1712: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 1719: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. NEY.
H.R. 1733: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. STABENOW.
H.R. 1748: Mr. CAPPS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1788: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1839: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. COBURN.
H.R. 1843: Mr. CRAPO.
H.R. 1846: Mr. SAM JOHNSON and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1861: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FROST, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. YATES.
H.R. 1864: Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 1883: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1912: Mr. ROGAN.
H.R. 1968: Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 1991: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. DICKEY.
H.R. 2001: Mrs. CHENOWETH.
H.R. 2003: Mr. COOK, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. HORN.
H.R. 2004: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. HILLIARD.
H.R. 2005: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 2006: Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. HEFNER.
H.R. 2064: Mr. DICKS and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2120: Mr. HAMILTON.
H.R. 2121: Mr. FROST, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2122: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2139: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. OBEY, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2143: Mr. FILNER and Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 2163: Mr. BOB SCHAFFER.
H.R. 2196: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2198: Mr. LUTHER and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 2200: Mr. FROST, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. GILMAN.
H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEWIS OF GEORGIA, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. FROST, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. COLLINS.
H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. GOODE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. YATES, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WEYGAND, and Mr. NADLER.
H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.
H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H. Res. 166: Mr. YATES.
H. Res. 173: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
H. Res. 191: Mr. HERGER, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. HULSHOF.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2003: Mr. BERRY and Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2003

OFFERED BY: MR. BARTON OF TEXAS

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Balanced Budget Assurance Act of 1997''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Title I—Ensure That the Bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997 Achieves Its Goal
Sec. 101. Timetable.
Sec. 102. Procedures to avoid sequestration or delay of new revenue reductions.
Sec. 103. Effect on Presidents' budget submissions; point of order.
Sec. 104. Deficit and revenue targets.
Sec. 105. Direct spending caps.
Sec. 106. Economic assumptions.
Sec. 107. Revisions to deficit and revenue targets and to the caps for entitlements and other mandatory spending.
Title II—Enforcement Provisions
Sec. 201. Reporting excess spending.
Sec. 202. Enforcing direct spending caps.
Sec. 203. Sequestration rules.
Sec. 204. Enforcing revenue targets.
Sec. 205. Exempt programs and activities.
Sec. 206. Special rules.
Sec. 207. The current law baseline.
Sec. 208. Limitations on emergency spending.
Title III—Use of Budget Surplus to Preserve Social Security Trust Fund
Sec. 301. Ending use of receipts of Social Security Trust Fund for other programs and activities.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) ELIGIBLE POPULATION.—The term ''eligible population'' shall mean those individuals to whom the United States is obligated to make a payment under the provisions of a law creating entitlement authority. Such term shall not include States, localities, corporations or other nonliving entities.

(2) SEQUESTER AND SEQUESTRATION.—The terms ''sequester'' and ''sequestration'' refer to or mean the cancellation of budgetary resources provided by discretionary appropriations or direct spending law.

(3) BREACH.—The term ''breach'' means, for any fiscal year, the amount (if any) by which outlays for that year (within a category of direct spending) is above that category's direct spending cap for that year.

(4) BASELINE.—The term ''baseline'' means the projection (described in section 207) of current levels of new budget authority, outlays, receipts, and the surplus or deficit into the budget year and the outyears.

(5) BUDGETARY RESOURCES.—The term ''budgetary resources'' means new budget authority, unobligated balances, direct spending authority, and obligation limitations.

(6) DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.—The term ''discretionary appropriations'' means budgetary resources (except to fund direct spending programs) provided in appropriation Acts. If an appropriation Act alters the level of direct spending or offsetting collections, that effect shall be treated as direct spending. Classifications of new accounts or activities and changes in classifications shall be made in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate and with CBO and OMB.

(7) DIRECT SPENDING.—The term ''direct spending'' means—

(A) budget authority provided by law other than appropriation Acts, including entitlement authority;

(B) entitlement authority; and

(C) the food stamp program.

If a law other than an appropriation Act alters the level of discretionary appropriations or offsetting collections, that effect shall be treated as direct spending.

(8) ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY.—The term ''entitlement authority'' means authority (whether temporary or permanent) to make payments (including loans and grants), the budget authority for which is not provided for in advance by appropriation Acts, to any person or government if, under the provisions of the law containing such authority, the United States is obligated to make such payments to persons or governments who meet the requirements established by such law.

(9) CURRENT.—The term ''current'' means, with respect to OMB estimates included with a budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31 U.S.C., the estimates consistent with the economic and technical assumptions underlying that budget.

(10) ACCOUNT.—The term ''account'' means an item for which there is a designated budget account designation number in the President's budget.

(11) BUDGET YEAR.—The term ''budget year'' means the fiscal year of the Government that starts on the next October 1.

(12) CURRENT YEAR.—The term ''current year'' means, with respect to a budget year, the fiscal year that immediately precedes that budget year.

(13) OUTYEAR.—The term ''outyear'' means, with respect to a budget year, any of the fiscal years that follow the budget year.

(14) OMB.—The term ''OMB'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(15) CBO.—The term ''CBO'' means the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

(16) BUDGET OUTLAYS AND OUTLAYS.—The terms ''budget outlays'' and ''outlays'' mean,

with respect to any fiscal year, expenditures of funds under budget authority during such year.

(17) BUDGET AUTHORITY AND NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—The terms ''budget authority'' and ''new budget authority'' have the meanings given to them in section 3 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

(18) APPROPRIATION ACT.—The term ''appropriation Act'' means an Act referred to in section 105 of title 1 of the United States Code.

(19) CONSOLIDATED DEFICIT.—The term ''consolidated deficit'' means, with respect to a fiscal year, the amount by which total outlays exceed total receipts during that year.

(20) SURPLUS.—The term ''surplus'' means, with respect to a fiscal year, the amount by which total receipts exceed total outlays during that year.

(21) DIRECT SPENDING CAPS.—The term ''direct spending caps'' means the nominal dollar limits for entitlements and other mandatory spending pursuant to section 105 (as modified by any revisions provided for in this Act).

TITLE I—ENSURE THAT THE BIPARTISAN BALANCED BUDGET AGREEMENT OF 1997 ACHIEVES ITS GOAL

SEC. 101. TIMETABLE.

On or before:	Action to be completed:
January 15	CBO economic and budget update.
First Monday in February.	President's budget update based on new assumptions.
August 1	CBO and OMB updates.
August 15	Preview report.
Not later than November 1 (and as soon as practical after the end of the fiscal).	OMB and CBO Analyses of Deficits, Revenues and Spending Levels and Projections for the Upcoming Year.
November 1–December 15	Congressional action to avoid sequestration.
December 15	OMB issues final (look back) report for prior year and preview for current year.
December 15	Presidential sequester order or order delaying new/additional revenues reductions scheduled to take effect pursuant to reconciliation legislation enacted in calendar year 1997.

SEC. 102. PROCEDURES TO AVOID SEQUESTRATION OR DELAY OF NEW REVENUE REDUCTIONS.

(a) SPECIAL MESSAGE.—If the OMB Analysis of Actual Spending Levels and Projections for the Upcoming Year indicates that—

(1) deficits in the most recently completed fiscal year exceeded, or the deficits in the budget year are projected to exceed, the deficit targets in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 107;

(2) revenues in the most recently completed fiscal year were less than, or revenues in the current year are projected to be less than, the revenue targets in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 107; or

(3) outlays in the most recently completed fiscal year exceeded, or outlays in the current year are projected to exceed, the caps in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 107;

the President shall submit to Congress with the OMB Analysis of Actual Spending Levels and Projections for the Upcoming Year a special message that includes proposed legislative changes to—

(A) offset all or part of net deficit or outlay excess;

(B) offset all or part of any revenue shortfall; or

(C) revise the deficit or revenue targets or the outlay caps contained in this Act;

through any combination of—

(i) reductions in outlays;

(ii) increases in revenues; or

(iii) increases in the deficit targets or expenditure caps, or reductions in the revenue targets, if the President submits a written determination that, because of economic or programmatic reasons, less than the entire amount of the variances from the balanced budget plan should be offset.

(b) INTRODUCTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S PACKAGE.—Not later than November 15, the message from the President required pursuant to subsection (a) shall be introduced as a joint resolution in the House of Representatives or the Senate by the chairman of its Committee on the Budget. If the chairman fails to do so, after November 15, the joint resolution may be introduced by any Member of that House of Congress and shall be referred to the Committee on the Budget of that House.

(c) HOUSE COMMITTEE ACTION.—The Committee on the Budget, in consultation with the committees of jurisdiction, or, in the case of revenue shortfalls, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall, by November 15, report a joint resolution containing—

(1) the recommendations in the President's message, or different policies and proposed legislative changes than those contained in the message of the President, to ameliorate or eliminate any excess deficits or expenditures or any revenue shortfalls, or

(2) any changes to the deficit or revenue targets or expenditure caps contained in this Act, except that any changes to the deficit or revenue targets or expenditure caps cannot be greater than the changes recommended in the message submitted by the President.

(d) PROCEDURE IF THE APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FAILS TO REPORT REQUIRED RESOLUTION.—

(1) AUTOMATIC DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEES ON THE BUDGET OF THE HOUSE.—If the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives fails, by November 20, to report a resolution meeting the requirements of subsection (c), the committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution reflecting the President's recommendations introduced pursuant to subsection (a), and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF DISCHARGE RESOLUTION IN THE HOUSE.—If the Committee has been discharged under paragraph (1) above, any Member may move that the House of Representatives consider the resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and not debatable. It shall not be in order to consider any amendment to the resolution except amendments which are germane and which do not change the net deficit impact of the resolution.

(e) CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS IN THE HOUSE.—Consideration of resolutions reported pursuant to subsection (c) or (d) shall be pursuant to the procedures set forth in section 305 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and subsection (d). Notwithstanding subsection (d) and any other rule or order of the House of Representatives or the Senate, it shall be in order to consider amendments to ameliorate any excess spending or revenue shortfalls through different policies and proposed legislation and which do not change the net deficit impact of the resolution.

(f) TRANSMITTAL TO SENATE.—If a joint resolution passes the House of Representatives pursuant to subsection (e), the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall cause the resolution to be engrossed, certified, and transmitted to the Senate within 1 calendar day of the day on which the resolution is passed. The resolution shall be referred to the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(g) REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIAL JOINT RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE.—The Committee on the Budget, in consultation with the committees of jurisdiction, or, in the case of revenue shortfalls, the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report not later than December 1—

(1) a joint resolution reflecting the message of the President; or

(2) the joint resolution passed by the House of Representatives, with or without amendment; or

(3) a joint resolution containing different policies and proposed legislative changes than those contained in either the message of the President or the resolution passed by the House of Representatives, to eliminate all or part of any excess deficits or expenditures or any revenue shortfalls, or

(4) any changes to the deficit or revenue targets, or to the expenditure caps, contained in this Act, except that any changes to the deficit or revenue targets or expenditure caps cannot be greater than the changes recommended in the message submitted by the President.

(h) PROCEDURE IF THE APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE FAILS TO REPORT REQUIRED RESOLUTION.—(1) In the event that the Committee on the Budget of the Senate fails, by December 1, to report a resolution meeting the requirements of subsection (g), the committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution reflecting the President's recommendations introduced pursuant to subsection (a) and of the resolution passed by the House of Representatives, and both joint resolutions shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) Any member may move that the Senate consider the resolution passed by the House of Representatives or the resolution introduced pursuant to subsection (b).

(i) CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE.—Consideration of resolutions reported pursuant to subsections (c) or (d) shall be pursuant to the procedures set forth in section 305 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and subsection (d).

(j) PROCEDURE IF JOINT RESOLUTION DOES NOT ELIMINATE DEFICIT EXCESS.—If the joint resolution reported by the Committee on the Budget, Way and Means, or Finance pursuant to subsection (c) or (g) or a joint resolution discharged in the House of Representatives or the Senate pursuant to subsection (d)(1) or (h) would eliminate less than—

(1) the entire amount by which actual or projected deficits exceed, or revenues fall short of, the targets in this Act; or

(2) the entire amount by which actual or projected outlays exceed the caps contained in this Act;

then the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report a joint resolution, raising the deficit targets or outlay caps, or reducing the revenue targets for any year in which actual or projected spending, revenues or deficits would not conform to the deficit and revenue targets or expenditure caps in this Act.

(k) CONFERENCE REPORTS SHALL FULLY ADDRESS DEFICIT EXCESS.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider a conference report on a joint resolution to eliminate all or part of any excess deficits or outlays or to eliminate all or part of any revenue shortfall compared to the deficit and revenue targets and the expenditure caps contained in this Act, unless—

(1) the joint resolution offsets the entire amount of any overage or shortfall; or

(2) the House of Representatives and Senate both pass the joint resolution reported pursuant to subsection (j)(2).

The vote on any resolution reported pursuant to subsection (j)(2) shall be solely on the subject of changing the deficit or revenue targets or the expenditure limits in this Act.

SEC. 103. EFFECT ON PRESIDENTS' BUDGET SUBMISSIONS; POINT OF ORDER.

(a) BUDGET SUBMISSION.—Any budget submitted by the President pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 shall be consistent with the spending, revenue, and deficit levels established in sections 104 and 105, as adjusted pursuant to section 107, or it shall recommend changes to those levels

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget unless it is consistent with the spending, revenue, and deficit levels established in sections 104 and 105, as adjusted pursuant to section 107.

SEC. 104. DEFICIT AND REVENUE TARGETS.

(a) CONSOLIDATED DEFICIT (OR SURPLUS) TARGETS.—For purposes of sections 102 and 107, the consolidated deficit targets shall be—

(1) for fiscal year 1998, $90,500,000,000;
(2) for fiscal year 1999, $89,700,000,000;
(3) for fiscal year 2000, $83,000,000,000;
(4) for fiscal year 2001, $53,300,000,000; and
(5) for fiscal year 2002, there shall be a surplus of not less than $1,400,000,000.

(b) CONSOLIDATED REVENUE TARGETS.—For purposes of sections 102, 107, 201, and 204, the consolidated revenue targets shall be—

(1) for fiscal year 1998, $1,601,800,000,000;
(2) for fiscal year 1999, $1,664,200,000,000;
(3) for fiscal year 2000, $1,728,100,000,000;
(4) for fiscal year 2001, $1,805,100,000,000; and
(5) for fiscal year 2002, $1,890,400,000,000.

SEC. 105. DIRECT SPENDING CAPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective upon submission of the report by OMB pursuant to subsection (c), direct spending caps shall apply to all entitlement authority except for undistributed offsetting receipts and net interest outlays, subject to adjustments for changes in eligible populations and inflation pursuant to section 107. For purposes of enforcing direct spending caps under this Act, each separate program shown in the table set forth in subsection (d) shall be deemed to be a category.

(b) BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORTS.—Within 30 days after enactment of this Act, the Budget Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate shall file with their respective Houses identical reports containing account numbers and spending levels for each specific category.

(c) REPORT BY OMB.—Within 30 days after enactment of this Act, OMB shall submit to the President and each House of Congress a report containing account numbers and spending limits for each specific category.

(d) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—All direct spending accounts not included in these reports under separate categories shall be included under the heading ''Other Entitlements and Mandatory Spending''. These reports may include adjustments among the caps set forth in this Act as required below, however the aggregate amount available under the ''Total Entitlements and Other Mandatory Spending'' cap shall be identical in each such report and in this Act and shall be deemed to have been adopted as part of this Act. Each such report shall include the actual amounts of the caps for each year of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 consistent with the concurrent resolution on the budget for FY 1998 for each of the following categories:

Earned Income Tax Credit,
Family Support,
Civilian and other Federal retirement:
Military retirement,
Food stamps,
Medicaid,
Medicare,
Social security,
Supplemental security income,
Unemployment compensation,
Veterans' benefits,
Other entitlements and mandatory spending, and
Aggregate entitlements and other mandatory spending.

(e) ADDITIONAL SPENDING LIMITS.—Legislation enacted subsequent to this Act may include additional caps to limit spending for specific programs, activities, or accounts with these categories. Those additional caps (if any) shall be enforced in the same manner as the limits set forth in such joint explanatory statement.

SEC. 106. ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS.

Subject to periodic reestimation based on changed economic conditions or changes in eligible population, determinations of the direct spending caps under section 105, any breaches of such caps, and actions necessary to remedy such breaches shall be based upon the economic assumptions set forth in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 (House Concurrent Resolution 84, 105th Congress). At the same time as the submission of the report by OMB pursuant to section 104(c), OMB shall submit to the President and Congress a report setting forth the economic assumptions in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 and the assumptions regarding eligible populations used in preparing the report submitted pursuant to section 104(c).

SEC. 107. REVISIONS TO DEFICIT AND REVENUE TARGETS AND TO THE CAPS FOR ENTITLEMENTS AND OTHER MANDATORY SPENDING.

(a) AUTOMATIC ADJUSTMENTS TO DEFICIT AND REVENUE TARGETS AND TO CAPS FOR ENTITLEMENTS AND OTHER MANDATORY SPENDING.—When the President submits the budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, and upon submission of the OMB report pursuant to section 201(a) for any year, OMB shall calculate (in the order set forth below), and the budget and reports shall include, adjustments to the deficit and revenue targets, and to the direct spending caps (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the current year, the budget year, and each outyear, to reflect the following:

(1) CHANGES TO REVENUE TARGETS.—

(A) CHANGES IN GROWTH.—For Federal revenues and deficits under laws and policies enacted or effective before July 1, 1997, growth adjustment factors shall equal the ratio between the level of year-over-year Gross Domestic Product, as adjusted by the chain-weighted GDP deflator measured for the fiscal year most recently completed and the applicable estimated level for that year as described in section 106.

(B) CHANGES IN INFLATION.—For Federal revenues and deficits under laws and policies enacted or effective before July 1, 1997, inflation adjustment factors shall equal the ratio between the level of year-over-year change in the Consumer Price Index measured for the fiscal year most recently completed and the applicable estimated level for that year as described in section 106.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS TO DIRECT SPENDING CAPS.—

(A) CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.—The adjustments produced by changes in concepts and definitions shall equal the baseline levels of new budget authority and outlays using up-to-date concepts and definitions minus those levels using the concepts and definitions in effect before such changes. Such changes in concepts and definitions may only be made in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Government Reform and Oversight and Governmental Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(B) CHANGES IN NET OUTLAYS.—Changes in net outlays for all programs and activities exempt from sequestration under section 204.

(C) CHANGES IN INFLATION.—For direct spending under laws and policies enacted or effective on or before July 1, 1997, inflation adjustment factors shall equal the ratio between the level of year-over-year change in the Consumer Price Index measured for the fiscal year most recently completed and the applicable estimated level for that year as described in section 106 (relating to economic assumptions). For direct spending under laws and policies enacted or effective after July 1, 1997, there shall be no adjustment to the direct spending caps (for changes in economic conditions including inflation, nor for changes in numbers of eligible beneficiaries) unless—

(i) the Act or the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying such Act providing new direct spending includes economic projections and projections of numbers of beneficiaries; and

(ii) such Act specifically provides for automatic adjustments to the direct spending caps in section 105 based on those projections.

(D) CHANGES IN ELIGIBLE POPULATIONS.—For direct spending under laws and policies enacted or effective on or before July 1, 1997, the direct spending caps shall be adjusted to reflect changes in eligible populations, based on the assumptions set forth in the OMB report submitted pursuant to section 106. In making such adjustments, OMB shall estimate the changes in spending resulting from the change in eligible populations. For direct spending under laws and policies enacted or effective after July 1, 1997, there shall be no adjustment to the direct spending caps for changes in numbers of eligible beneficiaries unless—

(i) the Act or the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying such Act providing new direct spending includes economic projections and projections of numbers of beneficiaries; and

(ii) such Act specifically provides for automatic adjustments to the direct spending caps in section 105 based on those projections.

(E) INTRA-BUDGETARY PAYMENTS.—From discretionary accounts to mandatory accounts. The baseline and the discretionary spending caps shall be adjusted to reflect those changes.

(b) CHANGES TO DEFICIT TARGETS.—The deficit targets in section 104 shall be adjusted to reflect changes to the revenue targets or changes to the caps for entitlements and other mandatory spending pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) PERMISSIBLE REVISIONS TO DEFICIT AND REVENUE TARGETS AND DIRECT SPENDING CAPS.—Deficit and revenue targets and direct spending caps as enacted pursuant to sections 104 and 105 may be revised as follows: Except as required pursuant to subsection (a) and (b), deficit, revenue, and direct spending caps may only be adjusted by recorded vote. It shall be a matter of highest privilege in the House of Representatives and the Senate for a Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate to insist on a recorded vote solely on the question of amending such caps. It shall not be in order for the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives to report a resolution waiving the provisions of this subsection. This subsection may be waived in the Senate

only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members duly chosen and sworn.

TITLE II—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. REPORTING EXCESS SPENDING.

(a) ANALYSIS OF ACTUAL DEFICIT, REVENUE, AND SPENDING LEVELS.—As soon as practicable after any fiscal year, OMB shall compile a statement of actual and projected deficits, revenues, and direct spending for that year and the current fiscal year. The statement shall identify such spending by categories contained in section 105.

(b) ESTIMATE OF NECESSARY SPENDING REDUCTION.—Based on the statement provided under subsection (a), the OMB shall issue a report to the President and the Congress on December 15 of any year in which such statement identifies actual or projected deficits, revenues, or spending in the current or immediately preceding fiscal years in violation of the revenue targets or direct spending caps in section 104 or 105, as adjusted pursuant to section 107, by more than one-tenth of one percent of the applicable total revenues or direct spending for such year. The report shall include:

(1) The amount, if any, that total direct spending exceeded, or is projected to exceed, the aggregate direct spending cap in section 105, as adjusted pursuant to section 107.

(2) All instances in which actual direct spending has exceeded the applicable direct spending cap.

(3) The difference between the amount of spending available under the direct spending caps for the current year and estimated actual spending for the categories associated with such caps.

(4) The amounts by which direct spending shall be reduced in the current fiscal year to offset the net amount that actual direct spending in the preceding fiscal year and projected direct spending in the current fiscal year exceeds the amounts available for each cap category.

SEC. 202. ENFORCING DIRECT SPENDING CAPS.

(a) PURPOSE.—This subtitle provides enforcement of the direct spending caps on categories of spending established pursuant to section 105. This section shall apply for any fiscal year in which the statement provided under section 201 identifies actual direct spending in the preceding fiscal year or projected direct spending in the current year in excess of the aggregate direct spending cap, as adjusted pursuant to section 107.

(b) GENERAL RULES.—

(1) ELIMINATING A BREACH.—Each non-exempt account within a category shall be reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the baseline level of sequestrable budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to eliminate a breach within that category.

(2) PROGRAMS, PROJECTS, OR ACTIVITIES.—Except as otherwise provided, the same percentage sequestration shall apply to all programs, projects and activities within a budget account.

(3) INDEFINITE AUTHORITY.—Except as otherwise provided, sequestration in accounts for which obligations are indefinite shall be taken in a manner to ensure that obligations in the fiscal year of a sequestration and succeeding fiscal years are reduced, from the level that would actually have occurred, by the applicable sequestration percentage or percentages.

(4) CANCELLATION OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.—Budgetary resources sequestered from any account other than an trust, special or revolving fund shall revert to the Treasury and be permanently canceled.

(5) IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, administrative rules or similar actions implementing any sequestration shall take effect within 30 days after that sequestration.

SEC. 203. SEQUESTRATION RULES.

(a) GENERAL RULES.—For programs subject to direct spending caps:

(1) TRIGGERING OF SEQUESTRATION.—Sequestration is triggered if total direct spending subject to the caps in the preceding fiscal year and projected direct spending subject to the caps in the current fiscal year exceeds the total of aggregate caps for direct spending for the current and immediately preceding fiscal year.

(2) CALCULATION OF REDUCTIONS.—The amount to be sequestered from direct spending programs under each separate cap shall be determined by multiplying the total amount that direct spending in that category exceeded or is projected to exceed the direct spending cap for that category by—

(A) the net amount that total direct spending exceeded, or is projected to exceed, the aggregate spending caps, as identified pursuant to paragraph 201(b)(1); multiplied by

(B) the net amount that direct spending by which the category exceeded and is projected to exceed the direct spending cap for that category, divided by the net amount that total spending exceeded and is projected to exceed the applicable direct spending cap for all categories in which spending exceeds the applicable direct spending caps.

(3) UNIFORM PERCENTAGES.—In calculating the uniform percentage applicable to the sequestration of all spending programs or activities within each category, or the uniform percentage applicable to the sequestration of nonexempt direct spending programs or activities, the sequestrable base for direct spending programs and activities is the total level of outlays for the fiscal year for those programs or activities in the current law baseline.

(4) PERMANENT SEQUESTRATION OF DIRECT SPENDING.—Obligations in sequestered direct spending accounts shall be reduced in the fiscal year in which a sequestration occurs and in all succeeding fiscal years. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, after the first direct spending sequestration, any later sequestration shall reduce direct spending by an amount in addition to, rather than in lieu of, the reduction in direct spending in place under the existing sequestration or sequestrations.

(5) SPECIAL RULE.—For any direct spending program in which—

(A) outlays pay for entitlement benefits;

(B) a current-year sequestration takes effect after the 1st day of the budget year;

(C) that delay reduces the amount of entitlement authority that is subject to sequestration in the budget; and

(D) the uniform percentage otherwise applicable to the budget-year sequestration of a program or activity is increased due to the delay;

then the uniform percentage shall revert to the uniform percentage calculated under paragraph (3) when the budget year is completed.

(6) INDEXED BENEFIT PAYMENTS.—If, under any entitlement program—

(A) benefit payments are made to persons or governments more frequently than once a year; and

(B) the amount of entitlement authority is periodically adjusted under existing law to reflect changes in a price index (commonly called ''cost of living adjustments'');

sequestration shall first be applied to the cost of living adjustment before reductions are made to the base benefit. For the first fiscal year to which a sequestration applies, the benefit payment reductions in such programs accomplished by the order shall take effect starting with the payment made at the beginning of January following a final sequester. For the purposes of this subsection, veterans' compensation shall be considered a program that meets the conditions of the preceding sentence.

(7) LOAN PROGRAMS.—For all loans made, extended, or otherwise modified on or after any sequestration under loan programs subject to direct spending caps—

(A) the sequestrable base shall be total fees associated with all loans made extended or otherwise modified on or after the date of sequestration; and

(B) the fees paid by borrowers shall be increased by a uniform percentage sufficient to produce the dollar savings in such loan programs for the fiscal year or years of the sequestrations required by this section.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any year in which a sequestration is in effect, all subsequent fees shall be increased by the uniform percentage and all proceeds from such fees shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury.

(8) INSURANCE PROGRAMS.—Any sequestration of a Federal program that sells insurance contracts to the public (including the Federal Crop Insurance Fund, the National Insurance Development Fund, the National Flood Insurance fund, insurance activities of the Overseas Private Insurance Corporation, and Veterans' Life insurance programs) shall be accomplished by increasing premiums on contracts entered into extended or otherwise modified, after the date a sequestration order takes effect by the uniform sequestration percentage. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for any year in which a sequestration affecting such programs is in effect, subsequent premiums shall be increased by the uniform percentage and all proceeds from the premium increase shall be paid from the insurance fund or account to the general fund of the Treasury.

(9) STATE GRANT FORMULAS.—For all State grant programs subject to direct spending caps—

(A) the total amount of funds available for all States shall be reduced by the amount required to be sequestered; and

(B) if States are projected to receive increased funding in the budget year compared to the immediately preceding fiscal year, sequestration shall first be applied to the estimated increases before reductions are made compared to actual payments to States in the previous year—

(i) the reductions shall be applied first to the total estimated increases for all States; then

(ii) the uniform reduction shall be made from each State's grant; and

(iii) the uniform reduction shall apply to the base funding levels available to states in the immediately preceding fiscal year only to the extent necessary to eliminate any remaining excess over the applicable direct spending cap.

(10) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—Except matters exempted under section 205 and programs subject to special rules set forth under section 206 and notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any sequestration required under this Act shall reduce benefit levels by an amount sufficient to eliminate all excess spending identified in the report issued pursuant to section 201, while maintaining the same uniform percentage reduction in the monetary value of benefits subject to reduction under this subsection.

(b) WITHIN-SESSION SEQUESTER.—If a bill or resolution providing direct spending for the current year is enacted before July 1 of that fiscal year and causes a breach within any direct spending cap for that fiscal year, 15 days later there shall be a sequestration to eliminate that breach within that cap.

SEC. 204. ENFORCING REVENUE TARGETS.

(a) PURPOSE.—This section enforces the revenue targets established pursuant to section 104. This section shall apply for any year in which actual revenues in the preceding fiscal year or projected revenues in the current year are less than the applicable revenue target, as adjusted pursuant to section 107.

(b) ESTIMATE OF NECESSITY TO SUSPEND NEW REVENUE REDUCTIONS.—Based on the statement provided under section 201(a), OMB shall issue a report to the President and the Congress on December 15 of any year in which such statement identifies actual or projected revenues in the current or immediately preceding fiscal years lower than the applicable revenue target in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 107, by more than 0.1 percent of the applicable total revenue target for such year. The report shall include—

(1) all laws and policies described in subsection (c) which would cause revenues to decline in the calendar year which begins January 1 compared to the provisions of law in effect on December 15;

(2) the amounts by which revenues would be reduced by implementation of the provisions of law described in paragraph (1) compared to provisions of law in effect on December 15; and

(3) whether delaying implementation of the provisions of law described in paragraph (1) would cause the total for revenues in the current fiscal year and actual revenues in the immediately preceding fiscal year to equal or exceed the total of the targets for the applicable years.

(c) NO CREDITS, DEDUCTIONS, EXCLUSIONS, PREFERENTIAL RATE OF TAX, ETC.—(1) If any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 added by the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1997 establishing or increasing any credit, deduction, exclusion, or eligibility limit or reducing any rate would (but for this section) first take effect in a tax benefit suspension year, and would reduce revenues over the 5-year period beginning with the tax benefit suspension year, such provision shall not take effect until the first calendar year which is not a tax benefit suspension year.

(2) SUSPENSION OF INDEXATION.—No new adjustment for inflation shall be made to any credit, deduction, or exclusion enacted as part of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1997 in a tax benefit suspension year.

(d) END OF SESSION.—If the OMB report issued under subsection (a) indicates that the total revenues projected in the current year and actual revenues in the immediately preceding year will equal or exceed the applicable targets, the President shall sign an order ending the delayed phase-in of new tax cuts effective January 1. Such order shall provide that the new tax cuts and adjustments for inflation shall take effect as if the provisions of this section had not taken effect.

(e) SUSPENSION OF NEW BENEFITS BEING PHASED IN.—If, under any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 added by the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1997, there is an increase in any benefit which would (but for this section) take effect with respect to a tax benefit suspension year, in lieu of applying subsection (c)—

(1) any increase in the benefit under such section with respect to such year and each subsequent calendar year shall be delayed 1 calendar year, and

(2) the level of benefit under such section with respect to the prior calendar year shall apply to such tax benefit suspension year.

(f) PERCENTAGE SUSPENSION WHERE FULL SUSPENSION UNNECESSARY TO ACHIEVE REVENUE TARGET.—If the application of subsections (c), (d), and (e) to any tax benefit suspension year would result in total revenues in the current year to equal or exceed the targets described in section 104 such that the amount of each benefit which is denied is only the percentage of such benefit which is necessary to result in revenues equal to such target. Such percentage shall be determined by OMB, and the same percentage shall apply to such benefits.

(g) TAX BENEFIT SUSPENSION YEAR.—For purposes of this section, the term ''tax benefit suspension year'' means any calendar year if the statement issued under subsection (b) during the preceding calendar year indicates that—

(1) for the fiscal year ending in such preceding calendar year, actual revenues were lower than the applicable revenue target in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 106, for such fiscal year by more than 1 percent of such target, or

(2) for the fiscal year beginning in such preceding calendar year, projected revenues (determined without regard to this section) are estimated to be lower than the applicable revenue target in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 106, for such fiscal year by more than 0.1 percent of such target.

SEC. 205. EXEMPT PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

The following budget accounts, activities within accounts, or income shall be exempt from sequestration—

(1) net interest;

(2) all payments to trust funds from excise taxes or other receipts or collections properly creditable to those trust funds;

(3) offsetting receipts and collections;

(4) all payments from one Federal direct spending budget account to another Federal budget account;

(5) all intragovernmental funds including those from which funding is derived primarily from other Government accounts;

(6) expenses to the extent they result from private donations, bequests, or voluntary contributions to the Government;

(7) nonbudgetary activities, including but not limited to—

(A) credit liquidating and financing accounts;

(B) the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation Trust Funds;

(C) the Thrift Savings Fund;

(D) the Federal Reserve System; and

(E) appropriations for the District of Columbia to the extent they are appropriations of locally raised funds;

(8) payments resulting from Government insurance, Government guarantees, or any other form of contingent liability, to the extent those payments result from contractual or other legally binding commitments of the Government at the time of any sequestration;

(9) the following accounts, which largely fulfill requirements of the Constitution or otherwise make payments to which the Government is committed—

Bureau of Indian Affairs, miscellaneous trust funds, tribal trust funds (14–9973–0–7–999);

Claims, defense;

Claims, judgments and relief act (20–1895–0–1–806);

Compact of Free Association, economic assistance pursuant to Public Law 99-658 (14–0415–0–1–806);

Compensation of the President (11–0001–0–1–802);

Customs Service, miscellaneous permanent appropriations (20–9992–0–2–852);

Eastern Indian land claims settlement fund (14–2202–0–1–806);

Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation, interest payments (20–1850–0–1–351);

Internal Revenue collections of Puerto Rico (20–5737–0–2–852);

Payments of Vietnam and USS Pueblo prisoner-of-war claims (15–0104–0–1–153):

Payments to copyright owners (03–5175–0–2–376);

Salaries of Article III judges (not including cost of living adjustments);

Soldier's and Airman's Home, payment of claims (84–8930–0–7–705);

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, interest payments (46–0300–0–1–401);

(10) the following noncredit special, revolving, or trust-revolving funds—

Exchange Stabilization Fund (20–4444–0–3–155); and

Foreign Military Sales trust fund (11–82232–0–7–155).

SEC. 206. SPECIAL RULES.

(a) CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—Any sequestration order shall accomplish the full amount of any required reduction in payments under sections 455 and 458 of the Social Security Act by reducing the Federal matching rate for State administrative costs under the program, as specified (for the fiscal year involved) in section 455(a) of such Act, to the extent necessary to reduce such expenditures by that amount.

(b) COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—For the Commodity Credit Corporation, the date on which a sequestration order takes effect in a fiscal year shall vary for each crop of a commodity. In general, the sequestration order shall take effect when issued, but for each crop of a commodity for which 1-year contracts are issued as an entitlement, the sequestration order shall take effect with the start of the sign-up period for that crop that begins after the sequestration order is issued. Payments for each contract in such a crop shall be reduced under the same terms and conditions.

(2) DAIRY PROGRAM.—

(A) As the sole means of achieving any reduction in outlays under the milk price-support program, the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide for a reduction to be made in the price received by producers for all milk in the United States and marketed by producers for commercial use.

(B) That price reduction (measured in cents per hundred-weight of milk marketed) shall occur under subparagraph (A) of section 201(d)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1446(d)(2)(A)), shall begin on the day any sequestration order is issued, and shall not exceed the aggregate amount of the reduction in outlays under the milk price-support program, that otherwise would have been achieved by reducing payments made for the purchase of milk or the products of milk under this subsection during that fiscal year.

(3) CERTAIN AUTHORITY NOT TO BE LIMITED.—Nothing in this Act shall restrict the Corporation in the discharge of its authority and responsibility as a corporation to buy and sell commodities in international trade, or limit or reduce in any way any appropriation that provides the Corporation with funds to cover its realized losses.

(c) EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.—

(1) The sequestrable base for earned income tax credit program is the dollar value of all current year benefits to the entire eligible population.

(2) In the event sequestration is triggered to reduce earned income tax credits, all earned income tax credits shall be reduced, whether or not such credits otherwise would result in cash payments to beneficiaries, by a uniform percentage sufficient to produce the dollar savings required by the sequestration.

(d) REGULAR AND EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

(1) A State may reduce each weekly benefit payment made under the regular and extended unemployment benefit programs for

any week of unemployment occurring during any period with respect to which payments are reduced under any sequestration order by a percentage not to exceed the percentage by which the Federal payment to the State is to be reduced for such week as a result of such order.

(2) A reduction by a State in accordance with paragraph (1) shall not be considered as a failure to fulfill the requirements of section 3304(a)(11) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(e) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND.— For the Federal Employees Health Benefits Fund, a sequestration order shall take effect with the next open season. The sequestration shall be accomplished by annual payments from that Fund to the General Fund of the Treasury. Those annual payments shall be financed solely by charging higher premiums. The sequestrable base for the Fund is the current-year level of gross outlays resulting from claims paid after the sequestration order takes effect.

(f) FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD.— Any sequestration of the Federal Housing Board shall be accomplished by annual payments (by the end of each fiscal year) from that Board to the general fund of the Treasury, in amounts equal to the uniform sequestration percentage for that year times the gross obligations of the Board in that year.

(g) FEDERAL PAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.— New budget authority to pay Federal personnel from direct spending accounts shall be reduced by the uniform percentage calculated under section 203(c)(3), as applicable, but no sequestration order may reduce or have the effect of reducing the rate of pay to which any individual is entitled under any statutory pay system as increased by any amount payable under section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, or any increase in rates of pay which is scheduled to take effect under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, section 1109 of title 37, United States Code, or any other provision of law.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) the term ''statutory pay system'' shall have the meaning given that term in section 5302(1) of title 5, United States Code;

term ''elements of military pay'' means—

(i) the elements of compensation of members of the uniformed services specified in section 1009 of title 37, United States Code;

(ii) allowances provided members of the uniformed services under sections 403(a) and 405 of such title; and

(iii) cadet pay and midshipman pay under section 203(c) of such title; and

(C) the term ''uniformed services'' shall have the same meaning given that term in section 101(3) of title 37, United States Code.

(h) MEDICARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any sequestration shall accomplish 90 percent of the required reduction by reductions in payments for services under title XVIII of the Social Security Act and 10 percent of the required reduction through increases in beneficiary premiums under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

(2) TIMING OF APPLICATION OF REDUCTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.— Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if a reduction is made in payment amounts pursuant to sequestration order, the reduction shall be applied to payment for services furnished after the effective date of the order. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of inpatient services furnished for an individual, the services shall be considered to be furnished on the date of the individual's discharge from the inpatient facility.

(B) PAYMENT ON THE BASIS OF COST REPORTING PERIODS.— In the case in which payment for services of a provider of services is made under title XVIII of the Social Security Act on a basis relating to the reasonable cost incurred for the services during a cost reporting period of the provider, if a reduction is made in payment amounts pursuant to a sequestration order, the reduction shall be applied to payment for costs for such services incurred at any time during each cost reporting period of the provider any part of which occurs after the effective date of order, but only (for each such cost reporting period) in the same proportion as the fraction of the cost reporting period that occurs after the effective date of the order.

(3) NO INCREASE IN BENEFICIARY CHARGES IN ASSIGNMENT-RELATED CASES.—If a reduction in payment amounts is made pursuant to a sequestration order for services for which payment under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act is made on the basis of an assignment described in section 1842(b)(3)(B)(ii), in accordance with section 1842(b)(6)(B), or under the procedure described in section 1870(f)(1) of such Act, the person furnishing the services shall be considered to have accepted payment of the reasonable charge for the services, less any reduction in payment amount made pursuant to a sequestration order, as payment in full.

(4) PART B PREMIUMS.—In computing the amount and method, part B premiums shall be increased by a percentage to be determined by dividing 10 percent of the amount that medicare spending exceeds the applicable cap by the total amount of all premium collections. All beneficiary premiums shall be increased by the percentage calculated pursuant to the preceding sentence, except that no increase in the premium shall result in a reduction in social security benefit payments to any beneficiary.

(5) NO EFFECT ON COMPUTATION OF AAPCC.— In computing the adjusted average per capita cost for purposes of section 1876(a)(4) of the Social Security Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall not take into account any reductions in payment amounts which have been or may be effected under this part.

(i) POSTAL SERVICE FUND.— Any sequestration of the Postal Service Fund shall be accomplished by annual payments from that Fund to the General Fund of the Treasury, and the Postmaster General of the United States and shall have the duty to make those payments during the first fiscal year to which the sequestration order applies and each succeeding fiscal year. The amount of each annual payment shall be—

(1) the uniform sequestration percentage, times

(2) the estimated gross obligations of the Postal Service Fund in that year other than those obligations financed with an appropriation for revenue forgone that year.

Any such payment for a fiscal year shall be made as soon as possible during the fiscal year, except that it may be made in installments within that year if the payment schedule is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. Within 30 days after the sequestration order is issued, the Postmaster General shall submit to the Postal Rate Commission a plan for financing the annual payment for that fiscal year and publish that plan in the Federal Register. The plan may assume efficiencies in the operation of the Postal Service, reductions in capital expenditures, increases in the prices of services, or any combination, but may not assume a lower Fund surplus or higher Fund deficit and shall follow the requirements of existing law governing the Postal Service in all other respects. Within 30 days of the receipt of that plan, the Postal Rate Commission shall approve the plan or modify it in the manner that modifications are allowed under current law. If the Postal Rate Commission does not respond to the plan within 30 days, the plan submitted by the Postmaster General shall go into effect. Any plan may be later revised by the submission of a new plan to the Postal Rate Commission, which may approve or modify it.

(j) POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS AND T.V.A.— Any sequestration of the Department of Energy power marketing administration funds or the Tennessee Valley Authority fund shall be accomplished by annual payments from those funds to the General Fund of the Treasury, and the administrators of those funds shall have the duty to make those payments during the fiscal year to which the sequestration order applies and each succeeding fiscal year. The amount of each payment by a fund shall be—

(1) the direct spending uniform sequestration percentage, times

(2) the estimated gross obligations of the fund in that year other than those obligations financed from discretionary appropriations for that year.

Any such payment for a fiscal year shall be made as soon as possible during the fiscal year, except that it may be made in installments within that year if the payment schedule is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. Annual payments by a fund may be financed by reductions in costs required to produce the pre-sequester amount of power (but those reductions shall not include reductions in the amount of power supplied by the fund), by reductions in capital expenditures, by increases in tax rates, or by any combination, but may not be financed by a lower fund surplus, a higher fund deficit, additional borrowing, delay in repayment of principal on outstanding debt and shall follow the requirements of existing law governing the fund in all other respects. The administrator of a fund or the TVA Board is authorized to take the actions specified in this subsection in order to make the annual payments to the Treasury.

(k) BUSINESS-LIKE TRANSACTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for programs which provide a business-like service in exchange for a fee, sequestration shall be accomplished through a uniform increase in fees (sufficient to produce the dollar savings in such programs for the fiscal year of the sequestration required by section 201(a)(2), all subsequent fees shall be increased by the same percentage, and all proceeds from such fees shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury, in any year for which a sequester affecting such programs are in effect.

SEC. 207. THE CURRENT LAW BASELINE.

(a) SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.—CBO and OMB shall submit to the President and the Congress reports setting forth the budget baselines for the budget year and the next nine fiscal years. The CBO report shall be submitted on or before January 15. The OMB report shall accompany the President's budget.

(b) DETERMINATION OF THE BUDGET BASELINE.—(1) The budget baseline shall be based on the common economic assumptions set forth in section 106, adjusted to reflect revisions pursuant to subsection (c).

(2) The budget baseline shall consist of a projection of current year levels of budget authority, outlays, revenues and the surplus or deficit into the budget year and the relevant outyears based on current enacted laws as of the date of the projection.

(3) For discretionary spending items, the baseline shall be the spending caps in effect pursuant to section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. For years for which there are no caps, the baseline for discretionary spending shall be the same as the

last year for which there were statutory caps.

(4) For all other expenditures and for revenues, the baseline shall be adjusted by comparing unemployment, inflation, interest rates, growth and eligible population for the most recent period for which actual data are available, compared to the assumptions contained in section 107.

(c) REVISIONS TO THE BASELINE.—The baseline shall be adjusted for up-to-date economic assumptions for all reports issued pursuant to section 107 of this Act and section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 208. LIMITATIONS ON EMERGENCY SPENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Within the discretionary caps for each fiscal year contained in this Act, an amount shall be withheld from allocation to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and reserved for natural disasters and other emergency purposes.

(2) Such amount for each such fiscal year shall not be less than 1 percent of total budget authority and outlays available within those caps for that fiscal year.

(3) No adjustments shall be made to the discretionary spending limits under section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 unless the amount appropriated for discretionary accounts that have been designated as emergency requirements exceed the amount reserved pursuant to paragraph (1). Any adjustment shall be limited to the amount that total appropriations designated as emergency requirements for the fiscal year exceeds the amount reserved pursuant to paragraph (1).

(4) The amounts reserved pursuant to this subsection shall be made available for allocation to such committees only if—

(A) the President has made a request for such disaster funds;

(B) the programs to be funded are included in such request; and

(C) the projected obligations for unforeseen emergency needs exceed the 10-year rolling average annual expenditures for existing programs included in the Presidential request for the applicable fiscal year.

(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(A) States and localities shall be required to maintain effort and ensure that Federal assistance payments do not replace, subvert or otherwise have the effect of reducing regularly budgeted State and local expenditures for law enforcement, firefighting, road construction and maintenance, building construction and maintenance or any other category of regular government expenditure (to ensure that Federal disaster payments are made only for incremental costs directly attributable to unforeseen disasters, and do not replace or reduce regular State and local expenditures for the same purposes);

(B) the President may not take administrative action to waive any requirement for States or localities to make minimum matching payments as a condition or receiving Federal disaster assistance or take administrative action to waive all or part of any repayment of Federal loans for the State or local matching share required as a condition of receiving Federal disaster assistance. This clause shall apply to all matching share requirements and loans to meet matching share requirements under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) and any other Acts pursuant to which the President may declare a disaster or disasters and States and localities otherwise qualify for Federal disaster assistance; and

(C) a two-thirds vote in each House of Congress shall be required for each emergency to reduce or waive the State matching requirement or to forgive all or part of loans for the State matching share as required under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

(b) EFFECT BUDGET RESOLUTIONS.—(1) All concurrent resolutions on the budget (including revisions) shall specify the amount of new budget authority and outlays within the discretionary spending cap that shall be withheld from allocation to the committees and reserved for natural disasters, and a procedure for releasing such funds for allocation to the appropriate committee. The amount withheld shall be equal to 1 percent of the total discretionary spending cap for fiscal year covered by the resolution, unless additional amounts are specified.

(2) The procedure for allocation of the amounts pursuant to paragraph (1) shall ensure that the funds are released for allocation only pursuant to the conditions contained in subsection (a)(3)(A) through (C).

(c) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount reserved pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be available for other than emergency funding requirements for particular natural disasters or national security emergencies so designated by Acts of Congress.

(d) NEW POINT OF ORDER.—(1) Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''POINT OF ORDER REGARDING EMERGENCIES

''SEC. 408. It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, containing an emergency designation for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(D) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or of section 208 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1997 if it also provides an appropriation or direct spending for any other item or contains any other matter, but that bill or joint resolution, amendment, or conference report may contain rescissions of budget authority or reductions of direct spending, or that amendment may reduce amounts for that emergency.''.

(2) The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 407 the following new item:

''Sec. 408. Point of order regarding emergencies.''.

TITLE III—USE OF BUDGET SURPLUS TO PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

SEC. 301. ENDING USE OF RECEIPTS OF SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND FOR OTHER PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

(a) If, in any year, revenues are higher than the targets in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 107, or spending is lower than the caps in section 105, as adjusted, and the deficits are lower than the targets in section 105, as adjusted pursuant to section 107, those amounts shall be applied pursuant to subsection (b).

(b) All funds described in subsection (a) up to $100 billion shall be used to reduce the consolidated budget deficit and, to the extent that funds are available to eliminate the consolidated budget deficit, to retire the outstanding debt of the United States Government held by the public.

(c) Any use of funds described in subsection (a) for any purpose other than provided in subsection (b) shall be subject to the requirements of section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and any reduction in the amounts described in subsection (a) shall be considered as an increase in the deficit.

(d) When the President submits the budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for any year, OMB shall adjust the Social Security Trust Fund surpluses for each year under this section, based on the most recent estimates of such surpluses to be provided to OMB by the Secretary of the Treasury.

H.R. 2003

OFFERED BY: MR. EVANS

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 17, strike line 2.

Page 36, after line 15, insert the following (and redesignate the succeeding paragraph accordingly):

(10) payments and expenses under programs, benefits, and activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs and, insofar as they relate to veterans, of the Department of Labor;

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE IN INDIA

SEC. 572. Not more than $51,180,000 of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available for assistance in India.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 38: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE IN INDIA

SEC. 572. Not more than $41,775,000 of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available for assistance in India.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 39: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR INDIA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available for assistance to the Government of India.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 40: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR INDIA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available for assistance in India unless such funds are provided to nongovernmental organizations.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. FOX OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMENDMENT NO. 41: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 572. None of the funds made available under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' may be used to directly support or promote trophy hunting or the international commercial trade in elephant ivory, elephant hides, or rhinoceros horns.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MS. HARMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 42: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING PROLIFERATION OF MISSILE TECHNOLOGY FROM RUSSIA TO IRAN

SEC. 572. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress find the following:

(1) There is substantial evidence that missile technology and technical advice have been provided from Russia to Iran, in violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime.

(2) These violations include providing assistance to Iran in developing ballistic missiles, including the transfer of wind tunnel and rocket engine testing equipment.

(3) These technologies give Iran the capability to deploy a missile of sufficient range to threaten United States military installation in the Middle East and Persian Gulf, as well as the territory of Israel, and our North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally Turkey.

(4) President Clinton has raised with Russian President Boris Yeltsin United States concerns about these activities and the Russian response has to date been inadequate.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President should demand that the Government of Russia take concrete actions to stop governmental and nongovernmental entities in the Russian Federation from providing missile technology and technical advice to Iran, in violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime;

(2) if the Russian response is inadequate, the United States should impose sanctions on the responsible Russian entities in accordance with Executive Order 12938 on the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, and reassess cooperative activities with Russia;

(3) the threshold under current law allowing for the waiver of the prohibition on the release of foreign assistance to Russia should be raised; and

(4) our European allies should be encouraged to take steps in accordance with their own laws to stop such proliferation.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. LAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 43: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR EGYPT

SEC. 572. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading ''ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'' not more than $615,000,000 may be made available for Egypt.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. MENENDEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 44: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading ''INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS'' that are made available for the International Atomic Energy Agency shall be made available for programs or projects of such Agency in Cuba.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. MICA

AMENDMENT NO. 45: Page 6, line 3, after ''$650,000,000'' insert ''(increased by $19,400,000)''.

Page 12, line 9, after ''$468,750,000'' insert ''(decreased by $19,400,000)''.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. SAXTON

AMENDMENT NO. 46: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE P.L.O., THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY, AND RELATED OR SUCCESSOR ENTITIES

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be provided directly to the Palestine Liberation Organization (P.L.O.), the Palestinian Authority, or related or successor entities.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. SAXTON

AMENDMENT NO. 47: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE P.L.O. OR THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be provided directly to the Palestine Liberation Organization (P.L.O.), or the Palestinian Authority.

H.R. 2159,

OFFERED BY: MR. TAYLOR

AMENDMENT NO. 48: Page 22, after line 10, add the following:

(o) Funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to establish and carry out a pilot program to provide affordable housing in the Russian Federation. Provided, that none of the funds appropriated may be used for the purposes of providing Russian military housing.

H.R. 2159,

OFFERED BY: MR. YATES

AMENDMENT NO. 49: At the end of the bill, insert the following after the last section (preceding the short title):

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA

SEC. 572. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by Title II of this Act may be made available to the Government of Croatia if that government relocates the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers, who participated during the Holocaust in the mass murder of Jews, Serbs, and Gypsies, at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia.

(b) NATIONAL INTEREST EXCEPTION.—Assisatnce restricted by subsection (a) may be furnished if the President determines that furnishing such assistance is important to the national interests of the United States.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Whenever the President makes a determination under subsection (b), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report with respect to the furnishing of assistance pursuant to the determination. Any such report shall include a detailed explanation of the assistance and how it furthers United States national interests.

H.R. 2159,

OFFERED BY: MR. YATES

AMENDMENT NO. 50: At the end of the bill, insert the following after the last section (preceding the short title):

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA

SEC. 572. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by Title II of this Act may be made available to the Government of Croatia if that government relocates the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers, who participated during the Holocaust in the mass murder of Jews, Serbs, and Gypsies, at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia.

(b) TERMINATION OF PROHIBITION.—The prohibition under subsection (a) with respect to the Government of Croatia shall terminate after the Government of Croatia provides the Secretary of State with compelling proof that the historical symbolism of Jasenovac, and the remains of those who were murdered by the Nazis and their collaborators, will remain undisturbed and that no other remains will ever be added to the remains of the victims of Nazi tyranny buried at Jasenovac, Croatia.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. YATES

AMENDMENT NO. 51: At the end of the bill, insert the following after the last section (preceding the short title):

LIMITATION OF ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by title II of this Act may be made available to the Government of Croatia if that government relocates the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers, who participated during the Holocaust in the mass murder of Jews, Serbs, and Gypsies, at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. YATES

AMENDMENT NO. 52: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 572. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'', not more than $2,900,000 may be made available to the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development for the Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) in Zimbabwe: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to such Agency under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' may be used to directly finance the trophy hunting of elephants or other endangered species as defined in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna (CITES) or the Endangered Species Act: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to such Agency under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' that are provided under the CAMPFIRE program may not be used for activities with the express intent to lobby or otherwise influence international conventions or treaties, or United States government decisionmakers: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to such Agency under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' that are made available for the CAMPFIRE program may be used only in Zimbabwe for the purpose of maximizing benefits to rural people while strengthening natural resources management institutions: *Provided further,* That not later than March 1, 1998, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the steps taken to implement the CAMPFIRE program, the impact of the program on the people and wildlife of CAMPFIRE districts, alternatives to trophy hunting as a means of generating income for CAMPFIRE districts, and a description of how funds made available for CAMPFIRE in fiscal year 1998 are to be used.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to the Department of Agriculture shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who issue, under section 156 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7272), any nonrecourse loans to sugar beet or sugar cane processors.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. CHABOT

AMENDMENT NO. 22: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who carry out a market program under such section.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. POMBO

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 728. None of the funds made available in title III of this Act may be used to provide any assistance (other than the servicing of loans made on or before September 30, 1997) under any program under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to any housing or project located, or to be located, in the City of Galt, California.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 54, after line 13, insert the following:

In addition, for the Food for Progress Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1736o), in addition to the amounts and commodities made available in fiscal year 1997 under subsections (f)(3), (g), and (l)(1) of that Act, $50,000,000 shall be available to furnish dairy products on a grant basis, to be derived by transfer from fiscal year 1997 unexpended balances for the Dairy Export Incentive Program. Products furnished under this provision shall not be subject to the existing commodity ceiling and funds made available under this provision shall not be subject to the caps under subsections (f)(3) and (l)(1).

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 25: On page 67, line 6, after the dollar amount insert: ''(reduced by $155,000,000)''.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 26: On page 67, line 6, after the dollar amount insert: ''(reduced by $105,000,000)''.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 27: On page 67, line 6, after the dollar amount insert: ''(reduced by $80,000,000)''.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 28: On page 67, line 6, after the dollar amount insert: ''(reduced by $55,000,000)''.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 29: On page 67, line 6, after the dollar amount insert: ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 30: On page 67, line 6, after the dollar amount insert: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 31: On page 67, strike lines 7 through 13.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 32: On page 67, strike lines 14 through 19.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 33: On page 67, strike lines 20 through 24.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 34: On page 68, strike lines 8 through 11.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

AMENDMENT NO. 35: On page 68, after line 16, add the following new section:

''SEC. For an additional amount for the purposes provided for under the heading 'Departmental Administration' in Title I of this Act, $1,500,000, and the amount provided under 'National Agricultural Statistics Service' is hereby reduced by $1,500,000.' ''

H.R. 2203

OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 502. None of the funds made available in this Act may be provided by contract or by grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to any institution of higher education, or subelement thereof, that is currently ineligible for contracts and grants pursuant to section 514 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–270).