

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 18, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie	Deal	Holden
Ackerman	DeGette	Hooley
Aderholt	Delahunt	Horn
Allen	DeLauro	Hostettler
Archer	DeLay	Houghton
Armey	Dellums	Hoyer
Bachus	Deutsch	Hulshof
Baesler	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Baker	Dickey	Hutchinson
Baldacci	Dicks	Hyde
Ballenger	Dingell	Inglis
Barcia	Dixon	Istook
Barr	Dooley	Jackson (IL)
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Jackson-Lee
Barrett (WI)	Doyle	(TX)
Bartlett	Dreier	Jefferson
Barton	Duncan	Jenkins
Bass	Dunn	John
Bateman	Edwards	Johnson (CT)
Bentsen	Ehlers	Johnson (WI)
Bereuter	Ehrlich	Johnson, E.B.
Berman	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Berry	Engel	Jones
Bilbray	English	Kanjorski
Bilirakis	Eshoo	Kaptur
Bishop	Etheridge	Kasich
Blagojevich	Evans	Kelly
Bliley	Everett	Kennedy (MA)
Blumenauer	Ewing	Kennedy (RI)
Blunt	Farr	Kennelly
Boehlert	Fattah	Kildee
Boehner	Fawell	Kilpatrick
Bonilla	Fazio	Kim
Bonior	Filmer	Kind (WI)
Bono	Flake	King (NY)
Borski	Foley	Kingston
Boswell	Forbes	Klecza
Boyd	Ford	Klink
Brady	Fowler	Klug
Brown (CA)	Fox	Knollenberg
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Kolbe
Bryant	Franks (NJ)	LaFalce
Bunning	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Burr	Frost	Lampson
Burton	Furse	Lantos
Buyer	Gallegly	Largent
Callahan	Ganske	Latham
Calvert	Gejdenson	LaTourrette
Camp	Gekas	Lazio
Canady	Gibbons	Leach
Cannon	Gilchrest	Levin
Capps	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Cardin	Gilman	Lewis (GA)
Carson	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Castle	Goodlatte	Linder
Chabot	Goodling	Lipinski
Chambliss	Gordon	Livingston
Chenoweth	Goss	LoBiondo
Christensen	Graham	Lowe
Clay	Granger	Lucas
Clayton	Green	Luther
Clement	Gutierrez	Maloney (CT)
Clyburn	Gutknecht	Maloney (NY)
Coble	Hall (OH)	Manton
Collins	Hall (TX)	Markey
Combest	Hamilton	Martinez
Condit	Hansen	Mascara
Cook	Harman	Matsui
Cooksey	Hastert	McCarthy (MO)
Costello	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Cox	Hastings (WA)	McCollum
Coyne	Hayworth	McCrery
Cramer	Hefley	McDade
Crane	Hefner	McDermott
Crapo	Herger	McGovern
Cummings	Hill	McHale
Cunningham	Hilleary	McHugh
Danner	Hinchee	McInnis
Davis (FL)	Hinojosa	McIntosh
Davis (IL)	Hobson	McIntyre
Davis (VA)	Hoekstra	McKeon

McKinney	Pryce (OH)	Souder
McNulty	Quinn	Spence
Meehan	Radanovich	Spratt
Meek	Rahall	Stabenow
Menendez	Ramstad	Stark
Metcalfe	Rangel	Stenholm
Mica	Redmond	Stokes
Millender-McDonald	Regula	Strickland
Miller (FL)	Reyes	Stump
Minge	Riggs	Stupak
Mink	Riley	Sununu
Moakley	Rivers	Talent
Mollohan	Rodriguez	Tanner
Moran (KS)	Roemer	Tauscher
Moran (VA)	Rogan	Tauzin
Morella	Rogers	Taylor (NC)
Murtha	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas
Myrick	Rothman	Thompson
Nadler	Roukema	Thornberry
Neal	Roybal-Allard	Thune
Nethercutt	Rush	Thurman
Neumann	Ryun	Tiahrt
Ney	Sabo	Tierney
Northrup	Sanchez	Torres
Norwood	Sanders	Towns
Nussle	Sandlin	Trafficant
Oberstar	Sanford	Turner
Obey	Sawyer	Upton
Olver	Saxton	Velazquez
Ortiz	Schaefer, Dan	Vento
Oxley	Schaffer, Bob	Visclosky
Packard	Scott	Walsh
Pallone	Serrano	Wamp
Pappas	Sessions	Waters
Parker	Shadegg	Watkins
Pascrell	Shaw	Watt (NC)
Pastor	Shays	Watts (OK)
Paxon	Sherman	Waxman
Payne	Shimkus	Weldon (FL)
Pease	Shuster	Weldon (PA)
Pelosi	Sisisky	Weller
Peterson (MN)	Skaggs	Wexler
Peterson (PA)	Skeen	White
Petri	Skelton	Whitfield
Pickering	Slaughter	Wicker
Pickett	Smith (MI)	Wise
Pitts	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Pomeroy	Smith (TX)	Woolsey
Porter	Smith, Adam	Wynn
Portman	Smith, Linda	Yates
Poshard	Snowbarger	Young (AK)
Price (NC)	Snyder	Young (FL)
	Solomon	

NAYS—18

Andrews	Ensign	Royce
Campbell	Kucinich	Salmon
Conyers	Lofgren	Scarborough
Cubin	Miller (CA)	Sensenbrenner
DeFazio	Paul	Stearns
Doggett	Rohrabacher	Taylor (MS)

NOT VOTING—16

Becerra	Gonzalez	Schiff
Boucher	Greenwood	Schumer
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Smith (OR)
Coburn	Manzullo	Weygand
Foglietta	Owens	
Gephardt	Pombo	

□ 1805

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENT TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998**

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXVIII, clause 1(c), I rise today to give the House notice of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on the bill (H.R. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs

for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes. The motion is at the desk.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. LARGENT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2159 be instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in section 581 of the House bill (relating to restrictions on assistance to foreign organizations that perform or actively promote abortions).

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2267, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998**

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2267) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOLLOHAN moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the House and the Senate on H.R. 2267, Commerce-Justice-State-Judiciary Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998, be instructed to insist on the House position regarding funding for programs under the Victims of Child Abuse Act in the Juvenile Justice Programs account.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, let me explain this motion to instruct to my colleagues. The House-Commerce-Justice-State appropriation bill provides \$7 million for various programs authorized by the Victims of Child Abuse Act. The Senate bill provides \$4.5 million for these programs, which is the budget request.

The Victims of Child Abuse Program improves the quality of local and Federal child abuse prosecution and case handling. It does this by identifying and implementing improved policies and procedures to assist State and Federal prosecutors in keeping abreast of modern practices in child abuse prosecution.

The program also funds local and regional child advocacy center programs

to focus attention on the needs of child abuse victims by enhancing coordination and support among community agencies and professionals involved in the intervention, prevention, prosecution, and investigation systems that respond to child abuse cases.

Children's advocacy centers are child-focused, facility-based programs that use multidisciplinary teams to coordinate judicial and social service systems' response to victims of child abuse, Mr. Speaker.

My motion instructs conferees to remain firm on the House position of \$7 million for Victims of Child Abuse programs. These programs are working and working well and deserve this level of funding.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the motion.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. ROGERS,  
KOLBE,  
TAYLOR of North Carolina,  
REGULA,  
FORBES,  
LATHAM,  
LIVINGSTON,  
MOLLOHAN,  
SKAGGS,  
DIXON, and  
OBEY.

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2267, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 255 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1370.

□ 1812

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. 1370) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, with Mrs. EMERSON, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 7 printed in House report 105-282 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] had been disposed of.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 255, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] and amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

□ 1815

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. 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.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1370, reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, should be

rejected for several reasons. The claim to constitutionality is dubious. The Bank rewards special interest groups with political favors. Reallocating money from the job-producing, productive sectors of the economy to the less efficient sectors distorts credit allocation. Reauthorization of the Bank is both bad economics and bad politics.

Article I section 8 of the U.S. Constitution enumerates areas over which Congress has authority. The ninth and tenth amendments further reinforce that powers not vested in the U.S. Congress are reserved to the States or to the people. The fifth amendment of the Constitution forbids the taking from the people in order to subsidize the business of the politically well-connected. It is not through free trade that the Government subsidizes the politically well-connected. Rather, it is through such organizations as the Eximbank.

The justification of H.R. 1370 under the general welfare clause of the Constitution stretches the imagination of the intent of the Founding Fathers. Nowhere in the authors' dreams could the general welfare clause be used to tax all American individuals in order to give corporate welfare to a few, specific, large political donors. The supporters of the bill have not satisfactorily explained how the authorization of the Eximbank could be justified as regulating commerce. To construe Congress' power to coin money so broadly as to include the Federal regulation of the provision of credit by creating and perpetuating the Eximbank threatens the intrinsic value of American money itself. As former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker pointed out, "The truly unique power of a central bank, after all, is the power to create money, and ultimately the power to create is the power to destroy." Even if Congress has the constitutional authority to destroy money incident to its enumerated authority to coin, this is not to say it should do so through the reauthorization of the credit-misallocating Eximbank.

The U.S. Government takes money from its citizens through taxes to subsidize other nations' purchases. Very often, our Government subsidizes the purchases by foreign governments, such as the People's Republic of China or other brutal regimes, whose practices many Americans find objectionable. In fact, according to the Export-Import Bank's 1996 Annual Report, the People's Republic of China was the second largest recipient country of U.S. Eximbank loans or loan guarantees; American taxpayers subsidized \$4.1 billion of mainland China's purchases. It is one thing to permit voluntary exchanges between citizens of different countries but quite another to coerce the American taxpayer to subsidize the purchases of a country whose practices offend many. Such practices can best be explained by considering the way in which the Eximbank operates.

Maria L. Haley, one of the five Bank directors, is a long-time friend of Bill from Arkansas who ran then-Gov. Clinton's program to attract foreign investment in the state. She advocated approval of loans to Pauline Kanchanalak (a Thai native living in Virginia) to set up Blockbuster video stores in Bangkok, Thailand. The Eximbank has never approved financing for franchise rights; retail stores abroad do not create U.S. jobs. Ms. Kanchanalak contributed \$85,000 on June 18, 1996, the same day DNC fundraiser John Huang arranged for her to be invited to a White House coffee. Mr.