United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 31, 1998 No. 39

# House of Representatives

The House met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER).

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
*March 31, 1998.*

I hereby designate the Honorable VINCE SNOWBARGER to act as speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

## 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 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

## FURTHER DEBATE IS NEEDED ON THE IMF

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss attempted misappropriation of American taxpayers' money for the International Monetary Fund.

I applaud the efforts by our Speaker to create a second supplemental appropriations bill to handle this. This will give the House the ability to have a straight up or down vote on increasing our financial commitment to the IMF.

The U.S. now presently provides about 18 percent of the IMF funds, and we are being asked to cough up another $18 billion without a full debate on the House floor about the merits of such a proposal.

In a recent Wall Street Journal article, three outstanding experts on international finance gave their views on the International Monetary Fund. George Shultz, President Reagan's Secretary of State; William Simon, Presidents Nixon and Ford's Secretary of Treasury; and Walter Wriston, former Chairman of Citicorp and Citibank. They asked the question, who needs the IMF? They point out that President Clinton and the IMF have shifted into overdrive in their efforts to save the economies of Indonesia, the Philippines, South Korea and Thailand, or to be more accurate, to save the pocketbooks of international investors who can face a tide of defaults if these markets are not now shored up.

I welcome the support of these distinguished experts on this subject. The way I see it, the IMF places American taxpayers in the position of guaranteeing a return on investment to those who engage in these risky schemes. The likelihood of an IMF bailout removes the incentive for nations to not engage in bad economic policies or pursue unsound financial practices.

As these distinguished gentlemen note in this article, the IMF can lull nations into complacency by acting as the self-appointed lender of last resort, a function never contemplated by our Founding Fathers. The world has changed a great deal since the IMF was founded in 1944 to assist in global trade by supporting currency convertibility and providing needed financing to defend exchange rates.

The financial crisis in Asia results from decades of direct government regulation, the absence of foreign competition, and closed financial systems. By relying on heavy-handed bureaucracies managing every aspect of their economies, these nations are destroying themselves financially.

This observation was echoed in the Wall Street Journal article recently. ''Asian nations are facing financial difficulties not because outside forces have imposed bad economic policies on them, but because they have imposed these policies on themselves.''

According to Shultz, Simon and Wriston, ''the Mexican people suffered a massive decline in their standard of living as a result of their crisis. As is typical when the IMF intervenes, the governments and the lenders are rescued, but not the people.''

They conclude the following. ''The IMF is ineffective, unnecessary and obsolete. We do not need another IMF. Once the Asian crisis is over, we should abolish the one we have.''

Now the President is asking us to increase our quota to the IMF without a constructive debate on the merits of this proposal. In fact, there is clear evidence that the IMF has sufficient capital to withstand any immediate financial distress anywhere in the world. The IMF right now has close to $50 billion in reserves and access to another $25 billion through their general arrangements to borrow.

In addition, the IMF will receive nearly $28 billion in loan repayments from other borrowing nations by the end of the year 2000.

If we add the more than $100 billion being borrowed and repaid by Thailand, Indonesia, and South Korea, the IMF will basically have $200 billion in its coffers, the same amount it had before the Asian crisis began.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues, what is the rush of throwing more American taxpayer money at the IMF, when there is substantial capital already in place? It is for one reason only. The proponents of the IMF do not want to just replenish the IMF fund; they want to expand the breadth and scope of the IMF itself so that the IMF will play an even more dominating role in global finances.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

It is our responsibility in Congress to prevent this latest abuse of taxpayers' money and to defeat the proposal to increase the U.S. share of IMF money by $18 billion.

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, later today the Republican leadership will bring to the floor the supplemental appropriations bill. I regret that I must oppose this bill because the offsets included in this legislation are simply not acceptable.

It is unconscionable that badly needed funding to support our troops in Bosnia and Iraq, and disaster relief for States like California, which have sustained upwards of $500 million in damages this winter, are unnecessarily being pitted against important programs which benefit the American people.

Despite the fact that more than 80 percent of the funds in this bill are for the Department of Defense, the Republican majority has not offset these costs by making one cut in defense spending. Instead, they have chosen to play partisan political games by making cuts in programs they know the administration and Democrats cannot support.

For example, Republicans have chosen to make cuts in education, the AmeriCorps Service Program, which gives disadvantaged youth a chance, and the Section 8 Program, which provides critically needed housing for our Nation's families, the elderly and the disabled.

The Republican leadership is sending this bill to the floor knowing it will be vetoed, and knowing that our troops and our communities will be left waiting for desperately needed relief.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve more. These funds should not be held up by political gamesmanship. I ask my Republican colleagues to put our troops and our communities first and to reconsider this ill-conceived tactic.

## HEADING TOWARD A FAILED CENSUS IN 2000

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again express my deep concern that we are headed towards a failed Census in 2000. Last week, the General Accounting Office released a new report stating that the risk of a failed Census had increased since their last report in July. Census 2000 was already in their high-risk category, and now things have gotten worse. We are just 2 years away from Census day, and the risks are increasing.

Why are we headed towards a failed Census? For one very simple reason: The Clinton Administration has unilaterally designed the largest statistical experiment in U.S. history. And despite their sincerity, the Census Bureau just does not have the technical capability to pull it off.

The plan that they and their statistical experts developed is breathtaking in its complexity. I have a Ph.D. in marketing and statistics, and I must say, from an academic standpoint, it is an interesting theory.

But the Census is not a theory; it is a massive field operation, and the more complex you make it, the more the chance of failure.

Now, some in the media who have sided with the administration do not want to face reality. They have invested so much in this polling theory that they want to find some other reason why this Nation is headed towards a failed Census. So now they, with the help of my friends in the Democratic Party, have come up with a new reason: It is Congress' fault.

Of course, it is the administration's plan that is headed towards failure. The majority in Congress has been warning for almost 3 years now that the administration's plan cannot work, but that does not matter. The defenders of polling theory have to blame someone, so it is Congress.

Now, I am fair-minded, so at the first hearing last week of the new Census Subcommittee, we decided to ask the GAO some questions. We asked if Congress was responsible for the following problems that are leading towards a failed Census. We asked the following questions:

We asked if the Commerce Department's Inspector General finding that the decennial census software is not being developed in accordance with any well-defined process; and the answer was, Congress has nothing to do with it.

The Commerce Inspector General's finding that estimates of software development schedules and resources are not realistically for the dress rehearsal or the Census; the answer was Congress has nothing to do with it.

The Commerce Inspector General's conclusion that he questions the Bureau's ability to develop and implement complete accurate software for the Census; no congressional fault.

The Commerce Inspector General's reporting that the Bureau's matching and unduplication programs are so geographically restricted that they will virtually guarantee more errors; again, no congressional fault.

The fact that the ICM sample drawn by the Bureau mistakenly included commercial addresses which would have thrown it completely off; again, no congressional fault.

The vague and incomplete guidance provided by the Bureau to local governments that, according to GAO, hindered efforts to establish complete count committees; no congressional fault.

The Commerce Inspector General's finding that the Bureau is not giving itself enough time to follow up on households that do not respond in the first 2 weeks; no congressional fault.

The fact that the Bureau's plan forces nonresponsive follow-up to be completed in just 6 weeks, instead of a more realistic time frame given that it took 13 weeks last time we did a decennial Census; this is not Congress' fault.

The fact that the Bureau's plan for the ICM assumes it can contact five times as many people as it did in 1990, and do it in half the time, 13 weeks versus 28 weeks; that is not Congress' fault.

The fact that if the response rate in this short 13-week time frame for the ICM falls below 98 percent, the Census will become less accurate.

The Commerce Inspector General reporting that experimented field managers feel the ICM sampling plan is unrealistic and they are assuming a 98 percent response rate; this is not Congress' fault.

The incompatibility of the Census Bureau's plan to start the ICM before nonresponsive follow-up is complete with the findings of the Inspector General that ''the integrity of the ICM hinges on the assumption that it is fully independent of nonresponsive follow-up;'' again, this is not Congress' fault.

The strategy of hiring moonlighters as Census enumerators, that the GAO has described as questionable; this is not Congress' fault.

The high rate of duplicative or nonexisting households on the address lists; that is not Congress' fault.

The problem with accuracy and completeness of the address list and matches provided to the localities by the Census Bureau; it is not Congress' fault.

The lack of information and resources provided by the Bureau to local communities that wish to review the address list; again, not Congress' fault.

The Bureau's failure to complete and present a comprehensive design review in January 1998, as promised, to the Inspector General; that is not Congress' fault.

The answer to all these questions was the same. Congress has nothing to do with the problems. These are specific design flaws in the Clinton Administration's unprecedented plan.

If you want to save the Census, simplify the design and go back to what you know works.

□ 0945

## GIVE THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT THE HIGHEST PRIORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced House Resolution 399, to work toward fully funding the Federal Government's statutory obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA. This resolution says, and I quote, ''Resolved, that the House of Representatives urges the Congress and the President to give programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act the highest priority among Federal education programs by working to fund the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under such Act.''

For those who may not be familiar with IDEA, it came about in 1975 as a result of a Supreme Court decision in the early 1970s that essentially said that we have an obligation under our Constitution to provide education for all Americans, regardless of what level of educational ability one might have; a very good decision and an important decision.

Unfortunately, however, when Congress passed the original IDEA bill in 1975, we enacted a statutory commitment to cover 40 percent of the excess costs of educating a learning-disabled student. Mr. Speaker, we have never done it. The fact of the matter is that, since 1975, we have never funded IDEA at any higher rate than about 7 to 7½ percent.

It is this Member's opinion that this practice has to end. There is no issue, there is no issue, that is more important to school districts, to school administrators, to school boards, to parents, and perhaps most importantly, to property taxpayers across this country than the chronic underfunding of special education.

I introduced this resolution last week. It is currently pending in the Committee on Education and the Workforce. I am hopeful we will see some action on it in the near future.

I believe it is time for this Congress to step forward and say it is time to end the mother of all unfunded mandates, a mandate that costs our cities and towns and municipalities over $10 billion a year. It is time, in 1998, to fully fund IDEA.

If we want to improve local education, if we want to take the burden off of families that are under stress to provide education for their children if their children may be disabled or coded in some form or fashion and not separate them from the rest of the community, if we want to fulfill the Government's mandate that was enacted over 20 years ago, do it for the first time in 1998. This is the year to fully fund special education.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation and send a message back to our constituents that the time has come for the Federal government to live up to its obligation to provide our school districts, our cities and towns, with the relief that we promised to provide them over 20 years ago in fully funding special education.

## CURRENT HIGH OIL PRICES CAUSED BY GREED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call attention to a contradiction in market economics. About 2 weeks ago, American consumers were told that oil prices had hit a record low, and last Tuesday the New York Times reported that crude oil prices rose 13 percent on the basis of a pledge to cut the supply. Thirteen percent was the biggest one-day rise in oil prices since the Persian Gulf War more than 7 years ago, yet there was no national or international crisis that precipitated the rise to 13 percent.

There is presently an oversupply of oil on the market. One would expect prices to be low and stay that way until demand overtakes supply. But this is not a rise in price because of a reduction of the supply or increase in demand. That just simply could not happen in a week. This is not a response to the market. This is a reaction to the promise, the promise, of cuts in crude oil supplies.

From my perspective, this is raw greed. For those Americans who are observing this process today, there is not one product that I can imagine, that many of us can imagine, that is not impacted by the price of crude oil, from our cars, motors, our engines, to the suit that I am wearing, to the tie that I am wearing, to our socks, to our shoes, to paper products, to all plastics, to paint, to chemical manufacturing, to computers. You have name it, just about every product that we produce in our Nation has some oil-based content.

So today the Federal Reserve Board will meet to set interest rates. If they raise interest rates because they think oil prices will be low and overheat the economy, the economy will simply slow and the oil companies will make out like bandits.

With the mere promise of higher oil prices, they can continue to produce oil in a glutted market, charge higher prices and, clearly, make out like bandits. So if the Federal Reserve Board today meets to raise interest rates, and therefore slow down growth of the U.S. economy, please do not blame the Democrats and, for that matter, do not even blame the Republicans. Just blame the oil companies, who happen to be Republicans.

## THE PARENTAL FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes this morning to talk about the Parental Freedom of Information Act.

Educators and parents agree that students do much better when parents are involved in the education. But there are many barriers to getting parents involved in the education process. What the Parental Freedom of Information Act does is try to remove some of those barriers.

Some of those barriers are something that are just indications of how far down our culture has slid. We have many broken homes, and many homes have both parents working. It is quite often too difficult for parents to spend the time they need to be involved in their children's education.

It certainly is a sacrifice of time when there are so many financial demands on parents these days because of the cost of housing, the cost of clothing, the cost of living, that they cannot spend the time to get involved because they are working.

Mr. Speaker, other forces in society have also caused a downhill slide. Quite often, we have lost touch with the virtues that built this great Nation, virtues like faith in God, hard work, honesty, integrity. That loss of virtues is also reflected in our school system.

Getting parents involved in the child's education will help build a structure where children will be able to rely on their parents to help improve their education. Like I said, in education, teachers, superintendents and parents all agree.

What the Parental Freedom of Information Act does is it allows parents access to the information related to their children's education. That includes medical records. It includes psychological testing. It includes test scores. It includes curriculum, anything involved with the curriculum.

What we have seen in some situations across America is that school systems have denied parents access to the information, even when it includes medical treatment or psychological testing.

In one case in Pennsylvania, in excess of 60 young women, girls, actually, in junior high were subjected to physical exams, which included exams that required them to take their clothes off. This was very much a shock for these girls. It was very difficult for them, traumatic for them, and many had to receive counseling afterwards. This was all done without parental consent, without parental notification.

The Parental Freedom of Information Act would give parents access to

medical tests and require that they get permission before they conduct something like this. Anything that is mandatory would require that parent consent before it is conducted.

It's the same with psychological testing, if there is any psychological testing; and there has been across the United States. In Texas and California, they have had psychological testing without parental consent.

This legislation does not prevent students from voluntarily seeking psychological testing, psychiatric help, or medical help if they do so voluntarily. In some cases, there are conflicts between parents and students; and they do need to get some type of counseling. That is not excluded by this bill. I think that is very healthy for students to try to work through some of their problems so they can communicate better with their parents, and vice versa.

Other barriers exist, especially related to some testing, that have been very difficult for parents to accept, especially when they are not involved in the process.

In my home State of Kansas there was part of a standardized test that was given to junior high students was a reading comprehension test. The story that was selected was of a 7th grade girl who developed a relationship with an inanimate object, actually a statue of a crow. In this story this junior high girl begins to communicate with this statue, and the statue becomes her spiritual guide.

Many parents in Kansas found that having junior high kids subjected to spiritual guides, or the philosophy of a spiritual guide, was offensive. They decided that they would try to do something about it. Eventually, the test was changed. But, parents were excluded from finding out about such types of standardized tests, tests that would subject every child in Kansas, sooner or later, to that.

Mr. Speaker, I would just ask that my colleagues help support the Parental Freedom of Information Act and strengthen education.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning hour debates, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.

□ 1100

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 a.m.

## PRAYER

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

O gracious God, You have given us the great promises of life and we see Your glory and majesty of the heavens and the miracles of life and hope. On this day we pray that we will see Your blessings in the day-by-day events, the ordinary circumstances that touch our lives. May we realize that when we say a good word, we are Your people; when we listen to others and respect their traditions, we are doing Your work; when we give honor and dignity to those who disagree with us, we are truly acting our faith in our daily lives. As we seek to do Your will in the daily routines of life, so we bless You, our creator and our redeemer. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. MCINNIS. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIBBONS 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.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

> S. 1751. An act to extend the deadline for submission of a report by the Commission to Assess the Organization of the Federal Government to Combat the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 15 one-minutes on each side.

## DEMOCRATS ARE NOT FOR TAX CUTS

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party stands for lower taxes, and that is not news. The Democrat Party stands for higher taxes, and that is not news either. What is news is that we have yet another Democrat who has had the courage to say out loud what liberal Democrats believe with great conviction to the depths of their souls.

Just last week, one liberal Democrat, proud to call herself a liberal and a leader of the party of big government, said point blank, ''The fact is that Democrats are not for tax cuts.'' Let us all listen to that again, because I find her candor quite refreshing: ''The fact is that Democrats are not for tax cuts.''

Now, I am sure that the White House spin machine could probably take that statement and show how we are all just cretins for thinking that these words mean what they say. But I am afraid most Americans understand exactly what these words mean without the benefit of the White House spin doctors.

How far the Democrat Party has come from the days of Andrew Jackson. Mr. Speaker, I tremble at the thought that the Democrat Party will practice what it preaches.

## MAJORITY WHIP OWES AN APOLOGY

(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, I was deeply saddened and chagrined to read in the paper the remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the Majority Whip, regarding slavery and the President's remark on the subject.

According to my colleague, and I quote, ''Here is a flower child with gray hair doing exactly what he did back in the '60s. He is apologizing for the actions of the U.S.'' While there is nothing wrong with apologizing, that is not what the President did.

What President Clinton did on his recent trip to Africa was express his regret over slavery. He said slavery was wrong, something we should all be able to agree on. At a time when the President and others are trying to nurture racial healing and reconciliation, it is unfortunate that there are those who would use the issue of race as a wedge to divide us.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) owes this House, the American people, and the President an explanation and an apology. He has said that the President cannot tell the truth about his mistakes and own up to them.

Mr. DELAY should admit his own error of judgment and apologize.

## NEW TRIBES MISSIONARIES

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of three American missionaries who have been held hostage for over 5 years by FARC guerillas.

In January of 1993, Colombian guerillas crossed the border and kidnapped David Mankins, Richard Tenenoff, and Mark Rich from a Panamanian Indian village. During the first year of captivity, FARC intermittently contacted New Tribes Missions to demand payment of a $5 million ransom. But, in 1994, the guerillas cut off all contact.

According to the New Tribes Missions authorities, there are credible reports that the three Americans are still alive. Last July, Assistant Secretary of State John Shattuck committed to doing everything possible to secure the release of these three Americans. In addition, a number of Latin American countries have pledged their assistance to resolving this hostage situation.

Mr. Speaker, American citizens' lives are at stake. I urge President Clinton, Secretary Albright, the State Department and all other appropriate American officials to work with other countries to help bring an end to this tragic situation.

## CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM KILLED ONCE AGAIN

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, well, we were here yesterday for almost 12 hours; and we were able to kill campaign finance reform. It reminds me of borrowing a lyric from the old song ''The Party's Over:'' ''It's time to wind up the masquerade. But make up your mind, the piper must be paid.''

The campaign finance reform has not been done. There are no limits on expenditures. There is no ban on soft money. There is no disclosure for independent groups that campaign for or against politicians. History reveals again last night that the Republican Party has killed the campaign finance reform once again.

In 1992, a bill got to the President's desk and Bush vetoed it. In 1994, the Senate Republicans filibustered against campaign finance reform and killed it. In 1996, this House, under present leadership, killed H.R. 3505. And now, in 1998, the House leadership once again killed campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party does not want to bite the money interests that field their campaigns. But do not forget, it is not the money that elects us, it is the people who vote.

## NO EMBARGO ON FOOD AND MEDICINE GOING TO CUBA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, a portion of the infrastructure of Fidel Castro in the United States is here in Washington today to promote the lives and propaganda of the regime. They will speak of a political embargo on the sending of food and medicine from the U.S. to Cuba while never mentioning an unkind word about the regime.

But, once again, Mr. Speaker, let us set the facts straight. There is no embargo on food and medicine going to Cuba. The United States is, in fact, the largest humanitarian aid donor to Cuba, sending more aid to the island than all of the other nations in the world combined.

If there are no medicines in Cuba, why do foreign tourists with hard currency receive top-quality health care on the island? If there is a shortage of food in Cuba, why do luxury hotels pamper tourists with world-class meals? If there are no medicines in Cuba, why has Castro exported $300 million in medicines over the past 2 years?

Do not believe the propaganda. The only embargo that has to be lifted is the embargo on freedom, human rights, and democracy that the Cuban dictator has imposed on the people of Cuba.

□ 1100

## KEEP TALKING ABOUT THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, last week as the cherry blossoms bloomed in Washington, Americans were treated to yet another sight that they had long awaited, a Republican legislative agenda. Finally the GOP articulated an issue when the leader of the other body declared that Republicans would block any increase in the minimum wage. Yes, while the Dow Jones climbs higher, Republicans say that some workers are unworthy of sharing in America's prosperity.

As my colleagues know, when trading closes each day on Wall Street, someone has to clean up the Stock Exchange, someone is serving drinks to the investors getting together to celebrate, and somebody is stitching together the $3,000 suits fashionable in the financial district. Yet some of those workers are struggling to get by on an annual income lower than the wardrobe expenses of some of the well-dressed brokers.

Mr. Speaker, I have one request of the Republican leader of the other body: Keep talking about the minimum wage. The staunch opposition can only help us in uniting working families, and when we Democrats pass a minimum wage increase over objections, we will be saying, ''Senator LOTT, thanks a lot.''

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Members should avoid references to Members of the other body.

## NO TAXATION WITHOUT COMPREHENSION

(Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the stirrings of patriotic revolution in this country 222 years ago were energized by the cries of ''No taxation without representation.'' Today it is time for a new call to common sense: ''No taxation without comprehension.''

That is right, Mr. Speaker, a tax code that even the experts cannot figure out is an assault on common sense, an assault on logic and an assault on the American conception of self-government. Formerly loyal British subjects were so offended by the idea of taxation without representation that soon a revolution of American patriots was born, and today more and more ordinary taxpaying Americans are so offended by a system of taxation without comprehension that a taxpayers revolt is emerging now across the land.

In simple terms, Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense to have a tax system that makes no sense. It is time to stop the madness and stand up to our absurd Tax Code, all 3,500 pages of it.

Democrats and Republicans unite. No taxation without comprehension.

## DO-NOTHING CONGRESS IN RECESS FROM REALITY

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress concludes the first 100 days of 1998, it is quite appropriately in recess. Indeed, the Republican leadership of this House has been in recess for most of this year on most issues that could really make a difference in the lives of most Americans.

They were in recess yesterday when, after demands for over a year to have a real debate on how to get the big money influence in this Congress controlled, they presented a phony bill that was rejected by even most of their own Members. They talk about taxes, but when it comes to closing the tax loopholes and ending the corporate welfare for those same big money contributors, this Congress has been in recess. When it comes to passing a budget that would protect Social Security first, in recess. On child care, on improving the quality of education, on

pension protection, they have been in recess.

The first 100 days of this Republican Congress: a do-nothing Congress in recess, in recess from reality.

## AMERICANS SHOULD OBSERVE APRIL FOOL'S DAY ON APRIL 15

(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, we are roughly 13 hours away from the first day of April, also known as April Fool's Day. This year, Mr. Speaker, I think America should observe April Fool's day on April 15. Why? Well, April 15 is the day when the IRS plays the biggest prank of all, trying to convince the Americans that it has turned over a new leaf as a kinder, gentler agency.

Mr. Speaker, the Americans are no fools. They see the IRS for exactly what it is, out of control. April 1 has been dedicated to fools, and April 15 has been dedicated to the IRS, just 14 days between losing one's mind and losing one's money.

Working men and women in this country are sick and tired of having the joke played on them. Our families deserve a government that is dedicated to reform and accountability, not abusive power and status quo.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of real and practical IRS reform, tax reform now, not tomorrow. We must end the practical joke on the taxpayers of this country.

## FLORIDA FIXES THEIR ELECTRIC CHAIR

(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, Daniel Remeya said he killed people for the fun of it. In 1985 he killed a clerk for $50. Two days later he killed a grocery clerk. Two days after that he killed a restaurant manager. That same day he killed two repair men, my colleagues. Now, after all that his attorneys said Florida's electric chair does not work properly, constituting cruel and unusual punishment, therefore Remeya should be spared.

Beam me up.

I want to commend Florida for, No. 1, fixing their electric chair; and, No. 2, for using the electric chair on this creep who killed innocent victims for the fun of it.

Good night, sweet prince.

I say one last thing, Congress. An America that gives murderers three square meals, a roof and a law library is an America that will continue to have mass murderers. I yield back all the carnage in our cities.

## BESTEA WILL BENEFIT ONE OF AMERICA'S MOST DANGEROUS HIGHWAYS

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support BESTEA when it comes to the House floor this week. BESTEA focuses on safety and keeping our nation's highways safe like never before.

An example of this commitment is the High Risk Roads Interstate Program. This program, Mr. Speaker, allocates $5.75 billion to fund safety improvements to high risk roads with high accident rates. Funding of this program requires that safety must be the primary purpose of any project.

Mr. Speaker, this program will directly benefit my home State of Washington, which has the dubious distinction of having one of America's most dangerous highways. Highway 522 is a 10.5 mile road where 42 people have lost their lives in the past 20 years. Without this new program, the estimated $180 million price tag would remain out of reach, leading to more and more senseless deaths.

I urge my colleagues to support BESTEA.

## CONTINUE THE FIGHT FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Congress yesterday missed a great opportunity to reform the finance campaigning that we do in our country. I am happy to report that on a vote of 337 to 74 this House turned down some atrocious campaign finance reform legislation that was a total sham, and we did it in a bipartisan way. Americans have said we want campaign finance reform, we want to take the money out, we want to participate in the process, and we want an open debate on it.

I applaud my colleagues. Democrats have been strong in it. All 196 of us said ''no'' to the sham campaign finance reform legislation that was on the House floor last night, and I am happy that 74 of Republicans stood up to that challenge as well.

Let us reform the laws. Let Americans participate in campaign finance reform.

I commend my Democratic Caucus, Mr. GEPHARDT for his leadership. Let us continue the fight.

## NO APOLOGIES NEEDED

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is time for our President to come home. We owe no more apologies to the world. I am tired of hearing people go out and apologize for the United States of America.

Take a look at the United States of America's history. Look how many millions and millions and millions of people that we have helped. Look how many of our soldiers have given the ultimate sacrifice to defend freedom in this world.

Take a look at what our country offers the world today. We do more for the environment than any other country in the world. We have the best health care system of any country in the world. We have the strongest military of any country in the world which helps our friends at our expense.

Take a look at what we do for education for our own citizens. Take a look at what we do through the United Nations for other countries. Take a look at our foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, we have got nothing to apologize about. The President needs to come home. If apologies are due, maybe they are due over at the White House, but they are not due for being citizens of the United States.

I am a citizen of the United States of America, and let me tell every one of my colleagues I have no apologies.

## THE CONGRESS HAS GONE WILDLY ASTRAY

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to get to work on the people's agenda, the people's business, and to quit playing partisan games. Last year after passing a successful budget resolution the Congress today has gone wildly astray. The Republican Congress today cannot get along with the Clinton administration, it cannot get along with the Democrats and the Republicans in Congress, cannot get along with themselves.

Look what has been going on the last 2 weeks in the House: Making a mockery out of campaign finance legislation yesterday, partisan bills considered under suspension where there was certainty such bills would fail. Secondly, last week giving short shrift to the environment and fortunately the so called Forest Health measure was defeated. The bills are failing; we cannot agree on subjects we should agree on and find a sound common ground upon.

And today we have got a bill scheduled on financial modernization, the bill that we have been working on for a decade, and what is happening is that the Republican leadership is hijacking the credit union bill to put it onto this badly flawed bill, H.R. 10. It is like giving a ticket to somebody on the *Titanic*. This bill makes a mockery out of the due process and deliberate consideration. Substantive amendments will not be considered, we are going to have a total of about four or five hours to debate it, and it is all but immunized

from substantive debate on important issues in terms of our economy and the people we represent. When are we going to get to work and quit the partisan antics that seem to touch every item on the House agenda.

## WILL OUR MILITARY FORCES BE UNABLE TO MEET NATIONAL SECURITY NEEDS BECAUSE OF ILL-CONCEIVED BUDGET CUTTING?

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

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, this year will represent the 14th consecutive year of real decline in Federal defense spending. In less than a decade we have gone from 18 Army divisions down to 10. We have gone from a 600-ship Navy down to 300. Our soldiers' optempo continues to increase, our equipment continues to age, and yet the defense budget seems to get smaller and smaller with each passing year.

Yet to my dismay, I read in the March 25 Congress Daily that some of my colleagues are disappointed that the supplemental appropriations bill was not offset with DOD funds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that we have a constitutional obligation to provide for the common defense of this Nation. It will be far more costly in dollars, and potentially in American lives, if our military forces are unable to meet the Nation's national security needs because of ill-conceived budget cutting.

## CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM—THANKS FOR NOTHING

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the Republican leadership's planned defeat last night of campaign finance reform, I wanted to give my colleagues an update on the current state of the law.

If someone is a small business person in Arkansas grossing $100,000 a year, it is still legal for them to give $1 billion to the political party of their choice. If this is a family of four making $30,000 a year, it is still legal for them to donate $1 billion to the political party of their choice. If they retire on Social Security and on fixed income, it is still legal for them to give $1 billion to the political party of their choice. And if this is a young couple in their 20s still trying to pay off student loans, it is still legal for them to give $1 billion to the political party of their choice.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for nothing.

## HONESTY IN OUR LEADERS DOES MATTER

(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, we are losing the concept of honesty and trust in our society. Over the last few months here in Washington the concept is fading and being replaced by denial, distraction, delay and destruction of those seeking the truth. We all know in our hearts that honesty is always the best policy, but when leadership in a free society lowers the standard, it affects us all.

Mr. Speaker, leadership does matter. We all saw that when the President spoke on MTV, saying he would inhale if he had to do it all over again, and then drug use actually increased.

If we lower the standard of honesty and trust, it means we no longer honor our commitments to our checking accounts, resulting in bounced checks. It means that we no longer honor our commitments to credit card accounts, meaning more bankruptcy. It means we no longer honor our commitments to marriage, meaning divorces will rise.

Is there not enough hot checks today? Do we not have enough bankruptcy? Is there not too many divorces today? Let us demand honesty and trust from ourselves, our neighbors and our elected officials.

## BANNING SOFT MONEY

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, the freshman campaign finance bill takes the bold and important step of banning soft money. In the last election Democrats and Republicans combined to raise more than $260 million in soft money. That was a 206 percent increase from 1992. If we extrapolate, when we get to the year 2000 we will be spending $1 billion in soft money.

□ 1130

We divide the House into two groups: Those who think there is not enough money in the pot to spend doing elections, and those who think there are far too many dollars to be spent. And the problem is not what is illegal, so much as what is legal that we accept. Let us bring credibility back to the Congress. Let us have real campaign finance reform, and let us not think that the public is going to accept the sham that went on last night.

## HELP FOR WORKING FAMILIES

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years, as Americans watched the Tax Code grow to 5.5 million words, special interests were gaining power at the expense of working families, families who formed the backbone of America, who work hard, play by the rules, and pay more than their fair share of the taxes.

James Madison warned about the evils of special interests, which he called ''factions'' because special interests could make demands, demands at the expense of the public good, at the expense of common interests, at the expense of sound policy.

James Madison was right, and history, for the past 40 years, has shown that special interests have grown in power while ordinary middle-class families watch their tax bills grow year after year.

Last year, for the first time in 16 years, we gave American families a tax break. Let us eliminate the marriage penalty; let us help working families. Let us let the Tax Code work for Americans and not for the special interests.

## RESTORE THE PUBLIC'S TRUST

(Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as public servants, we are commissioned to be guardians of the public trust, but each year the public's trust steadily declines. And why? Because too often Presidents, the new ones, and the new Congresses, go on with practices that are established by the old Congresses that violate that trust.

Take, for example, the Social Security Trust Fund. Every year we borrow from that trust fund, and we do not have the money to pay it back. We give that to the next generation.

This year, the President's proposal not only says we should borrow this year, but for the next 3 years, for a so-called balanced budget. He takes $101 billion out of people's retirements and spends it on his programs and says, isn't that great? And now he is traveling the world giving out foreign aid to other countries that he has taken out of people's retirement funds.

It is time to restore the trust in America to trust funds and stop this stealing.

## CONGRATULATIONS TO TENNESSEE LADY VOLS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Tennessee Lady Vols on once again becoming the national champions of women's collegiate basketball. This is an unprecedented third national championship in a row for Coach Pat Head Summitt and her staff and players.

Led by a young woman who has already been described as the greatest women's basketball player ever, Chamique Holdsclaw, the Lady Vols went 39 and 0 on the way to the national championship.

Coach Pat Head Summitt has now won an unbelievable six national championships and is considered one of the top basketball coaches of all time, male or female.

The dedication, the determination, the discipline of these young women is truly amazing. This is my hometown team, representing one of my alma maters, so I am especially proud of this outstanding group, but they have made all of Tennessee very proud, indeed.

Coach Pat Head Summitt, her assistants, Mickie DeMoss, Holly Warlick, Al Brown, and the Tennessee Lady Vols are great representatives for the sport of basketball and for this Nation.

## ETHICAL STANDARDS IN POLITICAL FUND-RAISING

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Democrats' call for national standards in education reflects their high regard for high ethical standards when it comes to raising money for their political campaigns?

I have no doubt that the other side, so proud of what they did during the 1996 elections, have learned a few lessons from the most ethical administration in history. Selling the Lincoln bedroom to the highest bidder; White House coffees with the most impressive rogues gallery of drug smugglers, arms dealers and con artists ever assembled.

I wonder if the national standards they have in mind will help with the little ''I do not recall problem'' that seems to afflict the majority from the White House who are asked to come to Capitol Hill to testify about campaign finance law breaking.

I wonder if the national standards they have in mind will do anything about shaking down impoverished Indian tribes for money, using the power of the IRS to target America's most vulnerable citizens, or invading the privacy of ordinary citizens by illegally obtaining their FBI files.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker. I wonder.

## CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, there was some debate yesterday on the floor about whether or not the majority party, the Republicans, were serious, coming to the floor with a bad campaign finance reform proposal, and setting up a procedure that meant they needed two-thirds of the House, not one-half-of-the-House-plus-one to win.

Well, I think there were two-thirds votes for something. There was two-thirds of the House at least that voted against the Republican proposal, and, frankly, it just shows how insincere this effort has been.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take back the political system in a way that will give the American people confidence. We have to put limits on spending. We have to decrease the amount of money to campaigns, not increase the amount of money to campaigns, and we have to have an honest debate on this floor with not just the ideas that have been created inside the Republican caucus, which were even rejected by a large number of the Republicans, but the ideas that are out here in the American public.

I have a proposal to limit spending to a $100 contribution from any person in the country; not thousands, not $25,000, not $75,000. Other people have other ideas. I believe in public financing. Many people agree with that; some disagree with that.

We ought to have an honest debate about these issues, and not let it die with the sham that occurred last night.

## MAKING TAXES UNDERSTANDABLE

(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, this year, millions of Americans will buy new cars. We will go on to car lots and select cars of our choice, and be told how much they cost.

But think about it for a minute, how complicated it must be to price a car; tires, computer systems, the radios and speaker systems and bumpers. And then there are the labor costs involved in it, and the liability for the insurance, and the utilities for the factory.

It is indeed a very, very complicated process to bring a car to your lot nearest to you in your hometown and say that car costs $31,286. It is a miracle of the capitalist system.

Now think in terms of what it is to pay your taxes. Have you paid your taxes yet? Probably not. Why not? Because it is too complicated. You know it is going to take hours and hours. You will have to sacrifice two or three evenings of your busy schedule, all to figure out what you owe Uncle Sam.

Why can the IRS not take a lesson from the motor companies and the private sector and just have clarity and simplicity, so that when you and I go to pay our taxes on April 15th, even though we might not like the amount, at least we understand what it is?

## SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last week several of my colleagues and myself stood in the well of this House, and we talked to the American public about the Republican leadership's lunacy and their crazy idea to impose a 30 percent sales tax on the American public. Lunacy. A 30 percent increase in the sales tax, a national sales tax.

In the course of that debate, I spoke out and I said that Republicans want to say that Democrats are not for tax cuts, and that we should not let them get away with saying that Democrats are not for tax cuts, because, quite frankly, Democrats have been standing on their feet talking about targeted tax cuts for working middle-class families in this country, and not the richest people in this country, which is where the Republican leadership and my colleague from Texas (Mr. DELAY) are coming from.

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. DELAY got up to speak this morning, and I say to him, watch the debate on the floor before you distort the words of a colleague. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is being corrected on how they misinterpreted the comments that I made.

We have the tape. You are going to have to eat your words.

## DEFEAT OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on yesterday's debacle. Some rose and said that this was legitimate campaign finance reform. The American public wants campaign finance reform. They do not want money to be the arbiter of the politics of America. They want money contributed honestly and reported effectively.

The chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, who offered these bills to the Congress, had one principal large bill. That bill, he said, would pass. We said it was a sham. The New York Times said it was a sham. The Washington Post said it was a sham. We were criticized on our side of the aisle for being partisan and saying it was a sham.

But, Mr. Speaker, when the vote was called, two-thirds of the majority party voted against their leadership's bill, including their leadership.

It was, indeed, a sham.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3579, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 402 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 402

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the

Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3579) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI, clause 7 of rule XXI, or section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall not exceed 90 minutes, with 60 minutes of general debate confined to the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and 30 minutes of general debate confined to title III equally divided and controlled by Representative Skaggs or his designee and a Member opposed to title III. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. The amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. No other amendment shall be in order except the further amendment printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. That amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against that amendment are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1145

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for purposes of debate on this issue only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 402 is a modified closed rule that will allow the House to consider H.R. 3579, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1998, in an expeditious and responsible manner.

The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(L)(6) of rule XI, requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report; clause 7 of rule XXI, requiring a 3-day availability of relevant printed hearings and reports on general appropriations bills; or section 306 of the Budget Act of 1974, prohibiting consideration of legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget unless reported by that committee.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It also provides an additional 30 minutes of debate on the provision of the bill in title III relating to the prohibition on the use of funds in the bill for military operations against Iraq. This time is to be equally divided between the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) and an opponent of the bill language.

I am sure Members on both sides of this issue would agree this is a timely and important debate, and I am pleased we were able to accommodate additional time for this purpose.

The rule provides that the bill be considered as read and that amendments printed in part 1 of our Committee on Rules report be considered as adopted. The rule waives points of order against the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill, or clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting reappropriations.

Additionally, the rule makes in order the amendment printed in part 2 of the Committee on Rules' report and provides that such amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The rule waives all points of order against this amendment, which is a manager's amendment designed to meet a specific need in the Northeast.

For the record, I have been advised by the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), that additional specific needs for the State of Florida, this recent emergency and tragedy that has happened in that State, have not been incorporated in this bill because of the timing of matters. These points will be addressed in conference with the other body, I am informed.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for a motion to recommit with or without instructions. It is a somewhat complicated rule, which is why I have taken so long to lay it out. There are other points about it that are worth noting by Members.

What we are attempting to do today is move ahead with an important supplemental spending bill made necessary by a series of natural disasters and several ongoing military missions in need of additional funding in this fiscal year.

I have heard little disagreement about the merit of the funding proposals that are included in today's legislation. We have all been saddened, in fact horrified, by the devastating impact of a series of storms and weather phenomena associated with El Nino in congressional districts across the country.

I think we also all recognize that the young men and women doing the hard work of peace in such places as Bosnia and the Persian Gulf rely on us to ensure that they have the resources necessary to conduct their missions as safely as possible. Whether we agree with the long-term policy that put them in harm's way or not is not the issue at this point.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, there has been much public commentary and disagreement among Members about the process by which these needs are to be met. We did hear much testimony yesterday from Members seeking to offer amendments to this bill. Most of the amendments were in some way or another in violation of House rules. Some of them dodge the tough issue of offsets, and some were not germane to the subject matter of this bill.

Based on that, and the importance of getting this bill done quickly, we have crafted a structured rule that seeks to keep the focus on the matters at hand; that is, the emergencies and keeping our military supported.

For instance, I know that some of our colleagues believe this bill should have been tied to funding for the IMF and United Nations funding. Given the complexity and the clear controversy surrounding both of those matters, I believe that marrying them with the disaster and defense proposals would only serve to delay our ability to get needed relief to victims and provide adequate funding for our troops overseas.

We cannot allow our efforts to help flood- and storm-ravaged communities or bring peace of mind to our troops to become bogged down in protracted negotiations over International Monetary Fund and United Nations funding. Those matters will be the subject of a subsequent bill next month.

In addition, we have discussed the ramifications of funding these needs with and without spending offsets. I am pleased that this legislation incorporates offsets for the spending it proposes, a difficult task in these times of tightened belts in light of last year's budget agreement.

By adopting this rule, the House will go a step further and declare its support for the general policy that all spending in this bill should be offset. I salute the appropriators for doing due diligence in coming up with the offsets for the new spending in this legislation. They have remained true to the principle of fiscal responsibility our majority has espoused since taking control of this House in 1994: There is no free lunch when it comes to taxpayers' money. Everything has a price, and all spending must be done in the context of making choices.

They are tough choices, but we are accountable. That does not mean that I agree with each and every choice that was made in this bill, nor does every other Member.

In one area involving funding for the airport improvement program, I think

the wisdom of this House will enhance the judgment made by the Committee on Appropriations. In adopting this rule, we will adopt an amendment that restores cuts proposed to the airport program, cuts that could have seriously jeopardized the continued progress of airport expansion and air travel safety across this country, in my view, and in the view of many others.

Mr. Speaker, we know this bill will not meet every need for the current fiscal year. Even as the Committee on Appropriations was marking up this bill, the administration was preparing an additional natural disaster-related funding request of $1.6 billion. Since that time, sadly, we have seen additional damage done to communities from violent storms. I gather the weather forecasters say we could see more. Mother Nature has never adhered to our congressional timetable and probably does not care much about our policies, either.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process, I continue to be troubled by the difficulty we face each year in coping with such natural disasters, emergencies whose specific timing, severity and targets are not predictable, but our only certainty is that we know that they are going to come at some time, somewhere, in some form. Somebody is going to be hurt, and we are going to have victims looking to the government for relief.

I will continue my efforts to find a better way, perhaps through a rainy-day type of reserve fund that we can better plan for these contingencies and make our spending decisions more predictable and rational in the future, but now we have to cope with the disasters at hand.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me speak in general to an issue raised by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations about funding in this bill for intelligence-related activities and programs.

There is some money within this bill for intelligence and intelligence-related activities that are critical to our national security interests. Although some have suggested that this funding is only a result of congressional prompting, let me assure the Members that this request is not from whole cloth. These are areas that the administration has identified as being a significant need at this time. The requests go to the very fiber of protecting our domestic tranquility.

This is accomplished by ensuring that we will have the human and technical means necessary to protect our deployed forces, to protect American citizens abroad and their interests, and to provide the eyes and ears that truly supply the first line of defense for our Nation.

We have let down this defense, particularly over the past year, and we have to make some repairs. These investments that we have before us are not always easy, but who among us is ready to further put our Nation at risk? I daresay, not a Member of this House.

Having been charged by all of this House to keep the portfolio on intelligence and to keep watch over this area of our national security, I can affirm to every Member that the items in this bill are needed and they are needed now.

In closing, I wish to commend, again, our colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work in getting this bill to the House expeditiously and in a fiscally responsible way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow for the consideration of H.R. 3579, which is a bill that makes $2.9 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations. As my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), has described this rule, it provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It provides an additional 30 minutes of debate on title III of the bill.

The rule self-executes three amendments. Only one amendment will be made in order on the House floor. Members will not have the opportunity to offer other amendments.

I oppose this restrictive rule, and all the Democrats on the Committee on Rules opposed it. A total of 32 amendments were submitted to the Committee on Rules. By permitting so few changes in the bill, the House will not be permitted to work its will. Members will not be able to fully represent their constituents during the floor amendment process.

The bill provides vital funding for our troops overseas and for recovery from natural disasters. That is good. However, the bill itself is seriously flawed. The increased appropriations contained in this bill are emergency spending, and they do not have to be matched with offsetting decreases in spending.

However, the Republican majority has chosen to include offsets anyway, using this bill as an excuse to cut important domestic programs. These cuts include a major reduction in housing for low-income people and the elderly. The cuts would also force the AmeriCorps program to shut down, ending this valuable source of people-to-people assistance for the poor, the needy, and the hungry.

I am constantly amazed, especially in the last few years, how, when we bring a bill like this to the floor, we, in order to find some money someplace, the first thing we do is always cut the programs that hurt the most needy of people in our country. I do not know what the reason is. It seems like maybe these people do not have a voice. They do not seem to maybe vote like they should. They do not have PACs or what have you. But we always cut them. This is another example of that.

My friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), wanted to offer an amendment striking the offsets. His amendment would remove the cuts that hurt the poor and the needy. By removing the bill's most controversial section, his amendment would reduce the chance that the bill would get bogged down in partisan politics and ensure that the emergency funds for our military troops would be delivered as quickly as possible.

The Committee on Rules denied the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) the opportunity to offer his amendment, and it denied the House the right to vote on it.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) asked the Committee on Rules permission to offer an amendment that would combine this bill with other emergency supplemental appropriations bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations. This action was requested by President Clinton.

Again, the Committee on Rules denied the gentleman from Wisconsin the opportunity to offer his amendment, and it denied the House the right to vote on it. So it went with most amendments that House Members wanted to offer.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill is a mean-spirited, controversial, and very partisan bill.

□ 1200

It should not go to the floor without the opportunity for Members to improve it. I urge the defeat of the rule.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time remains on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 20½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy at this time if the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) would yield some more of his time so we could equalize the time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed and cruel rule. This rule is cruel because it is closed and it does not allow any Democratic amendments, including the amendment that I offered to respond to the emergency facing this Nation's farmers and ranchers. It is also cruel

because it cuts programs vital to children, vital to senior citizens, immigrants, and others of those who are most unfortunate.

This closed and cruel rule does not allow an amendment that would have corrected the provision contained in the 1996 farm bill that treats American farmers and ranchers worse than we treat individuals who declare bankruptcy, worse than we treat foreign governments to whom we extend credit, and it sought to correct this provision before the planting season is over and before it is too late for many of these farmers.

Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent situation. This is an emergency situation. Contained in the 1996 farm bill is a provision that denies thousands of family farmers and ranchers eligibility to receive FSA direct and guaranteed loans if they have received a loan write-down or a settlement. There is no lending practice in the private sector as harsh and limited as the provisions in the 1996 farm bill, and it is particularly cruel because spring planting season is now and without access to credit, many farmers and ranchers will indeed go out of business and will not be able to produce.

Mr. Speaker, these farmers are not derelicts; they are hard-working citizens, many of whom face a credit crunch because of a hurricane, flooding, drought or other unanticipated economic downturn. This unique, callous provision was not contained in either the House or the Senate version of the 1996 farm bill. It was added in conference without the benefit of hearings, committee consideration or public debate. It was added without the vision of what its impacts would mean on thousands of small farmers and ranchers.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially brutal to those farmers who have been discriminated against and have pending cases. They are being denied a remedy of past discrimination, and they are also being denied the right that most of us have, a right to work and provide for their families.

It is even more astonishing that this closed rule does not permit the amendment that I offered, because the very same amendment is included in the Senate version of the emergency supplemental bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate what this rule does to small and family farmers who so much want to be a part of the American dream. But it is equally shameful that H.R. 3579, if passed, will take money from public housing and will shut down AmeriCorps.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this closed and cruel rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule which self-executes the McIntosh-Neumann amendment to H.R. 3579. This amendment expresses the sense of this House that any fiscal year 1998 emergency supplemental appropriations considered by the 105th Congress must not result in an increased level of total Federal spending.

I think it is absolutely critical that we stick to this principle in this Congress, that if we are going to spend more than the balanced budget, we will have offsets to reduce spending in other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I personally support the President's request for emergency supplemental appropriations to fund disaster relief and U.S. troop deployments in Bosnia and Iraq. However, this funding does not have to come at the expense of last year's budget agreement.

After working diligently to balance the budget for the first time in 30 years, many members of the Republican Conference, especially members of the Conservative Action Team, believe it is counterproductive for us to consider funding the President's emergency spending requests without providing the means to pay for them.

For this reason, I want to personally express my gratitude to the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman LIVINGSTON) of the Committee on Appropriations, and all of the members of that committee that voted to include a package of offsets in the emergency supplemental bill. This was the right thing to do, and I applaud their efforts.

Unfortunately, while the House bill contains these offsets, the Senate version does not. To send the strongest possible message to both the other body and the White House that this House is fully committed to offsetting the President's request for additional spending, this rule self-executes the McIntosh-Neumann amendment. This amendment demonstrates the House's commitment to fiscal responsibility and is intended to ensure that the Federal deficit does not increase as a result of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is this Congress is perfectly capable of providing emergency spending relief to disaster victims and our troops without retreating from our commitment to the American people to keep a balanced budget and not go back to deficit spending.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NADLER was allowed to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE DEATH OF FORMER CONGRESSWOMAN BELLA ABZUG

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to inform the House of the passing of a distinguished former Member of this House. Bella Abzug, who served here from 1970 to 1976 and had a distinguished career before her service here and after her service here, passed away this morning.

We will arrange a special order to talk about Bella and her many contributions to the welfare of this country. When we know about arrangements, we will inform the House, but we have just found out and she passed away just about an hour and a half ago.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for 1998 is a vicious Republican attempt to pit children against the disaster victims. It is an attempt to pit children against the situation that we find ourselves in in Bosnia.

The bill cuts bilingual and immigration education programs by $75 million. The cuts mean that half a million youngsters will be denied the opportunity to be able to learn English as quickly as possible.

I want to add again that this particular cut will strike deeply into the States of California, Florida, Texas, and several other States; that at the same time yesterday the particular amendment that came up regarding the investigation of making sure that citizens were made citizens before they vote, that that particular amendment struck at those particular States instead of trying to make it universal.

Mr. Speaker, it is a deliberate attempt to go after Hispanics. The administration strongly opposes these offsets, none of which are included in the Senate-based version of this bill. The President's senior advisors are recommending a veto of the bill as drafted in the House.

In addition, the Republican leadership has refused to let the House debate the bill under a fair rule, and we only ask that the leadership give us an opportunity to debate it in a fair rule so that we have an opportunity, so that the House, both Republicans and Democrats, will be able to vote up or down whether we should cut those education programs or not.

Bilingual and immigration education services for the neediest children are critical. This is important for them to continue to be able to learn English. For the House leadership and the Committee on Rules to deliberately not allow this democratic process to go forward, to not allow us an opportunity to continue to be able to debate this issue, is an outright attack on Hispanic youngsters throughout this country.

At a time when we are moving to a global economy, we should be making sure that youngsters learn as much about other languages as possible. We are doing just the reverse. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we make sure that we vote this down.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules, who we are pleased to welcome back.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the previous speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), I have great respect for the gentleman. He is one of the Members that stands and speaks his piece on the floor. We

know it comes from his heart, and I understand that. But maybe after the gentleman hears my statement here, he might understand a little bit, because there is certainly no intent ever to go after anyone in this country. That is why we have fought to remain the greatest, freest Nation on earth and we are the beacon of hope for all people in the world, and we want to continue to do that.

Mr. Speaker, last night I was unavoidably detained on my return from Europe where the plane we were flying in had the door burst its seals on two separate occasions and we had to return twice. I would say to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), we came back and hitched a ride back from Europe in a C–141, and I tried to sleep on the floor of that cargo plane, but it did not work. So I may not make any sense here today.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules, under the very able leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) reported out this rule which attempts to be as fair as possible while providing for expedited consideration of this emergency spending bill.

It is true that we were not able to make many amendments in order. I personally favored an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) which would have added money to badly underfunded defense procurement accounts, paid for with cuts in unproductive and unfunded foreign aid programs like aid to Russia. I would much rather have seen the offsets come from there.

But the vast majority of amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules did in fact have violations of either germaneness, and we have to pay attention to this because we, unlike the other body that has no rules over there, we have to live by the rules that we have in the House. These amendments did, in fact, violate the germaneness, legislating in appropriation bills or Budget Act waivers, and we have sworn to the men and woman that we will not bust the budget, these waivers, and we are trying to stick to that.

So all in all, this is a fair rule that will expedite this badly needed legislation in the wake of this winter's disasters around the country, whether it is El Nino in the western part of the country or the terrible ice storms up in my district, up on the Canadian border.

On the bill itself, Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that the supplemental helps alleviate some of the costs of the devastating ice storm that struck the northern part of my district, the entire northern part of New York, as well as Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine and a great deal of the Northeast, as a matter of fact. I could not possibly describe to any of my colleagues the damage that was done to the terrain, to the livelihoods and infrastructure of the area, but I ask my colleagues to just listen to a couple of them.

This storm lasted for 3 days and by many accounts left more than 5 inches of ice coating, toppling trees and telephone poles and power lines, just falling like dominos all across this entire north country in the Adirondack Mountains. One million people were without power, some for as long as 3 weeks, in the dead of winter and below zero temperatures. If any of my colleagues have had to live through that, I can tell them it was devastating.

FEMA, HUD and the SBA, among State and local government agencies, did yeoman's work in the immediate aftermath to help get people back on their feet and get their electricity back on so they would not freeze or starve to death.

However, there is still long-term damage to the roads, to the forests, whether it is the apple trees where the limbs were just totally decimated, whether it was maple trees that produced 90 percent of the syrup in this country that were just absolutely decimated, utility companies, and especially the struggling dairy farmers of that region.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am particularly pleased that this bill provides some much-needed additional relief to the dairy farmers up there who lost their livestock and lost their milk. These people, Mr. Speaker, live on an income of maybe 10 or 11 or 12 or $13,000 per year. Per year. And now they have lost 50 percent of that income for the remainder of this year. I mean, that is absolutely devastating to people like this. They operate on the tiniest of margins and a storm with devastating costs like this threatens to put them all out of business.

Thankfully, working with the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), whose district was literally devastated even more than mine, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) sitting over here, who represents the Syracuse area and some of the northern reaches, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, we were able to come through with additional relief for these farmers.

The relief came most importantly through two forms, Mr. Speaker. Four million dollars is included to help cover the cost of livestock that was lost during the storm. That is where the cows literally died because they could not be milked, and if they are not milked they die by the hundreds.

□ 1215

Just as importantly, we were able to add $6.8 million for the milk that was lost due to the power outage, and to help with diminished future production of cows who were struck with mastitis because they couldn't be milked for days.

Mr. Speaker, this is the least we can do for these areas that have been so hard hit by unexpected storms. I have stood here in this well and helped many areas throughout the country, whether it was the flooding in Iowa and North Dakota in the past, and now we would appreciate this little bit of help for the northern reaches of New York, which benefit from very, very few Federal programs. There is no way to prevent these tragedies but thankfully we can help them with this hardship. This bill starts to do that, Mr. Speaker.

On the defense portions of the bill, and this is even more important, I think, or just as important, let me say that I am extremely pleased that the additional funding for our military operations overseas is not paid for with cuts in other areas of the defense budget. That is very important.

For several years running now, this administration has made a habit of underfunding the defense budget, overcommitting our forces throughout the year time after time, and then coming to this Congress with a supplemental funding request for those operations paid for with cuts in defense procurement and research and development out of military personnel.

In other words, this administration has been robbing tomorrow's military preparedness in order to pay for the multiple overseas adventures on which they have sent the U.S. military, adventures like in Bosnia and Somalia and a half dozen other places. In fairness, most of this supplemental request is for operations in Iraq, a mission that I strongly support. However, it is imperative that even that funding not come out of tomorrow's military.

Mr. Speaker, this year we will most likely cut the defense budget for the 14th straight year, over my objections, but it is probably what will happen. And the logical, predictable results of that are now plaguing the United States Armed Forces and my colleagues all know it, if they go back home and talk to their recruiters. Our force structure has shrunk massively. The Army does not have the number of divisions today to repeat Desert Storm without pulling our forces from Bosnia and perhaps even Korea, which we cannot afford to do.

Our weapons systems are aging rapidly. I know. I was a victim of one trying to come back from Europe last night. Just the other day, the Pentagon announced it was grounding some Vietnam era Huey helicopters for safety reasons. It goes back to what we were doing with the old B–52 bombers when the doggone wings were falling off because they were so old and in disrepair.

How could this situation be? We have cut the military procurement budget by nearly 70 percent since 1985, 70 percent. What else could we expect? Recruiters are failing to meet their quotas. Go into your recruiters and ask them if they are getting a cross-section of American young men and women today. No, they are not, because they know they cannot depend on the military for a career anymore because of

what we have been doing here in Congress. Pilots are leaving the Navy and Air Force in record numbers. This slide has got to be halted, Mr. Speaker.

This bill is a good start in that direction because we do not allow for these supplemental spending increases to come out of the military budget. The choice is this: If President Clinton wants to deploy the U.S. military every time there is a problem throughout the world, some civil strife someplace, he is going to have to provide adequate funding for defense on top of it. And if he does not, he is going to have to pay for those military missions with cuts in some of the domestic spending programs that he considers a priority such as in this bill now. The bottom line is simple. There is no free lunch, Mr. Speaker.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to proceed out of order for 1 minute.)

IN HONOR OF THE MEMORY OF MICHAEL CARDIN

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we just heard, minutes ago, about the death of one of our former colleagues, Bella Abzug. She had a full career and made contributions that her talent and commitment enabled her to do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in great sadness to honor the memory of a young man who did not get the time to live out the promise of his ability, of his character, of his unbelievably goodwill. The son of our colleague, BEN CARDIN, and his wife, Myrna, died suddenly last week. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the entire House of Representatives joins me in extending condolences to the very sad Cardin family on the loss of a gifted and caring young man.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Michael Cardin since he was a very young boy. His father and I went to the general assembly in 1967 together. BEN first became a member of the Maryland general assembly on the year that Michael was born. He graduated from the University of Maryland law school on that day as well, in that year. But the proudest event of 1967 in the Cardin family was the birth of Michael.

I and some of the rest of my colleagues, perhaps, had the opportunity to watch Michael grow as he and his sister, Deborah, and their mother, Myrna, would visit their father in the House of Delegates and here in Congress. There were two characteristics, Mr. Speaker, that I remember most about Michael. He cared more for others than for himself, and he was an intelligent young man whose greatest concern was for those less fortunate than himself.

As a student at Wesleyan University in Connecticut, Michael continued to develop the commitment to serving others that he had shown even as a child. He served as editor in chief of the school newspaper where he demonstrated his strong communication skills and dedication to justice. In 1993, following in the footsteps of his grandfather, a great and good man, who has celebrated 93 years of service to his State and Nation, and his father, like both of them, Michael graduated from the University of Maryland School of Law. With his grandfather in attendance, Michael received his juris doctorate degree after hearing his father deliver the commencement address.

The occasion was a fitting honor for the Cardin family, which has contributed so very, very much to this State and this Nation. At the University of Maryland, Michael was remembered as being a talented student dedicated to becoming a lawyer to help people, not for profit. This past winter Michael was admitted to the Maryland bar, a bright future lay ahead. After passing the bar, he worked in Baltimore for the special counsel and volunteered at the Hamden Family Center working with children and families.

Everyone that I have talked to who worked with Michael at the Hamden Center said he was one of the brightest lights for all the children who were benefited by that center. His willingness to help others has always been a core value to Michael, and he demonstrated it in every part of his life.

At the service this past Sunday, his father rose and said that there were many instances of which he and Myrna had no knowledge, incidents that demonstrated with individual people, homeless, children, people in trouble, Michael repeatedly showed the character that he had, which I suspect was in his genes, because it was consistent with the Cardin contribution.

Mr. Speaker, Michael was 30 years of age. He left us too soon. All those who know him are heart sick. We can take comfort, perhaps, in knowing that in the time he spent with us he made a tremendous difference in the lives of all those he touched. His parents can take comfort in knowing, and I know they do, that Michael was a wonderful son from a wonderful family.

I do not know any family that I have ever met, Mr. Speaker, that is more supportive, closer, more giving, more respectful of one another than the family headed by BEN and Myrna Cardin. They are wonderful human beings, good and decent people who loved and nurtured their son without reservation. Michael, for the 30 years that he had, got the best that there was in the Cardin family.

I know that all my colleagues who know BEN so well, some who know Myrna and some who know Michael will join all of us in Maryland in honoring the memory of Michael Cardin, this compassionate and caring young man, and we will join together in extending our deepest sympathies, love and caring to BEN, Myrna, the Cardin family. We are a lesser land for Michael's loss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) will not come out of the time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL).

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if I might just speak out of order for 30 seconds, I would like to join with my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) to just let our good friend, BEN CARDIN, know on his first day back how much we care for him, how much we respect what he has accomplished here in the House but, more importantly, the kind of individual he is, and how much he has given, not only to his family, but to his country, and the quiet confidence that he walks these halls with and the important contribution that he will continue to make to this country. BEN, you are a dear friend to many of us, and we welcome you back.

Given the gravity of these last few minutes on the House floor, it seems almost inconsequential to go back to the normal business of what we take up in this Chamber. But the bill that is before the House today, which will provide badly needed assistance and aid to families throughout our country that have been devastated by storms, to people in Bosnia, and to our military troops is something that everyone on both sides of the aisle support. There is money in our country to provide that support. In fact, as many of us have talked about, for the first time in several decades, there is actually going to be a surplus this year. But rather than deal with that surplus issue, what this bill says is something different.

What this bill says is in order to provide payments to these programs, we are going to go out and we are going to cut money that needs to be spent to fight homelessness in America. We are going to go out and cut money that needs to be spent on providing Section 8 housing. We are going to provide cuts on money that needs to be spent on education programs.

There is no reason, there is no reason why we have to cut the homeless, why we have to cut Section 8 housing, why we have to cut education in order to fund people that have been devastated by storms. There is a process laid out called emergency spending. The President has paid attention to that process. He has declared an emergency. That is what this bill is about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has 19 minutes remaining.

□ 1230

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, we are all in favor of emergency help to people who suffered from storms and to pay the bills for what we are doing in Bosnia. But, Mr. Speaker, some of the offsets here are unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, in the entire budget there is $10 billion for section 8 housing. This is not for new section 8 units.

This is for supplementing the rent payments of low-income people in existing housing. This bill proposes to cut that by $2.2 billion, 22 percent.

And since there is no new section 8 housing, what does it mean? It means we are going to not renew the contracts of existing section 8s. It means that, in the next couple of years, we are going to say to 350,000 families, leave your homes. We are going to throw them out on the street. We are going to tell them the subsidies end. The rent doubled, they are guaranteed not to be able to pay that because, if they could afford it, they would not be in the program in the first place.

So, in order to meet some people's definition that we should not fund emergency programs out of emergency funds, those 350,000 people are out of their homes. I hope that is not what we want to do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), who is on the Committee on Appropriations and who is able to talk on this subject.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and also in strong support of the emergency supplemental. This rule allows for emergency disaster help to thousands of people throughout the country, and it also allows for a manager's amendment that will allow for additional CDBG funds which are offset.

Mr. Speaker, these people were harmed by these storms. They lost livestock. They in many cases lost the farm in this disaster.

In the northern part of New York State, literally thousands of power poles came down when the ice came. And then the wires laid across the road. Snow came on top of the wires. The plows could not get out. The roads were closed.

Farmers were absolutely isolated. Some of these folks live on roads 2 miles off the main drag with nothing on their road but their farm. So they were in a terrible condition. We need to get this aid to them as quickly as possible so that they can get about getting their lives back in order.

Mr. Speaker, we have done the responsible thing. We have chosen to offset these expenditures. That has not been done in the past. We put it on the credit card and let our children pay for those bills. We are going to pay for these expenses now.

The way we do it primarily is through section 8 housing. And the comments have been made that we are going to put people out on the street, that people are going to lose their subsidies, that they are going to be thrown out of their homes. That is not true, Mr. Speaker. That is absolutely not true.

These are future obligations under section 8 housing. These are next year's expenditures under section 8 housing. Our subcommittee, under the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, has pledged to make this program whole. These funds will be put into the budget.

But, Mr. Speaker, if the President of the United States had done the responsible thing and funded the military adventures that he is not paying for, we would not be put in this position.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it pains me to talk about the situation in which we find ourselves. Our colleague from New York pointed out a few moments ago the underfunding of the defense budget, and I agree; of our overcommitting our troops, and I agree. But that is not the issue before us today.

The issue before us today is whether we truly recognize an emergency, as has been so recognized by the White House and has been so recognized by the Senate, or whether this is to be an offset against other items in the budget.

The rule before us authorizes us to take up a bill that allows offsets. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a mistake. This is a matter of process. It is a matter of doing it right. Though 80 percent of the bill's appropriations are for military programs, all of the measures are offsets in the domestic programs. I think there should be no offsets, whether they come from the military or whether they come from the domestic.

This is an emergency. We do not plan on hurricanes. We do not plan on tornadoes. We do not plan on floods. We do not plan on those international crises, such as Bosnia and Iraq. And yet, this is not treated as an emergency.

This bill rescinds money from the low-income rental housing assistance, from the airport program, from the National Community Service Program, from bilingual education. Should this bill pass in this forum, it is a sure invitation for a presidential veto, an invitation that I am sure will not be refused.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask for a statement of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) controls 8 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) controls 16 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me the time; and I rise in what I would call tepid support of the rule here.

I believe that what we are going through could be prevented, and I think we need to start discussing this on the floor of the House of Representatives. We may have a balanced budget this year, I think CBO says by perhaps $8 billion. But in the 5 years, now my sixth year, that I have been in this Congress, every year we have wrestled at least once, if not more than once, with the emergency appropriations process; and the question is, do we offset it or not offset it? And now that we are starting to balance the budget, we are starting to offset it.

If we do not offset it, all of a sudden we have spending out there which has just been added to the debt in the past and now may take away from the surplus in the future.

If we do offset it, what are we going to offset it with? There lies an entirely different fight, which we will get into later when we get to the bill itself.

But the bottom line is there is a way of avoiding this. I have introduced legislation to this effect which is of a particular consequence because it is budget mechanisms we need to look at. A budget reserve account would do this. They do it in virtually every State and city and county government now. They have an emergency set-aside so that if they run into problems such as these very real emergencies, and they are going to happen, then they are able to pay for it out of that amount of money, which is built into the budget to begin with, and we prevent all this.

Do we not all want to prevent this? Can anybody possibly enjoy what we are going through here?

It is very simple. We look back over a period of 10 years. It comes out to about $5 billion or $6 billion a year. We already have the White House preparing another emergency request right now which would fall into this. If there are large exceptions, such as a war, whatever it may be, obviously, we would have to waive the act in that circumstance and treat it in a different sense. But for the average expenditure, the average emergency which comes along, it could fit into that. And then, instead of talking about set-asides and how we are going to pay for it, that amount of money would already be put into our budget. It makes all the sense in the world.

And, yes, there is a jolt when we initially do it; but the bottom line is this is less than 1 percent of the entire budget amount that we appropriate each year. There is simply no reason why we are not able to do it. It is called a rainy day fund in some States. I think we should call it a budget reserve account.

I believe we should do it. I believe we should do it rapidly so that we can prevent these incredible struggles, which are very counterproductive to what we are doing in Congress.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me also add my sympathy and love to the Cardin family.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), said, it seems almost without meaning to be here discussing these issues at this very sad time for one of our colleagues. But I do want to say that what concerns me about this legislation, and I vigorously oppose the rule, is that we seem to be returning to the radical legislative agenda of the 104th Congress, no bipartisanship, no caring.

There is no doubt that we are concerned as Americans about those who have suffered at the hand of these terrible, disastrous weather events. However, this supplemental appropriations legalization that we bring today is a cold wind from the winter as we enter into the spring to displace thousands upon millions of citizens out of their housing by cutting $2.2 billion from Section 8 housing for those who need housing in this Nation? Twenty-five thousand people are on the list needing public housing in Houston, Texas, alone.

Section 8 housing gives a push to those who are moving from welfare to work. It allows opportunities for young families and women to be housed throughout the community. We are pitting airline safety with housing for the poor. How tragic. How ridiculous. How shameless. Vote no on this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my dissent to the rule prohibiting the two amendments I offered to the emergency supplemental appropriations bill.

The first amendment moved to strike the rescission of $1.9 billion cuts from the Department of Health and Urban Development (HUD) Section 8 program. The program provides Section 8 subsidies to owners of low income housing.

The program is among our Nation's core housing programs—it provides safe, decent and affordable housing to families, the elderly and the disabled.

It is, therefore, a shame that I will not be able to give voice to the supporters of the Section 8 program since there are many supporters. The American people strongly support this program. The administration and the Banking Committee Democrats support this program.

Because of the Draconian cuts in this program, 2.1 million units now are at risk and 4.4 million Americans face the cold possibility of homelessness.

Let me be clear: A vote to restore the funds taken away from the Section 8 contract subsidies is not in any way a vote against the expenditures for recovery efforts from natural disasters, support of our troops in Bosnia, IMF loans or the payment of arrearages to the U.N. The two are unrelated. Therefore, it is disappointing to me that the Section 8 subsidies were used to offset the emergency appropriations when such offsets were not required to keep the budget balanced. We had the opportunity to provide for the Section 8 program and to address the urgent needs arising in Bosnia and areas hit by natural disasters at home. What we chose instead was to tell the American people that although we are engaged in a peacekeeping mission in Bosnia and attending to the victims of natural disasters around the country, there will be no relief for the economically disadvantaged, the elderly and the disabled to maintain affordable housing.

The second amendment moved to strike the rescission of $250 million from the AmeriCorps program in the supplemental emergency appropriations bill. AmeriCorps embodies the spirit of public service where young people nationwide are involved in community work, education and senior citizen programs.

The National Service Program was founded in the same tradition created by President Kennedy, who challenged each American citizen, ''ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country'' according to the CEO of Corporation for National Service, Harris Wofford, the Rescissions mean that approximately 85% of all AmeriCorps programs will be shut down by September 1, and no new programs will start as planned this coming summer and fall. In addition, eighty percent of the Learn and Serve America Program will be closed. For the residents of my home State of Texas, the cuts mean that the AmeriCorps state program will be slashed from $14 million to $2 million; the AmeriCorps National Program, from $2 million to $500,000; the Learn and Serve America Program, from $2 million to $500,000. The total amount of cuts is nearly $16 million.

AmeriCorps encourages its members to attend college by offering financial assistance for tuition purposes if they complete a term of service. In a single stroke, the rescissions will squash any hopeful expectations that the 4,181 currently qualified AmeriCorps members in Texas may have had to apply for the education awards.

In summary, the fate of the AmeriCorps Program is now tied to that of the emergency supplemental bill and unnecessarily, I may add. I hope that for the sake of our young people that AmeriCorps will be saved.

Thank you for allowing me to voice my dissent to the rule before the committee.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of maintaining our presence in Bosnia until lasting peace is established. I was privileged to visit our troops in Bosnia to witness the progress being made. Our continued presence in that region is important to the stability of the region. Yet I rise to oppose the rule and the emergency supplemental appropriation bill.

It is a disservice to Americans to force Congress to vote between full funding of important domestic programs and funding for peacekeeping. It is a disservice that is not necessary. These appropriations do not have to be offset. A choice between helping the survivors of genocide overseas and the much-needed domestic programs in the United States is a choice worthy of this House.

$1.9 billion in low-income housing assistance is at risk here, resulting in more than 800,000 Americans losing their housing beginning in October, many of them elderly. The Bible says, ''Who among you, when your brother asks for bread, would give him a stone?'' I ask, who among you, when your brother asks for shelter, would you turn a deaf ear? Who among you, when your brother suffers from devastation in one place, would take money from brothers in another place where they suffered devastation?

We speak of the requirements of budget mechanisms. Let us also speak of the requirements of people who are trying to survive.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, let me quote from a letter that I recently received from Colchester, Vermont, from a senior citizen who does not have a lot of money. She wrote, ''The list of persons who qualify for the section 8 program'' that she is applying for ''puts my name on a list with 990 persons ahead of me. When you enter your seventh and eighth decade, you don't have to be a rocket scientist to surmise that the likelihood of ever deriving benefit from this program is pretty minimal.'' And that is the story all over this country, elderly people needing affordable housing, working people needing affordable housing.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we have given huge tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America, when we spend $2 billion for B–2 bombers that the Pentagon does not want, when we provide $125 billion a year on corporate welfare, we do not have to continue the assault on affordable housing and on education.

Yes, the Northeast and the rest of this country was hurt by a disaster; and, as Americans, we must rise up, as we always have, to protect those people who were hurt. But let us not take away from the elderly and the working people and the poor to do so. It is unnecessary. Vote down this rule and support emergency relief.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while I am not authorized, I think on behalf of the Clinton administration I can thank the Republican Party.

There has been a lot of controversy about the President's decision to have troops in Bosnia. This bill, if it passes as is, will give him full legal authorization to keep troops in Bosnia longer.

The current law says the funding runs out June 30. This appropriations bill specifically earmarks $486 million to continue the troops in Bosnia beyond the June 30 deadline. For as long as this appropriations bill is in effect, it gives the President the authority to keep the troops in Bosnia.

Now I differ with the President. Because the Republican Party believes that to pay for the additional 3 months

in Bosnia prospective, not because of any back pay, we should cut section 8. The President and the Republican Party both want to keep troops in Bosnia for 3 more months. I disagree. The Republicans want to pay for it in part with section 8 reductions. The President disagrees.

I think the President's position, while wrong, is a little better than theirs. But be very clear, if we pass this bill—and I offered an amendment that was rejected by the Committee on Rules that would have let the House vote and restrict and give the President only 1 more month in Bosnia and then they would have had to pull out in 90 days. But this bill, and we are not talking about past money owed to Bosnia that was authorized and appropriated through June 30, this bill says $486 million for July and August and September.

□ 1245

Pass this bill as is, those of my colleagues who vote for this rule and this bill, and understand that there is no basis for criticizing the placement of the troops in Bosnia. My colleagues are voting here prospectively to give the President authority, but I am not sure how grateful he will be in the end.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, let me say what worries me about this whole procedure.

We anticipated that this bill would come out of committee not offset. We expected to have some sort of a vote on the floor, where on the floor they could make a decision one way or the other.

Now the normal procedure in the House is that we pass a version and the Senate passes another version, and in most cases we can reconcile that. Here is the problem with this bill: This bill is so different from the Senate version of the bill. From everything I can get from the Defense Department, there is a high degree of possibility that we will be laying off civilian employees in the Defense Department after this is passed because they cannot anticipate that a bill will be passed finally that will be agreed to beyond the Senate and the House.

For instance, the version in the Senate side has IMF in, it has all the things that many Members in the House do not agree on. The House obviously does not have all those things in it. The Mexico City language will come into play.

So we have a strong possibility, if this rule passes and we are not able to amend it, that this bill may never be passed into law. It means that training will be cut back substantially, it means that we could only train at the platoon level, that recruiting would have to be cut back. The Defense Department right now is working on a plan about what they would have to do because there is only four months left in the end of the fiscal year after we get back in June.

So I would urge the Members to vote against this rule. I will offer a motion to reconsider in the bill which will eliminate the offsets, and I think it is important that the Members of the House recognize the seriousness that this supplemental is in if it passes the House because there is a great danger that neither will be reconciled and that the Defense Department, because of the short time they have left, will lay off substantial numbers of civilian employees.

So I urge the Members to vote against this rule, come back with another rule where we can offer some amendments which will allow us to adjust the bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN).

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the Committee on Rules for making the amendment, the Neumann-McIntosh amendment, self-enacting in this rule. The amendment that we propose to this bill would simply say that if we spend money, if our generation is going to spend money on something useful and productive, that we have to pay the bill for it.

I have heard a lot of discussion out here today about whether or not this should be paid for, or offset, as we call it here in Washington. We need to all understand that the alternative is not simply that money is going to flow to here from heaven or some other way. The alternative to not paying for this bill is that we simply add it to the debt that is going to be passed on to our children.

I am not opposed to spending money for an emergency disaster relief bill. I think that most people in Wisconsin and most people in this country would look at a disaster situation and say we are willing to help the folks that have been hit by this disaster. I think that is common sense in America, and I think common decency in America would allow us to do that. The question is, when we spend the money to help those people where the disaster has occurred, do we offset that spending by reducing government spending elsewhere someplace in the budget, and that is really what is being debated here.

I heard a lot from the other side that we cannot do the offsets in the way they have been proposed, but I have heard very little about what we might do instead to reduce wasteful Washington or wasteful government spending someplace else. If somebody has got a better idea of how to reduce spending elsewhere so that we do not have to pass this additional expenditure on to our kids, I for one would certainly be listening.

But the bottom line is this: If our generation is going to spend money on something, on virtually anything, whether it be disaster relief or to pay for the fact that our President has forced our troops to stay in Bosnia or the Iraqi situation, when our generation spends that money, we do have a moral and ethical responsibility to pay for what we are spending.

Before 1995 nobody ever paid for these bills. They just simply spent the money, and it was tacked onto the amount of debt that we are going to pass on to our children. Since 1995 I am happy to say that has changed, and since 1995 every time one of these supplementals the has been proposed, at least in budget authority the spending has been offset. That is, we have paid attention to where the money is coming from.

Somehow in this city, in Washington, D.C., I get out here and there seems to be this huge disconnect between spending money and where the money is coming from. That money is coming from the taxpayers' pocket; it is not free.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the situation is that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has one more speaker, and he is going to yield to that speaker in a minute. I am going to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and then ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) to close for our side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Alan Greenspan has told us that we dare not break the budget caps, that the growing economy, interest rates, low inflation are because of that, that the balanced budget is a very important document that we bipartisanly worked on in this House. But if my colleagues take a look, we pay nearly a billion dollars a day on just the interest of the debt. That is before we pay for anything, one area.

Now some of us feel that those offsets, some offsets are good, but one cannot find any offsets in this body that people will agree on that is not painful, should it be National Endowment for the Arts, should it be AmeriCorps that costs $27,000 per volunteer, should it be such things as bilingual education, which over 72 percent of Californians want to get rid of because we are last in literacy, it has been in effect all this time.

But regardless, it is difficult, and we are going to have to make those kinds of decisions, but we feel that instead of going ahead and spending the money, which when we did not have the majority was the case for 30 years that put us into debt, then we have got to offset these and it is going to be painful.

I disagree with my own side on the housing issue; I think that is one area where we need to invest, but I would also say that Somalia was put there by the White House. The White House did Haiti without our input, they armed the Muslims in Bosnia without our

input, they kept us in Bosnia, $16 billion without any offsets or just increases in spending.

And so when we make these deployments, 300 percent uptempo increase for our military while it is about half the size, it means our kids are overseas and doing three times the work and we have a retention rate of our senior enlisted of only 24 percent. That means the quality. Our equipment is 1970s technology. I have got squadrons that have one or two airplanes left in the United States because their parts and all the equipment has got to be to the deployed units. And our kids are saying, ''Enough is enough, in a growing economy I can't hack this away from my family.''

We need to offset this. The fraud, waste and abuse in the military and other areas we need to eliminate, and it is going to be a difficult job, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) certainly the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) very much for the time.

Let us review why we are here. We have this legislation before us today because the President determined that we had an emergency with respect to Iraq; that we have an emergency need for additional funds to support our troops in Bosnia; that we have had a number of natural disasters around the country which require assistance to localities; we had a severe economic emergency facing the country because of the collapse of Asian currencies, something which will result in a huge trade deficit in this country which will close American factories and put American workers out of work; and that it was also time for us to pay the almost $1 billion in back dues that we owe the United Nations and its associated agencies.

The normal process under the budget rules is that, if the President declares an emergency and if Congress concurs, that these funds will be provided without offsets, on the theory, for instance, that if God decides that there is going to be a hurricane somewhere, he does not first have to check with the House of Representatives to make certain that his actions fit under our rules. Some people I guess disagree with that.

The response that we have had from the Congress and from the majority party leadership has been to insist that a number of large cuts in domestic programs be attached to the President's emergency request. And what has happened is that instead of dealing with this bill in an atmosphere of conciliation and partnership, instead we are facing an atmosphere of extreme confrontation as a result of that decision.

Now I believe there are 3 basic problems with the rule before us and with the legislation before us. First of all, it strips out of the bill any ability to deal with the economic crunch facing the country because of the disequilibrium between Asian currencies and our own. That is, in my view, the most serious economic problem faced by the country at this time. And yet we are not going to be allowed to do anything about that despite the fact that the President requested we do so on an emergency basis.

Secondly, this proposal blocks our consideration of 75 percent of the President's request for disaster assistance. That will mean that if we have one more major storm in summer, our ability to deal with emergency needs of communities will be gone, it will be eliminated, we will not have funds readily available to deal with those problems and we could face not only substantial delay in providing assistance to those communities, but they would also see the need for FEMA to take money from States who have already experienced disasters in order to try to deal with those emergency problems. That would slow down the recovery effort in States that are already receiving Federal funds.

Thirdly, it breaches the agreement of the budget deal last year which said that we would not raid domestic programs to pay for defense and we would not raid defense programs to pay for domestic, we would keep a fire wall between the two. This blows that away. Instead it says we are going to cut $2.2 billion in housing costs.

Now it was asserted by one Member on that side of the aisle that that will not cause a problem because these funds are not needed until next year. The fact is we do not just need $2.2 billion in funds next year in order to renew the contracts for subsidized housing for low-income citizens and the elderly. We need $10.8 billion in the budget next year for that purpose or else, if we do not provide that $10.8 billion, there are going to be millions of low-income people and senior citizens knocked out of their housing.

This bill takes 20 percent of that money and uses it for this purpose. That means if it is not replaced, if it is not replaced we will have 935,000 low-income Americans evicted from their supported housing, and one-third of those folks are elderly. I do not believe that is what America wants to see done.

This bill also terminates one of the President's favorite programs in a stick-it-in-your-eye response to the President, namely AmeriCorps.

It also cuts $75 million from bilingual education. I do not know about my colleagues' districts, but in my district I have thousands of Hmong refugees who do not even have a written language, who desperately need help in order to learn language, and I resent the fact that my local taxpayers are going to get stuck with the tab because the Federal Government will not meet its responsibilities in this area.

This reminds me of something an old friend of mine used to say when I served with him in the legislature, a fellow by the name of Harvey Dueholm who said, ''You know the problem in American politics is that all too often the poor and the rich get the same amount of ice, but the poor get theirs in the wintertime.''

□ 1300

That is what the Congress is doing by reshuffling priorities the way it is doing it here. I can find no rule, I can find no rule, which governs the debate for supplementals, I can find no rule that has ever in the past denied the minority an opportunity to offer an amendment to a supplemental appropriation. But that is what this rule does. That alone is reason enough for Members to turn it down.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, in its refusal to move ahead with the IMF, represents a reckless disregard for the future economic security needs of this country, and we ought not to ignore that problem today.

There is one other problem associated with the bill. I will be moving immediately after the rule to ask the House to go into executive session, that means secret session, to discuss a classified item in this bill.

The reason I need to do that is because last year this Congress made significant cuts in the intelligence programs of the country in order to pay for a number of projects not requested by the administration. The two major add-ons in the bill last year were a $700 million piece of pork for the Senate majority leader in Mississippi, and a $500 million piece of pork for the Speaker of the House in his home State of Georgia.

Now, this bill would make further domestic cuts in order to restore some of those intelligence fund reductions. Since that funding is contained in the classified portion of the bill, the House has to go into executive session to discuss this bait-and-switch strategy. So I will be making that motion at the end of consideration of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote ''no'' on the rule, to vote ''no'' on the gag rule, and to vote ''no'' on the bill. This is no way to establish bipartisan consensus. This is no way to establish a decent working relationship between the executive and legislative branches of government.

We need to try to find common ground between the two parties. I thought we had done that fairly well in the appropriations process last year, but apparently the confrontation artists in the majority caucus won the day, and so the rule today, instead of cooperation, is going to be confrontation. I think that is highly unfortunate. I think the best way to avoid needless confrontation is to turn down this rule and start over.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to Members in response to a procedural statement just made by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that there is no need

for the House to go into secret session, because the gentleman's complaint is about the offsets, not about the need for the intelligence matters.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, in 2 minutes I certainly do not have time to respond to all of the arguments I heard here today. I just want to remind Members that in the last 13 years, we have seen the investment in our national security go down dramatically every year, while at the same time spending on the other parts of the government was going up, up and up. So the argument that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has just made about domestic spending versus national security, I think Members should analyze that very closely before making that decision.

I was interested in the comment that our colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) made about not voting for the supplemental that provides for the balance of the year in Bosnia. I would say to the gentleman, whether you vote for that or not, the President is not going to bring those troops home at the end of June. We know that and the gentleman knows that.

The proof of the pudding is that in 5 years the President, without the approval of the Congress, has deployed troops to the area near Iraq, to Bosnia, to Somalia, to Rwanda, to Haiti and to a number of other places, without having the money in advance, and then he sent us the bill.

The problem is we did not appropriate any of this money up front, but we got the bill and we had to pay for it. And if we do not pay for those supplementals, and the biggest part of this defense supplemental, by the way, is not Bosnia, but for the deployment to the Southwest Asia area, but if we do not provide these funds that are already spent, we are going to have to stand down training.

Tomorrow is the beginning of the third quarter of this fiscal year. The Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps are all going to have to stand down training. They are not going to be able to get the spare parts that they need to keep the equipment working that is already being worn out. Our troops are being worn out because of these deployments.

There is no question we have to pay the bill in order to support our own troops. But we would be better served if we were to get the message to the President that before you start these major deployments that you will send us the bill for later on, you had better come to Congress and get some kind of support here, or at least some indication of whether you have the support or not.

Mr. Speaker, we will go into more of the details as we have more time as we debate the bill itself.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would urge a ''no'' vote on this rule.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 199, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—220

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
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
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
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
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
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
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—199

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
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)
Kennedy (RI)
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 (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Baesler
Cannon
Davis (IL)
Gonzalez
Jefferson
Paxon
Payne
Rangel
Riggs
Royce
Waters

□ 1324

Mr. BERRY and Mr. MCHALE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. HEFLEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MOTION THAT THE HOUSE RESOLVE ITSELF INTO SECRET SESSION

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, to enable the House to discuss an item in the classified annex to this bill, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves, pursuant to rule XXIX, that the House resolve itself into secret session, that the galleries of the House Chamber be cleared of all persons, and that the House Chamber be cleared of all persons except the Members of the House and those officers and employees specified by the Speaker whose attendance on the floor is essential to the functioning of the House and who subscribe to the notarized oath of confidentiality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) qualifies by citing rule XXIX that he has secret communications to make to the House.

The question is on the nondebatable motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 227, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

AYES—194

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
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
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
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 (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
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
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—227

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
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
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
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
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
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
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
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
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra
Cannon
Gonzalez
Hoyer
Jefferson
Payne
Rangel
Riggs
Royce
Waters

☐ 1345

Mr. PICKERING changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 111

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JOHN PORTER) as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 111.

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

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 3579) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

## 1998 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 402 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3579.

☐ 1348

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 3579) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), each will control 30 minutes of debate confined to the bill; and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) and a Member opposed, each will control 15 minutes of debate confined to title III.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the rule here to be structured, there will be 60 minutes debate on the present bill and then the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) will be debating for 30 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that the first 30 minutes be debated on the underlying measure, the middle 30 minutes to be shared equally, 15 minutes by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), 15 minutes by myself leading in opposition, with the remaining 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON).

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have just had a rule passed which denied the minority an opportunity to offer any significant amendment whatsoever. It is a rule that I strenuously opposed and asked the House to turn down.

Now I understand that the gentleman is asking unanimous consent that some other arrangement be agreed to other than that in the rule. I, for the life of me, do not understand why we ought to do that. If Members did not like the rule, then I wish they would have followed my request and voted against it as I did.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, the only reason I asked for this is to make sure that the debate is structured. If we are going to take the 90 minutes and have it commingled with the measure of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), it would be lost in the debate. Not only for the Members, but also for the American people to understand this important measure with regard to tying the hands of the Presidency, we should be able to debate for clarity.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's concern, but with all due respect, we wanted the debate structured, too. We wanted to have a structured debate on offsets. We wanted to have a structured debate on the fact that this rule does not allow 75 percent of the President's request. We wanted a structured rule, too. We were not given that. Under those circumstances, I do not see why I should accommodate this request when we were turned down on every single request that we made to structure the rule.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, this is our opportunity to structure a debate so that there will be clarity and understanding.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, our opportunity was by voting down the rule and coming back with a new rule. That is the way the House is supposed to operate under regular order. If the gentleman was not satisfied with the rule, he should have voted against it.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I think what we have is an ambiguity in the way the rule deals with this 30 minutes allocated to this particular issue. I would assume the Chair has discretion, given that ambiguity, to deal with it as seems reasonable. I had understood the gentleman from Wisconsin in particular, through his staff, to be concerned that we not have this 30-minute debate follow the general debate on the bill. I think that is what informs the gentleman from Indiana.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. On the assumption that the gentleman from Wisconsin yields for the purpose, the gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I understand we have pending a reservation on my unanimous consent request. My parliamentary inquiry is, is it within the prerogative of the Chair to designate time if there is 60 minutes debate on the underlying measure, and in the rule it states 30 minutes on the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), whether the first 60 minutes would in fact be on Mr. LIVINGSTON's bill, and the remainder on the Skaggs provision, would it be within the Chair's prerogative to designate the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair intends at this moment to accommodate the preference of the chairman of the committee, as the rule is structured, by starting with the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, for the reasons I have stated, since we were given no consideration whatsoever in our desire to offer even a single amendment to this amendment, I object to the unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to bring this emergency supplemental appropriations bill to the floor today. This bill provides important funding to sustain our troops in Bosnia and in Iraq in the amount of $1.8 billion. It also provides $575 million in assistance to those suffering from natural disasters throughout the country.

Since this last fall, there have been typhoons, ice storms, excessive rains causing flooding and mud slides, beach erosion, late spring hard freezes and tornadoes. Because of these extreme weather conditions, there has been significant widespread damage to crops, livestock, natural resources and the country's infrastructure.

The funding in this bill provides assistance to farmers, ranchers and dairymen. It funds repairs to highways, railroads, harbors and flood control facilities, national parks, forests and wildlife refuges and agricultural flood prevention facilities. In addition to providing direct support to the troops in Bosnia and Iraq, the bill also funds repairs to military facilities caused by typhoons, ice storms and the El Nino-related extreme weather.

The funding in this bill is fully offset with an equal amount of rescissions. This is consistent with the policy adopted by the Republican majority when we took control of the Congress in January of 1995. The struggle to offset emergency supplemental bills gets harder every year. With lean regular appropriations bills and half the year already over, it is even more difficult.

The leadership, and I agree that we should not go deeper into the defense function to pay for peacekeeping missions. And, in fact, I think one can make a very good case that the non-deployed forces would be unfairly robbed to keep the deployed forces going.

After a very tight regular defense appropriations bill and a continued proliferation of unbudgeted peacekeeping missions, we are simply not able to find the defense programs and activities that we could reduce that are removed from the direct support of the peacekeeping missions, which would also not hurt overall national security. Cutting them would only result in a weakening of one element of national security to help another. It makes no sense to hobble national security in this manner. Therefore, the offsets included in the bill are all in the non-defense area.

The funds proposed for rescission are generally in excess to those that would be needed this fiscal year. They have no impact during this fiscal year for the most part. You will hear a lot of worried talk today about the impact of those rescissions and their impact will not be felt if their restoration is accomplished later on.

But they are excess funds right now, and we need offsets, and that is why we have chosen them. We will be able to consider restoring them at the appropriate time later on. We need to pass this bill today to move the process forward, making emergency supplemental

appropriations a real possibility. I urge support of this fiscally responsible bill.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert a detailed table reflecting the status of this bill since adoption of the rule governing its consideration.

## EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 1998 (H.R. 3579)

| Doc No. | | Supplemental Request | Recommendation | Recommendation compared with request |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | FY 1998 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS | | | |
| | TITLE I - EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS | | | |
| | CHAPTER 1 | | | |
| | DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | | | |
| | Farm Service Agency | | | |
| 105-220 | Emergency conservation program (contingent emergency appropriations) | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | ..... |
| ..... | Tree assistance program (contingent emergency appropriations) | ..... | 4,700,000 | +4,700,000 |
| | Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account: | | | |
| | Emergency insured loans: | | | |
| 105-220 | (Loan authorization) | (87,000,000) | (87,000,000) | ..... |
| 105-220 | Loan subsidy (emergency appropriations) | 6,000,000 | ..... | -6,000,000 |
| 105-220 | Contingent emergency appropriations | 15,000,000 | 21,000,000 | +6,000,000 |
| | Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account | 21,000,000 | 21,000,000 | ..... |
| | Total, Farm Service Agency | 41,000,000 | 45,700,000 | +4,700,000 |
| | Commodity Credit Corporation Fund | | | |
| 105-220 | Dairy and livestock disaster assistance program (emergency appropriations) | 4,000,000 | ..... | -4,000,000 |
| ..... | Livestock disaster assistance fund (contingent emergency appropriations) | ..... | 4,000,000 | +4,000,000 |
| ..... | Dairy production indemnity assistance program (contingent emergency appropriations) | ..... | 6,800,000 | +6,800,000 |
| | Total, Commodity Credit Corporation | 4,000,000 | 10,800,000 | +6,800,000 |
| | Natural Resources Conservation Service | | | |
| 105-220 | Watershed and flood prevention operations (emergency appropriations) | 5,000,000 | ..... | -5,000,000 |
| 105-220 | Contingent emergency appropriations | 35,000,000 | 65,000,000 | +30,000,000 |
| | Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service | 40,000,000 | 65,000,000 | +25,000,000 |
| | Total, Chapter 1: | | | |
| | New budget (obligational) authority | 85,000,000 | 121,500,000 | +36,500,000 |
| | Emergency appropriations | (15,000,000) | ..... | (-15,000,000) |
| | Contingent emergency appropriations | (70,000,000) | (121,500,000) | (+51,500,000) |
| | (Loan authorization) | (87,000,000) | (87,000,000) | ..... |
| | CHAPTER 2 | | | |
| | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY | | | |
| | Military Personnel | | | |
| 105-220 | Military personnel, Army (emergency appropriations) | 184,000,000 | 184,000,000 | ..... |
| 105-220 | Military personnel, Navy (emergency appropriations) | 22,300,000 | 22,300,000 | ..... |
| 105-220 | Military personnel, Marine Corps (emergency appropriations) | 5,100,000 | 5,100,000 | ..... |
| 105-220 | Military personnel, Air Force (emergency appropriations) | 10,900,000 | 10,900,000 | ..... |
| 105-220 | Reserve personnel, Navy (emergency appropriations) | 4,100,000 | 4,100,000 | ..... |
| | Total, Military personnel | 226,400,000 | 226,400,000 | ..... |
| | Operation and Maintenance | | | |
| 105-220 | Operation and maintenance, Army (emergency appropriations) | 1,886,000 | 1,886,000 | ..... |
| ..... | Contingent emergency appropriations | ..... | 700,000 | +700,000 |
| 105-220 | Operation and maintenance, Navy (emergency appropriations) | 48,100,000 | 48,100,000 | ..... |
| ..... | Contingent emergency appropriations | ..... | 5,700,000 | +5,700,000 |
| ..... | Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps (contingent emergency appropriations) | ..... | 26,810,000 | +26,810,000 |
| 105-220 | Operation and maintenance, Air Force (emergency appropriations) | 27,400,000 | 27,400,000 | ..... |
| ..... | Contingent emergency appropriations | ..... | 21,800,000 | +21,800,000 |
| 105-220 | Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (emergency appropriations) | 1,390,000 | 1,390,000 | ..... |
| 105-220 | Contingent emergency appropriations | 50,000,000 | ..... | -50,000,000 |
| 105-220 | Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve (emergency appropriations) | 650,000 | 650,000 | ..... |
| 105-220 | Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve (emergency appropriations) | 229,000 | 229,000 | ..... |
| 105-220 | Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard (emergency appropriations) | 175,000 | 175,000 | ..... |
| ..... | Contingent emergency appropriations | ..... | 5,750,000 | +5,750,000 |
| ..... | Operations and maintenance, Air National Guard (contingent emergency appropriations) | ..... | 975,000 | +975,000 |
| 105-220 | Overseas contingency operations transfer fund (emergency appropriations) | 1,621,900,000 | 1,829,900,000 | +208,000,000 |
| | Total, Operation and maintenance | 1,751,730,000 | 1,971,465,000 | +219,735,000 |
| | Emergency appropriations | (1,701,730,000) | (1,909,730,000) | (+208,000,000) |
| | Contingent emergency appropriations | (50,000,000) | (61,735,000) | (+11,735,000) |
| | Revolving and Management Funds | | | |
| 105-220 | Navy working capital fund (emergency appropriations) | 23,017,000 | 23,017,000 | ..... |
| ..... | Contingent emergency appropriations | ..... | 7,450,000 | +7,450,000 |
| 105-220 | Defense-wide working capital fund (emergency appropriations) | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | ..... |
| | Total, Revolving and management funds | 24,017,000 | 31,467,000 | +7,450,000 |

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 1998 (H.R. 3579)— continued**

| Doc No. | | Supplemental Request | Recommendation | Recommendation compared with request |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Other Department of Defense Programs | | | |
| | Defense Health Program: | | | |
| 105-220 | Operation and maintenance (emergency appropriations) | 1,900,000 | 1,900,000 | ..... |
| ..... | (By transfer) (sec. 204(f)) | ..... | (5,000,000) | (+5,000,000) |
| | General Provisions | | | |
| | Reserve mobilization income insurance fund (contingent emergency appropriations) | | | |
| ..... | (sec. 203) | ..... | 37,000,000 | +37,000,000 |
| | Total, Chapter 2: | | | |
| | New budget (obligational) authority | 2,004,047,000 | 2,268,232,000 | +264,185,000 |
| | Emergency appropriations | (1,954,047,000) | (2,162,047,000) | (+208,000,000) |
| | Contingent emergency appropriations | (50,000,000) | (106,185,000) | (+56,185,000) |
| | (By transfer) | ..... | (5,000,000) | (+5,000,000) |
| | CHAPTER 3 | | | |
| | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL | | | |
| | DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY | | | |
| | Corps of Engineers - Civil | | | |
| 105-220 | Operation and maintenance, general (contingent emergency appropriations) | 25,000,000 | 84,457,000 | +59,457,000 |
| 105-220 | (By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations) | (5,000,000) | ..... | (-5,000,000) |
| | DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | |
| | Bureau of Reclamation | | | |
| 105-220 | Water and related resources (contingent emergency appropriations) | 2,340,000 | 4,520,000 | +2,180,000 |
| | Total, Chapter 3: | | | |
| | New budget (obligational) authority | 27,340,000 | 88,977,000 | +61,637,000 |
| | (By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations) | (5,000,000) | ..... | (-5,000,000) |
| | CHAPTER 4 | | | |
| | DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | |
| | United States Fish and Wildlife Service | | | |
| 105-216 | Construction (emergency appropriations) | 3,688,000 | 3,938,000 | +250,000 |
| 105-220 | Contingent emergency appropriations | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | ..... |
| | National Park Service | | | |
| 105-220 | Construction (contingent emergency appropriations) | 8,500,000 | 8,500,000 | ..... |
| | United States Geological Service | | | |
| 105-220 | Surveys, investigations, and research (contingent emergency appropriations) | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | ..... |
| | Total, Department of the Interior | 38,188,000 | 38,438,000 | +250,000 |
| | DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | | | |
| | Forest Service | | | |
| 105-220 | State and private forestry (emergency appropriations) | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | ..... |
| 105-220 | Contingent emergency appropriations | 28,000,000 | 28,000,000 | ..... |
| 105-220 | National forest system (emergency appropriations) | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | ..... |
| 105-220 | Contingent emergency appropriations | 5,000,000 | 5,461,000 | +461,000 |
| | Total, Forest Service | 58,000,000 | 58,461,000 | +461,000 |
| | Total, Chapter 4: | | | |
| | New budget (obligational) authority | 96,188,000 | 96,899,000 | +711,000 |
| | Emergency appropriations | (28,688,000) | (28,938,000) | (+250,000) |
| | Contingent emergency appropriations | (67,500,000) | (67,961,000) | (+461,000) |
| | CHAPTER 5 | | | |
| | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY | | | |
| ..... | Base realignment and closure account, Part III (contingent emergency appropriations) | ..... | 1,020,000 | +1,020,000 |
| | Family Housing | | | |
| 105-220 | Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps (emergency appropriations) | 15,600,000 | 15,600,000 | ..... |
| ..... | Contingent emergency appropriations | ..... | 1,000,000 | +1,000,000 |
| 105-220 | Family housing, Air Force (emergency appropriations) | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | ..... |
| ..... | Contingent emergency appropriations | ..... | 900,000 | +900,000 |
| | Total, Family housing | 17,100,000 | 19,000,000 | +1,900,000 |
| | Total, Chapter 5: | | | |
| | New budget (obligational) authority | 17,100,000 | 20,020,000 | +2,920,000 |
| | Emergency appropriations | (17,100,000) | (17,100,000) | ..... |
| | Contingent emergency appropriations | ..... | (2,920,000) | (+2,920,000) |

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 1998 (H.R. 3579)— continued**

| Doc No. | | Supplemental Request | Recommendation | Recommendation compared with request |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CHAPTER 6 | | | |
| | DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | | | |
| | Federal Highway Administration | | | |
| | Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund): | | | |
| 105-220 | Emergency relief program (emergency appropriations) | 224,000,000 | 224,000,000 | ..... |
| 105-220 | Contingent emergency appropriations | 35,000,000 | 35,000,000 | ..... |
| | Total, Federal Highway Administration | 259,000,000 | 259,000,000 | ..... |
| | Federal Railroad Administration | | | |
| ..... | Emergency railroad rehabilitation and repair (contingent emergency appropriations) | ..... | 9,000,000 | +9,000,000 |
| | Total, Chapter 6: | | | |
| | New budget (obligational) authority | 259,000,000 | 268,000,000 | +9,000,000 |
| | Emergency appropriations | (224,000,000) | (224,000,000) | ..... |
| | Contingent emergency appropriations | (35,000,000) | (44,000,000) | (+9,000,000) |
| | Total, title I: | | | |
| | New budget (obligational) authority | 2,488,675,000 | 2,863,628,000 | +374,953,000 |
| | Emergency appropriations | (2,238,835,000) | (2,432,085,000) | (+193,250,000) |
| | Contingent emergency appropriations | (249,840,000) | (431,543,000) | (+181,703,000) |
| | (By transfer) | ..... | (5,000,000) | (+5,000,000) |
| | (By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations) | (5,000,000) | ..... | (-5,000,000) |
| | (Loan authorization) | (87,000,000) | (87,000,000) | ..... |
| | TITLE II - RESCISSIONS | | | |
| | DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION | | | |
| ..... | Bilingual and immigrant education (rescission) | ..... | -75,000,000 | -75,000,000 |
| | DEPARTMENT TRANSPORTATION | | | |
| | Federal Aviation Administration | | | |
| | Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund): | | | |
| ..... | Rescission of contract authorization | ..... | -366,400,000 | -366,400,000 |
| ..... | (Limitation on obligations) | ..... | (1,668,600,000) | (+1,668,600,000) |
| | DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| | Public and Indian Housing | | | |
| ..... | Section 8 reserve preservation account (rescission) | ..... | -2,173,600,000 | -2,173,600,000 |
| | INDEPENDENT AGENCY | | | |
| | Corporation for National and Community Service | | | |
| ..... | National and community service programs operating expenses (rescission) | ..... | -250,000,000 | -250,000,000 |
| | Total, title II: | | | |
| | New budget (obligational) authority | ..... | -2,865,000,000 | -2,865,000,000 |
| | Rescissions | ..... | (-2,498,600,000) | (-2,498,600,000) |
| | Rescission of contract authorization | ..... | (-366,400,000) | (-366,400,000) |
| | (Limitation on obligations) | ..... | (1,668,600,000) | (+1,668,600,000) |
| | Grand total: | | | |
| | New budget (obligational) authority | 2,488,675,000 | -1,372,000 | -2,490,047,000 |
| | Emergency appropriations | (2,238,835,000) | (2,432,085,000) | (+193,250,000) |
| | Contingent emergency appropriations | (249,840,000) | (431,543,000) | (+181,703,000) |
| | Rescissions | ..... | (-2,498,600,000) | (-2,498,600,000) |
| | Rescission of contract authorization | ..... | (-366,400,000) | (-366,400,000) |
| | (By transfer) | ..... | (5,000,000) | (+5,000,000) |
| | (By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations) | (5,000,000) | ..... | (-5,000,000) |
| | (Limitation on obligations) | ..... | (1,668,600,000) | (+1,668,600,000) |
| | (Loan authorization) | (87,000,000) | (87,000,000) | ..... |
| | RECAP | | | |
| | Gross emergency appropriations | 2,488,675,000 | 2,863,628,000 | +374,953,000 |
| | Defense | (2,021,147,000) | (2,288,252,000) | (+267,105,000) |
| | Non-defense | (467,528,000) | (575,376,000) | (+107,848,000) |
| | Non-defense rescissions | ..... | -2,865,000,000 | -2,865,000,000 |

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this disaster relief and Bosnia-Iraq Supplemental Appropriations Act. I strongly support the provisions in this legislation that help Americans who have been involved in disasters around the country. I strongly support the activity of our military in Bosnia and Iraq. And I hope that we can get to a piece of legislation as quickly as possible that will support all of those efforts.

I know full well how important those efforts are. We had a big flood in my district in 1993 and in 1995. I stood on this floor and pleaded with the House to give timely help to my constituents, and the House did. So I have a very deep feeling about the need for this legislation. But the Republican leadership, just as they did a year ago, has refused to act responsibly and in a straightforward manner to provide these funds that have been requested by the administration.

□ 1400

They have insisted wrongly, in my view, on offsets which can be done under our budget act but which are not required under our budget act. In fact, we have provisions in our budget act that say that expenses like this which are truly emergencies do not need to be offset. But, again, the Republican leadership has decided to put in offsets; and, in my view, these offsets are very damaging in many, many areas of life in our country.

Let me just mention some. It will hurt children who need help so that they can learn English. It will undermine the ability of our airports to construct needed runway enhancements and install new security equipment, as we are trying to do in St. Louis, Missouri. It would effectively end the Americorps program and could lead to more than a 100,000 of our elderly citizens losing their housing. I do not think these are the trade-offs that we should be considering when we are considering emergency legislation.

These are emergency items. That is why we put that into the budget. These were things that were unforeseen when the budget was put together. If they had been foreseen, we would have found room in the budget. And we may find room in next year's budget. But to now come at the 11th hour and wipe out these domestic programs so that we can take care of bona fide emergencies makes no sense.

If Members want an alternative approach, we will have a motion to recommit that I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to vote for that would simply take out the offsets and say that this should be treated as we believe it should be, as an emergency.

But let me go further on why I think this bill is ill-advised. The Republican leadership has refused to allow the House to consider all the supplemental requests the President has forwarded. They left out the International Monetary Fund request. We have countries in Asia going into bankruptcy. The only thing that is keeping many of them afloat so that we do not lose more exports and have more unneeded imports in this country is the IMF request. If it sits for another 5, 6, 8 weeks, what will happen to the IMF and the countries that need help?

Finally, there is the matter of United Nations dues. Here we are today, the leader of the world, the leader of the United Nations, and we cannot find a way to bring ourselves to pay our dues. We have the unseemly situation where the Secretary General has gone and made a peace in Iraq, which is good for the entire world, and he cannot get the leader of the world to pay our debts, our dues to the United Nations.

The President wanted that in this bill, and it is not. It is being separated out. And all of this is being made subject to an untimely and unneeded request on the part of the Republicans again to put a family planning issue which has no place in any of this legislation as part of that legislation.

My colleagues, this is the wrong bill. It has been constructed in the wrong way. It has the wrong offsets. I am for the disaster relief, and I am for giving the money for our troops in Iraq and Bosnia, but not in this form, not with these offsets.

Vote for the motion to recommit. Vote for the motion to recommit to fund these programs properly. If that fails, vote against this legislation. It is the wrong thing to do.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), a distinguished member of the Committee on National Security, after which I will yield to him for a colloquy.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security for this piece of legislation. I think we need to get to the heart of the issue here and what is at stake. Why do we need this supplemental and why do we need to not further degradate the dollars to support our military?

Mr. Chairman, if we look at the facts, in the past 6 years we have seen our troops deployed 25 times at home and around the world. Now if we compare that to the previous 40 years, they were deployed 10 times. Now, Mr. Chairman, the problem is that none of those 25 deployments were budgeted for; none of those 25 deployments were paid for.

In the case of Bosnia, Mr. Chairman, by the end of the next fiscal year we will have spent $9.4 billion on Bosnia. In fact, Mr. Chairman, if we look at the previous 7 years, we have spent $15 billion on contingencies around the world. Now, the problem in the Congress is not that we oppose going into Bosnia. That is not the issue. The problem in Bosnia is why was America asked to put in 36,000 troops while the Germans, right next door, put in 4,000 troops? Why are we paying the costs for the troops, the housing and food for the Bangladesh military in Haiti?

The problem is that this administration has not done enough to get our allies to kick in their fair share of the cost of these deployments.

Look at Desert Storm. The Desert Storm operation cost us $52 billion. We were reimbursed $54 billion. But that has not been the case for the past 6 and 7 years. We have seen time and again money taken away from readiness, from modernization, from R&D, from those programs that we agreed to within a 5-year balanced budget context to be used to pay for deployments, none of which were budgeted for.

Therefore, we need to restore this money because the quality of life for our troops is at stake, because the modernization of our systems is at stake, and because we have robbed the military to the core, to the bone.

Talk to our troops in the field, Mr. Chairman. Listen to those young kids in Somalia who are on their second and third straight deployments. Listen to their stories of being away from home because of the cuts that we have made.

We need to understand these monies are desperately necessary to replenish funds that have been taken away from the military to pay for deployments that were never considered priorities by this administration when our troops were committed in the first place.

I ask my colleagues to support this appropriation measure, to oppose any measure to change it, to support the leadership of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) because what they are doing is right for our troops, it is right for America, and it is right for our role in the world today.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for the purposes of colloquy only.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the supplemental appropriations measure before the House today goes a long way to support the needs of our troops, supporting the added cost of Bosnia and Iraqi enforcement operations while ensuring that we are not further eroding a defense budget that is already stretched too thin.

As we move the bill forward, we must consider the many remaining needs of our troops around the globe. Of particular concern to our military commanders stationed abroad are the increasing range of missile threats, particularly those that could emerge this

year as a result of Russian technology transfers.

Last night, the House unanimously adopted an authorization bill, H.R. 2786, designed to enhance our missile defense systems against that very threat. Unfortunately, due to the timing of that action, we were unable to include those funds in this supplemental. However, it is my understanding that the administration supports execution of the actions in H.R. 2786 in fiscal year 1998.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct. Not only are we in complete agreement with the need to ensure effective missile defenses for our troops abroad, but we agree that these actions should remain a funding priority for fiscal year 1998. Although the administration limited the Bosnia supplemental to paying for the cost of that operation in the Persian Gulf, they are now supporting execution of theater missile defense enhancements this year.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the Senate approved funding for the theater missile defense enhancements in its supplemental bill. Given the tight constraints we are working under here today, I will not offer an amendment, but ask the chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee to ensure that this funding remains in the supplemental conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I share the interest of the gentleman in moving the theater missile defense initiative forward, and I assure my colleague that I will do my very best to preserve necessary funds in the supplemental conference.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time to talk about the manager's amendment. I rise to issue my strong support for it.

The ice storm of 1998 devastated 4 States in the Northeast. The damage was unlike anything ever experienced, and it was severe.

This amendment will provide funding through community development block grants. It will address needs not met through other disaster relief programs, either the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Small Business Administration. It will give States the flexibility to meet the critical needs of residents still recovering from the storm. And, most importantly, it will ease the economic burden of citizens least able to bear it.

I ask my colleagues to support the manager's amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by expressing my appreciation to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), chairman of the full committee; the entire Committee on Appropriations members and staff; and particularly my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH); and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules, for their very effective work on this bill.

As we have heard here today, Mr. Chairman, this is an initiative to try to redress a good many problems that are in this land today. People are struggling with the challenges of dealing with natural disasters, and I think by that very reason alone it deserves all of our unqualified support.

I just want to talk a moment about one particular portion, and that is the assistance that is provided for the dairy farmers of this Nation.

I know that some of this funding, particularly as it relates to the compensation for diminished milk production, is unprecedented and that some Members are concerned about this fact. But let there be no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, the losses in northern New York and, in fact, throughout the entire Northeast represent a very unique situation.

The assistance we are providing in this bill represents a small but a vitally important step on their road to recovery. The loss of electric power in this region had enormous repercussions beyond just inconvenience, although certainly inconvenient it was.

New York is the Nation's third largest dairy producer; and, without power, dairy farmers were unable to milk their herd. Those few with generators who could milk frequently had to dump their milk because the roads were impassable. And those who were rarely, on occasion, able to get to the milk trucks were unable to get to plants that were in operation. So the losses were absolutely devastating.

The inability to milk has caused, as I said, unique problems. No milking on normal schedule means sick animals, animals that contract mastitis, an illness which if not treated properly can kill the animal.

As I said, I thank the chairman for his assistance and urge the support of this initiative.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), the distinguished ranking member of the most effective HUD subcommittee.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me the time.

I reluctantly rise in strong opposition to this bill, and I say ''reluctantly'' because I very much favor the emergency supplemental appropriations that the bill contains. However, the construction of this bill forces me to oppose it.

The biggest problem with the bill is the domestic rescissions that the bill contains, none of which are required by the budget rules and all of which do great damage to important programs. By far the largest portion of these cuts, about three-quarters of the total, fall on section 8 housing assistance. This program helps people with very low incomes afford one of the basic necessities of life, a place to live.

Of the 2.8 million households receiving section 8 housing assistance, 32 percent are elderly, another 11 percent are disabled, 50 percent are families with children. Their median income is just over $7,500 per year. The funds being rescinded are reserves that are urgently needed to help meet the cost of renewing section 8 housing assistance contracts expiring next year.

If this rescission is allowed to stand and the funds are not replaced, contracts for 410,000 units of section 8 housing would not be renewed and the elderly and disabled people and young families living in these apartments would face the choice of paying large increases in rent, which they cannot afford, or losing their place to live.

We have more than 5 million low-income families with worst-case housing needs receiving no Federal housing assistance at all. Waiting lists for housing programs are years long in many areas. The number of families helped by Federal housing programs is going down.

In light of all this, we must stop using section 8 and other housing programs as the piggy bank every time someone wants to find some money to pay for something else. We ought to defeat this bill and bring back a clean supplemental appropriations bill that takes care of the urgent emergency needs without further devastating housing and other vital domestic programs.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, let us talk about those piggy banks. The gentleman from Missouri and his statements, I would like to speak directly to those.

First of all, for 30 years, Democrats controlled this Congress; and the debt has soared, where we pay over a billion dollars a day on just the interest. That is before law enforcement. That is before education. That is before anything that we want to pay for. The liberal Democrat leadership was against a balanced budget because that limits their ability to spend. They were against a tax relief for working families.

□ 1415

They were against welfare reform. They just wanted to spend more money for it. Who has to pay all of those extra costs for not having a balanced budget, for not having tax relief? They increase taxes and they put increase on Social Security tax. They cut veterans and military COLAs. They increase the tax on working families.

So the record is very clear. But who is going to pay for that? We had a D.C.

bill where we would waive Davis-Bacon to pay for 60-year-old schools. The word ''children'' was mentioned, but do we think the leadership would waive Davis-Bacon that saves 35 percent to build schools in Washington, D.C.? No, because they are tied to their union brothers. It is 35 percent savings. Again, who has to pay for that 35 percent? Working families and senior citizens.

Alan Greenspan has told us that we cannot bust these budget caps because the interest rates right now are between 2 and 8 percent lower. Now, what does that mean to working families? That they have more money for education, for their children. They have more money to buy a car, or even a double egg, double cheese, double fry burger if they want. But it is more money in their pocket instead of having to pay for the debt or come back in Washington, D.C.

They want to pay for IMF, $18 billion, when the economists debate on the value of that. It is $18 billion, but yet we are having to find offsets. Yet, the gentleman from Missouri wants to pay.

The United Nations, we pay 30 percent of all peacekeeping. The President has put us in Somalia without Congress. They put us in Haiti without Congress. They have kept us in Bosnia without Congress. Yet, we have to pay for it. Yet, our European nations have not paid for their share.

They say, why can we not pay our bills? Well, who pays for that $18 billion? Who pays for the billions of dollars that go to the U.N.? The working families. That is what I am saying.

There is a big difference between our plan and what the Democrats want to do, which is just spend more money without offsetting it and continue with the 30 years of tax-and-spend big government, liberal government. We are not going to allow that to happen.

Now, it is legitimate. They feel that big government can do everything. We do not. There is a difference in the choice, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, 3 years ago, as every American knows, this Congress was a snake pit of confrontation. There was one fight after another between the Congress and the White House, which led to a sustained government shutdown. It took a long time for the reputation of this Congress to recover from that obstreperousness.

Last year, in contrast, I felt we had a pretty good year in the appropriations process. Most of the time the appropriations bills were dealt with on a bipartisan basis. I think that that made people in the country feel better about their government. I think it made us feel a whole lot better about it. I think it made us feel a whole lot better about each other, because we were able to work out differences after we had defined those differences. We were able to find a common solution to many of those questions.

This year, unfortunately, we now seem to be walking right back into the confrontation mode. There have been numerous stories in the press reporting that those in the majority party caucus with the more militant attitude on political matters simply want the Congress to take the President on, on a whole range of issues.

So as a result, this bill, which ought to be an emergency appropriation which goes through rather quickly, this bill is going to take a long time to get out of the Congress, out of conference. When it gets to the President, it is going to be vetoed in its present form. That makes no sense, because we have a great deal of work to do. We have a very few days left in the legislative schedule to do it.

Let us take a look at the points of controversy in this bill. First of all, this bill refuses to appropriate 75 percent of the disaster assistance requested by the President. Now, the President does not ask for that money because he likes to ask for money. He asks for it because we have had a series of natural disasters around the country. Unless we are not going to help communities recover, we need to provide this money.

The President has asked for more money than we have in this bill because he understands that with the funding of the disasters that we have already had, if we have any significant storm activity in the summer, we will not have the money in the till to help the communities who need help on the dime, immediately.

Yet, despite the fact that on a bipartisan basis the Senate committee, under the leadership of the chairman of that committee, Senator STEVENS, despite the fact that the Senate added the full amount of the President's request, the majority party in this House refuses to provide that same funding.

Then in a second effort to establish confrontation with the President, the House majority party insists that to the President's request it add large cuts in housing, which will cut 20 percent of the funds that are needed next year to sign the contracts to sustain the living quarters for low-income Americans and senior citizens who are now living in subsidized housing around the country. One-third of the persons who will be forced out of those homes, if this action occurs, are elderly. That is a great Easter gift for this Congress to give those folks before we go home on 20 days recess.

Then it says we are going to cut $75 million for bilingual education. I did not used to care about that issue as much as I do now. But now I have had a huge influx of H'Mong population into my hometown and other communities. The H'Mong are the folks who did our dirty work during the war in Laos. They did the CIA's undercover dirty work. So the Federal Government made a decision to allow them to come into this country.

But now the Federal Government is bugging out on its responsibility to help train them and educate them. They do not even have a written language, so they are very hard to teach English. Yet, one of the programs that would help us do that is being shrunk by a very large amount by this action.

Then we come to the IMF. Nobody likes to come in here and ask for money for the International Monetary Fund. But the fact is we live in the real world, and if we do not defend ourselves in that real world, we are going to suffer the consequences.

Japan has been running an irresponsible fiscal policy for years. That and other actions finally led to a currency collapse in Asia. There is a huge overproductive capacity in this world in certain industries, a lot of it in Asia. Because of that currency collapse, a lot of very cheap goods which are artificially underpriced because of that currency collapse are going to shortly be under way to the United States to undercut American goods.

We are going to see plants close. We are going to see American workers go out of work. We are going to see the largest trade deficit in the history of the world. Yet, this Congress is choosing to do nothing whatsoever about it by holding the IMF hostage to a nongermane proposal.

Then what we find is that the Speaker of the House is reported in a number of press accounts to have threatened majority party Members of the Committee on Appropriations with the loss of their committee assignments if they do not follow the leadership's so-called strategy on this issue.

I do not understand why anyone thinks that it is for the good of America that we resurrect a confrontational attitude rather than a cooperative attitude in this Congress. I do not understand even how politically people think that that is going to win votes in an election year. I do not think it is.

So I regretfully and respectfully ask the House to turn this bill down. I know that the pragmatists on the majority side of the aisle did not want to see this confrontation occur, but they have been overruled. I regret that. Until such time as reason prevails, we have no choice but to ask Members to vote against this proposal. That is what I am asking Members to do.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his statement and associate myself with it, especially the issue concerning housing cuts. We have a $23 billion commitment over the next two years. Last year we cut $3.6 billion out of housing. We promised to make it up. We have not done it. This year we are taking more out. This is going to put people in the street.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the supplemental emergency assistance measures. I very much regret and strongly oppose

the ''offset'' provisions of these proposals which has ensured a collision course with the President's emergency request for additional fiscal 1998 funding for disaster aid and military action in Bosnia and Iraq as well as standing U.S. commitments to the United Nations and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). This IMF Funding means that our 183 nation member program is running on empty, the only tool that we have to prevent the global economic catastrophe, that could devastate our domestic economy. This measure, in fact, only provides 25% of the Presidents total request for funding of disaster assistance. After dragging this bill out for months on the eve of a Easter recess period, apparently the GOP assumes that the House can be forced to accept a deficient product. If we oppose them, they will lay the blame on others. Frankly, the blame and the shame is the GOP leadership. As the adage states: lead, follow—or get out of the way so that we can get the job done.

Our GOP colleagues insistence on including offsetting cuts in solely domestic programs illustrates their reluctance to provide basic programs that form the foundation of trust and the tools that American families need to care for themselves and one another. The GOP's package of cuts produces a number of offsets that would slash $2.9 billion in peoples priorities, and programs. These offsets jeopardize low-income housing programs for 100,000 people (many of whom are elderly 32% and disabled 11%), much needed airport improvements, terminating the AmeriCorps national service program for 1998, and major cuts in this years bilingual education. These programs are vital to the real needs of the most vulnerable in our society. While natural disaster needs would be met, this action would create a new disaster for those impacted by the offset cuts.

These harmful rescissions are unnecessary under the budget rules, which designate that true emergency funding may proceed without offsets. Nonetheless, the Republican Majority in this House has chosen to cut key domestic spending initiatives to offset defense and natural disaster emergencies; breaching the ''firewalls'' between the two categories of defense and domestic expenditures and the 1998 budget enacted into law last year.

These offsets are strongly opposed by the President and many Members of Congress. The Senate included no such offsets in its version of the bill, and there are no indications that they would do so. This clearly is a partisan effort to inject this new and divisive issue into the supplemental emergency assistance measures that will complicate the passage of this legislation. This raises questions as to the motives involved. The Republican Majority shut down the government with unrelated policy for several months in 1996. They denied much needed disaster help in 1997 because of an unrelated rider. Here we go again in 1998. The Republicans are holding hostage the emergency funding for the Department of Defense and disaster assistance, in an attempt, to force feed their unpopular and unfair agenda on the American people. This agenda gives new meaning to women, children, the disabled, and the elderly first. It is time to call a halt to the GOP political games and get on with the peoples business, not a GOP partisan policy agenda.

The next two fiscal years the committed renewal of section 8 housing units existing contracts serving existing low income families with children, the elderly and disabled will demand over $23 billion. The 1997 emergency supplemental did the same as this in removing $3.6 billion of the housing reserve funds and pledged to make it up, but they have not replaced the fund, but take more—this is not a honey pot and it hurts real people.

Mr. Chairman, the much-needed assistance for natural disasters and peacekeeping missions are sound and urgently needed. However, we must not permit this offset package to become our final action. This bill is a step backward, not forward. We should reject it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, just to assure the Members that the sky is not falling, I just want to make a few points. First of all, if it is confrontation that we have opposing views on how to treat the supplemental appropriations bill, then yes, it is confrontation. But I think it is not angry confrontation, it is simply a matter of differing philosophies.

For the last 60 years of this century, the now minority party, which used to be the majority party, guided the affairs of the country with the idea that we continue to spend and never worry about whether the money was there. All we are saying on the supplementals is that, sure, we can continue to spend, but it has to be within the budget.

For the last 4 years, we have in effect said that we will pay for the supplemental spending. We are coming up with $2.29 billion in extra spending for defense. We are coming up with $575 million for disaster relief. But we are going to offset. That is all we are saying.

The Senate has not said that, and we are going to meet them head on. But for our purposes in the House, we are going to offset this extra spending. I dare say we have succeeded.

We have got all these cries that the cuts in other existing unobligated funds are going to cause a disaster and the people are going to go homeless. The fact is that is not going to happen. These are unobligated funds, and they are not needed this year, this fiscal year. If they are needed later on, we will address that.

My friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, has said that a militant majority is demonstrating that we should do something so awful as pay as we go. We happen to think that is fiscal responsibility. It is not militant. It is just common sense.

He says that we have not adequately provided for the disaster relief that is needed. In effect, he is right, because the President, the day after we reported this bill out of the full committee, the President finally sent over an additional request of $1.6 billion for disaster relief that we have not had time to address, and we will address before this bill gets through its normal processes.

He says that he is concerned that we have attacked bilingual education. Look, the H'Mong have been here for 20 years. If they have no written language, we have got a good one. It is called English. Well, if they have not been here for 20 years, then they have been here for 10 or 15; I do not know how long. Anyway, we have got English. We have got English, and it is a perfectly good language.

We would like to teach them how to assimilate themselves into the United States, just like we would like to teach people of all ethnic backgrounds to assimilate themselves in the United States and teach their kids how to be productive American citizens. Just from day one, that is what we have done in America. That is why we are the melting pot. That is why we have succeeded in bringing cultures of all sorts together and have succeeded in becoming the most dynamic free Nation on earth.

□ 1430

The fact is, look, I adopted a little girl with my wife, a little girl from Taiwan. She came here at almost 7 years old. She could not speak English. She spoke Chinese. But we put her in an ''English as a second language'' course, and within 3 months she was speaking fluent English. She is a productive American citizen. I hope that others will likewise become productive American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, if I were to take a kid to Spain, I would not expect that child to only speak English and to be taught English in the schools. I would expect that child to be taught Spanish in the schools so that that child would live in Spain and become a productive Spanish citizen, if my colleagues will.

The point is, bilingual education in and of itself has been a failed program. It ought to be abolished. English as a second language is a successful program, and should be encouraged and hopefully will be because of the steps that we take here today.

These are good changes. This is a good bill. The offsets are simply common sense. I urge the adoption of this bill, the rejection of the motion to recommit, and hopefully we will get a conference soon, right after we come back from the break, and we will get this disaster relief to the people who need it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I want to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) made earlier.

I regret that I come to this floor to oppose this bill. Instead of coalescing funding to continue our peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and ensure a strong and forceful presence in the Gulf, we are being asked to undercut important domestic programs included in last year's budget agreement to finance our national security interests.

It is not enough that the budget agreement of 1985 provides for emergency spending without offsets during domestic or international crisis. It is not enough that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), it is not enough that Mr. LIVINGSTON fought hard to prevent making unwise and devastating cuts in domestic programs, notwithstanding the fact that he just said something a little different. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it apparently is not enough that the United States Senate, with the support of the President of the United States, passed this emergency spending without gutting domestic programs by voice vote.

No, Mr. Chairman, instead today this body is being asked to gut the Section 8 low income housing program which could leave 800,000 Americans without housing next year. We are being asked to effectively shut down the AmeriCorps program through a 60 percent cut, and perhaps in one of the most outrageous affronts contained in this bill, the leadership is advocating a cut of $75 million in bilingual and immigrant education.

Let there be no mistake, Mr. Chairman, as to the importance of the emergency funding the President is seeking. Continuing the U.S. presence in Bosnia is critical. Progress is being made in the implementation of the Dayton Accords, and this progress has only been possible because of U.S. participation in the NATO-led stabilization force. There is not one of us that has visited that force, that has not been proud of our men and women and the effect that they have had.

Apparently the majority party did not learn the lessons of the 1995 disaster relief supplemental. The chairman learned them; I think most of the chairmen of our subcommittees learned them. But their caucus did not learn them. There are very serious issues to be debated in this Chamber. However, we should not hold emergency funding hostage when on its surface we all support the need for a strong presence in Iraq and a need to respond to the ravages of El Nino.

I urge my colleagues to vote down the latest sham of the Republican leadership and release this funding from the daily game of politics in which we have been embroiled. Vote ''no.''

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE), distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water.

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

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to my distinguished friend from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) for purposes of a colloquy only.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, Guam suffered extensive damages due to Typhoon Paka last December. Due to Typhoon Paka the commercial port, which is the principal lifeline for all the residents of Guam, needs to be restored to its economic vitality. I understand that the bill before us today provides $84.5 million for the Corps of Engineers for emergency repairs due to flooding and other natural disasters.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's statement is accurate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand further that the $84.5 million is not project-specific and that there may be an opportunity to review Guam's request for port projects.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that the committee did not earmark disaster relief funds provided to the Corps of Engineers. The additional funding in the operation and maintenance account will be used to address high priority needs resulting from recent natural disasters at Corps-operated or Corps-maintained projects. The Corps of Engineers should consider Guam's request in conjunction with other projects eligible for emergency assistance consistent with current law and authorities.

I want to assure the gentleman that we will examine this issue as the process proceeds to conference with the Senate, and we will do our best.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, let us clarify the issue before us today. We are not here to correct the overdeployment of our military troops or the underfunding of our military troops. The issue before us today is whether this is an emergency as prescribed by the budget law or whether it is one that is not and calls for an offset.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could rise in support of this bill, the emergency supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1998. Unfortunately, the bill in its current configuration falls short in terms of timing, process and interpretation.

First there is a matter of timing. Once again this body has reacted slowly to an emergency situation, with consequences that will affect our fellow citizens both here at home and overseas. And yet, while the other body has essentially passed a bill to deal with these measures, we are still debating the matter in this body, and the result is that by the time we begin our 2-week spring recess we will not have completed this important work.

Second, there is a matter of process. Though 80 percent of the bill's appropriations are for military programs, all of the measure's offsets are in domestic programs. This is a sure invitation for a presidential veto, and I am sure that the President will accept that invitation.

As many know, the other body has not offset, I will repeat, has not offset its version of the supplemental with spending cuts. It has accepted the emergency designation for the supplemental, as it should have. I can envision a scenario where the other body would offer to accept offsets, but with a condition that those offsets come from the military appropriation accounts. What a disaster that would be.

Third, there is a matter of interpretation. I voted for last year's Balanced Budget Act. I believe we made great progress in the past 8 years to get our Nation's finances in order. The 1993 bill which I supported; last year, the Balanced Budget Act which I supported; and this year we see a surplus possibly of $8 million, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the first surplus since 1969. While provisions under the Budget Act will allow us to fund genuine emergencies, the other body has chosen to use those provisions. That is what we should do.

Secretary of Defense Bill Cohen wrote earlier this month that if the Department of Defense were required to provide offsets from within the DOD budget, the effect on DOD programs would prove calamitous.

I have seen the same thing for the domestic side. That has been well thought out. It is a matter of accepting what is reality. A rose by any other name is still a rose; an emergency by any other name is still an emergency. I think that in this present form it is very difficult for us to support, and I will not support this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN), distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today. First I would like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for sticking to our core principles, that 3 years ago we made a commitment that we were going to stop spending our children's money, and I would like to commend the chairman for sticking to those principles in this bill and sticking to the offsets. We understand the other body, the Senate, has not proposed offsets yet, and I would also like to express my appreciation for accepting the Neumann-McIntosh amendment that puts this body on record when we pass this bill, saying that when it goes to conference it should come back with the offsets intact.

I would also like to do, as I made it my custom to do over the last 3 years, to report to my colleagues what the actual numbers are in this spending bill.

The total new spending, the total, quote, emergency spending in this bill, is $2.865 billion in outlays and budget authority, and in fact the offsets amount to 1 million more than what the proposed new spending is as it relates to budget authority.

In outlays, the outlays are $350 million short, but I would add that it is

the closest that we have come of any of the supplemental appropriation bills that have passed through this body since we came here in 1995. It is the closest we have come to offsetting it in outlays as well as budget authority, and again in budget authority, to my colleagues, it is not only offset but there is actually $1 million extra in it.

Again, I would like to address the concerns of the other side. I heard the statement that 800,000 Americans will be without housing if this bill is passed. Well, first let me say that that is absolutely not true. But second, let me suggest to my colleagues on the other side that if in fact they genuinely believe that is true, then they have a moral and an ethical responsibility to bring something forward that allows these offsets to come from some other part of this budget.

Look, what we are asking for is to stop spending our children's money. We are asking to find offsets, that is, wasteful government spending that amounts to $2.8 billion out of $1700 billion of government spending. Let me say that once more, so we understand just exactly what this debate is all about. What we are saying is that, I want to make sure that this debate is very, very clear when we talk about finding these offsets or reductions in wasteful Washington spending to counter the new spending, we are looking for a grand total of $2.8 billion out of $1700 billion of government spending.

Now is there anyone in the entire United States of America that believes there is not $2.8 billion of wasteful Washington spending that can be eliminated so that we do not go and tack this new spending onto the legacy that we are going to give our children?

I would like to conclude by again commending our chairman for sticking to his guns and demanding that these offsets be included in this bill, because for years that was not the practice, and that is in fact how we got to the $5.5 trillion debt that we currently have staring us in the face.

I would conclude with the memory it is $2.8 billion in offsets. We are open to other suggestions; $2.8 out of $1700 is what we are looking for in terms of offsetting the bill.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, am I correct that under the rule no amendments are allowed, no alternatives can be proposed? Am I correct on that? It is a closed rule; am I correct?

The CHAIRMAN. There is one amendment.

Mr. HOYER. One amendment made in order. No other amendments other than an amendment allowed by the Committee on Rules can be made, no alternatives can be proposed for other offsets; am I correct, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. There is one amendment that was made in order under the rule.

Mr. HOYER. But no amendments can be offered; am I correct, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. There is one amendment to be offered in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HOYER. I understand that.

Can any additional amendments be offered, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. There can be an amendment offered as a recommittal in the House.

□ 1445

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker talked about wasteful Washington spending. I do not consider enabling senior citizens to have housing in my hometown or anybody else's hometown in the countryside to be wasteful Washington spending. I consider those to be necessary mercy initiatives so good and decent low-income Americans and retired senior citizens can live in decent housing.

I do not consider providing funding to persons who are willing to give of their time to assist with finding volunteers to deal with our kids after school so that they are in a safe place and are not committing crime is wasteful Washington spending. I call that good community activity.

I would point out that the rule the gentleman just voted for precluded us from attacking real wasteful spending. It precluded me from offering the amendment which would have reduced by 5 percent the Pentagon account that allows the Pentagon to pay $76 for a 57-cent set screw, and allows the Pentagon to pay $38,000 for aircraft springs that they previously paid $1,500 for. That is true wasteful Washington spending, I would submit to the gentleman from Wisconsin, and it is the kind of wasteful spending the gentleman protected with his vote for the rule.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, we are trying to determine when the Skaggs provision will be up for debate. I understand that 30 minutes are allotted for that as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair could entertain that debate at any time during general debate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I need to go up to the Committee on Rules. I would ask that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) be allowed to control my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland will control the time for the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) while he goes to the Committee on Rules.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Guam, (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD).

In the disaster relief section of the fiscal year 1998 supplemental appropriations bill, the committee accepted report language that makes mention of the ongoing discussion between the Government of Guam and the Navy over the repair responsibility for the repair of typhoon BRAC damaged properties on Guam. I have been assured by several civilian naval officials that the U.S. Navy, at a minimum, will be flexible if it is decided that the U.S. Navy is, indeed, responsible for said repairs.

Mr. Chairman, is it your understanding that if this action so occurs, the committee will entertain a request for funds in the regular fiscal year 1999 appropriations bill?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, yes, that is true. If the matter is settled between the Guam Government and the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Navy will accept the responsibility for the repair of certain typhoon damaged BRAC properties on Guam, our committee will consider such a request for funds in the fiscal year 1999 appropriations bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for this clarification. We will work on the issue.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, here is the problem that I see as we go forward with this process. Normally, when we pass a bill, we have a good idea that we will be able to continue the process in the Senate. It is not so late in the year, and if it is, we will pass a bill very similar to the Senate bill.

Now, this bill is so different than the Senate bill, we have a bill here which has a lot less money in it. We have a bill here which, in my estimation, when it is offset from domestic policy, will either assure a veto or, in the end, the Senate will not recognize it.

I just do not see any possibility of this kind of a bill being the end product when it goes to conference.

Now, if we do not accept the amendment that I am going to offer, the recommittal motion I am going to offer, then we have a situation where the Defense Department will not be able to go forward because it will not be assured of a bill happening.

One of the things that has happened in the past, when they are assured of a conference, they can work different departments, they can get money, they can hold back money, and they can work out something to get them through.

But here, they are not going to be able to do that, because they cannot be assured of a bill. Now, why do I say they cannot be assured of a bill?

Let us say that we pass this bill with offsets. Well, in the first place, the White House is against that. We go over to the Senate, we sit down, the Senate adds IMF, the Senate adds UN, and the Senate adds Mexico City.

Now, in my estimation, there is no way that they can come back to the House with a bill the size it is, with no offsets, and pass it in the House, and yet, on the other hand, there is no way we can go to the Senate with all offsets and pass it in the Senate.

So we have got a real problem, which leads me to believe that past history shows that the Defense Department cannot predict that they are going to have a bill. They only have 4 months left in the fiscal year, and the problem we are going to have when you only have 4 months, the Defense Department has to make a decision, how do I find the money to get us through the rest of the year.

All right, we cut back on training, we layoff civilian employees, substantial numbers of civilian employees for 10 or 15 days. We shut down the Defense Department. There are all kinds of options the Defense Department is investigating right now, looking at what we can do in case a bill, which is absolutely the opposite of the bill that is pending in the Senate, it has not passed yet, but it is pending.

We always in the past have been able to work these things out. This is an entirely different situation, which worries me. I am concerned, all of us have been through the committee process, if we pass a bill that is offset with domestic policy, the additional thing we do, we set domestic policy against defense policy, and when that happens we lose.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge Members to support my motion to recommit when it comes up.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to H.R. 3579 and would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) earlier.

I am in opposition basically because this bill would take away greatly needed funding for Section 8 low-income housing, and take away greatly needed funding for bilingual education. If there is a way to achieve the objective without desecrating our social programs, then so be it. I am opposed.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 3579, the Defense and Disaster Supplemental Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1998.

I join my fellow colleagues in opposition to this bill not because I believe we need not provide our troops with enough resources to succeed, whether it be in Bosnia or Iraq. I oppose this bill not because I believe we need not come to the aid and rescue of our fellow Americans who have suffered as a result of some national disaster. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I oppose this bill because it sets up a framework that takes $2.2 billion in funding from the section 8 low-income housing program; because it reduces funding for the bilingual education program by $75 million. This is absolutely unacceptable to me, to my constituents who reside in public housing and benefit from the section 8 program- a program that is currently underfunded, I might add- and to the legal immigrants who reside in my district and participate in the bilingual education program, which helps them transition into mainstream America.

Mr. Chairman, yes, indeed, this body appears to be revisiting, unfortunately, an all-too-familiar refrain and motif: when confronted with a tough decision, do not follow the dictates of what is fair or equitable; instead choose the path of least resistance. I am reminded of the saying that those who are whipped the easiest are whipped the most often. And, invariably, the target for cuts are those programs that serve public housing residents and benefit our immigrant population. Those groups that do not have an army of lobbyist to argue the merits of their case.

Consequently, I am compelled to oppose and urge my fellow members of Congress to oppose this measure, HR 3579, in an effort to restore equity and fairness and a sense of what is right to the decision-making process in this body.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I hope today that we will not diminish one of the most successful initiatives that has come from this city in the last 30 years, and that is the President's Corporation for National and Community Service. This legislation today proposes a significant decrease in what has been domestically one of the most successful initiatives that I can recall.

AmeriCorp has served hundreds of domestic violence victims throughout the State of Massachusetts. It has been enormously successful. It seems to me it goes hand-in-hand with what the other side has been talking about for the last decade about personal responsibility, a better and higher sense of citizenship, but, most importantly, and it has been inclusive, it suggested to millions of young Americans that the opportunity for some sort of tuition assistance down the road will be there if they only give back to this Nation the opportunity that the Nation has granted to them.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that in this supplemental that is being proposed today we would resist any effort along the way to curtail what I think has been an enormously successful Presidential initiative, and that has been the President's proposal for National Service Learning.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), our chairman, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. Chairman, I stand to oppose the supplemental for two reasons: Number one, we have the kind of sacrifice that we have to make here in the Congress, which says that we know that we need a strong military, we need to strengthen our military, but we also need to take care of the poor. We also need to take care of the housing needs of this country.

I do think that the two of them are compatible, that we can do both, and we should not use this particular bill to try to even things out between the military and the poor people who need housing and who need care in this country.

Mr. Chairman, this bill cuts education, it cuts the National Volunteer Service, it cuts any number of things which mean a lot to us here in the Congress representing all the people.

I say to the Congress we can do both. We need to vote no on this supplemental and go back and do the right thing, separating those two, doing what we should do by the military, and certainly immediately sending emergency assistance to our needy counties and cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The remaining 30 minutes for general debate on title III of the bill is equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), and a Member who is opposed to title III.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to title III.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will confer the time in opposition to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) given the fact that he is a member of the committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS).

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, whether to take this country into war, even a limited war, is a fundamental responsibility of this body, the Congress of the United States. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution states very clearly that ''Congress shall have the power . . . to declare war, grant letters of mark and reprisal.''

As George Mason, one of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention observed in debating this provision in 1787, it was meant to ''Clog the path to war.''

The Constitution is a terribly inconvenient thing. It imposes all sorts of rules that get in the way of this body when we want to run rough-shod over freedom of speech, or in this case, ignore our own responsibilities to make that fundamental decision.

Right now we have a welcome break in the action in the Persian Gulf anyway. Thank goodness we are not now faced with the immediate prospect of offensive military action, and that respite gives us a chance, which I appreciate our having, an opportunity to seize this afternoon to give some considered debate to the responsibilities that we have.

□ 1500

The limitation on funding that is now in the bill, as approved by the Committee on Appropriations, provides that none of the funds in this bill may be used to initiate offensive military action by the Armed Forces of the United States in order to enforce the inspection and destruction of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. It is carefully drawn to be narrowly limiting only of the President's authority, essentially, to take the country into offensive war. That is what it does.

It is also important to understand what it does not do. That is, it does not impede the continued deployment of troops in anticipation of the possible need for action against Iraq. It does not get in the way of the no-fly rules or any of the other current military operations in the region.

Why do this? It is because we know full well that, while there is a moment now when Saddam Hussein is complying, history instructs us that it is very likely that we will be back soon into a situation in which he is again confronting the international community. And the President has made it very clear that, under those circumstances, he would attack in order to enforce the U.N. inspection regime.

There is never a good time to do this. It is, by definition, only when we are faced with a ticklish international security problem, such as we now face in the Persian Gulf area, that the question comes up.

But, as my colleagues will recall, we had the good sense 7 years ago to make sure that then President Bush sought and received authority from Congress before launching the war against Iraq at that time. The same basic constraints ought to apply to this President in 1998.

Coupled with the sensible judgment that we made 7 years ago to insist on Congress' responsibility under the circumstances that existed then, with a similar assertion in 1998, we have an important opportunity to change the practice that existed throughout the Cold War years in which Congress deferred, I believe inappropriately, to the executive in these kinds of situations.

We should be proud to assume and to assert this most important responsibility that the Constitution gives to the Congress, not to the executive.

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman LIVINGSTON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for the fine work in this bill.

I rise in strong opposition to section 3002 of the bill, which prohibits the use of funds for military operations against Iraq unless the President gains congressional approval for the use of the military force regarding the compliance with U.N. resolutions relating to inspection and destruction of weapons of mass destruction.

I have opposed President Clinton on the use of military force on many occasions in this House. On this issue, though, I look at this, and as a matter of fact, my opposition has been really on two grounds, one on philosophy and the other with regard to poor consultation with this administration and Congress.

When I think of the President's use of military force, he likes to use our military force in every corner of the world based on some form of moral authority, humanitarian missions, and peacekeeping missions.

When I think of the Skaggs amendment, I believe the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) highlights the very poor consultation that the administration has with this Congress. It is tempting to support the Skaggs amendment. I cannot, because I happen to believe that this is much bigger than Bill Clinton. This, in fact, is about the presidency and its relationship to the Congress. It is a constitutional question, as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) just mentioned.

When I think of this question, or any Commander in Chief as such, I believe that the Commander in Chief requires the flexibility to respond to the international crises as they arise.

Congress has only actually declared war five times. There have been many occasions where troops have found themselves in harm's way in response to crises around the world. As a matter of fact, the crises sometimes are immediate and emergent, and the presidency needs that type of flexibility.

Iraq is one area where history shows that a crisis arises unpredictably and on short notice. I do not want to tie a President's hands in a critical area of the world. I believe that could be irresponsible and potentially dangerous.

When I think of about a month ago, when an offensive action was imminent in the Persian Gulf, I was one of the few voices here on Capitol Hill that was asking for a go slow-caution approach, because use of force is a last resort, not a first resort.

When we are operating in the arena of diplomacy, I do not believe we ever want to remove one of the tools from the toolbox. When in fact we are going to say to the world, or in particular to Saddam Hussein, that this President can take no actions unless Congress first responds, just permit the mind to flow and create every imaginable consequence that could arise from a mind like Saddam Hussein's.

As we depart from here for 2½ weeks, anything could happen while we are away. Saddam Hussein, by example, could use weapons of mass destruction against the Kurds or the Shi'ites, permit some type of spraying operation with regard to the spores of anthrax in that part of the world. As the winds swirl, they could find their way into Kuwait, and this President might want some form of an immediate response.

I know the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) could possibly, and I am not going to argue for him, he is very capable of doing that, but I think he put it in some kind of Dear Colleague that the President could call the Congress back into session. How realistic is it that he would do that? How often does that happen?

I really do like the flexibility on the part of the Commander in Chief to respond, especially to stand up against someone like Saddam Hussein. For us to somehow tie his hands to respond would be very poor. I do not want to do that.

What I want to share with my colleagues is, and I know I am fighting with my own temptation to support the gentleman from Colorado, but this issue is much bigger than this President. It is about the relationship between this Congress and the presidency.

Now the United States, as we find ourselves the sole remaining superpower in the world, many nations of the world look to us for their immediate consultation. Whether it is a consultation, counsel, support, the President needs the ability to respond. When there is a problem anywhere in the world and that commander goes to the President of the United States for any type of support, he needs that ability to respond.

The Congress, all of us, and there have been many debates over the past years about the use of force and Congress' prerogative. We control the pursestrings. We have those debates.

I think every Member of the Congress, if it came down to a sustained offensive military operation in Iraq, would require a vote here on the House floor. But when it would be responding, whether in self-defense or in response to Saddam Hussein's bizarre behavior, this President needs the flexibility to respond.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) for his initiative at putting this in the bill. I certainly believe it is in the best interests of this body to maintain the provisions in the bill, and hopefully we will keep it in throughout the duration of this supplemental appropriation.

The fact is, in 1991 we had an incredibly wonderful debate, an intense debate, a debate that strongly divided parties on both sides, as to whether or not we should go to the initial battle against Saddam Hussein, whether or not we should commit thousands of troops, along with the troops of many other countries to battle what was then the fourth largest army in the world.

By a somewhat narrow margin, the House and the Senate agreed that we should go forth. In fact, we did, and we had one of the most lopsided victories in the history of American warfare; in fact, in the history of world warfare. It just strikes me that here, some 7 years later, it is not any less important an issue that should be debated between the Members of Congress, members of all parties, all philosophies, and both Houses.

I am very concerned today, as I was a few months ago, when it looked very much like we were going to commit lots of American men and women in uniform to the potential of losing their lives in battle against the new Iraqi threat, but under the leadership of the same despot, Saddam Hussein.

We might well have brought about the death of tens of thousands of Iraqi citizens, and we might well have earned for ourselves the enmity of the entire Arab world. All of that would have been possible, and maybe it was for a good cause. Maybe it was necessary, but then again, maybe it was not.

The fact is, it would have been done without so much as a ''by your leave'' in Congress. This is a momentous issue. We debated it well 7 years ago. We should debate it equally well today.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the fallacy I see in the argument that both gentlemen are making is that we have forced Saddam Hussein to back down. Our inspectors are doing their work, and at a critical stage in the inspection process where half of it is over, we are saying to Saddam Hussein, okay, Congress is going to have to vote on this issue. We voted in 1991.

Members know, I led the fight on the Democratic side for going to war, and I believe very strongly a President should come to Congress to get authorization. I believe he still has authorization to go to war. I do not think, in this particular situation, there is any need for the Congress to act again on something that is clearly in our national security interest.

There are deployments Presidents have made I have disagreed with, that I do not believe were in our national security interest. I believe this is in our national security interest. More than half the energy resources in the world are in this area. It is absolutely essential we have stability. We need to react timely in order to prevent a war.

What happened the last time is when the United States had to react, he had to react immediately. He sent in the 82nd Airborne right before the marines. He sent in the marines. He sent in the air wing. They could have run over us, but because of the force of the United States, because the President of the United States acted, we were able to stop him from going into Saudi Arabia.

I am absolutely convinced, though, if he thought Congress was going to wait, and he was convinced Congress was going to vote against going to war. It is very easy now to say Congress passed a resolution to go to war, but let me tell the Members, in those days President Bush withstood tremendous pressure. He did a phenomenal job in getting that authorization passed. It was bipartisan, but it was obviously a very difficult debate.

So I think the timing is terrible. I know the President will veto this bill. There is another reason for him to veto this particular bill, if this provision is in this piece of legislation. So I would hope that the Members would think very clearly, they would listen to this debate, and then when it goes to conference, that we will be able to get this amendment removed so we can go on with our business, if this gets to conference.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 and a half minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I give high commendation to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, for bringing this to the floor.

Two arguments have been made against what the gentleman has achieved. I wish to respond to them. First, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) that the authorization to go to war passed in 1991 would still apply today, it does not. Today we are discussing the use of force in response to the failure of Saddam Hussein to allow inspection of his mass destruction weapons facilities, which occurred after we drove him out of Kuwait. Logically, this could not have been anticipated at the time of the 1991 vote. I was here. I voted yes then, as well. But we had no consideration then of force to terminate weapons' programs.

It would be as dangerous to say that the 1991 authorization applies today, as it was to say that the Gulf of Tonkin resolution gave approval for everything that followed in Vietnam. We must be careful in what we approve. We were careful in 1991, so that the men and women in our armed forces whose lives are at stake might know what their representatives have approved. And that was not an unbridled authorization for action seven years later.

The argument of the gentleman from Indiana, that because of this provision, the President will not be able to respond to Saddam Hussein's use of anthrax, is absolutely false. The ability of the President to respond to such an attack would be constitutionally possible, and also financially possible under this provision, simply by using money in the general Defense Department budgets.

The only effect of the restriction of the provision by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) is that funds used in this supplemental may not be used for the purpose of enforcing the U.N. inspections regime, without getting the approval of Congress. There is no restriction on responding to an attack upon the United States' interests or people, including the hypothetical case of Saddam Hussein's use of anthrax.

□ 1515

I conclude by saying I have done my very best to attempt to bring back to Congress the authority the Constitution gives and requires of us. Let us not let it slip through our hands once more. Let us instead stand up for our obligation under the Constitution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) for his amendment which puts into law our joint resolution, of which he is one of 108 cosponsors, to require just this.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to mention in just the few moments I have, not only does Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution apply, but also Article II, Section 2, where it says the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States and the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States. It is the Congress that does that. After they have been called into service, the President is then the Commander in Chief.

This is a good amendment. It needs to stay in the bill.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) for yielding me this time, and I appreciate very much his work in this effort.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important part of this legislation. This is not BESTEA, but it is ''best part.'' By far Section 3002 of this bill is the best part of this entire bill. The only thing I would like to add is that the money being spent in Bosnia and Iraq, $1.8 billion, should not be spent there either, because I am frightened that we will put our men in harm's way and then a situation will occur, and it will be virtually impossible for the Congress to turn down acceleration and amplification of the conflict over there.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stated that only five times we have declared war in our history. True. But who is going to stand here and say that men that died in Vietnam and in Korea were not in a war? They were illegal. They were unconstitutional. This is a very sound effort to bring back once again the constitutional responsibility of all of us to declare war, and only Congress can do that.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is very difficult for me, because there is nobody on the other side that I respect more, and he knows I speak that from my heart, than the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), who is a veteran, I have a lot of faith in.

Mr. Chairman, I soul-searched this very issue myself, and the bottom line is it is our responsibility as Members of Congress, and I think that is where the line splits.

We have a responsibility. It is difficult for me to blast the White House on getting us into the Somalia extension, putting us in Haiti against Congress, and putting us in Bosnia, arming the Muslims against the wishes of Congress and putting up billions of dollars, and then come out in support of this bill that does those very same things. This makes Congress uphold its responsibility, and I think it is very, very important that this debate is going on.

President Bush came to Congress and asked Congress to vote on this. President Clinton never does that. He just goes ahead and does it. In the case of Somalia, as we downsized, we denied armor, the White House denied armor to them and we lost 22 Rangers. In the case of Haiti, and especially in Bosnia where we are arming the Muslims and there are 10,000 Mujahedin and Hamas there, that is going to cause in my opinion World War III.

So with bad decisions on foreign policy and military deployment, and when we are operating at 300 percent the OPTEMPO and killing our military, we need this amendment and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), also a member of the committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) for yielding me this time, and I want to lend my strong support to the Skaggs provision in the bill, though I will oppose final passage of the bill because it puts the costs on the backs of the elderly and Section 8 contract renewals across this country.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Skaggs provision completely, and just wanted to say for the record how heartily I congratulate the gentleman. I also want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), my good friend, as well as others on the committee who may not agree with us, when I was first elected to Congress, having been a child of the Vietnam era and watching my friends shot to death and come home dismembered and so forth, I made a promise that I would never be a part of a Congress that sent our troops into battle without a vote.

I think all of us understood what that war did to this country, dividing us even until today. Many high level elected officials, sometimes rising as high as the Presidency of the United States, not wanting to reflect on that experience, still being afraid of it and all the feelings that it dredges up. 50,000 people killed in Vietnam, over 54,000 since that time by death through suicide. It was an experience that none of us alive today should ever forget.

Mr. Chairman, I decided I could never be here and allow that type of backdoor war to occur again. And yet I experienced the Persian Gulf buildup as a Member of this Congress and was a party to a suit filed by 52 colleagues to force President Bush to come to this Congress. There was no prouder moment. Judge Green said in his ruling when we went to court that the Court had no hesitation in concluding that an offensive entry into Iraq by several hundred thousand servicemen could be described as war within the meaning of Article I, Section 8, Clause 11.

I think that this Congress has no more serious constitutional responsibility and obligation than to vote on any offensive military action. I want to say to the gentleman from Colorado, I really congratulate him in his closing months here as a Member of the House for having the courage to bring this up and having this country and its people meet its constitutional obligations.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for yielding me this time, and I want to make sure that Members understand we are not talking about an amendment. There is not going to be a vote on this issue today. This question has been presented to me several times. This is in the bill.

As much as I agree with the comments being made by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), and those who support him, and I did not object to this being put in the bill in the full committee, I have to tell my colleagues that this does not solve the problems that the gentleman is talking about. This is very narrow. It goes only to the issue of Saddam Hussein's unwillingness to stay with the agreement that he has made now as far as inspection of his weapons cache.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) said, rightfully so, this is a monumental decision. Others have made similar statements. This is extremely important. It deals with the constitutional relationship of the Congress vis-a-vis the President of the United States, that is true. This Congress needs to address these issues, but not in a supplemental.

Mr. Chairman, a supplemental appropriations bill is not the place to solve this problem. Congress needs to address this issue full up, head on, to debate a revision or a reconsideration of the War Powers Act to properly establish the role of the Congress in the deployment of U.S. troops.

This amendment or this language today does not affect Bosnia. It does not affect Haiti. It does not affect anything else in the Iraqi area. It only affects that one very narrow circumstance.

So let us set aside some time for this Congress to establish once and for all what the proper relationship is of the Congress and the President before American troops are deployed to an area of hostility, before we get the bill to pay for these operations, despite the fact we had nothing at all to do with the decision to make those troop deployments.

Let us not be sending American troops all over the world unless Congress is a player and unless there is a darned good reason to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me stress the fact of why this supplemental is so important in the overall context of what we are talking about. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the committee, said there is no amendment before the committee. But what will be before the Committee very shortly is a motion to recommit this bill. And the reason I think it is important to look at it, I just have been trying to find out what is the Defense Department all about? What is it trying to do and what is it looking at as far as what will happen if this recommittal motion does not pass, and why?

Now, I explained earlier this bill will be so different, if it is offset, than the bill in the other House. Here is what they are considering: Laying off substantial numbers of civilian workers, because they are not sure that there will finally be a final resolution of the bill; furloughs at Defense bases across the country; they are also talking about delays in promotion, delays in moving families, and training cutbacks throughout the entire Defense Department.

The thing that worries me is that if this bill passes with offsets, we are talking about a stalemate between the House and Senate. We are talking about substantial disruption of the Pentagon's ability to operate because it is so late in the year. And when I offer the motion to recommit, I hope the Members will consider the fact that the motion to reconsider will only strike the domestic offsets, and immediately we can report the bill back without the offsets. Then the Defense Department can go forward without these offsets which destabilize the Defense Department

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has read off a litany of terrible things that would happen if the Defense Department did not get the

funds that have been allocated in this bill by a certain time. Would the gentleman tell me when that time might be?

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will tell the gentleman here is the problem. As he knows, in the past when we have come to the floor with supplementals, the Defense Department knew that the Senate and the House were very close in the versions they were going to pass. Here we are talking about two versions which are so different, and the addition of IMF and the U.N. and the Mexico City language, and the fact that the President will veto it if the Skaggs provision is in the bill. They are not sure they are going to get a bill.

So by March 31, which is today, they are in serious planning right now. And if this bill passes with the offsets, they say that they will have to take some of these steps in order to protect themselves.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I would have to tell the gentleman that the Defense Department has not made the first suggestion to me that they need any money immediately. I would expect if they did not get the money by May, that that certainly would be the case. But I would think if things were that dire, that they would have contacted the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and let him know.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to mislead the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I am not saying if they do not have the money. I am saying that they had no way of knowing what the supplemental was going to agree with. Until last week, all of us thought it would come out of committee with no offsets and then we would decide the issue on the floor.

So the Defense Department was in the unenviable position of not thinking that we were going to have the offsets and they also thought that bills might be put together. They did not face this thing until over the weekend, and I started to nose around and this is when I found out that this is a problem.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, finally I would tell the gentleman that it is my expectation that by the third or fourth week in May that this bill is going to be on the President's desk, and I would certainly hope that he would sign it if he is as concerned about the problems as the gentleman has described, as I am.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman LIVINGSTON), my friend, I tell him honestly that I have heard him say that before. He said it on the emergency bill that we had for the flood victims in the Midwest. The gentleman has said it before in terms of the budget and the shutdown of government.

The fact of the matter is this President believes he is part of this process and he believes that there are certain things he will not accept. We understand that. And I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) who said some of these items, yes, they ought to be debated in a larger context, but not on an emergency supplemental.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman LIVINGSTON) himself was for not having offsets, and I agreed with him on that. This is important and ought to pass as quickly as possible. And to facilitate that, we ought to take these extraneous issues, bring them on the floor, put in a day or two of debate. We certainly have not used much time in the last 90 days. We would have time to debate.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), ranking member of the Subcommittee on National Security, I intend to enthusiastically support his motion to recommit because I think it is the right way to go to get this critical bill through in a timely fashion.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this gentleman shares the concern of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) about extraneous issues. That is why we divided the U.N. arrearages, the IMF, and the abortion lobbying restrictions and put them on a different bill.

□ 1530

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have been criticized with regard to the reach of the language that is in the bill, section 3002, by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) as being too broad so as to tie the President's hands. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) seemed to suggest that it was too narrow, that we did not tie them quite enough. I figure I must have it about right if I am getting criticized from both sides on this.

If the President would merely pledge that he would come to Congress for a vote before initiating offensive action against Iraq, should that again become necessary, we would not have to do this.

The problem is the President of the United States has asserted, wrongly, I believe, that he has all the authority he needs now to launch an offensive war against Iraq if circumstances dictate.

I think that is wrong on the facts. It is certainly profoundly wrong on the Constitution.

We can get no better instruction in what our role in this ought to be than to listen to the voice of the one person who had more to do with drafting the Constitution than anyone else: Mr. Madison.

This is what James Madison said, ''In no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature and not to the executive department. The trust and the temptation would be too great for any one man.'' Including President Bush; including President Clinton.

The issue here is not whether we should be consulted in a Presidential decision. The question is the extent to which we will consult with the President in what is our decision. We should not defer, the Constitution does not give us the power to pass this responsibility to anyone else, including the President of the United States.

I appreciate my colleagues' participation in this debate on this very important matter. I just wish that we could have a vote so that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) would take the views of this House to conference with him to reinforce what I hope is his intention to keep this provision in the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I wanted to thank him for reading from James Madison. That is what I was trying to say, but I would have to admit and concede that James Madison said it far more eloquently than I did.

But we are saying the same thing. Congress and the President have proper relationships that must be better defined for all of us.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

If there was any question about the fairness of determining important items for floor consideration after yesterday's treatment of campaign finance reform, the House is now assured that even matters concerning disasters and spending for crucial military operations will be dealt with in a partisan manner.

First, despite a number of worthy amendments offered by Democrats, the Rules Committee chose only to adopt and consider Republican amendments. There is one exception—the Skaggs amendment—but the Rules Committee takes the tack that a Democratic amendment adopted unanimously by the Appropriations Committee should be debated again so that newly-found opponents can be given a chance to strike it.

Otherwise, the Rules report consists only of Republican amendments. Yet it still doesn't given the House a full debate and vote on those amendments. In fact, three amendments are just considered adopted.

One is a parochial amendment by Mr. HASTINGS—who just happens to be a member of the Rules Committee.

A second amendment is the McIntosh/Neumann ''sense of the Congress'' amendment about spending offsets for emergency supplemental appropriations bills. However, nowhere in this rule may Members actually offer additional offsets, or can the House make adjustments to the offsets that have been served up, or can the House consider the question of whether offsets should be required at all.

That leads us to the third amendment—the Tiahrt amendment—which changes the offsets approved by the Appropriations Committee just last week.

I disagreed with the offsets that were offered by Chairman LIVINGSTON last week, and I voted against the bill as a result. But I believe that once the Appropriations Committee has made such a decision, it shouldn't be changed by a self-executing rule served up by the Rules Committee.

Why can't Mr. TIAHRT bring his amendment to the floor for debate? Or why didn't he bring it to the Appropriations Committee, of which he is a Member? During our debate last week, Mr. TIAHRT didn't breathe a word about his objections to the Airport Grants In Aid rescission. In fact, Mr. TIAHRT didn't even propose the amendment approved by this rule. The amendment offered to the Rules Committee by Mr. TIAHRT would have replaced the Airports rescission with a rescission from the GSA building repair account.

But the Rules Committee, in their wisdom, straightened Mr. TIAHRT out, and made him realize that what he requested wasn't really what he wanted at all. The Rules Committee decided that Mr. TIAHRT really wanted to take additional rescissions out of Section 8 housing—he just didn't know it.

Finally, I have to protest the ill treatment given to Mr. WALSH and Mr. SOLOMON and New England Members in the manager's amendment. Why weren't these Members included in the self-executing rule? What does the leadership have against these champions of assistance to New England? Why are they singled out for 10 minutes of actual debate and a vote on their meritorious amendment? Only the Republican leadership knows for sure.

Unfortunately, the House will never know what it is missing today. Democrats proposed some good amendments to this bill—amendments and policy questions worthy of consideration by this House.

I proposed an amendment to the Rules Committee myself concerning the way USDA's Non-insured Crop Assistance Program—a disaster program of last resort—was working against farmers in California and other parts of the country who had suffered 80- to 100-percent agricultural losses, but happened to live in counties that had not experienced 35-percent losses county-wide.

I'm particularly disappointed that the Rules Committee did not make it in order because the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee had indicated a willingness to have my amendment considered today. I proposed it at the Appropriations Committee but withdrew it at the chairman's request, pending its scoring by the Congressional Budget Office.

As expected, CBO determined my amendment had a spending impact. However, the Rules Committee never set conditions for proposed amendments to this bill. I believe the House should have had the opportunity to decide whether my amendment was worthwhile and to be given the opportunity to determine offsets if offsets were believed to be warranted.

But I'm not the only Democrat left in the lurch.

Mr. MURTHA proposed an amendment to strike the offsets.

Mr. OBEY proposed an amendment to link the Administration's entire supplemental request in one bill, just as the Senate has done. Mr. OBEY also proposed an amendment to include the Administration's $1.8 billion request for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Instead, in a somewhat contradictory fashion, the House will act on an emergency bill that contains no funds for the emergency agency.

Ms. CLAYTON proposed an amendment matching a Senate provision clarifying ''debt forgiveness'' for USDA loans. This is an important issue that has never been debated by this House. And the effect of ruling Ms. CLAYTON's amendment out of order is that it won't be decided by the House, but will be decided instead by a handful of conferees.

In short, this rule is a sham. It turns upside down the notion that Members with legitimate amendments will get a fair hearing from the Rules Committee or that major policy issues on perhaps the most crucial function performed by the House—appropriations—will be debated and decided on the House floor.

I'd ask my Republican colleagues to join us in opposing this exercise in unfairness, but then I remember that members of the Appropriations Committee have been threatened with removal from the Committee if they don't go along with the leadership's strategy on this important bill. I can only imagine what will be done to those Republican Members not on the Appropriations Committee. They are likely to be drawn and quartered, or perhaps even worse—left out of the next self-executing rule.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the manager's amendment to supplement the community development block grant (CDBG) Program by $20 million. While I regret that the offset comes from section 8 housing, the Northeast needs CDBG funding to recover from the aftermath of ice storm 1998.

In January, Maine was hit by the worst natural disaster in its history. Heavy ice accumulation—up to five inches of ice—snapped utility poles in two. Two million feet of cable line, 2,600 utility poles, and 1,500 transformers were replaced. Roughly 649,000 customers—half of the population of Maine—were out of electricity in the dead of winter. For some rural areas, it took three weeks for electricity to be restored.

When Vice-President Gore visited Maine after the first of two ice storms in January, he said that it looked as if a neutron bomb had hit Maine—the people were fine, but the utility infrastructure had been destroyed. The cost of repairing the electrical infrastructure in Maine was $81 million.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has identified utility costs as a major unmet need. In the President's action plan for recovery, the CDBG Program is cited as one that can supplement other Federal assistance in repairing and reconstructing infrastructure. 24 CFR §570.201(1) provides that CDBG funds may be used to acquire, construct, reconstruct, rehabilitate, or install the distribution lines and facilities of privately-owned utilities.

Supplemental CDBG funding is critical to address needs stemming from the ice storm that devastated Maine and the other Northeastern States. Without the additional CDBG funding, our residents would bear much of the high cost of this natural disaster. That would be unfair. Mainers have paid their fair share over the years to defray the costs associated with other natural disasters.

I commend Chairman LIVINGSTON's recognition of the need for additional funding for the CDBG Program. FEMA recognizes that there are unmet needs related to the ice storm and that the CDBG Program can address these needs. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3579, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, a bill to further fund, at the expense of airports and Section 8 Housing Assistance, the unconstitutional effort to ''police the world.'' Having submitted amendments to the Rules Committee to defund the ''police the world'' aspects of this bill only to be denied in the Rules process, I must oppose final passage of this supplemental Appropriations bill.

One of the truly positive aspects of H.R. 3579 is Sec. 3002 stating that ''none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for the conduct of offensive operations by United States Armed Forces against Iraq for the purpose of obtaining compliance by Iraq with United Nations Security Council Resolutions relating to inspection and destruction of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq unless such operations are specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.'' This language is virtually identical to H.R. 3208, a bill I introduced in February of this year to require Congressional consent prior to any offensive attack by the United States on the Republic of Iraq.

Unfortunately, Congress has refused to acknowledge anytime recently that the proper and constitutional role of the U.S. military is to provide for the national defense and not the security of all foreign entities against attacks by all other foreign entities. It was for this reason that I submitted amendments to defund the military appropriations in H.R. 3579. The proper amount of appropriations for unjustifiable United States peacekeeping missions around the world is zero. Instead, this bill rescinds funding from domestic programs such as airport funding to be spent on our ''police-the-world'' program.

It has become the accepted political notion in this century that war is a Presidential matter in which Congress may not meddle, and certainly never offer dissenting views. Yet, no place in the Constitution do we find a presidential fiat power to conduct war. To the contrary, we find strict prohibitions placed on the President when it comes to dealing with foreign nations. The Constitution is clear: No war may be fought without a specific declaration by the Congress.

I, in fact, introduced H.R. 3208, in an effort to protect US troops from unnecessary exposure to harm and to stop President Clinton from initiating the use of force in the Persian Gulf. As a former Air Force flight surgeon, I am committed to supporting troops and believe the only way to completely support soldiers is to not put them in harms way except to defend our nation. Of course, those drumming for war say they want everyone to support the troops by sending them into battle: a contradiction, at best.

There is absolutely no moral or constitutional reason to go to war with Iraq or further intervene in Bosnia at this time. To go to war to enforce the dictates of the United Nations, or to play the part of 'policemen of the world,'

offends the sensibilities of all who seek to follow the Constitution. I refuse to participate in (or fund) an action which would possibly expose even one soldier to risk when there is absolutely no immediate threat to the territory of the United States.

For these reasons I must oppose this bill which provides additional funding for exactly these purposes.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this emergency supplemental appropriations bill. The Nation has two compelling needs that warrant immediate attention by this Congress. First, the Clinton Administration's foreign policy has launched our military to the four corners of the world without the appropriate funding to conduct these missions. Whether or not you support the Administration's policy in Bosnia or Southwest Asia, we must give the men and women in uniform our full support. The defense budget has been in great decline for 13 consecutive years, and cannot sustain the continual drain of these types of forward deployed operations without sufficient funding. In the past, the costs associated with these operations were taken ''out of hide'' by raiding the readiness accounts. Unless we provide DOD with an additional $2 billion for these operations, our military leaders have testified that all training will be halted during the fourth quarter to pay for the Administration's foreign policy forays. That is unacceptable, so we must move expeditiously with this appropriations bill.

Secondly, and most important to many of my constituents in southeast Alabama, is the $175 million in disaster assistance funding included in this legislation. Just three weeks ago, a large portion of my district, encompassing 12 of the 15 counties, have been declared a disaster area due to extreme flooding from the El Nino rains. One city in particular, Elba, was especially hard hit when a levee breached, resulting in two tragic deaths. The entire town was submerged in six feet of water, and displaced 2,000 residents.

The State is still in the preliminary stages of making final damage assessments, but it's clear that, in addition to the loss of personal property, serious road, bridge and railroad damage has resulted from this flooding. I'm pleased that the committee has made additional funding available for the emergency relief program to repair damaged highways and rail lines. The Administration has sent up an additional request for 1.66 billion for future and unmet FEMA requirements, which I understand will be dealt with during the House-Senate conference. This FEMA funding will go along way in helping with their much-needed individual and family grant programs, relocation assistance and disaster mitigation plans.

Prior to the flood, area farmers were also experiencing problems with the heavy rains that prevented necessary field preparations for this crop year. To add insult to injury, these heavy rains follow on last summer's drought that greatly reduced our farmer's crop yields. The bill provides additional funding for USDA's Emergency Conservation Program, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program, Livestock Disaster Assistance, and Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations. Our farmers do a great job in providing the United States with the cheapest and most plentiful food supply in the world. The least we should do as a National is make these assistance programs more readily available to our farmers to help mitigate damages from natural disasters.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the Committee's work on this bill and urge its immediate adoption.

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak about a subject that is very much on people's minds these days. That is, the upcoming sale of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for budgetary purposes. This past week there have been articles and editorials in newspapers across the country from places as different as Chicago, New Orleans, Syracuse, and Dallas noting the foolishness of the sale this Congress authorized last fall.

For the past three years, Chairman BLILEY and I have stood on this House floor and opposed sales of oil from the Reserve as a means of raising revenues. I opposed these sales first and foremost because of their impact on our energy security. Diminishing the Reserve which we paid such a dear price to create, over $21 million, will increase our vulnerability to those who would hold this nation hostage by withholding critical oil supplies.

Second, it has never made any fiscal sense to buy high and sell low. We have spent over $35 in purchasing and maintaining every barrel of oil in the Reserve. When the upcoming oil sale was approved last year I criticized it because it looked like the government was going to lose $10 per barrel sold. Now that oil prices have dropped that oil will be sold at a loss of nearly $20 a barrel and people are starting to wake up to the folly of their actions. As Charles Osgood is his Osgood File noted last week ''This is what you call being penny-wise and pound foolish. Its what you call being short-sighted. It's what you call being dumb.''

Finally, I would like to point out that an oil sale of nearly 20 million barrels will be devastating to a domestic oil industry that is already almost decimated by low oil prices. Instead of hurting our industry by adding to an already glutted market, we should be taking advantage of today's low prices to help ourselves by purchasing oil.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have an amendment to offer today, but I know that language striking the sale is in the companion bill considered by the other body. I would urge the House to accept such language when we go to conference on these bills.

I also hope that we learn from the consequences of our actions and hope that this year we finally end the practice of selling our energy security at bargain basement prices so that we never find ourselves in this situation again. As was stated in the Chicago Tribune editorial this past Sunday, ''Selling the oil into a flooded market at what amounts to a half-off price is just plain nutty.''

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am rising today to speak in opposition to this poorly crafted emergency supplemental appropriations bill being presented before us today. The fact of the matter is that this bill as it stands, would callously harm the most vulnerable members of our society, and do so, for what? Why must this Congress make a mutually exclusive choice between on one side, our troops overseas who need our support and those who are suffering as a result of natural disasters, and on the other side, several essential programs that were funded in last year's balanced budget agreement.

This bill, as proposed, would cut nearly 2 billion dollars from section 8 funding for elderly and low-income housing, 75 million dollars from bilingual education programs and effectively terminate the AmeriCorps program. Frankly, this is an unacceptable assault on several currently funded Federal programs both without any demonstrated cause or fair warning.

Although I think everyone knows how I feel about this, I will state on the record anyway that I fully support and appreciate the difficult duty that our Armed Forces have been asked to perform overseas. I do not take that duty for granted, and cherish their bravery in the face of danger above all else.

Nevertheless, we can not harm a delicate balance of important domestic interests just because we are either in a rush to fund our troops' activities abroad or because we have ancillary political and partisan interests at stake in the cuts made by this bill. Honestly, either reason is an unacceptable motive for robbing hundreds of thousands of Americans of the opportunity to have adequate shelter over their heads.

I have made a good faith effort to relieve the unnecessary pressures of this difficult ''either-or'' choice by offering two wide-sweeping amendments to this supplemental appropriations bill. These two amendments would do the following, one would restore the 1.9 billion dollars for elderly and low-income section 8 housing stricken by the bill, and the second amendment would reauthorize the AmeriCorps program. Both of these amendments would at least minimize the unjustifiable harshness of this hurried piece of legislation.

If we are going to make drastic changes in the current appropriations for a host of Federal programs, let's do it aboveboard. Let's address each of these programs specifically, and not destroy these programs under the guise of essential military and disaster relief spending. For these reasons, I oppose this emergency supplemental appropriations bill unless significant changes are made.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3579. This House has a responsibility to help those affected by the terrible El Nino-driven rains and midslides in the West, ice storms in the Northeast, tornadoes, floods and other natural disasters. We have a very real responsibility to our troops in Bosnia and the Persian Gulf. However, we cannot abandon our responsibility to protect the most vulnerable members of our society. I am appalled that Republican leaders plan to offset disaster and emergency assistance with cuts in programs that will hurt the elderly, children and low-income Americans.

I am disappointed I am being forced to vote against funding for disaster assistance. However, we cannot kowtow to another Republican maneuver to rob from the poor to protect the interests of the rich. The spending cuts that Republicans have demanded are targeted on the most vulnerable in our society. These cuts will force more than 800,00 low-income Americans from their homes, including more than 100,000 older Americans. I cannot support such drastic cuts to our Section 8 low-income housing program. I will not be a party to evicting almost a million Americans from their homes.

These offsets—which drastically cut or eliminate important safety-net programs—are being offered up by the same Republican leaders who want more tax cuts for the rich. We should be closing corporate loopholes rather than closing off opportunities and programs

that provide a lifeline for the poor and vulnerable in our society. If we would end just some corporate subsidies we could ensure that our military troops overseas and those impacted by natural disasters here at home will receive the assistance they need. They deserve no less.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill. We should send this bill back to the Committee to find offsets that do not compromise the health, safety and well-being of the most vulnerable in our society.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3579, the FY 1998 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.

First, this bill meets our obligations to our young men and women who are serving our country in our Armed Forces halfway around the world—in Bosnia and the Persian Gulf.

It should be noted that this Administration, knowing full well that our troops would remain in Bosnia long after their promised departure date, failed to request funding for that mission for the full fiscal year. That, Mr. Speaker, is unacceptable and with this bill we in Congress will provide the necessary leadership to meet those commitments.

Second, with this bill we are responding to the needs of families and communities here in the United States that have been devastated by flooding, tornadoes and other natural disasters.

With this bill, we are also keeping our commitment to pay for this added spending and we are meeting our obligations under the Balanced Budget Agreement.

I urge passage of the bill.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong opposition to this bill. Once again, emergency funds are being held hostage by an extreme Washington political agenda.

The President and Congressional Democrats proposed passing one single bill with funds for families hit hard by natural disasters, for our troops stationed in Bosnia, and for the businesses weathering the Asian financial crisis.

Instead, my Republican colleagues have chosen to play political games. They have coupled money for rebuilding communities hit by El Nino, keeping Saddam Hussein in check, and preventing the former Yugoslavia from flaring out of control with almost $3 billion in unnecessary cuts in housing, education, and community services. Why? To force the President to veto this bill with its urgently needed funds.

By playing politics, my colleagues in the majority are holding America's national security—at home and abroad—hostage. This is no time to play politics. People are suffering. American families' futures are in jeopardy.

I urge my colleagues to vote against politics as usual. Vote against this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the federal response to natural disasters, particularly as it relates to the recent devastating storm which hit Guam. Last December, Supertyphoon Paka, with winds gusts of about 200 miles per hour, damaged about 70 percent of the homes, toppled concrete telephone poles, damaged much of the island's infrastructure, and caused thousands of people to be homeless.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Small Business Administration, and other federal agencies responded to the immediate needs of the people of Guam, with emergency food and shelter, individual and family assistance, the clean-up of debris, and temporary unemployment assistance. While we appreciate the immediate federal response, the devastation is such that the ability to address the long-term recovery needs is beyond the capability of the Government of Guam.

On behalf of my constituents, I want to express my deep disappointment that Guam's needs as a civilian community were not addressed in the President's submission in this disaster bill. To be sure, there is proposed funding for the repair of military facilities in this submission and I certainly support this. However, the needs of the people of Guam for housing and repair of economically vital facilities like the Port have not been included.

Guam estimates that 5,774 houses were damaged by Typhoon Paka, of which 1,716 received major damages and 1,284 were totally destroyed. The individuals whose homes were damaged or destroyed applied for SBA loans. Many of those loans were approved; however, many families fell through the cracks. Families who were denied SBA loans returned to substandard houses or to rebuilt wooded or tin structures. The Government of Guam estimates that 759 families, fifteen percent of the total households that were damaged, are now living in substandard housing. Many of those who continue to be homeless are now residing with relatives until they are able to rebuild their homes through whatever means possible.

I am hopeful that Guam's request for disaster housing assistance can be addressed by the conferees or dealt with by the Department of Housing and Uban Development in its regular appropriations process.

I have also written to the members of the Appropriations Committee requesting supplemental funds for improvements to Guam's port facility. Our commercial port, which is the lifeline for all of the residents of Guam, was damaged by the storm and needs to be restored to its economic vitality. The emergency supplemental bill includes funds for the Corps of Engineers to help with disaster-assistance projects across the country. I am pleased that the Chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee agrees with me that the Corps of Engineers should consider Guam's request in conjunction with other projects eligible for emergency disaster assistance. I will urge the House and Senate conferees to acknowledge this need and to urge the Corps of Engineers to prioritize the port reconstruction projects for Guam. These port projects will have a positive effect on Guam's long-term recovery and its ability to withstand future devastating storms such as Typhoon Paka.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Guam have a history of weathering countless tropical storms because we are geographically in a typhoon alley. We learn from each experience and we have taken positive steps after each storm to harden our homes and structures and to prepare for hard times. Currently, FEMA and the Government of Guam are working on a task force to recommend a number of hazard mitigation activities which will help us in future devastating storms. To have survived Supertyphoon Paka with no loss of life is a testament to the resilience and vitality of the people of Guam.

As Congress and the Administration addresses the needs of the various communities which have suffered from natural disasters, I hope that Guam's request for disaster assistance will be taken into account. Disasters are disasters wherever they occur, and the American citizens in the States and the territories—from the Caribbean to the Pacific areas—look to the federal government for leadership and cooperation during difficult times. I trust that the Congress will augment this emergency supplemental bill with some much-needed funds for Guam's recovery from Supertyphoon Paka.

The CHAIRMAN. The 30 minutes for debate under the rule has expired. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) has 7 minutes remaining in general debate, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendments printed in part I of House Report 105–473 are adopted.

The text of H.R. 3579, as amended by the amendments printed in Part I of House Report 105–473, is as follows:

H.R. 3579

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

**CHAPTER 1**

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

EMERGENCY CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Emergency Conservation Program'' for expenses resulting from ice storms, flooding, and other natural disasters, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

TREE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

An amount of $4,700,000 is provided for assistance to replace or rehabilitate trees and vineyards damaged by natural disasters: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request of $4,700,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For additional gross obligations for the principal amount of emergency insured loans

authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928–1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, for losses in fiscal year 1998 resulting from ice storms, flooding and other natural disasters, $87,000,000.

For the additional cost of emergency insured loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, $21,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $21,000,000 that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

LIVESTOCK DISASTER ASSISTANCE FUND

Effective only for losses incurred beginning on November 27, 1997, through the date of enactment of this Act, $4,000,000, to implement a livestock indemnity program to compensate producers for losses of livestock (including ratites) due to natural disasters designated pursuant to a Presidential or Secretarial declaration requested during such period in a manner similar to catastrophic loss coverage available for other commodities under 7 U.S.C. 1508(b): *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request of $4,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

DAIRY PRODUCTION INDEMNITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Effective only for losses incurred beginning on November 27, 1997, through the date of enactment of this Act, $6,800,000 to implement a dairy production indemnity program to compensate producers for losses of milk that had been produced but not marketed or for diminished production (including diminished future production due to mastitis) due to natural disasters designated pursuant to a Presidential or Secretarial declaration requested during such period: *Provided,* That payments for diminished production shall be determined on a per head basis derived from a comparison to a like production period from the previous year, the disaster period is 180 days starting with the date of the disaster and the payment rate shall be $4.00 per hundredweight of milk: *Provided further,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request of $6,800,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for ''Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations'' to repair damages to the waterways and watersheds resulting from ice storms, flooding, tornadoes and other natural disasters, $65,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $65,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

**CHAPTER 2**

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $184,000,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $22,300,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $5,100,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $10,900,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Navy'', $4,100,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $2,586,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That of this amount, $700,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $53,800,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That of this amount, $5,700,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $26,810,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $49,200,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That of this amount, $21,800,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $1,390,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $650,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $229,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $5,925,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That of this amount, $5,750,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget

and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $975,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund'', $1,829,900,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds to fiscal year 1998 appropriations for operation and maintenance, working capital funds, the Defense Health Program, procurement, and research, development, test and evaluation: *Provided further,* That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further,* That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in Public Law 105–56.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

NAVY WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For an additional amount for ''Navy Working Capital Fund'', $30,467,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That of this amount, $7,450,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress.

DEFENSE-WIDE WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For an additional amount for ''Defense-Wide Working Capital Fund'', $1,000,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Defense Health Program'', $1,900,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. No part of any appropriation contained in this chapter shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 202. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414).

SEC. 203. In addition to the amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense under Public Law 105–56, there is hereby appropriated $37,000,000 for the ''Reserve Mobilization Income Insurance Fund'', to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 204. (a) QUALITY ASSURANCE REPORT ON MILITARY HEALTH CARE.—The Secretary of Defense shall appoint an independent panel of experts to evaluate recent measures taken by the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs and the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy and Air Force to improve the quality of care provided by the Military Health Services System.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—(1) The panel shall be composed of nine members appointed by the Secretary of Defense. At least five of those members shall be persons who are highly qualified in the medical arts, have experience in setting health care standards, and possess a demonstrated understanding of the military health care system and its unique mission requirements. The remaining members shall be persons who are current beneficiaries of the Military Health Services System.

(2) The Secretary shall designate one member to serve as chairperson of the panel.

(3) The Secretary shall appoint the members of this panel not later than 45 days after enactment of this Act.

(c) FUNCTIONS OF THE PANEL.—The panel shall review the Department of Defense Access and Quality Improvement Initiative announced in early 1998 (together with other related quality improvement actions) to assess whether all reasonable measures have been taken to ensure that the Military Health Services System delivers health care services in accordance with consistently high professional standards. The panel shall specifically assess actions of the Department to accomplish the following objectives of that initiative and related management actions:

(1) Upgrade professional education and training requirements for military physicians and other health care providers;

(2) Establish ''Centers of Excellence'' for complicated surgical procedures;

(3) Make timely and complete reports to the National Practitioner Data Bank and eliminate associated reporting backlogs;

(4) Assure that Military Health Services System providers are properly licensed and have appropriate credentials;

(5) Reestablish the Quality Management Report to aid in early identification of compliance problems;

(6) Improve communications with beneficiaries to provide comprehensive and objective information on the quality of care being provided;

(7) Strengthen the National Quality Management Program;

(8) Ensure that all laboratory work meets professional standards; and

(9) Ensure the accuracy of patient data and information.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date on which the panel is established, the panel shall submit to the Secretary a report setting forth its findings and conclusions, and the reasons therefor, and such recommendations it deems appropriate. The Secretary shall forward the report of the panel to Congress not later than 15 days after the date on which the Secretary receives it, together with the Secretary's comments on the report.

(e) PANEL ADMINISTRATION.—(1) The members of the panel shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized by law for employees of agencies while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the panel.

(2) Upon request of the chairperson of the panel, the Secretary of Defense may detail to the panel, on a nonreimbursable basis, personnel of the Department of Defense to assist the panel in carrying out its duties. The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the panel such administrative and support services as may be requested by the chairman of the panel.

(f) PANEL FINANCING.—Of the funds appropriated in Public Law 105–56 for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $5,000,000 shall be transferred to ''Defense Health Program'', to be available through fiscal year 1999, only for administrative costs of this panel and for the express purpose of initiating or accelerating any activity identified by the panel that will improve the quality of health care provided by the Military Health Services System.

**CHAPTER 3**

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For emergency repairs due to flooding and other natural disasters, $84,457,000, to remain available until expended, of which such amounts for eligible navigation projects which may be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund pursuant to Public Law 99–662, shall be derived from that Fund: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

For an additional amount for ''Water and Related Resources'' to repair damage caused by floods and other natural disasters, $4,520,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Army shall not authorize, permit, or undertake any activity to stabilize, cover, or permanently alter the site where the Kennewick Man remains were discovered prior to the final disposition of the lawsuit entitled Bonnichsen, et al. v. United States, et al. and designated as United States District Court, District of Oregon CV No. 96–1481, unless such district court makes a determination that such activity is reasonable and necessary in light of potential adverse impacts on scientific investigation of the site or other relevant considerations. For the purposes of this paragraph, the term ''site'' means any land, beach, or river bank within 100 yards of the location where any portion of the Kennewick Man remains were discovered.

**CHAPTER 4**

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for ''Construction'', $28,938,000, to remain available until expended, to repair damage caused by floods and other acts of nature: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That of such amount, $25,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act is transmitted by the President to Congress.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for ''Construction'', to repair damage caused by floods and other acts of nature, $8,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act is transmitted by the President to Congress.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for ''Surveys, Investigations, and Research'' for emergency expenses resulting from floods and other acts of nature, $1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act is transmitted by the President to Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For an additional amount for ''State and Private Forestry'' for emergency expenses resulting from damages from ice storms, tornadoes and other natural disasters, $48,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That of such amount, $28,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act is transmitted by the President to Congress.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For an additional amount for ''National Forest System'' for emergency expenses resulting from damages from ice storms, tornadoes and other natural disasters, $10,461,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That of such amount, $5,461,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act is transmitted by the President to Congress.

**CHAPTER 5**

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART III

For an additional amount for ''Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part III'' to cover costs arising from El Nino related damage, $1,020,000, to be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps'' to cover costs arising from Typhoon Paka related damage, $15,600,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

For an additional amount for ''Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps'' to cover costs arising from El Nino related damage, $1,000,000, to be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Family Housing, Air Force'' to cover costs arising from Typhoon Paka related damage, $1,500,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

For an additional amount for ''Family Housing, Air Force'' to cover costs arising from El Nino related damage, $900,000, to be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

**CHAPTER 6**

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For an additional amount for the Emergency Relief Program for emergency expenses resulting from floods and other natural disasters, as authorized by 23 U.S.C. 125, $259,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That of such amount, $35,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That any obligations for the Emergency Relief Program shall not be subject to the prohibition against obligations in section 2(e)(3)(A) and (D) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997: *Provided further*, That 23 U.S.C. 125(b)(1) shall not apply to projects resulting from flooding during the fall of 1997 through the winter of 1998 in California.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

EMERGENCY RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND REPAIR

For necessary expenses to repair and rebuild freight rail lines of regional and short line railroads or a State entity damaged by floods, $9,000,000, to be awarded to the States subject to the discretion of the Secretary on a case-by-case basis: *Provided*, That not more than $2,650,000 shall be solely for damage incurred in the Northern Plains States in March and April 1997: *Provided further*, That not more than $6,350,000 shall be solely for damage incurred as a result of El Nino in the fall of 1997 through the winter of 1998: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this head shall be available for rehabilitation of railroad rights-of-way, bridges, and other facilities which are part of the general railroad system of transportation, and primarily used by railroads to move freight traffic: *Provided further*, That railroad rights-of-way, bridges, and other facilities owned by class I railroads are not eligible for funding under this head, unless the rights-of-way, bridges, or other facilities are under contract lease to a class II or class III railroad under which the lessee is responsible for all maintenance costs of the line: *Provided further*, That railroad rights-of-way, bridges, and other facilities owned by passenger railroads or by tourist, scenic, or historic railroads are not eligible for funding under this head: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control

Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That all funds made available under this head are to remain available until September 30, 1998.

TITLE II

RESCISSIONS

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts made available under this heading in Public Law 105–78, $75,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided,* That, to the extent necessary to carry out such rescission, the Secretary of Education shall deobligate funds that have been obligated but have not been expended.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Of the available contract authority balances under this heading, $610,000,000 are rescinded.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 105–66, none of the funds in this or any other Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $1,425,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and noise compatibility planning and programs, notwithstanding section 47117(h) of title 49, United States Code.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

SECTION 8 RESERVE PRESERVATION ACCOUNT

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts recaptured under this heading during fiscal year 1998 and prior years, $2,173,600,000 are rescinded: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall recapture $2,173,600,000 in amounts heretofore maintained as section 8 reserves made available to housing agencies for tenant-based assistance under the section 8 existing housing certificate and housing voucher programs.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS OPERATING EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts made available under this heading in Public Law 105–65, $250,000,000 are rescinded.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 3001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR MILITARY OPERATIONS AGAINST IRAQ

SEC. 3002. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for the conduct of offensive operations by United States Armed Forces against Iraq for the purpose of obtaining compliance by Iraq with United Nations Security Council Resolutions relating to inspection and destruction of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq unless such operations are specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON SPENDING OFFSETS FOR EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. . (a) FINDINGS.—The House of Representatives finds that——

(1) the House has worked diligently to balance the Federal budget for the first time in 30 years;

(2) the House is committed to fiscal responsibility and continued balanced budgets and will not allow Washington to return to the days of deficit spending;

(3) the House is committed to ensuring that the current level of Federal discretionary spending does not increase as a result of any emergency supplemental appropriations; and

(4) reducing spending to offset emergency supplemental appropriations will send a clear message to the American people that the Congress is serious about preventing uncontrolled Federal spending.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that any emergency supplemental appropriations considered in the 105th Congress shall not result in an increased level of total Federal discretionary spending.

In title II (relating to rescissions), in the item relating to ''Department of Transportation—Federal Aviation Administration—Grants-In-Aid for Airports (Airport and Highway Trust Fund)(Rescission of Contract Authority)'', after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $243,600,000)''.

In title II (relating to rescissions), in the item relating to ''Department of Transportation—Federal Aviation Administration—Grants-In-Aid for Airports (Limitation on Obligations)'', after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $243,600,000)''.

This Act may be cited as the ''1998 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act''.

The CHAIRMAN. No other amendment to the bill is in order except the further amendment printed in part II of the report. That amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part II amendment printed in House Report 105–473 offered by Mr. LIVINGSTON:

CHAPTER 7

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS FUND

For an additional amount for ''Community development block grants fund'', as authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, $20,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2001, for use in states affected by the January, 1998 Northeast ice storm for which a Presidential disaster declaration under title IV of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act has been issued, to assist in the long-term recovery and mitigation from the effects of that ice storm; *Provided,* That such funds may be used for eligible activities, except those activities reimbursable or for which funds are made available by the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Small Business Administration: *Provided further,* That in administering these amounts, the secretary may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or the use by the recipient of these funds, except for statutory requirements related to civil rights, fair housing and nondiscrimination, the environment, and labor standards, upon a finding that such waiver is required to facilitate the use of such fund: *Provided further,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request of $20,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the budget request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

On page 29, line 9 increase the pending figure by $20,000,000 and on line 11 increase the pending figure by $20,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 402, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON).

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendment before the committee would provide $20 million for HUD's Community Development Block Grant Program to assist in the recovery from the recent Northeastern U.S. ice storm. This storm caused damage to property and utilities in this area of the country in an unprecedented manner.

Providing funding in this account is similar to what has been done in recent past disasters. The funding in this amendment would be offset by an increase to the Section 8 housing excess reserve rescission. This amendment will bring important additional relief to this area caused by the huge ice storm that devastated the Northeastern U.S. and Canada. I urge its adoption.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) claim the time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, yes, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I wanted to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his work in addressing the issue and regret that we could not work on this given the time constraints.

I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) for remembering the Northeast in the manager's amendment.

This amendment addresses the particular dilemma created in the ice storm of January and the destruction of the infrastructure in the Northeast. The ice storm of 1998 was perhaps the most far-reaching disaster that has ever hit Maine. Every county in my State was declared a Federal disaster area.

Across the region, families lived without heat or electricity, many for upwards of 2 weeks. Roads became impassible due to ice and to fallen trees. Our forest suffered devastating damage. Farmers suffered significant loss of livestock, milk, buildings and equipment. Federal agencies responded promptly to the crisis created by the unprecedented storm. They tried to get there as quickly as possible in marshaling forces to assist farms, food pantries and more. However, the resources they had on hand were insufficient. This manager's amendment goes a long way toward providing those resources, and it will help to rebuild the infrastructure through the community development block grant.

I rise today in support of the disaster relief funding provided in this legislation. I know that in this beautiful 80-plus degree weather we are enjoyed now in Washington, it may be easy to forget the recent natural disasters that have ravaged Maine and other parts of the country.

The Ice Storm of '98 was perhaps the most far-reaching disaster that has ever hit Maine. Every county in my state was declared a federal disaster area. Across the region, families lived without heat or electricity, many for upwards of two weeks. Roads became impassable, both due to ice and to fallen trees. Our forest suffered devastating damage. Farmers suffered significant losses of livestock, milk, buildings and equipment.

Federal agencies responded promptly to the crisis created by the unprecedented storm. Staff from FEMA, the Farm Service Agency and the Natural Resources Conservation Service quickly helped, marshaling forces to assist farms, food pantries and more.

However, the resources they had on hand were insufficient. This bill goes a long way toward providing those resources. It will help the farmers who in many cases were least able to afford the cost of recovery. It will help us to recover our forests. We are still in a recovery stage, and the funding provided in this bill will greatly assist us in that long and arduous process.

I want to especially thank the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Livingston, for remembering the Northeast in his manager's amendment. This amendment addresses the particular dilemma created in the Ice Storm of January, the destruction of the infrastructure of the Northeast.

I am concerned with the rescissions called for in the bill, particularly for the deep cuts in the Section 8 housing program and the AmeriCorps program. The funding provided for in this bill, as defined by the Budget Act, falls under the definition of a true emergency, and I therefore believe that offsets are not necessary. I appreciate the efforts of the Ranking Member, Mr. OBEY, in addressing this issue, and regret that he has not been allowed to offer an amendment to rectify this situation.

Again, I want to extend my appreciation to the Appropriations Committee for their efforts to provide needed disaster assistance in this Emergency Supplemental bill. The people of Maine suffered greatly at the hand of Mother Nature this winter. They look to us to help them in their recovery, much as we have helped in the recovery for other areas of the country in other natural disasters. I urge my colleagues to support both the manager's amendment and the bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I spoke at length earlier in the introductory remarks on this bill. Like the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI), I want to thank the chairman and certainly the ranking member. The devastating damage in the Northeast is almost indescribable. It is still there.

Secretary Andrew Cuomo, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, has pledged his support. He would be in support of this amendment. We again thank both sides for their consideration. We really need it and we just appreciate it so much.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I also want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) for recognizing the need for additional funding for the CDBG program. I rise today in support of the manager's amendment to supplement that block grant program by $20 million.

I do regret that the offset comes from Section 8 housing, and I hope that at some point that can be changed, but the Northeast has a real need for CDBG funding in the aftermath of the ice storm. This was for Maine the worst natural disaster in our history. Heavy ice accumulation accumulated on trees, on utility poles. We lost 2,600 utility poles, 2 million feet of cable and 1,500 transformers, all of those had to be replaced. Roughly 650,000 customers, half the State of Maine, were out of power for at least some point, many people for up to 2 weeks.

Supplemental CDBG funding is critical to address their need. I support this manager's amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Let me simply say that I know that the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was also interested in this amendment and contacted me numerous times on it. I personally have no problem with the action taken by the gentleman in his amendment to provide additional community development block grant assistance in the Northeast. My only problem with this amendment, again, is that I do not like the fact that we are cutting an additional $20 million out of housing for the most needy human beings in this country.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 3¾ minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking member, for the hard work that has been put in on behalf of all the people in the country who have had such a difficult time this year. We were just meeting with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration talking about some of the effects of the El Nino weather pattern and their ability to track it, and try to predict it for the future because it will return. And that is planning for the future, Mr. Chairman.

But what we are doing now is trying to respond to the damage that has already been done. The amendment that the chairman has will help us to help those communities through community development block grants to put back together the damage that was done earlier. This ice storm in our part of the country, northern New York, and as Members know, these funds cover all the areas that were harmed by the weather, in California, New Mexico and the South, Georgia, Florida, New York, Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, the ice storm was a catastrophe of a magnitude such that Canada, the Nation of Canada, this was the greatest natural disaster in the history of Canada.

All the areas of the Northeast that border Canada were damaged equally. There were estimates of over 30,000 power poles taken down in this storm. As the ice came and accumulated, we had telephone electrical wire that was just a hair's breadth thick covered with that much ice. So the weight of the ice pulled down one after another of these power poles, and the electric wires and telephone wires were lying all over the roads, and then it snowed on top of the ice in the roads, covered over the wires so the plows could not go out and clean up the roads so that there was no passable commerce, and the dairy farmers in particular had to throw milk away.

You had barns collapsing from the weight of the ice and the snow and animals dying in the collapsed barns. You had animals that were out in the

weather that couldn't get back in who died because of the inclement weather. You had fires that began because of electrical breakdowns and the fire departments could not get to those homes because of the impassible roads. It was clearly a catastrophe.

So these funds, while they will not be enough to make everybody whole again, will go to communities and in many cases people do not realize the State of New York is primarily still an agricultural State. New York State is not a parking lot around New York City. It is a huge expanse of forest land and agricultural land and impoverished rural communities. So all these communities will qualify as they will in Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, for community development block grant funds, which are there to help our poorest communities and our poorest neighbors to help to ameliorate some of the losses that they have incurred.

Mr. Chairman, I will conclude by saying I am very grateful to my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, both sides of the fence, who brought this bill to this point. I look very much forward to working with them to pass this bill and to get it through the conference.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

All I would say, I would simply make an observation that what we are doing in this legislation today is reimbursing farmers for the loss of animals. That is fine. I do not disagree with that.

However, unfortunately, we are not going to be reimbursing families for the loss of housing for their grandparents. I do not think that is fine. But nonetheless, the Congress will work its wondrous ways as it usually does, often with the national interests being damaged in the process. I am sorry about that, but I guess that is the way it goes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1545

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHAW) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, 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. 3579) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 402, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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 MR. MURTHA

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MURTHA. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MURTHA moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3579, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment to strike title II of the bill.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate my concern about this piece of legislation. Normally, when we would come to the floor from the Committee on Appropriations, we would have pretty well fashioned legislation which we knew was very close to something that the Senate was going to consider; and, in the end, we would be convinced that it would pass both bodies.

As late as Thursday or Friday of last week, we believed that we would be able to report out of Committee a bill that was not offset. Even today, the Defense Department is not sure whether this particular piece of legislation will be offset. They know now that we will not have IMF. We know that we will not have the U.N. attached to this bill.

On the other hand, the other body has an entirely different bill with no offsets. It is over $5 billion, almost twice as large as this particular bill.

Under normal circumstances, the Defense Department would not be caught in the middle. It would be able to say, okay, we are going to try to get a bill and work things out. All day long, as I understand it, they have been trying to come up with provisions of what would happen if we passed a bill that is offset with the Skaggs amendment, which the President will veto, and with provisions which offset the domestic policy, which concerns the White House and they claim they will veto. It puts us in a position where we have a bill which will not be signed into law, and they only have 4 months left in the fiscal year. So the Defense Department is in a position where it has to begin to find ways to find the money for the last 4 months of operation.

We have cut the Defense Department substantially. There is no question about it. They have been overdeployed. There is no question about that. But we are talking about money that is absolutely essential to replace the money for the deployment in Iraq and the deployment in Bosnia.

We have already voted on the floor of the House to continue the operation in Bosnia. We have already spoken to the fact that we believe it is absolutely essential to our national security to be in Iraq. So what are they talking about?

Here is what they are talking about as far as what they would do in order to recoup the money because they are not sure it is going to be passed into law and signed by the President. Civilian worker furloughs at defense bases. And it may be, I have heard a rumor, as high as all the Defense Department civilian employees could be laid off across the country for 10 days. My colleagues can imagine how disruptive that would be.

They are also talking about delays in promotions, which has happened before with minor delays in funding from the Congress, delays in moving families.

I remember last year going to the Presidio in California, and they were talking about they could not move students from one place to another. They had to delay the moving of students because they had run out of money at the end of the fiscal year.

We talk about training cutbacks down to platoon level. That is what could happen if the Defense Department did not get this money.

Now I paint dire circumstances, but I paint that because the Defense Department is in the middle. And I do not doubt the integrity of the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he is going to tell us there is going to be a bill passed and if it passed he can assure that. But he also thought before we brought this bill to the floor that it was not going to be offset. And I do not know if he advised that, and I understand. I think all of us appreciate the need to offset some of these expenses that the Senate has in, and I think in the end we could probably work something out like that.

So I would hope that the Members of Congress would not take a chance on destabilizing the Defense Department and they would vote to recommit this bill and then report it right back out without the offsets and allow the Defense Department to find a way to get by the next month until a final bill is passed into law and signed by the President.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, and I will try not to use all 5 minutes, I am sympathetic to the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

The last thing in the world we want to do is adversely impact the Defense Department. But the gentleman might remember that the President did not request enough money to complete fiscal year 1998, let alone fiscal year 1999, for the troops in Bosnia.

Mr. Clinton wrote in his budget a shortfall, for whatever reason. I do not want to question his motivation. He may have had good reason. We were not sure whether we were pulling the troops out a year and a half ago. We

were not sure whether we were going to pull the troops out this year. But the fact is the President did not request enough money to support our troops.

So we cannot accept that stipulation of fact and then argue, well, if we do not act fast enough, the troops are not going to have enough money. I mean, whose fault is that? It is not Congress' fault. It is the President's fault.

We are coming up with the list here of extra money for the Defense Department, $2.2 billion in defense, and that provides for Iraq and Southwest Asia and Bosnia and disasters affecting military installations and reserve mobilization insurance programs. We are providing the money for the Defense Department. In addition, we are providing for well over half a billion dollars in disaster relief for people that have been affected by all sorts of disasters all over the country.

The fact also is that the prime rate in the American economy is something like about 8.5 percent. You can get a mortgage at around 7 percent interest rate. Fifteen years ago that was a 14-percent prime and 21 percent for a mortgage in some areas. The American economy is spinning.

Why is it doing very well? The fact is, one of the principal reasons it is doing very well is that the Congress has acted responsibly with respect to its financial affairs over the last 4 years. The Congress has not spent more money than was budgeted. We are spending a billion dollars less on nondefense discretionary spending than we spent 4 years ago.

If we looked at the President's own projections for spending 4 years ago, 1994, that was $120 billion over what we have spent in those 4 years for nondefense discretionary. The point is, this is a fiscally responsible approach. Will it pass through all of the hurdles and get through the Senate and get to the President's desk? I do not know. I do not want to prejudge that one way or the another.

All I am saying is this House of Representatives has been fiscally responsible by saying, yes, we will spend more money for defense, we will spend more money for disasters, but we will take it out of existing spending in the rest of the budget. That is not too much to ask.

Let us keep the interest rates low, let us keep the American economy spinning, and let us make sure that we continue to be fiscally responsible.

I urge the defeat of the motion to recommit, which would eliminate the offsets of this bill. I urge passage of the bill itself. And I hope that when we return from the recess that we will have a quick conference and that we will be able to get this down to the Pentagon so they will have the money that they need and so that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) will not be distressed any further.

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.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 15-minute vote, which, if the motion to recommit is rejected, under the rules, will be followed by another 15-minute vote on final passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 224, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—195

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
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
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
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)
Kennedy (RI)
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 (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—224

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
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
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
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
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
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
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Berry
Cannon
Fawell
Gonzalez
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Payne
Rangel
Riggs
Royce
Waters

□ 1616

Mr. PAXON and Mr. SOLOMON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. MARKEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 208, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—212

Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—208

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
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)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
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 (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Berry
Cannon
Gonzalez
Jefferson
Payne
Rangel
Riggs
Royce
Schumer
Waters

☐ 1634

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So 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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, last night I was tied up in the Committee on Rules testifying on my amendment to the Financial Modernization Bill.

Due to this, I arrived on the floor at the very last minute and inadvertently voted ''aye'' on rollcall No. 81. My intention was to vote ''no'' because of my opposition to the language in the bill. I would like the RECORD to show on rollcall No. 81, my vote would have been ''no.''

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, last evening I was the visiting lecturer at the Columbia University School of Law in New York and, therefore, unable to participate in the rollcall votes.

Had I been present and voting on rollcall votes 81, 82, 83 and 84, the campaign reform issues, I would have voted ''aye.''

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL SERVICES ACT OF 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 403 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 403

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed two hours, with one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final

passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 403 is a modified closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 10, which is the Financial Services Act of 1998. The rule provides 2 hours of general debate: 1 hour equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce. The rule also waives all points of order against consideration of this bill.

The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is printed in part 1 of the Committee on Rules report on the rule, which appears on these desks here, shall be considered as an original bill for the purposes of amendment. That amendment shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to describe the amendment in the nature of a substitute, so the Members are clear on what this rule makes in order as a new base text for H.R. 10.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consists of the following parts: The compromise text for H.R. 10 reached between the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and the Committee on Commerce, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 19, so if Members want to read the bill, they can look in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 19; the credit union legislation, as reported from the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and approved by voice vote last Thursday, March 26, in that committee; a new thrift title which replaces Title 4 with an amendment which closes the unitary thrift holding company loophole as of March 31, 1998. That is a change from September up to March 31, 1998. So Members should be aware of that, because a number of Members have come to me over the last several days and wanted to know what we are doing with this thrift section of the bill. That is what it does. And changes necessary to ensure that the legislation is fully offset.

In order to comply with the Budget Act, the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by the rule transfers funds out of the Federal Reserve and into the general fund.

Mr. Speaker, this rule also waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule then makes in order five amendments which shall be offered in the order printed in the report, may only be offered by a Member printed in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent. The amendments shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to stack votes, and finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this is an abundantly fair rule on an extremely complicated and delicate piece of legislation. It deals with the future of the banking industry in this country, of the securities industry in this country, and the insurance industry.

If Members think about that, each of these three industries really is involved with all of the other industries throughout America, and more so in not only the Fortune 500 companies and how they conduct their business overseas in this new global economy, but also with the small entrepreneurial businesses, the businesses that really run the economy of this country, and how they can participate in this new world global economy. That is how important this bill is before us today.

The chairmen of the committees of jurisdiction have spent countless days, they have spent months, even years, laboring to achieve some kind of consideration of this issue. It has been going on for at least the 20 years that I have been a member of this body; I see the gentleman from New York (Mr. JOHN LAFALCE) sitting there, for as long as he has been here, and he has been here longer than I have.

I salute the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) for their work on this very, very important subject, as well as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHN BOEHNER), who happens to be our conferences chairman, who has headed up the task force which has really brought all of these industries together.

No industry is completely happy. If they were, then there would be something wrong with this bill. But the fact that they are not means that we have reached compromise, and we can now move forward into the 21st century in making these industries competitive.

Mr. Speaker, the rule makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute which I believe will garner a high degree of support on this floor. The compromise text of H.R. 10 has been met with considerable begrudging support from many of the industries, but again, they are now willing to sit down and understand that we have to have this bill. It has to become law.

The credit union legislation received broad support in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services last week, which we just mentioned, and passed by voice vote; and the thrift fix addresses concerns expressed by many Members in the weeks since the committees reached a compromise on the underlying bill, so we have tried to bring all Members and all of these industries together.

The rule allows for very important discussions on the commercial basket concept, with two alternataives allowed. It also allows a significant amendment by the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce.

Finally, there is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) to relieve some of the burden of the Community Reinvestment Act on small banks.

I am going to tell the Members, small bankers have been out there calling Members of Congress saying they are all upset with this piece of legislation. I am going to tell the Members, the small bankers cannot have it all their way. It has to be a compromise. This is a tremendous compromise by making this amendment in order, which is going to benefit these small banks and community banks across this country.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation represents, I think, a visionary effort to reform our Nation's complicated and outdated financial services law.

The Glass-Steagall Act, the law which prohibits the affiliations between commercial banking and securities activities, dates back to 1933. That is 3 years after I was born, Mr. Speaker. I have been amazed at how much the world has changed in just the last 5 years, let alone since 1933. The marketplace has evolved so much that it is unrecognizable from the era in which these laws were written.

Congress, given the rapid pace of change in the market, has been perceived to be irrelevant to our Nation's financial services debate. Think about that. I am going to repeat it one time. Congress, given the rapid pace of change in the market, has been perceived to be irrelevant to our Nation's financial services debate. That is because we have not done our job on this issue over the last 20 years.

Congress has, unfortunately, shirked its responsibility to write the Nation's laws, and the courts and regulators have written them for us. I am going to tell the Members, that is a disgrace. Any time this Congress sits back and refuses to face the important issues facing this country, and lets the courts and regulators do it for them, it is a shame. We all should be ashamed of it.

Mr. Speaker, the inability of the legislative branch for many years to pass meaningful financial services reform has harmed our markets and our ability to compete in that world global market that I have spoken about earlier.

American financial institutions, and all the affected industries with an interest in reforming these laws, have

been at a competitive disadvantage with our international competitors all over this world. Passage of this legislation is critical to our ability to compete overseas.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is balanced, it is fair, and it is a measured proposal which addresses all of the critical issues in the current financial landscape. It provides for affiliations between banks, securities firms, insurance companies, and other financial firms by eliminating the Glass-Steagall protections between those industries.

The bill also allows for these expanded activities in a bank holding company structure, which is critical to ensure the safety and the soundness of our country's financial institutions.

Recent history has shown the enormous cost that can result from rash and unfettered deregulation of certain types of financial institutions. As a result of the savings and loan debacle that we all went through here, and we had to spend billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to bail out those S&Ls, the resulting explosive costs have just been insurmountable. A bipartisan consensus has developed around the holding company framework as the prudential way to allow for expanded financial services.

The bill also addresses the critically important question of credit union membership, which has received a great deal of attention since the Supreme Court ruled in February on the ''common bond'' issue. The bill grandfathers existing multiple common bond groups and allows such groups to continue accepting members, thereby protecting all current credit union members, regardless of the Supreme Court decision.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also contains important language ensuring functional regulation of insurance sales, and that is so terribly, terribly important. Insurance underwriting regulation will be the same for all competitors and regulated by the States, and that is the way it should be. That is what is provided for in the Constitution of our country. H.R. 10 also codifies a consensus definition of insurance, ensuring appropriate functional regulation and a level competitive playing field.

Mr. Speaker, writing a financial services reform bill which contemplates a marketplace of the 21st century does not mean we should disregard the lessons of the past.

This legislation will provide the legal structure for a marketplace of the future, while still ensuring regulatory structures which have demonstrated their effectiveness in acknowledging the importance of protecting depositors and protecting investors.

Mr. Speaker, again, it just bothers me to see some Members shirk their duty. They worry about offending this group of constituents or that group. But there comes a time when we know better. We know best, we know what is going on here, and we have to put together something that is going to allow these three very important industries to be able to compete.

This legislation will be a step in the right direction. It does not mean that we are going to solve it. This is not the final step, the passage of this legislation. As Members know, there is another body over there. It is called the Senate. They have no rules over there, but we are told that if we can pass this legislation with a substantial vote, that Senator AL D'AMATO, the chairman of the Banking Committee, will take up this legislation. He will work with us to work together for a compromise that will be acceptable to all the industries. But if we do not pass the rule today and we do not pass the bill, we are not going to have that opportunity.

I am going to say one more time to the Members here, they think there is a lot of time left, but there is not. We are going to hopefully adjourn this place at least by October 1 so Members can at least spend 30 days home campaigning for reelection. If we do that, Members will only have about 40 legislative days on this floor to pass 13 appropriation bills, to pass the conference report and the supplemental we just put out of here.

To pass this kind of legislation, we need to do it now so we will have time to work with the other body and with the White House, because there is a third party of the government, before we can really put the bill together as a compromise. That is why Members need to come here today, they need to vote for this rule, and then they need to participate in the debate.

There is plenty of debate time. Ask the questions, get the answers to questions, then vote one's conscience on this bill. But at least let us pass the rule and give ourselves the opportunity.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I oppose it because the Committee on Rules Republicans have combined two major legislative initiatives, and in doing so, have denied the House the opportunity to fully examine, debate, and work its will on these matters.

H.R. 10, the Financial Services Modernization Act, and H.R. 1151, the Credit Union Membership Access Act, are probably two of the most important and far-reaching legislative proposals this House will consider this year.

H.R. 10, the financial services modernization bill, is very controversial and has been the subject of contentious debate in both the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and the Committee on Commerce for the past 10 years.

The other bill, H.R. 1151, was reported last week by voice vote from the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

□ 1700

And so in what seems to be an effort to find votes to pass the former, the Republican leadership has tied the credit union fix to it.

Mr. Speaker, this tactic should be rejected. The House should have the opportunity to debate the merits of both financial modernization as well as the credit union fix, but the House should not be forced into using H.R. 1151 as the tail that wags the dog of H.R. 10.

Each of these proposals are extremely important in their own right and considering them tied together does a disservice to the House. I urge every Member to reject this rule.

Compounding the dilemma we now face, the Republican majority on the Committee on Rules has effectively cut off debate on H.R. 10 and has allowed for the House to consider only five amendments to the financial services modernization portion of the bill. In addition, no amendments were made in order to the credit union provisions.

Forty amendments were submitted to the Committee on Rules for our consideration, including 19 amendments by Republican Members and 21 amendments by Democratic Members. Only one Democratic amendment was included in the amendments made in order by the rule. While this amendment will be offered by the ranking Democratic Members of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and the Committee on Commerce, other amendments offered by those two Members, as well as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, were shut out of the process.

These Members proposed important and relevant amendments, and in some case those amendments reflected the action of the committees of jurisdiction which were exorcised from the text of H.R. 10 that is before us today. This action on the part of the Republican majority does nothing to open up the process and allow the House to comprehensively debate the issues surrounding this complex and controversial bill.

Mr. Speaker, in the years I have served in Congress, it has never been easy for the House to consider banking legislation. But this rule makes it almost impossible for the House to fully consider the merits of these two major legislative proposals.

First, by tying the two bills together the Republican leadership may be sabotaging the passage of the credit union legislation which, if considered on its own, might well pass on the suspension calendar. Second, the Republican leadership has denied many Members the opportunity to offer substantive amendments to the text of the underlying bill.

For these two reasons I urge defeat of the rule.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for consideration of H.R. 10, the Financial Services Act of 1997. Congress has tried 10 times since 1979 to repeal Glass-Steagall. It is time that the elected representatives of the Congress, rather than appointed regulators, make the legislative decisions affecting the powers of the financial services industry.

This rule eliminates the bulk of the thrift title from the legislation. This change will allow thrifts to continue to offer credit to customers for home ownership without having to become banks or to be subject to onerous restrictions on their authority. The revisions allow existing thrifts to continue operating exactly as they are now. It also preserves the ability of thrifts to be sold or transferred to new owners.

The rule also incorporates provisions of H.R. 1151, the Credit Union Membership Act, which is of a great interest to many members of credit unions across this country. This rule allows for consideration of repeal of Glass-Steagall as well as a number of amendments from Members on both sides of the aisle. I urge its adoption.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 89]

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
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
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
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)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
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
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
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
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

☐ 1732

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). On this rollcall, 387 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL SERVICES ACT OF 1998

Mr. FROST Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE).

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership wants the United States House of Representatives to play Russian roulette with the future of the credit union industry. We refuse to play that game.

One month ago, the Supreme Court cast in doubt the future viability of federally chartered credit unions; and men and women of goodwill in both the Republican and Democratic parties said, we have an enormous problem and we must come up with an immediate solution. Working together, working cooperatively, working collegially, we came up with that solution, an excellent solution that passed, I believe, unanimously by voice vote last Thursday.

Some have now said that what the Republican leadership has done in joining together this unanimously passed credit union bill, which could pass the House floor tonight or tomorrow by voice vote in my judgment if brought up separately, is give credit union members a first-class ticket on the ship Titanic. We do not know if that is going to be the case. Because if this should pass, it would be a long sail; and it might go down.

But we in the Democratic Party do not wish to play Russian roulette with the future of the credit union industry. We have the solution. We want to pass that solution today independently and solve the problem once and for all.

With respect to H.R. 10, who opposes it? The consumer groups oppose it. Who else opposes it? The administration opposes it. As a matter of fact, the most recent statement of opposition says that the Treasury Department will recommend that the President veto the bill in its present form, and that is the bill that the Republican leadership wishes to attach the credit union bill to. We reject that approach.

There are so many problems with H.R. 10. Now, a rule ought to permit us to deal with those problems, the problems of the National Bank Charter in particular, the problems of the Thrift Charter. The rule does not permit even one amendment on any of the issues the Treasury says will compel it to recommend a veto with respect to the National Bank Charter and the Thrift Charter. Not one amendment is permitted on the National Bank Charter or the Thrift Charter by this Committee on Rules.

This rule must be rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 23½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Claremont, California, (Mr. DREIER), vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, who is a very valuable Member and has formerly served on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. He and I do not always agree on these banking matters, but I yield him such time as he may consume.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Glens Falls, the distinguished chairman of the committee, for yielding me the time.

I do rise in support of this rule. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), chairman of the Committee on Commerce, have worked long and hard to produce what many believe to be a fragile compromise to bring about long overdue reforms to the financial services industry; and, for that reason, they deserve to be heard; and that is why I am going to be voting in support of the rule.

At the same time, as has been said during this debate earlier, I have more than a few very serious concerns about H.R. 10 that I do not believe can be fixed by the amendments that have been made in order under this bill. I think they could have if we had been able to make a substitute that I was proposing in order, but I do not believe they can be fixed under the structure that we now have.

Among those many concerns is the fact that H.R. 10 imposes massive new regulatory burdens on financial institutions, destroys a very valuable private sector charter, and encourages excessive litigation.

We are going to hear a lot today about how functional regulation will create a more level playing field for financial services firms to compete. But, in reality, Mr. Speaker, functional regulation does little more than saddle already highly regulated companies with additional layers of government regulation and bureaucracy in an effort to protect markets of less competitive firms. It responds to the parochial interests of government regulators rather than the preferences of consumers, which really should be our top priority here.

In short, this is really the Japanization of our financial services industry. By preventing the chartering of any new unitary thrift holding companies, H.R. 10 also punishes sound, profit-making private-sector companies because another industry wants them obliterated as a competitor.

Because H.R. 10 confers a competitive advantage to so-called grandfathered thrifts, Congress will be under constant pressure to take the next step, which is to impose a Soviet-style growth cap on that industry like that which was imposed on the non-bank banks 11 years ago. Imagine if 10 years ago, as computer makers began to embrace the Windows operating system, Congress mandated that all computers be loaded only with a DOS operating system. The cry of outrage would be deafening.

I also find it troubling that H.R. 10 attempts to hide behind the mantle of States' rights in an effort to perpetuate an obsolete regulatory system that is destructive to the economy. The U.S. has six major, well-entrenched financial regulators and a duplicative set of regulators in all 50 States. In the name of States' rights, H.R. 10 significantly increases uncertainty over the scope of State regulation of insurance. This, in turn, will lead to costly and unnecessary litigation. It will increase the insurance products to consumers, again the group that should be our top priority.

If my colleagues agree that excessive litigation is an ever-tightening noose around the neck of our economy, they should think twice about supporting a bill that promises litigation against any bank that attempts to devise innovative financial products and services for its customers, the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, in early 1995, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) began the process that eventually led to H.R. 10 by focusing initially on a narrow Glass-Steagall repeal bill that was devoid of the regulatory shenanigans and government intervention that characterizes this current bill. There was a fear that efforts to pass comprehensive legislation to modernize the financial services industry would get bogged down by legislative industry and regulatory turf battles.

Well, Mr. Speaker, those fears have come true once again. Instead of letting the marketplace determine winners and losers, H.R. 10 attempts to legislate who can compete with whom and who can produce and sell what. It is bad for consumers; and, Mr. Speaker, it is therefore bad for our economy.

However, as I said, the authors of this measure do deserve to be heard. So I do support the rule, but I will oppose this bill when it comes forward.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of this bill has been put together by two categories of people. First of all, a bunch of people out there in the business world think they are going to cut a fat hog free from exemptions and free from responsibilities and free from good sense controls to ensure that there would be fair behavior and proper behavior in the marketplace. The other is a group of people who do not understand what is going on in the financial world.

Financial world people think it runs on money. It does not. It runs on public confidence. And as long as we remember that and craft our laws in the proper fashion, we will have the confidence of the public and we will have the most successful financial operation in the whole world.

I rise not in anger but really in sorrow. And I want to say that I have tried to work with my Republican colleagues to cut a deal to preserve certain essential protections for American investors, for American consumers, and for the American financial community and industry.

□ 1745

Regrettably, I did not do that. I was not successful. But in any event, we are now confronted with whether or not this rule should be granted. It is with regret I suggest to my colleagues that the rule ought not be granted and, rather, that we ought to proceed to go back to the drawing board and come up with a better piece of legislation, which protects consumers, which protects investors, and which protects the confidence of the American people in what is the most extraordinarily successful financial community, financial undertaking in the history of the world.

Let us look at some of the defects in this. One of the most noteworthy is that the bill, under the rule, we would find would preempt State insurance commissioners from regulating the solvency of insurance companies. I have an amendment that would have corrected this problem. The rule does not permit me to offer it. Certainly to attack the solvency of the insurance world and the insurance industry is not the way to enhance confidence or, indeed, to ensure the safety of American investing public.

It was only about 10 years ago that lax regulation allowed the savings and loan industry to become insolvent, and that cost the American taxpayer more than $150 billion. I wonder if we are prepared, then, to gamble with the taxpayers' money once again, this time on insurance. If Members vote for this rule, that is what is going to be moving forward in the financial community.

Does it surprise anyone that the managers amendment would also preempt State securities administrators from enforcing antifraud statutes to protect investors? I have an amendment that would have fixed this problem, but the rule does not allow me to offer it.

Last Congress we enacted legislation that confirmed State responsibility for enforcement of security antifraud statutes, simply because they do a good job. Many of these issues are local in character, and because we do not have enough money to put into Federal responsibilities.

Are we going to allow that authority to be taken away from the States? I suggest not. My counsel to my colleagues is, let us not vote for a bad rule; let us reject the rule and go on.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend and classmate, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), who worked long and hard as chairman of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule.

Let us take a look at where we have been. We have been, the last many years, controlled in this financial services industry essentially by court decisions and by fiat from unelected regulators and bureaucrats. Is that the way we want our financial services industry to be conducted? Or do we want to have the Congress of the United States, who is responsible to the voters and the citizens of this country, to make these ultimate decisions?

If we do not pass this rule, we do not have the opportunity to have Congress step in where courts and regulators have always penetrated and give us an opportunity to set the basic framework for financial services into the next century. That is really what this debate is all about.

But we cannot get to that debate, no matter what our particular position is, unless we pass this rule. This has been heavy lifting. Those of us who have worked in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and the Committee on Commerce trying to craft compromises have worked long and hard to get to this day.

In my own Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials, we had a historic agreement between two warring factions that had gone on for years and years, the independent insurance agents and the banks. The insurance agents finally recognized that today banks are going to be able to sell insurance, and banks finally recognized that they had to follow a certain set of guidelines and be regulated by State insurance regulators. We came to that historic agreement, something that had held up this legislation time and time and time again.

So we have seen these compromises made, and we have seen this product come together for the first time in 10 attempts by this recent Congress to reform Glass-Steagall. The WTO agreement that was recently signed in Geneva opens up markets all over the world. Countries all over the world are liberalizing their markets and allowing Americans and other companies to come in and compete for insurance.

We gave up nothing in those agreements in WTO, but other countries throughout the world, 100 of them, have agreed to open up their markets, many of which have been closed from time immemorial.

Are we going to, in this Congress, fail to pass a rule and fail to pass a bill that would modernize our financial structure at the same time we see the rest of the world coming our way and opening up their markets? I hope not. There has been too much work, too much sincere effort at compromise to get us where we are today to throw it all away and say Congress is incapable of dealing with these difficult issues.

I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, vote for this rule. Give us an opportunity to explain how effective this bill can be in providing a modern financial services industry that will be the envy of the world.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule. Not because there is substantive differences with regards to the bill itself, H.R. 10, where, as my colleague referred to it as Titanic, no, not because of that, but this rule does not permit us to deal with the major substantive issues that this body needs to deal with.

This bill was heard in neither the Committee on Commerce nor the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. This bill is an assault on the committee process in this House. This was put together by a few individuals and excluding those that disagree with them; and now they are surprised and say to us, in order to debate it, we have to do it according to this rule.

What does this rule do? First of all, it hijacks the credit union bill, which is a noncontroversial bill that could pass and should pass. It is urgently needed. It should pass on suspension. But what this rule does is said we cannot talk about and we cannot vote and will not vote on the thrift charter and the character of the thrift charter. This rule says we cannot and will not talk about the credit union bill, even though it incorporates it into this. No vote. No consideration.

This rule suggests that we will not vote on something called an operating subsidiary in terms of the corporate structure that a financial institution may choose.

This rule dismisses something called deference in terms of what regulators have, both State and Federal, and sets up some cockamamy type of court procedure in terms of how we are going to arrive at that. To suggest it is going to eliminate the court, this sends an engraved invitation to the courts to deal with this issue in a highly unusual and, I think, yet ineffectual matter.

On and on this bill goes and offers a few amendments on topics that have little substantive effect in terms of what was going on, which were never heard. This bill certainly was opposed by consumer groups, opposed by the administration, opposed, of all groups, by the American Bankers Association. And Republicans are bringing this bill up here? I cannot believe it.

In fact, if we pass this bill, we will be taking a step backward, not forward. This does violence and undercuts and atrophies the National Bank Charter. We are suggesting we are going to modernize banks at the same time we are doing undercutting one of the most innovative charters we have in terms of providing opportunities for financial growth in this economy.

This will be a step backwards from where we are going in terms of facing the problems and providing the tools that our economy needs in order to be successful.

This rule needs to be defeated. If we send this over to an icy death in the Senate, we will envy progress that can be made and should be made on financial modernization in this session. Members should vote no on this and reject this type of tactics. We ought to know there is something wrong with it. If Members read all 350 pages and they think they understand it, then vote for it. But if they do not, they better not vote for it.

Ask your leadership to provide some leadership and to provide the opportunity to deal with the people's business and not to jam these things through on a partisan manner. But to start calling for a partisan vote in terms of a financial modernization bill, I will tell my colleagues there is something dramatically wrong with the direction they are going. Vote no.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule on H.R. 10. Why am I opposed? Let me count the ways.

First, I object strenuously to this attempt to hijack H.R. 1151 by linking it to H.R. 10. Regardless of the underlying merit of H.R. 10, regardless of where one might stand on the politics or the process that has brought us here today, there is no rational reason to link this 350 plus pages of controversial bill with the must-pass credit union legislation. This rule must be viewed as an attempt to slow down, if not imperil, the solution to the credit union membership dilemma resulting from the Supreme Court's February ruling. There is no other way to view it. If this rule passes, I urge that the motion to recommit contain instructions to pass only the credit union legislation as passed by the Banking Committee last week.

Many Members filed many amendments to this bill. Yet we see only five, and really only three substantive, amendments before us under this. There definitely should be time and certainly accommodation to address the key issues on this bill. There should be an opportunity to improve this bill. But against the backdrop of a self-imposed deadline and the excuse for urgent action on the credit union issue, this House and the public are to be short changed on even a debate, much less a fair vote on the policies at hand.

The most important amendment discussed last night in the Rules Committee was the LaFalce Vento/Bentsen amendment to reinstate and restore the Banking Committee's financially viable and safe operating subsidiary for national banks. The operating subsidiary amendment raised issues of great import to the overall issue of financial modernization and to the Members of the Banking Committee and the Administration. But adoption of this deficient rule would mean that amendment won't even be considered. We can't vote on an alternative corporate structure for banks, or stop the shredding of the national bank charter the policy in the H.R. 10 that is before the House. This rule on H.R. 10 denies all of us a vote on the key issue in this bill.

No, we can't discuss substance on the future of financial services in this country. But we can discuss an amendment—for twenty minutes—that would gut the Community Reinvestment Act for banks with less than $250

million in assets, an issue that has nothing to do with financial institution modernization. This amendment was not offered in either Committee's consideration and certainly represents yet another poison pill for this rule and H.R. 10, or should I say the H.R. Titanic.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked long and hard and in good faith on a financial services modernization bill for many years as have most of my colleagues on the Banking and Financial Services Committee. This rule and this bill make a mockery of a deliberate consideration and of the contributions of many Members. This is a bad faith effort to avoid issues that this House should consider. This measure was reported from the Banking Committee over nine months ago. This rule and this H.R. 10 has made partisan a bill that was a balanced, bipartisan effort when it passed the Banking Committee on June 20, 1997 with the support of 10 Democrats. A version of H.R. 10 was also passed by the House Commerce Committee and our two committees began work last fall on a compromise.

But the fact is H.R. 10 for the past five months has been a moving target. Just last night, March 30th, the 350 page version that is before the House was finalized. If Members are comfortable with such a procedure and the resulting substance, then we could dispense with the committees and let a handful of the select and self-appointed decide what we will vote upon and what we can debate. If you are willing to dismiss the committees in favor of such a procedure, just vote for this rule. And I hope you can explain this 350 page bill and why banks and others are cut off at the knees and impacted adversely. I cannot and I will vote no on this pseudo modernization bill. I urge you to do the dame.

Vote ''no'' on the rule at the very least to provide the time to pull together a serious debate and a balanced bill for consideration by the House. Vote no on this rule and send a message to the Republican Leadership to schedule the credit union bill for the suspension calendar tomorrow, instead of sending it down to the icy waters of a protracted consideration with the other body. Vote no on this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), chairman of the Committee on Commerce for a response.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I had not planned to speak again, but after the last speech by the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Minnesota, I feel obligated to do so.

The gentleman worked long and hard in his committee. He produced a bill with a by-two-vote majority, and the chairman reserved the right to vote against it on the floor.

The insurance agents were opposed. The insurance companies were opposed. The brokers were opposed. The banks were opposed. Indeed, the banks have been opposed to everything we have tried to do ever since day one. Why? Because they get everything they want from the regulators. They do not want a bill.

I will tell my colleagues, if we do not get a bill in this Congress before we get back to it or our successors get back to it in the next Congress, the regulators will have given even more authority, and it will be even harder to move a bill. So it rings kind of hollow.

If we do not vote for this rule, we do not get to consider the underlying bill and the various amendments. And we must remember, even as it goes across the aisle to the other body, they will have to be considered in committee. They will have to be considered on the floor. There will be a conference which the gentleman from Minnesota will be a member of. There will be opportunities to further improve the bill.

But if we stop it tonight, as we can do if we vote against this rule, there will be no bill this year. It will be even harder to move in the next year.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule for the unfortunate and unfair linking of H.R. 1151 and the very bad provisions eliminating the Community Reinvestment Act.

I rise in opposition to the rule on H.R. 10, the Financial Services Competition Act of 1997. While I support the provisions dealing with Credit Unions, I cannot support the rule on this bill as it stands, coupled with H.R. 1151.

The rule joins H.R. 1151, non-controversial credit union legislation, with H.R. 10. This unnecessarily links H.R. 1151, the overwhelmingly bipartisan supported credit union legislation, to the more controversial H.R. 10, thus endangering passage of H.R. 1151.

H.R. 1151 was passed out of the Banking Committee by voice vote last week and has received the bipartisan support of the leadership both in the House and Senate.

There is no question that the credit union legislation would pass both Houses of Congress this year and be signed into law by the President. Therefore, H.R. 1151 should not be jeopardized by the more controversial H.R. 10.

In addition, H.R. 10 is a creation of the Republican leadership with no input from democratic Members. In their effort to patch together compromise legislation from bills marked up by the Commerce and Banking Committee, the Republican leadership has stripped the bill of important consumer protection amendments.

While the Dingell/LaFalce amendment that was made in order represents some key Democratic consumer protection provisions, there were a number of other important Democratic consumer protection amendments that were not made in order. Instead, the rule makes in order a Bachus amendment that would strip essential Community Reinvestment Act provisions, an amendment that was not considered by either the Banking or Commerce Committees.

Based on the linkage of the non-controversial credit union legislation and the lack of Democratic consultation, I oppose this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI).

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, in a bipartisan effort, a young man from Ohio joined me to put together a bill to solve the problem of allowing American credit unions to continue to survive in anticipation of the Supreme Court ruling that happened a little more than a month ago. That bill was fairly simple. Here is the copy of it.

As of this moment, we have 207 cosponsors in this House in support of H.R. 1151. But understanding the legislative process, H.R. 1151 came to the hearing process and the markup; and, ultimately, last week, H.R. 1151 survived as a bill of approximately 31 pages that did not satisfy anyone completely but satisfied enough of the Members of this House that almost the majority are still cosponsors of H.R. 1151.

And if left to come to this floor, I have not any doubt it would survive on a voice vote under suspension to be sent on to the Senate and with a good opportunity to be taken up to the Senate and passed as it is presently structured and sent on to the President for his signature.

The indication today from the notification we have received from the Secretary of the Treasury, we would have his recommendation that the President sign the bill and put it into law, thus freeing the credit unions from captivity.

Instead, that 35-page bill has been weighed down by the Committee on Rules tonight by 350 pages of some of the most contentious financial modernization, if that is what it can be called, legislation that we can imagine.

The thing that disturbs me about the House of Representatives when they do something like this is they try and defy the rules of physics. There is no way this little skinny bill is going to carry this heavy contentious bill into law.

So the ultimate result will be that we subject the 70 million American members of credit unions that we may end up, over the next 42 days of legislative days, without the rescue, without the life jacket that is absolutely necessary that could be obtained if the leadership and the Committee on Rules would just free H.R. 1151.

□ 1800

Now I guess there are people like me that this jointure is trying to attract. I have told the leadership on both sides of the aisle that in the present state of what I know about H.R. 10, the modernization bill, not even if the Deity himself came to Earth and asked me to vote for that bill could I support it.

I am talking to the 207 Members now that are now cosponsors of 1151. It is time that we assert our right, by voting ''no'' on this rule, to free 1151 to go through the process and assure 70 million Americans that they will have the right to exercise their free choice in financial services in this country, and then perhaps, I suggest to the leadership that we take the process that was

carried on to come up with a compromise 1151 and apply those same tactics to trying to solve the financial modernization bill.

There are amendments that were offered that would have given great strength to that bill. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) indicated desires, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) indicated desires, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) indicated desires, amendments that would help that bill. Instead, H.R. 10 is going to sink 1151 unless we are smart enough today to vote ''no'' on this rule.

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

In all my 31 years in government I have never seen anything happen like is happening today. The phones are ringing off the hook, including my own, and they are coming from the friendly banker, and this lobbying effort is something I have never seen in my life happen here, and the country is going to regret it because this body is not going to work its will.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the resolution from consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) withdraws House Resolution 403.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES MEETING REGARDING BESTEA

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have an announcement.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules will meet at 6:30 sharp to consider the rules resolution on BESTEA, and I would hope that all Members would be there because this will be the floor action for tomorrow.

## CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS REGARDING LONG-RANGE AIR POWER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-236)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on National Security, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998, Public Law 105–56 (1997), and section 131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Public Law 105–85 (1997), I certify to the Congress that no additional B–2 bombers should be procured during this fiscal year.

After considering the recommendations of the Panel to Review Long-Range Air Power and the advice of the Secretary of Defense, I have decided that the $331 million authorized and appropriated for B–2 bombers in Fiscal Year 1998 will be applied as follows: $174 million will be applied toward completing the planned Fiscal Year 1998 baseline modification and repair program and $157 million will be applied toward further upgrades to improve the deployability, survivability, and maintainability of the current B–2 fleet. Using the funds in this manner will ensure successful completion of the baseline modification and repair program and further enhance the operational combat readiness of the B–2 fleet.

The Panel to Review Long-Range Air Power also provided several far-reaching recommendations for fully exploiting the potential of the current B–1, B–2, and B–52 bomber force, and for upgrading and sustaining the bomber force for the longer term. These longer term recommendations warrant careful review as the Department of Defense prepares its Fiscal Year 2000–2006 Future Years Defense Program.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 31, 1998.*

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

## THE MARRIAGE TAX ELIMINATION ACT

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, the question of the day is why is the enactment of the Marriage Tax Elimination Act so important? I believe the best way to answer that question is with a series of questions. Do Americans feel that it is fair that our Tax Code imposes a higher tax on marriage? Do Americans feel that it is fair that 21 million average working married couples pay an average of $1,400 more in higher taxes than an identical couple living together outside a marriage? Do Americans feel it is right that our Tax Code actually provides an incentive to get divorced?

The answer is clear. Of course not. It is not only wrong, it is unfair. It is immoral that our Tax Code punishes marriage.

The south side of Chicago, in the south suburbs, $1,400, the average marriage tax penalty, is 1 year's tuition at Joliet Junior College. It is 3 months of child care at a local child care center. It is real money for real people.

The Marriage Tax Elimination Act has 238 cosponsors, effectively eliminating the marriage tax penalty. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Let us do it now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight what is arguably the most unfair provision in the U.S. Tax code: the marriage tax penalty. I want to thank you for your long term interest in bringing parity to the tax burden imposed on working married couples compared to a couple living together outside of marriage.

In January, President Clinton gave his State of the Union Address outlining many of the things he wants to do with the budget surplus.

A surplus provided by the bipartisan budget agreement which: cut waste, put America's fiscal house in order, and held Washington's feet to the fire to balance the budget.

While President Clinton paraded a long list of new spending totaling at lease $46–$48 billion in new programs—we believe that a top priority should be returning the budget surplus to America's families as additional middle-class tax relief.

This Congress has given more tax relief to the middle class and working poor than any Congress of the last half century.

I think the issue of the marriage penalty can best be framed by asking these questions: Do Americans feel its fair that our tax code imposes a higher tax penalty on marriage? Do Americans feel it fair that the average married working couple pays almost $1,400 more in taxes than a couple with almost identical income living together outside of marriage? Is it right that our tax code provides an incentive to get divorced?

In fact, today the only form one can file to avoid the marriage tax penalty is paperwork for divorce. And that is just wrong!

Since 1969, our tax laws have punished married couples when both spouses work. For no other reason than the decision to be joined in holy matrimony, more than 21 million couples a year are penalized. They pay more in taxes than they would if they were single. Not only is the marriage penalty unfair, it's wrong that our tax code punishes society's most basic institution. The marriage tax penalty exacts a disproportionate toll on working women and lower income couples with children. In many cases it is a working women's issue.

Let me give you an example of how the marriage tax penalty unfairly affects middle class married working couples.

For example, a machinist, at a Caterpillar manufacturing plant in my home district of Joliet, makes $30,500 a year in salary. His wife is a tenured elementary school teacher, also bringing home $30,500 a year in salary. If they would both file their taxes as singles, as individuals, they would pay 15%.

MARRIAGE PENALTY EXAMPLE IN THE SOUTH SUBURBS

| | Machinist | School teacher | Couple |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adjusted gross income | $30,500 | $30,500 | $61,000 |
| Less personal exemption and standard deduction | 6,550 | 6,550 | 11,800 |
| Taxable income | 23,950 | 23,950 | 49,200 |
| Tax liability | 3,592.5 | 3,592.5 | 8,563 |
| Marriage Penalty | ..... | ..... | 1,378 |

But if they chose to live their lives in holy matrimony, and now file jointly, their combined income of $61,000 pushes them into a higher tax bracket of 28 percent, producing a tax penalty of $1400 in higher taxes.

On average, America's married working couples pay $1,400 more a year in taxes than individuals with the same incomes. That's serious money. Everyday we get closer to April 15th more married couples will be realizing that they are suffering the marriage tax penalty.

Particularly if you think of it in terms of: a down payment on a house or a car, one years tuition at a local community college, or several months worth of quality child care at a local day care center.

To that end, Congressman DAVID MCINTOSH and I have authored the Marriage Tax Elimination Act.

It would allow married couples a choice in filing their income taxes, either jointly or as individuals—which ever way lets them keep more of their own money.

Our bill already has the bipartisan cosponsorship of 232 Members of the House and a similar bill in the Senate also enjoys widespread support.

It isn't enough for President Clinton to suggest tax breaks for child care. The President's child care proposal would help a working couple afford, on average, three weeks of day care. Elimination of the marriage tax penalty would give the same couple the choice of paying for three months of child care—or addressing other family priorities. After all, parents know better than Washington what their family needs.

We fondly remember the 1996 State of the Union when the President declared emphatically that, quote ''the era of big government is over.''

We must stick to our guns, and stay the course.

There never was an American appetite for big government.

But there certainly is for reforming the existing way government does business.

And what better way to show the American people that our government will continue along the path to reform and prosperity than by eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Ladies and Gentleman, we are on the verge of running a surplus. It's basic math.

It means Americans are already paying more than is needed for government to do the job we expect it.

What better way to give back than to begin with mom and dad and the American family—the backbone of our society.

We ask that President Clinton join with Congress and make elimination of the marriage tax penalty—a bipartisan priority.

Of all the challenges married couples face in providing home and hearth to America's children, the U.S. tax code should not be one of them.

Lets eliminate The Marriage Tax Penalty and do it now!

WHICH IS BETTER?

NOTE: The President's Proposal to expand the child care tax credit will pay for only 2 to 3 weeks of child care. The Weller-McIntosh Marriage Tax Elimination Act H.R. 2456, will allow married couples to pay for 3 months of child care.

WHICH IS BETTER, 3 WEEKS OR 3 MONTHS

CHILD CARE OPTIONS UNDER THE MARRIAGE TAX ELIMINATION ACT

| | Average tax relief | Average weekly day care cost | Weeks day care |
|---|---|---|---|
| Marriage Tax Elimination Act | $1,400 | $127 | 11 |
| President's Child Care Tax Credit | 358 | 127 | 2.8 |

## MOURNING THE PASSING OF BELLA ABZUG

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge sadly the passing of Bella Abzug, a former Member of this House of Representatives. Bella Abzug was a fearless defender of the rights of the people. She was always there arguing on behalf of the downtrodden, arguing on behalf of civil rights, staking out a claim for the rights of women, fearless defender of the rights of women, someone who was admired across this country for her independence, for her courage, for her willingness to stand up and speak out for what she believed in.

Bella Abzug was a legendary figure not only in the politics of New York State but in the Government of the United States. She became a symbol of someone who would fearlessly represent the interests of her constituency, someone who had the ability through her personality to summon masses of people to the standards of truth and justice in this country.

Bella Abzug is going to be missed in this country, and she will be missed by millions of Americans who have appreciated her dedication, her love of our Nation and her understanding that America can always be better, that it has a higher truth to resonate to, that it should be an all-inclusive Nation, a Nation where the rights of women are upheld as well as everyone, a Nation where the rights of the poor are upheld as well as everyone, a Nation where all of us have a chance to make this a better place.

I will miss Bella Abzug. She was a personal friend. She was someone with whom I had the opportunity to share many moments, and I could tell my colleagues I have learned from her and I consider her a treasure for this country, and on behalf of the people of the 10th District of the State of Ohio I want to say, ''Farewell, Bella. Thank you for serving this Nation.''

## 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HULSHOF 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 Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## THE IMPORTANCE OF SMALL BUSINESSES IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today about a success story that is close to home. It is about an independent business located in my hometown in Illinois where I grew up, which is a farming community in central Illinois. The business is the farm implement business which has served many beautiful and profitable farms that are located in this part of Illinois for many years.

In fact, on July 25, 1998 this business will celebrate its 100th anniversary. The business I am referring to is the Smith-Marcotte, Inc. I am pleased, therefore, to come to the floor today to recognize this business, but in a larger sense to recognize the importance of small businesses throughout America.

Whether we are celebrating their 100th anniversary, their 50th anniversary or their 1st anniversary, it is a known fact that small businesses in America create more jobs for working men and women than all the industrial giants of our country together. Therefore, small business is truly the engine that keeps the great American economic machine running.

Another point that I think is extremely important about small business is the opportunity it gives to men and women who want to have the independence, and, yes, take the responsibility of being on their own so that they can have the opportunity to be entrepreneurs. There are those in our society who may be happier working for a giant corporation. There are many who feel the need and the stirring in their souls to be entrepreneurs, to own their own business, to have the opportunity in this way to seek success for themselves and their families.

□ 1815

Small businesses, like the Schmidt-Marcotte, are truly important to rural America. I am pleased to recognize this business and all the others like them across America for what they do for the rural economy.

I may not have mentioned, but at the beginning I intended to say that not only does this business deserve to be honored for the number of years, but that I have a personal involvement with Schmidt-Marcotte, Inc.; it has been a part of my life when I was growing up for many years. I have known the principals for my entire life, which is over half the time that they have been in business.

When I was growing up, the then Schmidt Blacksmith Shop and Implement Business was located just on the back of the block where my parents' home was located. I would, as a young child playing in the neighborhood, often pass the blacksmith shop and look in the door. Maybe I would venture inside to see and talk to the men that were working at their jobs.

At that time, the blacksmith shop was still outfitted with the billows and fires burning in the keels, which were part of the trade of a blacksmith. You would see the owner making horseshoes or other apparatus for use for horses and farm machinery.

I have known all the generations except the founder, who was an immigrant named Richard Schmidt, who came from Germany. He was the first generation, and he immigrated to Central Illinois in 1881. He was followed in the business by his son, Paul A. Schmidt, his son, Richard E. Schmidt, and his son, Steven P. Schmidt, and his two children, Michael and Jenny. They are all very real people to me, not just names.

As has been the pattern over the years, small businesses grow and merge. Sometimes they divide. But in this case the Schmidt Implement Business has grown and merged with the Marcotte Implement Business, and then in the nineties merged with the Cox-Evans Implement Business, and here again my relationship with the Cox-Evans family goes back for almost my entire life. This family is now in its fourth generation in the farm implement business.

It is my hope as we recognize the Schmidt-Marcotte Implement Business today we will also reflect a little bit upon what in this country has made it possible for this country to grow and prosper, and with those reflections, we should rededicate our efforts and our commitment to keeping America strong and our government supportive and not overpowering, so that this small business can survive a second 100 years, and so that all small businesses across America can continue the opportunity to grow and prosper.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD my full text of the history of the Schmidt-Marcotte Implement Business in Illinois.

The business actually began with Richard Schmidt's immigration to Atlanta, Illinois, from Germany in 1881. Upon his arrival, Richard began work for Mr. Demer Rhodes, the local blacksmith. Richard worked for Mr. Rhodes for several years, learning the ''smithy'' business. In 1895, Richard married Minnie Butler and set up housekeeping. Three years later, two events occurred which would eventually set the course for the business: Richard purchased the blacksmith shop from Mr. Rhodes and his son, Paul A. Schmidt was born.

The first shop, a two-story building, was located near the railroad on First Street. The lower level was a general blacksmith shop. A day's work consisted of shoeing horses, sharpening plow shares, and general welding, all very hard, physical labor. The firing of the metal was done in two coal-fired forges and then pounded into shape on anvils. The second floor of the building housed a complete wagon and buggy manufacturing facility and repair shop. Finished buggies and wagons were moved upstairs by means of an outdoor ramp.

Around 1915, Richard purchased a gas engine to power a set of overhead line shafts which ran various machines by individual belts. This engine powered a 75 pound trip hammer to forge metal once done by human hand, a punch and sheer to cut iron, a drill press, and a threat cutting machine. This was the beginning of automation for the business. Eventually the gas engine was replace by an electric motor.

In 1916, Richard's son, Paul, graduated from Atlanta High School and joined his father in the business. When World War I started in 1917, Paul went into the armed services and served a tour of duty in France. Upon his son's return in 1918, Richard had added to the blacksmithing business a line of horse drawn implements—the beginning of the family farm implement business as I know it today.

The first horse-drawn implements sold by the business were manufactured by Emerson-Braningham Company. The line of implements included horse-drawn gang plows, sickle mowers, and disk harrows. Still, the blacksmithing business flourished as the bulk of farm power was still furnished by horses.

1926 was to become a letter year for the business; Richard Schmidt died and son, Paul, took over the business. In that same year, the Emerson-Braningham Company was bought out by J.I. Case Company of Racine, Wisconsin, and Paul Schmidt signed his first contract with J.I. Case Company, the beginning of 72 years of continuous service to the local farm community. Two years later, Paul and his wife Ruth, had a son—Richard E. Schmidt—the third generation.

With the onset of the Great Depression in the 1930's, the word for the next several years was ''survival.'' In 1933, total cash sales for Paul Schmidt were less than $1,500.00. in order to keep the business going, a large portion of the work done was either for barter or charged on the book. Few tractors and machines were sold at this time. The business survived once again on blacksmith work and welding. Life was hard for farmers. A bushel of corn was worth $.10. The heat wave and great drought of 1936 caused many crop failures and that winter was one of the coldest on record.

1937 seemed to be the turning point in the farm machinery business. The economy had picked up and the Great Depression appeared to be over. Paul purchased two train carloads of Case two-row cornpickers. The cost of these machines was approximately $900.00. Modern combines that could be pulled by a tractor, began to replace the threshing machines.

The farm economy was on an upswing. The practice of trading horses and cow for new machines was common-place. At one time, Paul had eight horses and two cows boarded at Hoblit Farms south of Atlanta. The late 1930s introduced rubber tractor tires, taking the place of steel-lugged wheels. This enabled the farmers to travel faster, provided more traction in the fields, and made local road commissioners happier.

Few farm machines were made with the onset of World War II in 1941. Farm machinery manufacturers turned their efforts to making war equipment. The bulk of the business at the blacksmith shop was that of repairing old equipment. By the end of the war in 1946, Paul Schmidt had built a new modern tractor shop, a parts room and office facility.

It was always Richard E. Schmidt's intention to join the family business. He graduated from Atlanta High School in 1946 and was accepted at the University of Illinois. After one year of college, Richard returned home to help manage the business. In 1950, Richard was drafted into the U.S. Army and served his tour in Korea. At the same time, post-war sales increased and the business flourished. By the end of the Korean Conflict in 1953, the business had changed from a blacksmith shop selling some machinery to a farm machinery dealership doing some blacksmith work. Richard returned home from the war, and in January of 1953 married Dema Smith. One year later, the future fourth generation to take over the business, Steven Paul Schmidt was born.

The late 1950's brought major growth to the business and to the farm economy. In 1958, Case Company introduced their first automatic tractor transmission. This was the beginning of major technological advances for farm machinery manufacturers. Machinery was becoming larger and more sophisticated.

With the addition of the New Idea farm machinery line in 1960, Richard E. Schmidt broadened the business' customer-base twofold. First, to include a larger group of farmers and second to the seed corn industry. New Idea appealed not only to area farmers but to the seed corn industry because of its introduction of self-propelled corn harvesters. With the addition of this new equipment line, an additional building was erected at the downtown location in 1968 so that machinery could be repaired inside where it was sheltered from the weather. Paul A. Schmidt and Son employed five people at this time. Sadly, the decade closed with the passing of Paul A. Schmidt on February 4, 1969. Paul had enjoyed over 50 years in the farm machinery business.

Schmidt Implement Company was formed in 1970. Good grain prices during the mid-1970s encouraged rapid growth in the business. In 1976, Dick's son, Steven P. Schmidt graduated from Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Illinois; with a degree in business administration. Shortly after graduation, Steven joined the family business.

The growth of the business determined the fate of the original blacksmith shop. It had become apparent that the business had outgrown its original downtown location; a move was required. An eight-acre tract of land was purchased on the south edge of Atlanta. The business would be bordered by I–55 and U.S. 66. An 11,200 square foot metal building was constructed on the site in May of 1978, doubling the original shop size. The new site, once the northwest edge of the old Atlanta fairgrounds, is marked by a cornerstone. The day of the village blacksmith has passed on.

This was a busy time for both Richard and Steven Schmidt. 1977 welcomed the birth of son Michael to Steven Schmidt; daughter Jenni was to follow in 1979. The fifth generation of Schmidts had arrived.

For Richard, 1978 found him elected to the office of president of the J.I. Case Dealer Council. This council was formed to provide a common link between dealers and corporate management.

The business continued to flourish under the government's PIK (payment-in-kind) program and in 1985, two major equipment lines, J.I. Case and International Harvester, merged to become Case International. This merger eventually precipitated another partnership. On November 1, 1987, two Logan County farm equipment dealers joined forces, Schmidt Implement Company and Marcotte International, Inc. of Lincoln, Illinois. This merger became operational under the name of Schmidt-Marcotte, Inc., resulting in the cloture of the Marcotte dealership on Woodlawn Road in Lincoln. With the merger came the construction of two more buildings and doubled the number of employees.

William (Bill) Marcotte brought to the business 21 years of association with International Harvester products. Bill graduated from Southern Illinois University in 1966 with a degree in agriculture. He worked for International Harvester as a sales representative out of their Peoria office. In 1973, he was transferred to Lincoln, Illinois as an assistant manager and purchased the dealership in 1974. He had been owner/operator until the merger in 1987.

In 1992 Schmidt-Marcotte further enhanced their central Illinois leadership in agriculture implement sales by merging with Evans Implement of Lawndale. David Evans closed his business in Lawndale, purchased stock in Schmidt-Marcotte, and joined the Schmidts and Bill Marcotte as a business partner. This merger provided the company with their second major farm equipment manufacturer-New Holland-as well as several short line companies including Kinze, an industry leader in planting equipment.

David Evans' family has been involved in the farm equipment business since 1953. That year his grandfather and uncle, John Cox and John R. Cox, started Cox implement Company, an Allis-Chalmers dealership in Lincoln. Cox Implement flourished and in 1966 they moved their business to Lawndale to accommodate the business' growth and need for space. In 1979, David and his father, Tom, bought the dealership and operated it under the name of Evans Implement. As the years passed, the Allis-Chalmers dealership grew with the addition of Steiger, Kinze, New Holland, and a host of short line companies. Tom Evans retired in 1991. That same year Dave's son, Tim Evans, joined the business. Tim, currently the office manager of Schmidt-Marcotte, is a fourth generation family member involved in the farm equipment business.

Schmidt-Marcotte's merger with Evans resulted in greatly expanded customer services in areas including sales and parts.

Schmidt-Marcotte, Inc., currently operates with Steve Schmidt as president, Bill Marcotte as vice-president, and Dave Evans as treasurer, and currently employs 30 individuals. In December, 1998, Michael Schmidt will graduate with a degree in agriculture from Western Illinois University, and plans to join his father, Steve, in the business, marking five generations in the farm implement business.

In closing, a celebration marking their 100 years of service will be held in Atlanta, Illinois at the business on July 25, 1998.

## TRIBUTE TO CADET SHIRER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MASCARA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Cadet Shirer, a lifelong Western Pennsylvanian, a very special person who is celebrating his 100th birthday.

Mr. Shirer was born and raised in Westmoreland County in the community of Alverton, Pennsylvania, on March 31, 1898. He still calls Alverton his home, a community which also is the residence of his two children, Thomas and Joyce, and their families.

I want to take this opportunity also to honor Mr. Shirer for his dedication to his country. At the age of 19, he joined the Army to defend his country during World War I. He served in the E Company of the 10th Pennsylvania Infantry, and later as a member of the medical troop that was shipped to France.

He is one of the few remaining World War I veterans in Western Pennsylvania, and the last surviving charter member of the Veterans of World War I and the VFW Post in Scottdale, Pennsylvania.

His commitment to the ailing troops did not end with the signing of the Armistice. For 20 years, beginning in 1961, Mr. Shirer took it upon himself to help veterans in Westmoreland County by providing them with the necessary transportation to the nearby Veterans Administration Hospital in Pittsburgh.

I have had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Shirer at several events in my district. He is a distinguished man who still proudly wears the Army uniform when attending veterans events. What strikes me most about him is his ability to recite by memory John McCrae's great war poem, ''In Flander's Fields,'' and the Gettysburg Address, remember, without the assistance of notes. He is truly a remarkable man.

In your honor, Mr. Shirer, we are having a flag flown over the Nation's Capitol building today. I join Mr. Shirer, his children, his grandchildren and his great grandchildren in wishing him a very happy 100th birthday. He stands as a symbol for all veterans who have fought to keep this country's freedom.

## A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NEUMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight for a very special reason. A lot of times we talk about having a vision for the future of this country, and we talk about a social vision for the future of this country and we get all confused about Washington's role in that social vision. This morning I was reading the Washington Times, and there is an article that I would just like to call everyone's attention to, because it says a lot about this vision.

We talk a lot, first, about education and how we can make education number one in the world. We talk here in Washington about how if we get out of the way and get control of education back into the hands of the parents and the community, and we get our parents back actively involved in making the decision on where their kids could go to school, and what should be taught in the schools. If we can get the parents involved actively in these kids lives, then education will once again be number one in the world, and that is the best thing we could do here in Washington.

This article this morning that I was reading talks about a lot of the other implications of getting the parents back involved in the lives of the kids. This article was a national study of 12,000 teens, and they found the influences of family, school and personal character, and they found that these influences can either protect teens from all kinds of problems or result in teens having more problems.

Listen to some of these results, because these are the issues we talk about here in Washington, and we sometimes get hung up out here in Washington about how Washington can fix these problems.

How do we stop teenagers from cigarette use? Listen to what they found in this survey of 12,000 students. Cigarette use among teens: How do you slow it down? Number one, parent, family, connectedness. Parents and family doing things together.

Number two, parent at home before and after school, at dinner time, and at bedtime.

Number three, parents and teens do activities together regularly.

Notice what is missing from this list? There is no new Washington program to solve the problem, but rather parents involved with their teenagers.

Let's go on to another one. Alcohol use among teens. You see this idea of getting parents back involved in education of their kids is going to have a lot of side effects. Let's talk about alcohol use among teenagers.

Number one among these 12,000 students surveyed, number one to slow alcohol use among teenagers, parent-family connectedness.

Number two, parent at home before and after school, at dinner time, and at bedtime. And listen to this one: Teen religious identity. You want to slow down alcohol use amongst teenagers? Parents need to be involved with their kids once again.

Marijuana use, how do you stop marijuana use amongst teenagers? Again, no new Washington program, no new Washington spending, number one to stop marijuana use amongst kids, remember, this was 12,000 students surveyed: Parent-family connectedness. Parents doing things with their kids.

Number two, parents at home before and after school, at dinner time and bedtime. Notice the consistency here. When the parents are around for their kids, the abuse of whether it is alcohol or cigarettes or marijuana goes down dramatically.

How do you solve teen pregnancy in the United States of America? You are here in Washington. You would think the solution to teen pregnancy is handing out condoms in school. That is not how you solve it.

Listen to what 12,000 students told in answer to this survey: The best way, teens need to know that parents disapprove of teen use of birth control. The number one thing that resulted in fewer teenage pregnancies was when the teens know that parents disapprove of birth control activities.

What do we do here in Washington? We encourage additional birth control, and it is exactly the opposite outcome of what we should be doing.

Number two, parents and teens do activities together regularly. This is how you slow teen pregnancy in America. Number one and two are exactly the opposite of what we are recommending here in Washington.

Number three, teen use birth control properly at first and last act. Again, that is three, that is down the list with these students as opposed to parents being actively involved with their kids.

I pointed this out because there is a lot of discussion in this city about how Washington can solve these problems, and the reality is when you actually talk to the students, the right answer is parents being actively involved with their kids is the best thing that can happen.

Now, what could Washington do to help this situation? We have a tax rate that says $37 out of every $100 that a typical American family earns gets paid into taxes to the government in one shape or form or another, either State, Federal, local or property taxes.

So if we really want to help solve the problems of cigarette use in teens, alcohol use in teens, marijuana use in teens, if we want to slow the pregnancy rate amongst teenage girls, if we really want to help with these things, why don't we talk about reducing this tax burden on families so that one of the parents or both of the parents can be home more often and more actively involved with their kids?

## TRIBUTE TO PAUL ROBESON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Paul Robeson, accomplished scholar, Phi Beta Kappa, Rutgers University valedictorian, twice All-American Football hero, graduated Columbia University Law School, practicing attorney, Shakespearian actor, and, for two decades, was considered one of the greatest baritones in the world.

Mr. Speaker, on April 9th, thousands of his fans and admirers throughout the world will celebrate the 100th birthday of one of America's most gifted and accomplished individuals, Paul Robeson.

For several years now, there have been efforts under way to try and have a commemorative stamp in his honor and bearing his name. For some reason, the Postal Service has not seen fit to do so. Therefore, I take this opportunity to ask the question, why, and urge the Postal Service to correct this oversight.

Surely Paul Robeson fits the criteria. Dr. James Alsbrooks points out that various reference books refer to Mr. Robeson as an ''American Treasure'' and deserves respect. Among them are the World Book Encyclopedia, Britannica, Collier's Encyclopedia, and the Academic American Encyclopedia, which states that Paul Robeson was one of the most distinguished Americans of the 20th Century.

In addition to his brilliant stage career, Robeson learned several foreign languages. He played the title role in the 1943 Broadway production of ''Othello,'' which ran a record 296 performances.

In 1944, he was awarded the Academy of Arts and Letters Gold Medal for best diction in American Theater and the Donaldson Award for Best Actor. In the 1930s, Robeson spent a great deal of time in Europe and was deeply impressed by the Soviet Union and its seeming lack of racial prejudice.

In 1939, he returned to the United States. He supported the American war effort during World War II and campaigned for the sale of war bonds.

After the war, Paul Robeson became increasingly disillusioned with the treatment and status of blacks in American society. He became a spokesman on civil rights issues. In 1950, as a result of some pro-Soviet Union statements, the State Department revoked his passport, charging him with pro-communist leanings. However, in 1958, the Supreme Court upheld his right to go abroad.

Paul Robeson was what we today would call an activist-artist-scholar, who had a profound impact on forcing America to look at racism, classism, militarism and a concept of mass struggle. He was attacked relentlessly, brought before the House un-American Activities Committee, and hounded continuously by ultra right wing conservatives. However, Robeson continued to stand, fight, speak out and perform. He was indeed a tall tree in the American forest.

□ 1830

Given all of these accomplishments and all of these attributes, it is inconceivable that we could deny the placement of such an American on one of our postage stamps, especially given the fact that Bugs Bunny, Wolfman, Frankenstein, John Henry, Paul Bunyan and other symbols adorn these precious vehicles of communication.

As we proceed to the 100th birthday of Paul Robeson, I urge the U.S. Times Postal Service to move expeditiously to correct the gross injustice, to correct and recognize the enormous contribution of one of our most gifted, most talented, and most impactful citizens. He stood for what America is destined to become: free, just and equal. Let us put him on a stamp.

## REFORM OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the Joint Economic Committee, sometime ago I began or the Joint Economic Committee began a review of a proposal which came to us from the International Monetary Fund through the Treasury of the United States. Secretary Rubin, in essence, passed along the request of the International Monetary Fund, the IMF, for an appropriation of $18 billion to, in their words, permit the IMF to continue their work.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker. The IMF, which was established in 1945, over the years since 1945 has had a total, a quota appropriated to it, of about 36 billion U.S. dollars. So one might ask why it would be that the IMF would come to us today and in one lump sum request the appropriation of $18 billion, a 50 percent increase in 1 year over what they have had over the past 50-some odd years?

So we began to look at this as a very serious matter. This is $18 billion of U.S. taxpayers' money that would be used for purposes around the world; for perhaps good purposes, in some instances, and perhaps for questionable purposes in other instances; but $18 billion, billion with a B, of U.S. taxpayers' funds.

So when we began to look at the operations of the IMF, we noticed that something was quite peculiar. That was that, after a great deal of study, we determined that the average amount of interest that the IMF obtains in making its loans to risky creditors in other countries is about 4.7 percent; that is right, 4.7 percent.

By today's standards, or by any standards in the modern world, 4.7 percent is a fairly low interest rate. Americans who buy homes pay in the neighborhood of 7 percent. Americans in this day and age who buy cars pay an interest of 9 or 9½ percent. Americans who use credit cards pay interest rates from 18 to 24 percent. So 4.7 percent interest is a relatively low interest rate.

After we determined that this was the case, we drafted some legislation to try to change the way the IMF does business. Mr. Speaker, we did not suggest that the $18 billion of American taxpayers' money should be forwarded, appropriated and forwarded to the International Monetary Fund. We said, before we even consider sending them another dime, that we ought to change the rules as we see them, as we participate in the IMF, as to how it operates. They would be some fairly simple and straightforward changes.

The first change would involve our ability to find out what the IMF is

doing, why they make their decisions and how they make them. Because today they do it in secret, Mr. Speaker. They do it in secret. And, as a matter of fact, even when Members of Congress ask why the decisions were made that were made, we cannot see their minutes, we cannot see their reports, we cannot see the studies of the results of what they obtained. So we are requesting to be able to see into their procedures: transparency, we call that.

We also introduced in the same bill, which happens to be H.R. 3331, a provision that would require them to use American dollars, both in the case of the $36 billion they already have and in the case of whatever we may appropriate in the future, and that they loan at market interest rates, adjusted for risk.

That is an important factor, because, Mr. Speaker, if you have the opportunity to go out and borrow some money, if you are a lender and you start loaning at 4.7 percent, believe me, you have lots of customers. So we would require that they loan at market rates, and we would also require that they establish an independent advisory board that would report to the public periodically about their activities.

The reason for me taking the floor to explain this tonight, because I have done this before, is that a very prestigious organization in Washington, the Heritage Foundation, will soon release a report, a draft of which I have here. They support the notions and the concepts contained in H.R. 3331.

They say, for example, that with regard to the issue of being able to see what the IMF does, they say, ''Demands for greater transparency are a part of nearly every piece of legislation involving the IMF.''

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article by Brett Schaefer on this subject.

The material referred to is as follows:

HOW CONGRESS SHOULD REFORM THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

(Brett D. Schaefer)

Recent weeks have seen vigorous debate in Congress over America's participation in and funding of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Both the Senate and the House of Representatives have passed supplemental appropriations bills containing the $17.9 billion requested by the Administration for the IMF. Both bills request specific reforms in IMF operations or policy. Unfortunately, either these reforms would have little impact on the current operations of the IMF, or they are completely unenforceable.

Congress should utilize the rare opportunity offered by this legislation to reform the economically harmful activities of the IMF.[1] Short of denying funding for or eliminating the IMF, the best way for Congress to correct its failings would be by enacting legislation like The IMF Transparency and Efficiency Act of 1998 (H.R. 3331), sponsored by Representatives Jim Saxton (R–NJ), Richard K. Armey (R–TX), and Tom Campbell (R–CA). This bill attempts to shine a bright light on the internal workings of the IMF, which have been all too often closed to outside scrutiny. In addition, it would mitigate the market distortion caused by IMF loans. It requires the IMF to charge market interest rates on its loans, and establish an independent review board to examine its policies, practices, and results. Finally, H.R. 3331 contains the most stringent enforcement measures of any current reform proposal.

CURRENT LEGISLATION

The Senate passed a supplemental appropriations bill on March 26, 1998, to grant the Administration's request for $17.9 billion for the IMF. Negotiations between the Administration and the leadership in the Senate resulted in changes that greatly weakened the reforms demanded by earlier versions of the bill. For example, instead of demanding that the IMF pass a resolution to change its loan policies, a provision approved in the earlier version by the Senate Appropriations Committee, the new agreement only requires the Secretary of the Treasury to certify that the world's seven largest economies—the so-called Group of 7 (G–7) nations—agree to use their influence to push two specific reforms in IMF policies.[2] These reforms would obligate recipients of IMF assistance to: (1) end government subsidies and directed lending and (2) comply with international trade agreements. This deal removed the provision in the original legislation that would punish the IMF for failing to enact congressionally mandated reforms. Instead of demanding concrete results on reform before granting money to the IMF, the legislation recently passed by the Senate merely requests a nebulous promise from the G–7 countries to pursue reform.

The Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives passed two supplemental appropriations bills on March 24, 1998. One contains appropriations for both the IMF and the United States' arrears to the United Nations, and the other provides funding for U.S. participation in the Bosnia peacekeeping mission, military expenses in the Middle East, and disaster relief. The reform provisions for the IMF in the House bill are very similar to those originally present in the Senate bill. Specifically, before the funds appropriated in the bill could be dispersed, transferred, or made available to the IMF, the Secretary of the Treasury must certify that the IMF Board of Executive Directors had passed a resolution requiring every user of IMF resources to: (1) comply with all international trade agreements and obligations to which the borrower is a party; (2) eliminate government directed lending or subsidies; and (3) guarantee that countries would not discriminate between domestic and foreign creditors or debtors when resolving debt problems.

In addition, the House bill includes three directives that (1) the Treasury report on advances in financial transparency, application of internationally accepted accounting practices, elimination of subsidies, and improving the effect of IMF assistance on worker's rights; (2) the President ensure that no U.S. resources are ''made available, directly or indirectly, to promote unfair competition against the American semi-conductor industry''; and (3) the IMF member countries establish an advisory commission on the international financial system.

Although the House bill is stricter than the Senate legislation, it remains far from ideal. Both would give the IMF $17.9 billion—the entire Administration request—with ineffective or unenforceable conditions, and would result in little change in how the IMF does business, which is the root of the problem.

THE IMF TRANSPARENCY AND EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1998

As a lender of last resort, the IMF disrupts the global market. Worse, the secretive nature of the IMF prevents any accurate evaluation of the extent of this disruption. The problem, therefore, is not that the IMF lacks sufficient funds, but that its distribution of subsidized loans and its secretive nature reward poor governance, encourage excessive risk-taking by investors, and conceal information necessary to counter these effects. The best way to avoid these outcomes would be to shun these kinds of subsidized loans altogether. Short of eliminating the IMF, which would be the ideal solution, Congress can focus on mitigating the more harmful consequences of IMF lending.

The best vehicle for achieving this goal is The IMF Transparency and Efficiency Act of 1998 (H.R. 3331), sponsored by Representative Jim Saxton (R-NJ), Richard K. Armey (R-TX), and Tom Campbell (R-CA). H.R. 3331 demands that the Executive Directors of the IMF initiate specific reforms:

Increase transparency. Demands for greater transparency are a part of nearly every piece of legislation involving IMF reform. Despite Congress's appropriation of $17.9 billion in American taxpayer dollars to the IMF, the organization refuses to grant Congress or the American public timely access to the minutes of its board meetings, its loan agreements, and its performance evaluations.

[1] For detailed criticism of the IMF and the detrimental effects of its policies on developing countries and the global economy see: Bryan T. Johnson and Brett D. Schaefer, ''Congress Should Give No More Funds to the IMF,'' Heritage Foundation Backgrounder No. 1157, February 12, 1998; ''No New Funding for the IMF,'' Heritage Foundation Backgrounder Update No. 287, September 23, 1997; and ''The International Monetary Fund: Outdated, Ineffective, and Unnecessary,'' Heritage Foundation Backgrounder No. 1113, May 6, 1997; Bryan T. Johnson, and John Sweeney, ''Down the Drain: Why the IMF Bailout in Asia is Wasteful and Won't Work,'' Heritage Foundation Backgrounder No. 1150, December 5, 1997.

[2] The G–7 includes Canada, France, German, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States. It meets periodically to coordinate economic policies, discuss treaties or agreements, and issue policy statements. The G–7 are the seven largest contributors to the IMF and control 44.82 percent of its votes, according to the 1997 IMF Annual Report.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I was on official travel with the President of the United States last week, and I missed a number of votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall numbers 80, 78, 76, 75, 74, 73, and 69. I would have voted yes on rollcall numbers 79, 77, 72, 71, 70, and 68.

## A HISTORICAL HEALER: MARY JANE LAWSON BROWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a historical healer, Mary Jane Lawson Brown, who has been considered to be one of the most important figures in the history of health care in Palatka, Florida.

Born in 1882, Mary Jane Lawson was an incredible person by any measure, let alone an historic and extraordinary woman. In 1915, Mary Jane Lawson enrolled in training school for embalming, one of the only two women at the

school. Completing her courses of study in the same year, she became the first African American licensed to perform funerals in the State of Florida.

In 1918, she opened the Mary Lawson Sanatorium. At first, the sanatorium cared for the African American residents of the Palatka area. However, by 1922, the sanatorium was caring for people of all races in a community desperately short of health care facilities.

The 35-bed Mary Lawson Sanatorium, later to be renamed the Mary Lawson Hospital during the 1930s, housed x-ray equipment, a laboratory, and surgical facilities. For a long period in Putnam County history, the Mary Lawson Hospital was the only location in the county equipped for physicians to perform surgery.

As the owner and administrator of the primary health care center in Putnam County throughout the Roaring Twenties, the Great Depression, World War II, and the 1950s, Mary Jane Lawson has been regarded as a blessing to Palatka.

In 1925, Mary Jane Lawson and her close friend, Mary McLeod Bethune, started the first chapter of the Advancement of Colored Women, which continues to be a large national organization today. Mary McLeod Bethune founded the Bethune Cookman College in Daytona Beach, Florida, and lived in Palatka during the 1920s.

During this time period, Mary Jane Lawson provided assistance on several efforts to attain funding for the college that Cookman had started. This was yet another way Ms. Lawson gave back to the community.

Mary Jane Lawson lived to be 79 years of age. The efforts of Ms. Lawson extended to her granddaughter, Mary Lawson Brown. Ms. Brown and her son, Theodore Brown II, are both licensed funeral directors who live and own the Lawson & Son Funeral Home; and it has remained one of the largest and oldest business in the Palatka community.

As we celebrate Women's History Month, I ask that my colleagues join me as I applaud this historical healer who shares her talents among the residents of the great State of Florida.

---

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 New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs LINDA SMITH is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOEKSTRA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

## PARENTS' TRUE PRIORITY: TIME WITH THEIR CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, as I was driving to the airport last Friday, I heard on the CBS News part of a statement by the national head of the YMCA. He said, because of all the broken homes and other factors, children are being deprived of time, love, and attention like never before in our history. He was speaking out because of the horrendous tragedy in Arkansas.

Then I switched stations and heard Dr. Laura Schlesinger, the radio psychologist, read something written by a third grader about his heroes, his parents. He emphasized, and Dr. Laura emphasized by reading it twice and stressing the word, ''time.''

Then in Sunday's Knoxville News Sentinel was an article by Mike Barnicle of the Boston Globe. The headline said, ''How much time do we really spend with our children?''

Mr. Barnicle wrote, ''It's not the guns. It's not TV. It's not movies featuring enormous amounts of gratuitous violence.'' He said,

> ''We can indulge ourselves in all of the semantic or psychological contortions available. We can assemble commissions, tie yellow ribbons around trees, shed tears, utter prayers, listen to speeches, read editorials, and we are still left with the apparent stone-cold fact that these multiple homicides were committed allegedly by two boys. One is 11, the other 13.''

Mike Barnicle continued by pointing out that,

> ''Today we communicate by e-mail, cell phones, laptops, the Internet, websites, and home pages. Yet we don't know what a 13-year-old is doing in his spare time.''

He ended his article in this way:

> Accountability rarely makes its way to the conversation table because so many parents are busy, too preoccupied with the moment to realize that the true priority—the most difficult task, as well as their greatest achievement, potentially—is staring them in the face with a . . . look that says, ''Talk to me, man.''

For 7½ years before I came to Congress, I was a criminal court judge trying primarily the felony cases. The first day I was Judge, I was told that 98 percent of the defendants in felony cases came from broken homes.

I went through thousands of cases and read over and over again, ''Defendant's father left home when defendant was 2 and never returned. Defendant's father left home to get a pack of cigarettes and never came back.''

Then 3 or 4 years ago, I read an article about two leading criminologists who had studied 11,000 felony cases from around the country; and they said, the biggest single factor in serious crime, nothing else was even close, was father-absent households. Then I read that the 13-year-old boy in Arkansas, probably the leader, was the son of parents who divorced when he was 9; and his father lives in Minnesota.

I know there are exceptions to every rule. I know that many wonderful people come from broken homes. I know there are hundreds of thousands of single mothers who are doing miraculous, even heroic, jobs raising their children. I also know that divorce hurts children; and many of them are hurt deeply, far worse than we realize, and scarred for life.

So many fathers are slowly going out of the lives of their children. This hurts both boys and girls, but girls, who so often stay with their mothers, seem to be able to handle it better. We have a very serious epidemic in this Nation of small boys growing up without a good male role model. I know sometimes divorce is inevitable. It is the only choice. But I also believe that one of the greatest blessings you can give any child is two loving parents.

Government cannot solve this problem alone. We need more men who will get active with the Boy Scouts and Sunday school and organizations that work with young boys, but government can help. We need school systems which will make a greater effort to hire male teachers at the elementary level. A very small percentage of elementary teachers are male right now.

But the biggest way government could help, Mr. Speaker, is by lowering its budget and increasing the family's budget. The biggest factor in most divorces is strong, even bitter disagreements over money.

In 1950, the Federal, State and local governments took about 3 or 4 percent each from the average family. Today, the government at all levels takes almost 40 percent in taxes and another 10 percent in government regulatory costs. One spouse has to work to support the government while the other works to support the family. If the government at all levels took less from the average family, there would be far fewer families that would split up due to the millions of arguments over family finances.

There is nothing we can do to end all divorce or end all crime, but if we could greatly downsize government and decrease its cost, we would greatly strengthen the family. If we could substantially decrease the government's budget, we could increase the family's budget. Many more families would stay together; and parents, whether single or married, could do far more for their children. It is no accident that when

government was much smaller and took far less of our incomes, there was far less divorce and far fewer broken homes than today.

I think it is obvious that serious crime would go way down if we made government much smaller and let families keep more of what they earn.

Unfortunately, we will see even more serious crimes committed by children if we continue to see broken homes at the rate of the past several years.

One last thing, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that acts of violence and other very serious problems have become much more frequent since prayer and Bible-reading were taken out of the schools.

There has been much national publicity given to the study that showed the most serious problems in schools in the 1940s were things like chewing gum and talking in class, while today teachers have to deal with guns, knives, drugs, violence, and so forth.

I know that most children, on most days probably did not listen when we had prayer and Bible reading in the schools.

But you never knew when some child might have come to school hurting in some way because of a problem at home or something else and who might have been helped by a prayer or a particular Bible verse.

Also, it sent a daily message to our children that there was some chance of help when our problems got too big. Now, and for many years, children do not and have not received that message.

Once again, it would not solve all problems if we put prayer and Bible reading back in the schools, but it would help, and it would do much more good than harm.

## PRESIDENT CLINTON'S REMARKS ON SLAVERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that I bring to the attention of this House a very fitting commentary by Richard Cohen, printed today in the Washington Post, March 31, 1998. It is titled, ''A Fitting Apology.'' Might I just share partially some of the comments made in this article?

It starts off by saying, ''Should President Clinton now apologize for apologizing? It seems he should. His remarks about the American role in the slave trade, neither historically inaccurate nor, you would think, all that controversial, have been denounced by no less a personage than a key member of the House GOP leadership and mocked, nay, scorned, by pundits galore. We are not, I take it, sorry about slavery, a rhetorical question.

''Clinton's words are worth setting down in their full unremarkableness.''

As the author says, quoting President Clinton, ''Going back to the time before we were even a Nation, European Americans received the fruits of slave trade, and we were wrong in that.''

You may want to read that statement a second time, and once you have done so, let me assure you that nothing has been left out.

Again, might I quote this statement? It says, ''Going back to the time before we were even a Nation, European Americans received the fruits of slave trade, and we were wrong in that.''

As the author says, and once you have done so, reading it twice, as I have done, let me assure the Members that nothing has been left out. There it is, a bland statement of regret. Yet, the august majority whip of the House of Representatives, THOMAS DELAY, blasted the President for what he said in Africa.

''Here is a flower child with gray hair doing exactly what he did back in the sixties,'' DELAY said, referring to Clinton's antiwar activities, according to Richard Cohen's column. ''He is apologizing for the actions of the United States.''

Not exactly. Clinton did not say anything about the United States, although he certainly could have. Slavery, after all, was not ended until the Civil War and the capitulation of the confederacy.

□ 1845

Until then, it was legal in the State of Texas for one human being to own another and to sell his or her children if he so chose. Our colleague further objected that Clinton said nothing about the role of Africans, such as the chieftains in Uganda who were selling blacks to slave traders. Others of an equally scholarly bent have noted that it was West Africa, not Uganda, that supplied most of the slaves to the New World.

This has not been limited, of course, to those in the United States Congress, for Patrick Buchanan added another bit of history, seemingly inaccurate and small in mind. He said, ''When Europeans arrived in sub-Saharan Africa the inhabitants had no machinery, no written language,'' he wrote. ''When the Europeans departed, most of them by 1960, they left behind power stations, telephones, telegraphs, railroads, mines, plantations, schools, a civil service, a police force and a Treasury. Now with the Europeans gone, much of sub-Saharan Africa has reverted to chaos.''

I am very delighted, as a Member of the United States Congress who has had the opportunity in recent months to visit Africa, first with the presidential mission of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and recently with the President of the United States, that history tells us differently.

First of all, sub-Saharan Africa is an emerging 48 nations, along with the 53 nations of the continent, that is quite progressive. And frankly, the colonizers who came did not leave Africa in such good repair. I am delighted that this Congress passed, with the support of Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, the African Growth and Opportunity Act that will recognize Africa as an equal partner.

Mr. Speaker, I also am very saddened by the lack of acknowledgment that all of us should regret slavery, whether we live on the continent of Africa or whether we came here in the bottom of the belly of slave boat, as my ancestors did, or whether we are of European descent.

The statement by the President was not one, I believe, of a flower child; it was that of the President of the United States of America, the leader of the free world, acknowledging an era in all of our history which we would like to forget or at least acknowledge that it was a bad time for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we in the United States Congress can recognize that an apology is simply that, an acknowledgment of something that happened that was wrong. I have always taught my children, and I was always taught, that a simple apology goes a long way. And that it is.

Of course, President Clinton did not make an apology; he simply expressed regrets. And all of the press and the media and the recordings of what he said simply acknowledge a regretful period in the history of America and Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we begin a healing process. There is nothing wrong with simply admitting that was a regretful time, a time we wish not to repeat.

## RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you and other Members of the House and talk this evening about not just a piece of legislation but something that is affecting the way that we live in this country, and what happens when a number of people who are quite unfortunately intolerant of basic values in America got the court systems to go along with them and to start silencing people who are trying to exercise free speech and trying to exercise their right under the First Amendment of freedom of religion. But unfortunately the First Amendment has been twisted against it.

Let me share, Mr. Speaker, the story of a young man in Medford, New Jersey. His name is Zachariah Hood. Now he is 8 years old, but things began for him when he was in first grade. First grade, boy, that is a joyful time. I have got five kids. They are in college and high school now, but I recall the life and the energy and the vigor of a first grader. And especially when they get a chance to do something on their own in the class, to be in charge of the class, even for a few minutes.

Well, Zachariah Hood was in first grade in Medford, New Jersey, and the class had a reading contest and whoever won the contest would get to read

a story to the class. Not only that, they could pick the story they wanted to read.

Little Zachariah was happy and he won the contest. Zachariah got the right. He was going to read a story to his classmates and he proudly brought his own book to school to read a brief story. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to share the story that he wanted to read, because, Mr. Speaker, he was told he could not do it. When the teacher saw the book that he brought in and the story that he wanted to read, the teacher told him, ''Oh, no, the Constitution does not let you read this at public school.''

The book was called The Beginner's Bible. It was not the King James, it was not the Revised Standard or any other edition. It was just a book for kids telling some Bible stories, and this is the story that he wanted to read and he was told was unconstitutional. Mr. Speaker, the story is about Jacob and Esau and here I quote from it. I quote it in its entirety:

Jacob traveled far away to his uncle's house. He worked for his uncle taking care of sheep. While he was there, Jacob got married. He had 12 sons. Jacob's big family lived on his uncle's land for many years. But Jacob wanted to go back home.

One day, Jacob packed up all of his animals and his family and everything he had. They traveled all the way back to where Esau lived. Now, Jacob was afraid that Esau might still be angry at him, so he sent presents to Esau. He sent servants who said, ''Please do not be angry anymore.'' But Esau was not angry. He ran to Jacob. He hugged and kissed him. He was happy to see his brother again.

Mr. Speaker, that is the story. I have finished quoting it, the story about the reunion of Jacob and Esau. Esau, of course most of us know, had previously sold Jacob his birthright for a bowl of pottage. And Zachariah Hood just wanted to read a story to his classmates about Jacob and Esau and the reunion of two brothers. He thought that was a nice story, and I think it is too.

But the school system said, ''Oh, the First Amendment will not let you do that.'' They told him, ''We have something called separation of church and State.'' I will comment about that in a minute, Mr. Speaker, about what that really means. But the school said, ''We have separation of church and State and you cannot read in public school this story out of your Beginner's Bible.''

Zachariah's parents were not real happy. They sued the school. Now one would think over something like this the kid ought to win his case. He ought to be able to read a nice simple story about two brothers getting back together. But no, the United States District Court, basing it on rulings that our Supreme Court has been making over the last 36 years, said ''Oh, the school is right. You cannot read that story at public school.'' The story that I just read they held was unconstitutional, that it violated the separation of church and State, and it was prohibited by the very First Amendment which was enacted by our Founding Fathers to protect us.

What kind of malarkey is this, Mr. Speaker, when the First Amendment that is supposed to protect faith in America is being used as a weapon against it?

Now, I have here, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the story that the Associated Press ran on this from the newspaper in New Jersey, the Star Ledger, which was printed January 29 of this year. I provided a copy to the Clerk, Mr. Speaker, and I submit it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MEDFORD FIRST-GRADER'S BIBLE STORY STIRS A BATTLE OVER RELIGIOUS RIGHTS

(By Melanie Burney)

The case of a New Jersey boy barred from reading a Bible story to his first-grade class is bound for a federal appeals court as the battle continues over religious expression in public schools.

The lawsuit centers on whether the Medford elementary school teacher violated the 6-year-old boy's First Amendment rights.

U.S. District Court Judge Joseph H. Rodriquez in Camden ruled last month that the teacher was justified and school officials acted appropriately.

But an attorney for the boy's family, backed by the Virginia-based Rutherford Institute, filed an appeal Tuesday with the 3rd U.S. Circuit of Appeals in Philadelphia challenging the lower court ruling.

While prayer in school has been barred for decades, court rulings have allowed some religious expression in schools. U.S. Department of Education guidelines also permit students to express their religious beliefs in some circumstances through homework, artwork and other assignments.

''This case isn't an attempt to argue that Bible-reading and prayer should be returned to school or anything of that sort,'' said attorney F. Michael Daily of Merchantville, who filed the appeal. . . . This case is really one of trying to obtain some equilibrium in religious rights of students.

Some legal experts say the case could ultimately land before the U.S. Supreme Court to define the boundaries for religion in public schools.

''It's potentially precedent-setting,'' said Douglas Laycock, a professor at the University of Texas Law School in Austin. ''I think there's a need to clarify.''

The controversy began in February 1996 when Zachariah Hood chose a story about Jacob and Esau from The Beginner's Bible to read aloud to the class. Students in the class were rewarded for good reading performances by being allowed to read a story of their choice. Zachariah initially selected Dr. Seuss' ''The Cat in the Hat,'' but decided it was too long.

Teacher Grace Oliva instructed him to read the story to her privately first, and decided it was inappropriate, said attorney John Dyer, who represents the Medford Board of Education.

''Should a child be able to espouse a belief at any time that child wishes in a first-grade classroom?'' asked Dyer. ''The answer that most people would say is no because the teacher must retain control over the classroom.''

''The problem is hard because the teacher tells the kids you can choose anything you want and then it turns out there are some things you can't choose,'' Laycock said. ''Once you give kids a choice, discrimination against religion is a real problem.

The boy's family filed suit in June 1996.

''I never expected it to become a lawsuit,'' the boy's mother, Carol, said. ''We are not religious fanatics. We are very normal. We are mainstream, religious people.''

The Rutherford Institute—the conservative organization representing Paula Jones in her sexual harassment lawsuit against President Clinton—is paying the family's legal bills.

The institute is pressing this case as part of its strategy to clarify the religious expression permitted in public schools, said Kim Hazelwood, eastern regional coordinator.

''We're finding that there's a lot of confusion around the country on what the boundaries are,'' Hazelwood said. ''This case shows that there are still individual students whose religious speech is being restricted.''

Zachariah left the school district shortly after the incident; the family moved to nearby Lumberton, for reasons related to the lawsuit.

The lawsuit, which names state and local school officials, seeks unspecified compensatory damages from the school board. It also calls for a new policy to ''protect students who present religious views.''

Mr. Speaker, I think it is really important that people be able to look at this and think upon it and ponder. What has the Supreme Court done? Think about something as simple as the Ten Commandments. The decisions the U.S. Supreme Court has made have not just been against prayer in public schools, but they said that the Ten Commandments cannot be posted on the walls of the public school.

Here in the House Chamber we have, and I am facing it right now, we have the image of Moses where we can see it, and it reminds us of Moses as the great lawgiver because he brought the Ten Commandments down from Mount Sinai. In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court has a depiction of Moses and the Ten Commandments on the wall in the chambers, the official chambers of the U.S. Supreme Court.

We have right above your head, Mr. Speaker, ''In God We Trust,'' which we have on our coins and dollar bills and other places as a national motto. But the U.S. Supreme Court said, ''No, you cannot have the Ten Commandments either just posted on the wall of a public school.'' They did that in the case in 1980 of Stone v. Graham, and their reasoning they wrote in their opinion: Because if the Ten Commandments were there, students might read them, might revere them, and might obey them.

Just think of what they would be asked to obey, the values that are fundamental to us, commandments such as, ''Thou shalt not kill.'' When we hear, Mr. Speaker, about the terrible thing that happened in Jonesboro, Arkansas just last week, would we not like to be free to teach our kids in public school that it is wrong to kill? I mean they do not get that message on television. Why, why are some intolerant people trying to separate us from our values by stripping out prayer, stripping out references to religion or the Ten Commandments, or stripping out the reunion of two brothers from our public schools, as happened to Zachariah Hood, a first grade student?

Mr. Speaker, trying to address this and similar decisions, sad distortions of the First Amendment, is the very reason that over 150 Members of this body have come together as cosponsors of the religious freedom amendment. It is a constitutional amendment, Mr. Speaker. We revere the U.S. Constitution. I hold it as a sacred document. But the U.S. Supreme Court has twisted it beyond recognition.

□ 1900

The first amendment, the very first part of it says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. It does not say you have to strip away religious references in our society. It does not say you cannot have prayer. It does not say you cannot refer to the Ten Commandments. It just says we will not have an official religion. We will not have a government-designated religion in the USA, but we are going to have religious freedom. But we are caught in a Catch 22, devised by the court. If you try to exercise freedom of religion on public property, you are told, no, we are saying that is the same as establishing a national church, and we are going to stop you.

And you have this debate that goes on about taking away our heritage. I want to share with you, Mr. Speaker, the religious freedom amendment. The full text, it is pretty straightforward, we tried to track what the first amendment really said and really intended and followed that as our pattern, but at the same time reversed the distortions that the U.S. Supreme Court has made of it.

The religious freedom amendment, House Joint Resolution 78, simply states, to secure the people's right to acknowledge God according to the dictates of conscience, neither the United States nor any State shall establish any official religion, but the people's right to pray and to recognize their religious beliefs, heritage or traditions on public property, including schools, shall not be infringed. Neither the United States nor any State shall require any person to join in prayer or other religious activity, proscribe school prayers, discriminate against religion or deny equal access to a benefit on account of religion.

That is it, Mr. Speaker. That is the positive statement of our rights and the protection against government trying to create a national church or trying to compel people to pray or tell them how to pray or what to pray, but to secure our rights, which have been stripped away systematically by these series of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, rights that have not just affected me and my family, but Zachariah Hood, the first grade student of New Jersey, and his family and people all around the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is really sad to see and hear about the things going on, like in Ohio, there is a lawsuit now in Ohio, Mr. Speaker, that is related to their State motto. We can say in God we trust as it does in the House Chamber as our motto. In fact, the Star-Spangled Banner states, in one of the verses, and this be our motto, in God is our trust. Ohio, as its State motto, makes a similar reference. But unfortunately it is being sued to take it away.

The motto is simply, with God all things are possible. That is it. Pretty straightforward. Pretty simple. But the ACLU does not like that, the same people who are bringing the lawsuits against school prayer, against the Ten Commandments, against all sorts of simple, nonthreatening references, to strip away, to censor them; they are suing Ohio. They are suing West Virginia to stop prayers at football games. They are suing to take things off of city seals and logos. They will get around to our currency in God we trust at one time or another, I am sure, but, Mr. Speaker, the standard ought to be pretty straightforward and simple.

You do not compel anybody to participate, just like when we have the pledge of allegiance at school, nobody is compelled to join in. The U.S. Supreme Court has given them that right, and I agree with that decision, but let us apply the same standard to school prayer to say nobody can be compelled to participate, but that does not give you the right to censor those that do want to participate. That is fair. It protects minority and majority.

That is what the first amendment is supposed to do, to protect all of us. I think it is fascinating that some people think the first amendment is only meant to protect them, but no one else, and it is to protect their right to be intolerant and not my might to express my faith or the rights of children who want to start the day with a simple prayer, not because they are compelled by the school, the school should not compel them to do that. But if the students say we want to start the day with a prayer, why not? If someone does not want to join in, they do not have to join in, but why tread on the rights of those who want to start the day at school the same way we start the day here in the Congress of the United States, with a prayer; the same way that the Oklahoma legislature and probably every legislature in this country opens every day, with a prayer; the way that city councils begin their meetings, with a prayer; the way that Rotary Clubs will start their meetings, with a prayer, or Kiwanis clubs or Chambers of Commerce or Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts or whoever it might be? It is common. It is ordinary. It is good. It is positive. Yet we have intolerant people saying, oh, it is horrible. It offends me to hear you pray.

Mr. Speaker, I think the problem is with the person that chooses to take offense, not with the person that chooses to express hope. Unfortunately, our courts have sided with those who want to suppress simple expression of faith. The religious freedom amendment will be on the floor of this House in the next few weeks. It has been approved by the Subcommittee on the Constitution. It has been approved by the House Committee on the Judiciary.

This is the first time that a school prayer amendment has been approved by a committee of Congress, even though the decision against voluntary prayer in public schools was rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court back in 1962, 36 years ago. We have not had a vote in this House on a proposal like that for 28 years. Even then it took some special maneuvering to get it around the committee process.

I am appreciative of the Judiciary chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), who has helped to shepherd it through and get it to where now we are about to have an historic vote.

Mr. Speaker, it is long overdue that we address the problem of court discrimination against religion. Mr. Speaker, I think that as we do this, we need to focus on the fact that we are doing this because the American people have never accepted what the Supreme Court did. I have a collection of 36 years of public opinion polls and consistently three-fourths or more of the American people say, yes, we support a constitutional amendment to make it possible to have prayers in public schools again. If you ask them to, if you go to another question, you say, well, what about songs around, dare I say it, around Christmastime, because some schools do not even want to call them Christmas pageants they have anymore. They are winter programs. And you will find places where you can go that they will say, you can sing Frosty the Snowman, you can sing Walking in a Winter Wonderland, you can sing Here Comes Santa Claus, but you better leave out Silent Night and O Come All Ye Faithful.

The religious freedom amendment says that is an expression of religious heritage or tradition. That ought to be permitted, whether it is a Christian song or it is a Jewish song or that of another faith, let people understand that there is faith as a normal part of life. We may have some differences among us, some people may pray different ways. Let them hear each other pray different ways. Let them be aware that beyond the differences and even more important than the differences is a unity, a unity and a belief in God. The Declaration of Independence states that belief.

The founding document of the United States of America says, we hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men.

Our Founding Fathers wrote the very reason for government is not to create rights or to establish rights, but to protect, to secure the rights which come

to us from our Creator, from God. Is that taught? It is in the Declaration of Independence. Yet some people are telling us that that is not a proper teaching these days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As I am sitting here listening to your great explanation of the need for this amendment, it occurs to me that there is not a single thing in this amendment that was not thought to be commonplace, that was not thought to be absolute, that was not thought to be definite for the 175 years after the Bill of Rights became part of the Constitution.

Certainly, when you look back at the Founding Fathers, the men, and they happened to be men at that time, we would have women if we had a constitutional convention today there, but those people who were in Philadelphia, as you look at their debates, as you look at their discussions, it is so clear that they understood, Mr. ISTOOK, the difference in separation of church and State and removing God from country. In fact, in comment after comment that Washington and Franklin and others make, it is so clearly an interwoven part of what they thought was absolutely essential that we not eliminate God from country, that in the furthest reaches of their imagination, the interpretation of the documents they worked on that has happened in the last 5 years by the courts would not have been thought to be even remotely possible.

When you look at Washington's comments that religion and morality are the key cornerstones for a democracy, when you look at John Adams' comments when he, I think he was the minister, the Ambassador to Great Britain, he saw the Constitution for the first time, and as he wrote back his observations about the Constitution, he said, surely this is a document for a godly people because it will serve no other. It was not the kind of document that could work in a society that did not have a basis and belief, and faith and belief in God. But they did not want to really determine what faith or what God that was.

From the heritage that they were coming out of, where many of the colonies had had a State-supported church, it was clear what they wanted the first amendment to do. It was clear what that immediate addition to the Constitution was all about. Not to eliminate God from country, not to eliminate religion from society, but in fact to say, we are not going to have a State-sponsored church. We are not going to use tax money to support one religion over another. We are going to be sure that all religions can freely be expressed, can freely be established in this country.

And then if you look at right away what happens, as the government is founded, you see that religion is part of that, that God is part of that. Washington, as he established the tradition when he wanted to put his hand on the Bible to be sworn in as the President of the United States, he wanted the document, the book that he based his faith on to be the basis for the beginning of that administration. And that has become obviously part of our tradition, that we swear not only before God as people become President of our country, but we swear with a binding commitment to what they have based their faith on as we use the Bible.

As you have pointed out already, not only the first Congress, but every day of every Congress since then, as far as I know, and certainly every day of the Congress since I have been here, we start with ceremonies that would be a violation of high school graduation. We start every day with ceremonies that then we turn, by ignoring this problem, we turn to people all over America and say, we are certainly not going to start a day of the Congress without time to pause, time to meditate, time to ask the Chaplain or a guest Chaplain to come in and pray, but we are not really going to stand up and make it clear that you should be able to do that, too.

I think that the Capitol, most Americans would sense that we were in a very public building, that we were definitely in a tax-supported and, most people would probably say, tax-supported in excess institution, as we are here in the Congress and in the Capitol. And we start each day with that prayer.

As I think you also pointed out, the Speaker looks directly in front of him and sees Moses, the lawgiver. The Supreme Court sets under the carving of the lawgiver, of Moses, the giver of the Ten Commandments and decides we cannot put those same commandments on a schoolhouse wall if the school board wants to. How contradictory could you be? How can the court do that without asking that somebody come in and sandblast the lawgiver, that very reference to the Ten Commandments, sandblast that off their wall.

□ 1915

If they are going to say that some school can't hang that on the wall for fear that the students who walk by it every day might begin to emulate those commandments, might begin to think, well, you know, maybe stealing and killing and lying is wrong.

Our society, our laws are based on those very premises. And, really, all the amendment that I was pleased to cosponsor with my colleague, along with many others in this Congress, all this does is get us back to where Americans from 1787 until the 1960s thought without question we could and should in our Nation be. This is just going back and clarifying something that nobody had a problem with for 175 years.

But somehow, in our sophistication, somehow in our higher view of things, we figured out what the people that drafted these documents apparently did not understand. Because if they understood them, they were immediately and constantly and consistently in violation of them. And then in the 1960s and the 1970s and 1980s and 1990s, we further and further move away from those principles that are so basic and were so easily understood for so long in America.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, there is something that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was making comment about; and I certainly appreciated his going from the beginning of this country, which was founded on Judeo-Christian principles, to the time that we are here tonight and talking about the good things that those of us who believe strongly in the right to practice our religion freely, which this Constitution guarantees us.

But one thing that my colleague was saying that really rang up there with me is that it is so tragic in this Nation today where I believe the Justice Department reports that 100,000 young people bring guns to school every day. I want to repeat that. 100,000 students bring guns to school every day. Yet those same students, and please correct me if I am incorrect, those same students cannot bring a Bible to the school but yet they can carry guns.

Mr. ISTOOK. Reclaiming my time, I would say to my colleague that, fortunately, few schools try to actually ban the Bible, although there have been cases of it. At this point, the courts have not gone so far to say the student cannot bring a Bible to school.

But the test, of course, is not how many rights do we have left. The test is how many rights have already been taken away from us. Because if that student, with or without a Bible, says we want to have a prayer at graduation or a football game or school assembly or to start the day in class, they are told, oh, no, someone might not want to hear it.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman would further yield for just a moment, and I want him to correct me if I am wrong. Is it not true that in Texas, and I forgot the town, somewhere around Galveston I believe, a couple, 3 years ago, that a Federal judge actually told the principal of a school that if during the graduation that the person giving the prayer would use the name Jesus that if that was going to be done that the judge would order that U.S. marshals be stationed at the school and the person that used the word Jesus in a prayer would be removed? Am I correct or incorrect in that?

Mr. ISTOOK. I wish I could tell my colleague that he is incorrect; but, unfortunately, he is correct. The high school, I believe, was Ball High School in Galveston, Texas.

I read the transcript of the judge's remarks because of an appellate decision, which is still subject to the Supreme Court's changing. But at that

time, because of an appellate decision, he felt that he had to honor their request to let them have a prayer at graduation, but he started putting limitations on it saying, if anyone mentions Jesus, I will have the U.S. marshal there to arrest them.

So he was telling them, you know, I am going to tell you how to pray. And, unfortunately, most of the court decisions, including the U.S. Supreme Court decision in 1992, said we should not have prayers at graduation. That was the Lever v. Weisman case, which came out of Rhode Island.

So the gentleman is correct that they are saying we should not have prayers at graduation. They are suing West Virginia now over prayers at football games. There are other lawsuits going on. There are still some schools which, frankly, have students practicing civil disobedience, that they are having prayers during school instructional hours, basically because the ACLU has not gotten around to suing them yet.

I will make some more comments on this, but I would like to hear more from the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Just one more question while my colleagues are standing here to talk about this issue.

Is it not true that a constitutional amendment, as my colleague said in his earlier remarks, certainly the Constitution is like the Bible. It is sacred. It guarantees our right to practice our freedom, which, again, religion to be practiced freely. If the Constitution is to be amended, if it passes the House, and I want my colleague to touch on this, and the Senate, then it goes back to the States. Would the gentleman briefly explain that process for those that might be watching around this country so they know that they will actually have the final say through their legislative process?

Mr. ISTOOK. Certainly.

The Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, understood there could be some problems that would require somebody who misinterpreted the Constitution, as the Supreme Court has done. So they created within the Constitution a mechanism which is a constitutional amendment, which has been used a couple dozen times in this country; and it is a very straightforward mechanism. There is an alternate one with conventions.

But basically it says, two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate approve a constitutional amendment. Then it goes to the States for ratification. Three-fourths of the States must ratify that amendment. Now, they do not need a two-thirds vote in each of those States. They only need a simple majority. But it is done through the legislatures.

We notice there is no official role of the President or of the governors of the State. It is done by the House and the Senate of the Congress, and then it goes to the State legislature for the Houses and Senates and Assemblies, as they are called, in the various States.

That is the process. That is the process we are following with the religious freedom amendment. I would like to point out that that is the process that has been followed several times when the U.S. Supreme Court had a distortion that Congress thought was necessary to correct.

The 11th amendment to the Constitution was to overturn a U.S. Supreme Court decision about whether States could be sued in Federal courts by citizens of other States. And the 14th amendment, the first portion of it, was intended to overturn the Dred Scott decision, which had held that African Americans, whether slave or free, could not become citizens of the United States. So the 14th amendment was a constitutional correction of a U.S. Supreme Court decision. The income tax amendment involved changing a U.S. Supreme Court amendment. That was the 16th amendment.

So this is the process that has been followed in other cases. Also, the 26th amendment, to make 18 the voting age. They are all responses to decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. So, too, the religious freedom amendment is in response to a number of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

We may want to detail some of those in a minute and how this affects some of those decisions. But it is responding to the anti-prayer, anti-Ten Commandments, anti-nativity scenes, and anti-graduation prayer and similar decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court. We are following the process set up by the Founding Fathers.

Mr. JONES. I want to thank the gentleman very much for his leadership and to tell him that many people in the Third District of North Carolina are very pleased that he, along with many of his colleagues, some here tonight, have fought on this issue. We hope and we pray that we do have a debate this year on this floor dealing with trying to clarify our constitutional rights to practice our religion.

Mr. ISTOOK. I very much appreciate the comments of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Before recognizing another colleague, I would like to elaborate a bit on something the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) brought up, which was the Founding Fathers' intent.

He talked about George Washington. A lot of people do not know that the day after the first amendment was approved by the Congress, Washington asked Congress to declare a national day of prayer and fasting. Obviously, he did not think that was inconsistent with what Congress had just done, because they turned around and they approved a day of prayer and fasting.

In fact, when we talk about the intent of the Founding Fathers, I know different people say, well, Thomas Jefferson said this and that. Of course, he did not draft the first amendment. He was not there. But if we want to go to an authoritative source for what the first amendment really intended to do and to look for some guidance on this catch phrase that is used often without thinking, this catch phrase that says, ''separation of church and State,'' what does it mean, why do we not choose for our authority the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, William Rehnquist?

I am not talking about the Chief Justice 200 years ago. I am talking about the one today that, as part of his work, has gone through and studied it. And in one of the official decisions, and he was a dissenter in this decision, but he talked about this; and that was the 5–4 decision that came down in 1985 in the case of Wallace v. Jaffrey, where the U.S. Supreme Court said that for a State to permit a moment of silence, for a State to permit a moment of silence in public schools was unconstitutional because it could be used by students to say a silent prayer.

That is how outrageous the decisions have gotten. It was a 5–4 decision of the Supreme Court. And Justice Rehnquist, in commenting about what the other Justices were doing, wrote about this term ''separation of church and State.''

I want to tell my colleagues what Chief Justice Rehnquist said. He said, the term ''separation of church and State'' has caused a ''mischievous diversion of judges from the actual intentions of the drafters of the Bill of Rights. The wall of separation between church and State is a metaphor based on bad history, a metaphor which has proved useless as a guide to judging. It should be frankly and explicitly abandoned.''

Those are the words of the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, who wrote them just right across the street from this building as part of an official opinion. Why? Because he studied it. And, as he said, ''The evil to be aimed at, so far as its drafters were concerned, appears to have been the establishment of a national church and perhaps the preference of one religious sect over another. But it was definitely not concerned about whether the government might aid all religions evenhandedly.''

So I take no less authority than the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court to say that that term has been used to twist and distort the real meaning and the real intention of the first amendment. The religious freedom amendment follows what Justice Rehnquist said was the actual intention and should still be the actual intention of the first amendment had it not been corrected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my friend for yielding. I had a few remarks in response to the gentleman's points, but I wish to begin by commending him for the thoughtful research that he has put into this resolution and into this draft.

First, though, let me just observe, as the gentleman from Oklahoma observes quite accurately and also the gentleman from Missouri observes, the Supreme Court sits in a building with the symbols of Moses and the Ten Commandments.

I had the very great honor to serve as a law clerk to Mr. Justice White on the United States Supreme Court. And every day when we opened argument, the Supreme Court began in the following manner: ''Oyez, oyez, oyez. All persons having business before the honorable, the Supreme Court of the United States are admonished to draw near and give their attention, for the Court is now sitting. God save the United States and this honorable court.''

Now, if those exact same words were said by a high school valedictorian in her commencement address, I take it that at least some Federal judge would say, ''Impermissible because you have asked God's blessing on government's property.''

□ 1930

It must be remarkably ironic for the Supreme Court to deal with this issue, knowing that the very day they began the argument they invoked God's blessing on their proceedings.

The second point I wanted to share, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) has been quite scholarly in his research of the Constitution and the fact that we have amended it many times in response to Supreme Court opinions, that one must be thoughtful one does not do this lightly. But the process is such that it cannot be done lightly, requiring, as it does, the two-thirds approval of the Senate, excuse me, of the other body, of the House of Representatives, and then three-quarters approval of the various States.

Then, in addition to the amendments that the gentleman raised which were in response to the Supreme Court opinions, I do not know if you mentioned, but the 16th belongs there as well, when the Supreme Court had said the Congress could not constitutionally impose a tax on incomes. There are some of us who might have wished that that decision of the Supreme Court stood forever, but it was reversed by an amendment to the Constitution to permit the income tax as well as all of the other examples that the gentleman raised.

Thirdly, there is a most remarkable difficulty in consistency with the Supreme Court's teaching on free speech. *Tinker* v. *Des Moines* is a case that speaks to conduct in schools. I am sure that the gentleman remembers, I certainly do, during the Vietnam war a number of students in the Des Moines school district were interested in expressing their opposition to the Vietnam war by wearing black arm bands. The Supreme Court not only held that the wearing a black arm band was a form of speech, but that it could not be prohibited by the local school board, that the individual student had the right to express himself in this case by wearing a black arm band.

I can only speculate, but suppose the student wanted to wear a cross or wanted to wear a yarmulke or wanted to wear another symbol of his or her particular faith, if engaged in this conduct on government property, would the Court say that this is impermissible, when the Court said that the school district could not prevent the individual from expressing his point of view about the Vietnam war?

If that is so, then we have created not a protection against the establishment of religion, but we have created a discrimination against religion. Then the expression of religion is in a lower status than the expression of a political point of view.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would engage in a dialogue on this, because you are exactly right, you are right on target, I believe, with your analysis, because religion has been relegated to a category of speech which must be controlled and limited, because supposedly it carries some danger or some threat.

You are familiar, as an attorney, with a number of cases where the U.S. Supreme Court has said, even though the First Amendment states an absolute right of free speech, that does not give you the right to incite a crowd to rebel against the government or to engage in libelous and slanderous comment or to yell ''fire'' in a crowded theater and so forth.

So, too, we have some limits on free speech, but we also have freedom of religion. They have placed expression of religion, prayer and similar things in a category that does not have the same protection as you mentioned of wearing a black arm band.

There may be some other students in class who say, ''I am offended by your wearing of a black arm band,'' but that does not give them the right to censor the other student. But if the student says, ''I am offended because they offer the prayer,'' then the Supreme Court says, oh, well, in that case, we are going to say you cannot do it.

The U.S. Supreme Court has passed decisions protecting the Nazi swastika. They have passed decisions protecting the burning of a cross. The case I am thinking of, the swastika, it was where the American Nazis were wanting to march through Skokie, Illinois, a Jewish community with a number of Holocaust survivors. The U.S. Supreme Court said no, free speech, no matter how insulting or horrible you may see it to be, they still have their right of free speech. But when it comes to religious expression, they have said, oh, it is okay, you can suppress it.

In your State of California, the Internal Revenue Service, one of its big district offices is Laguna Niguel. I have got a copy of the memo that was circulated to the employees of the IRS saying you cannot have in your desk or your personal work space a Bible, a picture of Christ, a cross, a Star of David, or other religious symbols.

I wrote the IRS. I said what is this about, telling people that in their own desk that they cannot have these? This is part of their personal effects out there. The IRS wrote back and they said items which are considered intrusive, such as, and I am quoting by the way, ''items which are considered intrusive, such as religious emblems or sexually suggestive cartoons or calendars'' had to be controlled and restricted. They have placed religious speech in the same category as pornography, requiring not only restriction but prior restraint by the government. That is the danger. I wanted to share that with you.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding additional time to me to comment.

Mr. ISTOOK. Certainly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The examples you give are most disturbing. I would add to them a case with which the gentleman is familiar. It never went to the Supreme Court, but a teacher assigns his class a moment, several minutes to read an assignment, during which he reaches into his valise, produces a Bible, reads from the Bible; when the time is up, closes the Bible and puts it back into his valise. Had he been reading the Wall Street Journal, it would not have been an issue. Had he been reading Das Kapital, it would not be an issue. But because he was reading a Bible, it became an issue of disciplining that teacher for having done so on school property.

I would like to, if the gentleman would allow me, to draw particular attention to the phraseology of the amendment that he has drafted. A number of people of goodwill are concerned that the gentleman is amending the First Amendment, and they hold the First Amendment in high esteem and veneration; one might almost say almost as a religious matter.

The care with which this amendment is drafted, however, surely should reassure them that we are not undermining in the slightest the protections against the government establishing religion. All the gentleman's amendment does is to say that conduct which would otherwise not violate the First Amendment, establishment of religion, shall not be deemed to violate the First Amendment because it happens to occur on government property.

So if the school says, this is the prayer we will say violates the First Amendment, and the Istook amendment would not change that, if the school says there shall be only Christian prayer, it violates the First Amendment. But if a student in the lunch hour says we would like to have a group of Christian students who wish to read the Bible at this corner of the lunchroom, it would not be struck down simply because it happened on government property. That is a very essential but a very narrow change.

I suspect, without knowing, that the gentleman probably took some grief from his friends, from our friends, on

this debate for not going far enough. Let me commend him for being very careful and guiding his direction in this amendment just to the situation where the location of speech that would otherwise not violate the First Amendment becomes the issue.

So it must be action of the individual, not the government, as it was in the case of that student giving her valedictorian speech. It must be action that would not establish religion or choose between religions. But the mere fact that it occurs on government property would not make it impermissible any more than it is against government, it should be against the First Amendment for me tonight to invoke the Lord's name on behalf of the cause that we both defend.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield a moment, and let us look at this specific example of prayer in public schools. It should not be the role of a principal or a teacher to say we are going to have prayer at school or prayer to start the school day or football game or whatever. But if the students are saying, and it could be individually, it could be collectively, are saying we want to have that, then the government is in the position of accommodating that.

So we have here the language that says the people have a right to pray. The government does not prescribe it. It does not prescribe it. It does not say you must have the school prayer. It does not say what the content has got to be. So the government does not prescribe it. But if the people exercising their right say we want to be able to have a prayer, we are required by law to be here at school all day, why should we be isolated from what is normal just because we are required by law to be at school.

U.S. Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart wrote about that in some of these cases. He stated in a society that so structures a child's life where attendance at public school is compulsory, if the child is required to be isolated from normal everyday religious influences, then religion has been placed in an artificial and State-created disadvantage. I think Justice Stewart had it right.

I would yield further to Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I only have one final remark, although I am more than happy to continue if the gentleman would like. You have been very gracious in yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I was struck by the eloquence of the gentleman from Oklahoma by adding the references to God in the Declaration of Independence. The gentleman from Oklahoma spoke to the opening phrases of the Declaration of Independence. I wanted to conclude with the ending phrase of the Declaration of Independence.

As the heroes drew together in Philadelphia to create our country and knew they were risking their lives, they concluded by saying,

And for the support of this declaration, with a firm Reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.

Just as they began the declaration with an invocation to God, they concluded it with an expression of firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence. Surely it would confound every one of them to think that the Lord's name could not be expressed by individual citizens on government property.

I do believe that if the Supreme Court interpreted the Independence Hall to be government property in Philadelphia in 1776, they would have been hard-pressed to strike down this invocation to the Deity. I applaud the gentleman's effort.

Mr. ISTOOK. I thank the gentleman from California. Mr. Speaker, I would note, too, that it is not only the Founding Fathers of the country as a whole that were so desirous of making sure that we expressed our reliance upon God for our rights and for our values that we teach to our children and want to pass on from one generation to another, it was not just those who founded the United States, but also those who have served as Founding Fathers of our different States have seen fit to incorporate language into our State constitutions that acknowledges our reliance upon Divine Providence.

For example, the different State constitutions, each and every one of them, all 50 States include an express reference to God within their State constitutions. I mention that to some who say, why should we mention God in the U.S. Constitution? Why have all 50 States seen fit to mention Him in theirs?

For example, the State constitution in Alaska states that its citizens are, ''grateful to God and to those who founded our Nation in order to secure and transmit to succeeding generations our heritage of political, civil, and religious liberty.''

In Colorado, their constitution includes the phrase, ''with profound reverence for the Supreme Ruler of the universe.'' The constitutions of Idaho, California, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, and Wisconsin all use this exact phrase, ''grateful to Almighty God for our freedom.''

It goes on. I have got a list of all 50 State constitutions and the different references to them. It is about time that we understand that we have had Founding Fathers, and some of them may have been female as well as male, but in all 50 States that have seen this necessity to reflect a pillar principle upon which this Nation was founded.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would just like to point out this is not just something that State constitutions recognize. An overwhelming majority of Americans in every single poll express belief in God, 96 percent, 97 percent, 98 percent.

Then we go about our public business as if the 2 percent or the 3 percent that have questions about the existence of God should determine the way the rest of us approach these topics. Those constitutions reflect that every time Americans are polled. That is clear.

Americans believe that there is a Creator. Certainly, if we approach our public business as if there is a Creator, we are going to approach public business differently than if we believe that all this is some bizarre accident, that these are not creatures of God indeed, but these are some accidental collision of protoplasm that have resulted in somebody who has become a person on the street.

□ 1945

Americans believe in God. This amendment allows that to be expressed in whatever way they want to express it, and I would just also like to point out that the work that you have done on this has been so well received that the groups, among many other groups that support, those groups would include the American Conference of Jews and Blacks, the Catholic Alliance, the Concerned Women of America, the International Pentecostal Church of Christ, the Jewish Union, the Salvation Army, the Southern Baptist Convention, the Traditional Values Coalition, the U.S. Family Network, a broad base of groups that find many topics frankly that they do not agree on, agree that this amendment gets us back to what the Constitution was intended to say and allows, as our friend from California has so well pointed out, allows what is otherwise protecting the Constitution to also be part of public functions and public ceremonies, and I am grateful to you for your leadership on this and grateful to you for yielding me some time to join you tonight and in every other effort you make in this regard.

Mr. ISTOOK. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Missouri and his very excellent insights that he has expressed. I want also to express, Mr. Speaker, and I will not go through the whole laundry list of other organizations that are supporting the religious freedom amendment, but I would like to observe that one of them is, for example, the National Association of Evangelicals which represents some 48 different denominations.

This is long overdue, Mr. Speaker, that we recognize that all the problems in America are not solved by doing things with taxes or highways or national defense, that this Nation was founded by people who believed in God and believed that our rights came from God as they stated in the Declaration of Independence, and if we try to sever our freedom and our rights from He who gave our rights to us, and if we say that we have to isolate children while they are required to be at school, they have to be isolated from these references just because there may be some among them or among their parents

who are so intolerant that they want to silence other people.

Mr. Speaker, if my freedom of speech exists only when everybody around agrees with me, I do not have free speech. If my freedom of religion exists only when I am around people who believe the same things that I do, then I do not have freedom of religion. If I can not express my religious beliefs even when people may disagree with them or express my political beliefs or social beliefs or just flat my opinion, then I do not have freedom any more. The essence of freedom is that we tolerate our differences rather than trying to suppress them, and for the courts to take the First Amendment and twist and distort it, and say this is now a tool for stopping people from expressing their religious belief because they happen to be on public property?

My kids are required to be on public property to be at school. Does that mean they are required to leave behind the teachings that we try to give them at home and at church?

I hear some people say, oh, my goodness, you ought to be happy, you can pray at home and you can pray at school. Well fine. But I happen to believe in a faith that says pray without ceasing, and it does not say that you have to stop praying when you enter onto government property or when somebody else is around that says, ''Well, I do not like what you are doing.'' I say to them, ''I appreciate that. I am sure that there are some things that you may do which I may not like either, but I respect and would fight for your right to say and do things with which I may disagree, and I would hope that you would have the same understanding, the same belief in our Constitution and our principles, and that you would say whether I agree with your prayer or your religious thoughts or not, I believe you have a right to express them.''

The problem is not with people who want to express the hope and faith of prayers. The problem is with people who are intolerant and do not want to hear it.

Mr. Speaker, the religious freedom amendment protects these freedoms and these rights, whether it be first grader Zachariah Hood who was told he could not read the story of the brothers Jacob and Esau reuniting, or whether it be my children or anyone else's or those of us in this Congress or any place on public property.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that people will support the religious freedom amendment and that more Members will proclaim its necessity.

## TRIBUTE TO BELLA ABZUG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. KENNELLY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to one of the greatest women who ever served in the Congress of the United States of America, Bella Abzug of New York, who died today.

I remember when I first was considering running for Congress I went to New York to seek Bella Abzug's counsel. What I got was one of the most intense question and answer sessions of my life.

Why was I running?

What did I really care about?

Was I willing to fight for women and for families?

Bella wanted to make sure that I could answer those questions to her satisfaction.

Today when I was here in the Congress, we were voting all day, today I stopped down below this Chamber and stopped for a few moments for lunch, and I saw CAROLYN MALONEY, a woman who represents New York City like Bella did, and she said, ''Did Bella treat you like she treated me, saying are you tough enough, are you strong enough, do you care enough about representing your people?''

And I said, ''CAROLYN, she asked me all those questions that she asked you: Were we tough enough, were we strong enough to represent the people of the United States of America?'' And I think that CAROLYN MALONEY and I think that BARBARA KENNELLY could answer those questions yes, we were tough enough, we were strong enough.

Could we do it in the style of Bella Abzug? No.

Could we be so delightful, in how she could fight for those fights for the families of America? Probably not.

But do we look at her as our leader? Yes, we did.

It is worth remembering today what it was about when Bella ran for Congress, about what drew me and dozens of other women to look at her as a touchstone, to look at her as someone who we could look to and then run for Congress. It was her strength, her commitment, it was her passion, Bella Abzug's conviction about what she believed in.

Yes, many of us who entered public life after her, we wanted to be in her footsteps, but we found different ways to get where she wanted to go, different ways to express ourselves, different ways to approach issues. But our differences were of style, not of substance.

Bella was, for many of us, our inspiration.

I would have to say to you today that I think about Bella, I think about where she was and where I was, where so many of us were that come to this body, work so hard from early morning until late night. We have to say that she was always our conscience. We always wanted to work as hard as she did, to care as much as she did, to really be as committed as Bella Abzug was for the families of the United States of America.

Today we should not only mourn her death, but I stand here tonight, Mr. Speaker, and say to you we should recommit ourselves to her vision of an America where men and women have equal chances, where ordinary citizens could hold their government accountable.

Bella Abzug would say, what is happening, where are we, what are we about? And she would demand answers. She knew that the men and women and their families had to have those answers.

Did we ever live up to what Bella thought possible? I stand here tonight feeling very badly about her death. Talked to Bella over the years, talked to her so often. Did I ever reach to where she thought I should reach? Probably not. But I have to say to you that she was there for all of us, especially for we women who came to the Congress, to make sure that we understood that we had to care about what we were representing. Everybody in our districts, we all, every man and woman that comes to this body represents everybody in their districts. But when we women come, we have to make sure, because there are many fewer of us, that we represent women and families. And she understood that so clearly, and she made that so clear to us. Because we were so few, we had to make our argument to be so absolutely on the mark.

And I have tried to do that, and I used to say to Bella, ''Look, I don't talk like you, I'm not as extreme as you, I'm not as exciting as you, I'm not as compelling as you. But I am here, like you, to represent all the families, all the children of the United States of America.''

Do we win some of those fights? Of course we did. We have absolutely won many of those fights, and what we cared about she cared about, and I look at Bella now and I think that she held a standard for me all these years, a standard to make sure that I could do as well as I can do. Did I do ever as much as she wanted me to do? Of course I did not. Anybody who served in this House, we could never do as much as Bella wanted us to do. But what Bella Abzug made us do was know that we could do better, that we could work harder, that we could get up early in the morning, that we could work later in the day, that we could take care of the families of the United States of America, that we could take care of the children.

I can remember one day when I did not know Bella. It was a day that I feel like I feel today, I feel so badly about this woman who was so wonderful. Bella Abzug was an absolutely wonderful woman.

I had another wonderful woman in my life, and her name was Ella Grasso, Governor of the State of Connecticut. I was Secretary of State in her administration, and she always made me feel wonderful like Bella did. She always also wanted me to do better, to work harder, to get more done, and I kept trying. But she was the first Governor that ever served, the first woman in

the United States of America who served as Governor of the State of Connecticut in her own right, and she knew Bella Abzug because they served together in the Congress, and Ella died earlier than she should have died. She died of cancer when she was Governor of the State of Connecticut. And of course Ella was Governor, and I do not even think Bella was Congresswoman at that time. But I can remember I was Secretary of the State of Connecticut, and I was very involved in Ella's funeral, and there was not a lot of Congress people at Ella's funeral. But guess what? Bella Abzug came to Ella's funeral. She understood a good woman. And I am standing here tonight telling you we had a wonderful women with Bella Abzug, and I say with sadness, but with great pride, we needed her when we had her, we will miss her.

Bella Abzug, I loved you. I just hope I can do as much as you want me to do

## HMO CRISIS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I met a woman who killed a man. I did not meet her in prison; she was not on parole. She had never even been investigated by the police. In fact, for causing the death of a man she received congratulations from her colleagues and moved up the corporate ladder.

The woman, Dr. Linda Peeno, was working as a medical reviewer at an HMO. In testimony before the Committee on Commerce on May 30, 1996, she confessed that her decision as an HMO reviewer to deny payment for a lifesaving operation led to the preventable death of a man she had never met.

Since then Dr. Peeno has regretted her HMO deeds every day of her life. In contrition she has blown the whistle on the ways that HMOs deny payment for health services. She showed how plans draft contract language to restrict access to benefits. She showed how HMOs cherry-pick healthy patients, and she showed how HMOs use technicalities to deny necessary care.

□ 2000

Dr. Peeno also told Congress about the most powerful weapon in an HMO's arsenal; to hold down costs. HMOs generally agree to cover all services that are deemed ''medically necessary.'' But because that decision is made by HMO bureaucrats, not by the treating physician, Dr. Peeno called it ''the smart bomb of cost containment.''

Hailed initially as a great breakthrough in holding down health costs, the painful consequences of the managed care revolution are being revealed. Stories from the inside, like those told by Dr. Peeno, are shaking the public's confidence in managed care. You can now read about some of Dr. Peeno's experiences in the March 9 edition of U.S. News & World Report.

The HMO revelations have gotten so bad that the health plans themselves are running ads touting the fact that they are different from the bad HMOs that don't allow their subscribers their choice of doctors, or who interfere with their doctors practicing good medicine.

Here in Washington one add says, ''We don't put unreasonable restrictions on our doctors. We don't tell them that they can't send you to a specialist.''

In Chicago, Blue Cross ads proclaim, ''We want to be your health plan, not your doctor.''

In Baltimore, the Preferred Health Network ad states, ''As your average health plan, cost controls are regulated by administrators. At PHN, doctors are responsible for controlling costs.''

This goes to prove that even HMOs know that there are more than a few rotten apples in the barrel. The HMO industry has earned a reputation with the public that is so bad that only tobacco companies are held in lower esteem.

Let me cite a few statistics. A national survey shows that far more Americans have a negative view of managed care than a positive view. By more than 2 to 1, Americans support more government regulation of HMOs.

The survey shows that only 44 percent of Americans think that managed care is a good thing. Do you want proof? Well, recently I saw the movie, ''As Good As It Gets.'' When Academy Award winner Helen Hunt expressed an expletive about the lack of care her asthmatic son gets from her HMO, people in the audience clapped and cheered. It was by far the biggest applause line of the movie.

No doubt the audience's reaction was fueled by dozens of articles and news stories highly critical of managed care, and also fueled by real live experiences.

In September 1997, the Des Moines Register ran an op-ed piece entitled ''The Chilly Bedside Manner of HMOs'' by Robert Reno, a Newsweek writer.

Citing a study on end-of-life care, he wrote, ''This would seem to prove the popular suspicion that HMO operators are heartless swine.''

The New York Post ran a week-long series on managed care. Headlines included, ''HMOs' cruel rules leave her dying for the doc she needs.''

Another headline blared out, ''Ex-New Yorker is told get castrated so we can save.''

Or this one, ''What his parent didn't know about HMOs may have killed this baby.''

Or how about the 29-year-old cancer patient whose HMO would not pay for his treatments. Instead, the HMO case manager told him to hold a ''fund-raiser.'' A fund-raiser.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that campaign finance reform will not stymie this man's chance to get his cancer treatment.

To save money, some HMOs have erected increasingly steep barriers to proper medical care. These include complex utilization review procedures, computer programs that are stingy about approving care, medical directors willing to play fast and loose with the term ''medically necessary.''

Consumers who disagree with these decisions are forced to work their way through Byzantine appeals processes which usually excel at complexity, but generally fall short in terms of fairness, and these appeals, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, sometimes last longer than the patient.

The public understands the kind of barriers they face in getting needed care. Republican pollster, Frank Luntz, recently held a focus group in Maryland, and this is what consumers said. One participant complained, I have a new doctor every year. Another said she is afraid that ''if something major happened, I won't be covered.'' A third attendee griped that he had to take off work twice because the plan required people to see the primary care doctor before seeing his specialist.

Those fears are vividly reflected in editorial page cartoons. Here is one that reflects what that focus group was talking about. It shows a woman working in a cubicle in the claims department of an HMO. In talking to a customer she remarks, no, we don't authorize that specialist. No, we don't cover that operation. No, we don't pay for that medication. She is then surprised, no, we don't consider this assisted suicide.

These HMO rules create ethical dilemmas. A California internist had a patient who needed emergency treatment because of fluid buildup in her lungs. Under the rules of the patient's plan, the service would come at a hefty cost. She told the doctor she couldn't have the treatment because she didn't have the money. However, if she was admitted to the hospital, she would have no charges. So the internist bent the rules. He admitted her, and then he immediately discharged her.

Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, are HMOs forcing doctors to lie for their patients?

HMOs have pared back benefits to the point of forcing Congress to get into the business of making medical decisions. Take for example the uproar over so-called drive-through deliveries. This cartoon shows that some folks thought health plans were turning their maternity wards into fast food restaurants.

As the woman is handed her new child, the gatekeeper at the drive-through window asks, congratulations, would you like fries with that?

Well, in 1995, Michelle and Steve Bauman testified before the Senate about their daughter, Michelina, who died 2 days after she was born. Their words were powerful and eloquent. Let me quote from Michelle and Steve's statement.

Baby Michelina and her mother ''were sent home 2 hours after delivery. This was not enough time for doctors

to discover that Michelina was born with streptococcus, a common and treatable condition. Had she remained in the hospital an additional 24 hours, her symptoms would have surfaced and a professional trained staff would have taken the proper steps so that we could have planned a christening, instead of a funeral.

Her death certificate listed the cause of death as meningitis, said Michelle and Steve, when it should have read ''death by the system.''

In the face of scathing media criticism and public outrage, health plans insisted that nothing was wrong, that most plans allowed women to stay at least 48 hours, that babies discharged the day of delivery were just as healthy as others.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that line of defense sounds a lot like the man who was sued for causing an auto accident. ''Your Honor,'' he says, ''I was not in the car that night, but even if I was, the other guy was speeding and swerved into my lane.''

For expectant parents, however, the bottom line was fear and confusion. There is nothing more important to a couple than the health and safety of their child. Because managed care failed to condemn drive-through deliveries, all of us were left to wonder whether our own plans place profits ahead of care.

The drive-through delivery issue is hardly the only example of the managed care industry fighting to derail any consumer protection legislation. What makes this strategy so curious is that most plans had already taken steps to guarantee new moms and infant 2 days in the hospital. Sure, there were some fly-by-nights that might not have measured up, but most responsible plans had already reacted to the issue by guaranteeing longer hospital stays.

The HMO efforts to reassure the public that responsible plans don't force new mothers and babies out of the hospital in less than 24 hours, however, was completely undermined by their opposition to a law ensuring this protection for all Americans. This was a missed opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for the responsible HMOs to get out front, to proactively work for legislation that reflected the way they already operated.

Not only would it have improved managed care's public image, but it would have given them some credibility.

So why then did managed care oppose legislation on this issue? Because the HMO industry is Chicken Little. Every time Congress or the States propose some regulation on this industry, they cry, ''The sky is falling; the sky is falling.''

I would suggest that by endorsing some common-sense patient protections, managed care would be more believable when they oppose legislation.

Today's managed care market is highly competitive. Strong market rivalry can be good for consumers. When one airline cuts fares, others generally match those fares. In health care, when one plan offers improved preventive care or expanded coverage, other market participants may follow suit.

But the competitive nature of the market also poses a danger for consumers. In an effort to bolster profits, plans may deny coverage of care that is medically necessary, or they may gag their doctors to cut costs.

Some health plans have used gag rules to keep their subscribers from getting care that may save their lives.

During congressional hearings 2 years ago, we heard testimony from Allen DeMeurers, who lost his wife, Christy, to breast cancer. They are pictured here with their children. When a specialist at UCLA recommended that Christy undergo bone marrow transplant surgery, her HMO leaned on UCLA to change its medical opinion.

Mr. Speaker, who knows whether Christy would be with her two children today had her HMO not interfered with her doctor-patient relationship?

HMO gag rules have even made their way on to the editorial pages. Here is one such cartoon. A doctor sits across the desk from a patient and remarks, ''I will have to check my contract before I answer that question.''

Dr. Michael Haugh is a real live example of this problem. He testified before the Committee on Commerce and told how one of his patients was suffering from severe headaches. He asked her HMO to approve a specific diagnostic procedure. They declined to cover it, claiming that magnetic resonance arteriogram was ''experimental.''

Now, remember, Dr. Peeno testified about the clever ways that health plans decide not to cover requested care.

□ 2015

Dr. Haugh explained the situation in a letter to his patient. In it he wrote: ''The alternative to the magnetic resonance arteriogram is to do a test called a cerebral arteriogram, which requires injecting dye into the arteries, and carries a much higher risk to it than the MRA. It is because of this risk that I am writing to tell you that I still consider that an MRA is medically necessary in your case.''

Two weeks later the medical director of BlueLines HMO wrote to Dr. Hough. He said, ''I consider your letter to the member to be significantly inflammatory. You should be aware that a persistent pattern of pitting the HMO against its member may place your relationship with BlueLines HMO in jeopardy. In the future, I trust you will choose to direct your concerns to my office, rather than in this manner.''

This is amazing. The HMO was telling this doctor that he could not express his professional medical judgment to his patient. Cases like these and others demonstrate why Congress needs to pass legislation like the Patient Right to Know Act, to prevent health plans from censoring exam room discussions.

This gag rule cartoon is even more pointed. Once again, a doctor sits behind a desk talking to a patient. Behind the doctor is an eye chart saying, ''Enuf iz enuf.'' The doctor looks at a piece of paper and tells his patient, ''Your best option is cremation, $359, fully covered.'' And the patient says, ''This is one of those HMO gag rules, isn't it, doctor?''

The HMO industry continues to fight Federal legislation to ban these gag rules. The HMOs and their minions here in Congress still keep the Patient Right to Know Act from coming to the floor, despite the fact that it has 299 cosponsors, Members of Congress, on the bill. The bill is endorsed by more than 300 consumer and health professional organizations and has already been enacted into law for Medicare and Medicaid patients.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members, what is wrong with cover all Americans? Even some executives of major managed care plans have privately told me that they are not opposed to the ban on gag rules, because they know that competition can result in a race to the bottom in which basic consumer protections are undermined.

My bill to ban gag rules presents managed care with an opportunity to be on the vanguard of good health care. Instead, they are frittering away another opportunity, just like they did with the drive-through delivery issue. And in opposing a ban on gag rules, HMOs have only fueled bipartisan support for broader and more comprehensive reform legislation.

In recognition of problems in managed care, last September three managed care plans joined with consumer groups to announce their support of an 18-point agenda. Here is a sample of the issues that the groups felt required nationally enforceable standards: guaranteeing access to appropriate services, providing people with a choice of health plans, ensuring the confidentiality of medical records, protecting the continuity of care, providing consumers with relevant information, covering emergency care, disclosing loss ratios, banning gag rules.

These health plans and consumer groups wrote, ''Together we are seeking to address problems that have led to a decline in consumer confidence and trust in health plans. We believe that thoughtfully designed health plan standards will help to restore confidence and ensure needed protection.''

Mr. Speaker, I could not have said it better myself. These plans, including Kaiser Permanente, HIP, and Group Health of Puget Sound, probably already provide patients with these safeguards. So it would not be a big challenge for them to comply with nationally enforceable standards. By advocating national standards, these HMOs distinguish themselves in the market as being truly concerned with the health of their enrollees.

Noting that they already make extensive efforts to improve their quality of care, the chief executive officer of Health Insurance Plan, known as HIP, said, ''Nevertheless, we intend to insist on even higher standards of behavior within our industry, and we are more than willing to see laws enacted to ensure that.'' Let me repeat that: ''We are more than willing to see laws enacted to ensure that result.''

One of the most important pieces of their 18-point agenda is a requirement that plans use a layperson's definition of an emergency. Too often, health plans have refused to pay for care that was delivered in an emergency room.

The American Heart Association tells us that if we have crushing chest pain, we should promptly go to the emergency room, because that could be a warning of a possible heart attack. But sometimes HMOs refuse to pay if the tests later on are normal. Mr. Speaker, if the HMO only pays when the tests are positive, I guarantee that people will delay getting proper treatment for fear of them getting a big bill. They could die if they delay diagnosis and treatment.

Another excuse HMOs use to deny payment for ER care is the patient's failure to get preauthorization. This cartoon vividly makes the point: ''Kuddlycare HMO. My name is Bambi. How may I help you? You are at the emergency room and your husband needs an approval for treatment? Gasping? Writhing? Eyes rolled back in his head? Doesn't sound all that serious to me. Clutching his throat? Turning purple? Uh-hmm. Have you tried an inhaler? He's dead? Well, then he certainly doesn't need treatment, does he?'' And then the reviewer puts down the phone and says, ''People are always trying to rip us off.''

Does this cartoon seem too harsh? Ask Jacqueline Lee. In the summer of 1996 she was hiking in the Shenandoah Mountains when she fell off a 40-foot cliff. She fractured her skull, her arm, her pelvis. She was airlifted to a local hospital and treated. Now, Members will not believe this. Her HMO refused to pay for the services because she failed to get ''preauthorization.'' I ask the Members, what was she supposed to do, lying at the bottom of the 40-foot cliff with broken bones? Call her HMO for preauthorization?

I am sad to say that, despite strong public support to correct problems like these, managed care regulation still seems stalled here in Washington. Some opponents of legislation insist that health insurance regulation, if there is to be any at all, should be done by the States. Other critics worship at the altar of the free market and insist that it is ''the invisible hand'' that cures the ills of managed care.

I am a strong support of the free market, and I wish we could rely on ADAM SMITH's invisible hand to steer plans into offering the services that consumers want.

While historically State insurance commissions have done an excellent job of monitoring the performance of health plans, Federal law puts most HMOs beyond the reach of State regulation. Let me repeat that. Most people do not know this. Federal law puts most HMOs beyond the reach of State regulation.

So we ask, how is that possible?

More than 2 decades ago Congress passed the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, which I will refer to as ERISA, in order to provide some uniformity for pension plans in dealing with different State laws. Health plans were included in ERISA almost as an afterthought, and the result has been a gaping regulatory loophole for self-insured plans under ERISA.

Even more alarming is the fact that this lack of effective regulation is coupled with an immunity from liability for negligent actions. Let me repeat that: This lack of effective regulation is coupled with an immunity from liability for negligent actions. If the HMO has made a negligent action which has resulted in harm or death of a patient and they are under the ERISA exemption, they are scot-free of any liability.

Mr. Speaker, personal responsibility has been a watchword for this Republican Congress. This issue is no different. I have worked with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHARLIE NORWOOD) and others to pass legislation that would make health plans responsible for their conduct. Health plans that recklessly deny needed medical service should be made to answer for their conduct. Laws that shield them from their responsibility only encourage HMOs to cut corners.

Take this cartoon, for example. With no threat of a suit for medical malpractice, an HMO beancounter stands elbow to elbow with the surgeon in the operating room.

□ 2030

When the doctor calls for a scalpel, the bean counter says ''pocket knife.'' The doctor asks for suture, bean counter says ''Band-Aid.'' The doctor says ''Let's get him into intensive care,'' HMO bean counter says, ''Call a cab.''

Mr. Speaker, some States have responded. Texas, for instance, has responded to HMO abuses by passing legislation that would make ERISA plans accountable for improper denials of care. But that law, Mr. Speaker, is being challenged in court and a Federal standard is needed to protect all consumers.

The lack of legal redress for an ERISA plan's medical malpractice is hardly its only shortcoming. Let me describe a few of ERISA's other weaknesses: ERISA does not impose any quality assurance standards or other standards for utilization review. Except as provided for in Kassebaum-Kennedy, ERISA does not prevent plans from changing, reducing or terminating benefits.

With few exceptions ERISA does not regulate a plan's design or content, such as covered services or cost sharing. ERISA does not specify any requirements for maintaining plan solvency. ERISA does not provide safeguards of a State Insurance Commissioner.

It seems to me that we can take one of three approaches to reforming the way health plans are regulated by ERISA. The first would be to do nothing. But, Mr. Speaker, I have demonstrated why I think, and I think most of my colleagues would agree, that is not acceptable.

The second option would be to ask the States to re-assume the responsibility of regulating these plans. This was the traditional role of States and they continue to supervise other parts of the health insurance market. But I will tell why that will not work. Turning regulation of ERISA plans over to States will be fought tooth and nail by big business and by HMOs and it will not happen.

That only leaves one viable option: some minimal, reasonable, Federal consumer health protections for patients enrolled in ERISA plans.

There are many proposals on the table, including the Patient Access to Responsible Care Act, the Patient Bill of Rights, the 18-point agenda released by Kaiser H.I.P. and AARP. Whether we enact one of these options or some other yet to be drafted, Congress created the ERISA loophole and Congress should fix that loophole.

Defenders of the status quo sometimes say that making plans subject to increased State or Federal regulation is not the answer. They insist that like any other consumer good, managed care will respond to the demands of the market. I would note, Mr. Speaker, that I know of no other industry that is not liable for their acts of misconduct like self-insured ERISA health plans. So the shield from liability provided by ERISA by itself distorts the health care market.

It differs from a traditional market in other ways as well. For example, the person consuming health care is generally not paying for it. Most Americans get their health care through their employer. Because the primary customer, the one paying the bills, is the employer, the HMOs have to satisfy their needs before they satisfy the needs of the patients. And the employer's focus on the cost of the plan may draw the HMO's attention away from the employee's desire for a decent health plan.

As Stan Evans noted in ''Human Events,'' many HMOs operate on a capitated basis. This means that plans are paid a flat monthly fee for taking care of you. This translates to the less they spend on medical services, the more profit they make. How many markets, Mr. Speaker, function on the premise of succeeding by giving customers less of what they want?

Take a look at this cartoon which illustrates perfectly the bottom-line mentality of HMO plans. The patient is

in traction while the doctor reviews his chart. The HMO bedside manner, the doctor says, ''After consulting my colleagues in Accounting, we have concluded you are well enough. Now go home.''

Are HMOs paying attention to their patients' health or to their stockholders' portfolios?

Stan Evans again hit the nail on the head when he noted ''Paid a fixed amount of money per patient regardless of the care delivered, HMOs have a powerful motive to deliver a minimum of treatment. Care denial, pushing people out of hospitals as fast as possible, blocking access to specialists and the like are not mistakes or aberration. They stem directly from the nature of the setup in which HMOs make more money by delivering less care, thus pitting the financial interest of the provider against the medical interest of the patient.''

His comment raises an important issue. Presented with tragedies like those of the Baumans or Mrs. DeMeurers, managed care defenders argue that ''those people are just anecdotes.''

What Mr. Evans points out is that cases like these are not mistakes or aberrations or ''anecdotes.'' They are exactly the outcomes we would expect in a system that rewards those who undertreat patients.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, markets only function when consumers have real choices. Dissatisfied consumers have limited options. Most employers offer employees very few health plans. For many, the choice of health plans is simple: ''Take it or leave it.''

Freedom in the health insurance market for many now means quitting your job if you do not like your HMO. There is not a free market when consumers cannot switch to a different plan. But even if we were to put aside all of these arguments and assume that health insurance was a free market, there is still the need for legislation to guard patients from abuses. The notion of consumer protections is consistent and supportive of our concept of free markets.

In his book, ''Everything For Sale,'' Robert Kuttner points out the problems of imperfect markets. ''Industries such as telecommunications, electric power and health care retain public purposes that free-market forces cannot achieve. For example, as a society we remain committed to universal access to certain goods. Left to its own device, the free market might decide that delivering electricity and phone service to rural areas and poor city neighborhoods is not profitable, just as the private market brands cancer patients as 'uninsurable.'''

Think for a minute, Mr. Speaker, about buying a car. Federal laws ensure that cars have horns and brakes, headlights. Yet despite these minimum standards we do not have a ''nationalized auto industry.'' Instead, consumers have lots of choices. But they know that whatever car they buy will meet certain minimum safety standards. You do not buy safety ''a la carte.''

The same notion of basic protections and standards should apply to health plans. Consumer protections will not lead to socialized medicine any more than requiring seat belts has led to a nationalized auto industry. In a free market, these minimum standards set a level playing field that allows competition to flourish.

Critics of regulating managed care also complain that new regulation will drive up the cost of health insurance. How often have I heard this argument. In criticizing the Patient Access to Responsible Care Act they cite a study showing that certain provisions could increase health insurance premiums from 3 to 90 percent. Three to 90 percent. What a joke. Such a wide range is meaningless. It must be an accountant's way of saying, ''I don't know.''

Other studies have said that costs may go up slightly but nothing near the doomsday figures suggested by opponents of this legislation. A study by the accounting firm Muse & Associates shows that premiums will increase between seven-tenths of 1 percent and 2.6 percent if the Patient Access to Responsible Care Act is enacted.

And do not let the HMOs tell anyone that the rising premiums we are seeing this year are the result of Federal regulation. HMOs have been charging below-cost premiums for years, and as a result we are now seeing premium increases long before the passage of any Federal consumer protection legislation.

Keep in mind also the shareholder's philosophy of making money can come into conflict with the patient's philosophy of wanting good medical care. To save money many plans have nonphysician reviewers to determine if callers requesting approval for care really need it. Using medical care ''cookbooks,'' they walk patients through their symptoms and then reach a medical conclusion.

Unfortunately, the cookbooks do not have a recipe for every circumstance, like the woman who called to complain about pain caused by the cast on her wrist. The telephone triage worker asked the woman to press down on her fingernail and see how long it took for the color to return. Unfortunately, over the phone she could not see that the patient had fingernail paint.

How far can this go? Well, like this cartoon shows, pretty soon we could all be logging on to the Internet and using the mouse as a stethoscope.

This trend should trouble every one of us. Medicine is part science, it is part art. Computer operators cannot consider the subtleties of a patient's condition. Sometimes answers can be known by reading a chart. But sometimes doctors reach their judgments by a sixth sense that this patient is really sick. There are certain things that computers cannot comprehend.

Mr. Speaker, doctors are expected to be professional, to adhere to standards and to undergo peer review. Most of all, they are expected to be their patients' advocates, not to be government or insurance apologists. It is in the interest of our citizens that their doctor fights for them and not be the ''company doc.''

Like a majority of my colleagues, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1415, the Patient Access to Responsible Care Act, otherwise known as PARCA. In an effort to derail this legislation, the managed care community has made a number of false statements about this bill. For example, they repeatedly state that PARCA would force health plans to contract with any provider who wanted to join its network. That is clearly a false statement.

In two separate places the bill states that it should not be considered an ''any willing provider'' bill. PARCA simply includes a provider nondiscrimination provision similar to what was enacted in Medicare last year. Provider nondiscrimination and ''any willing provider'' are no more the same than equal opportunity and affirmative action.

Mr. Speaker, similarly, some opponents have suggested that the bill would force health insurance to be offered on a guaranteed issue or a community rating basis, and I say this is a nonissue. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and I oppose community rating and guaranteed issue, and will not support any bill that would result in community rating or guaranteed issue.

Mr. Speaker, when I began these remarks I mentioned the focus group held in Maryland by Frank Luntz. At end of the session he described a package of consumer protections much like the Patient Access to Responsible Care Act and he asked participants whether they were in favor. All 28 hands shot up. One woman even said she was shocked that it did not already exist.

Next Mr. Luntz asked how many would support the package if it caused health insurance premiums to increase 5 percent. All 28 thought that was a reasonable price to pay for those protections. In fact, 27 out of 28 would support the proposal even if it caused insurance premiums to increase by 10 percent, and nearly three-quarters still supported the package if it caused insurance premiums to increase by 15 percent. Yet, as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, a study by Muse & Associates shows that enactment of PARCA would only raise premiums between seven-tenths of 1 percent and 2.6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, consumers have lost confidence in their HMOs. The public clearly thinks that they have cut costs at the expense of quality. It is time for reform. The American public is crying for help and is looking to Congress for answers. The time for talking has passed. Our goal should be passage of comprehensive patient protection legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am committed to seeing legislation enacted by the close of

this 105th Congress, and I am open to working with all interested Members, Democrat or Republican, to develop a bipartisan patient protection bill. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 586, the Patient's Right to Know Act, which has 299 cosponsors and would ban gag rules, should be brought to the floor for a vote.

□ 2045

Mr. Speaker, just last week a pediatrician told me about a 6-year-old child who had nearly drowned. The child was brought to the hospital and placed on a ventilator. The child's condition was serious. It did not appear that he would survive. As the doctors and the family prayed for signs that the boy would live, the hospital got a call from the boy's insurance company. Explained the HMO, ''Home ventilation is cheaper than inpatient care. I was wondering if you had thought about sending the boy home.''

Or consider the death of Joyce Ching, a 35-year-old mother from Fremont, California. Mrs. Ching waited nearly 3 months for an HMO referral to a specialist, despite continued rectal bleeding and severe pain. Joyce Ching was 35 years old when she died from a delay in diagnosis of her colon cancer. Joyce Ching, Christy DeMeurers, Michelina Baumann, Dr. Peeno's patient, Mr. Speaker, these are not just ''anecdotes.'' These are real people who are victims of HMOs. Let us fix the problem. The people we serve are demanding it.

To paraphrase Shakespeare: Hath not these ''anecdotes,'' these HMO victims' eyes? Hath not these ''anecdotes'' hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions, fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as these same HMO apologists? If you prick the ''anecdotes,'' do they not bleed? If you tickle these ''anecdotes,'' do they not laugh? If you shortcut their care for profits, do they not die? And for those who dismiss them as ''anecdotes,'' will they not revenge?

Mr. Speaker, let us act now to pass meaningful patient protections. Lives are in the balance.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2400, BUILDING EFFICIENT SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND EQUITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–476) on the resolution (H. Res. 405) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2400) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1, 1998, MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS H.R. 1151, CREDIT UNION MEMBERSHIP ACCESS ACT

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding clause 1 of rule XXVII, it be in order at any time on Wednesday, April 1st, 1998, for the Speaker to entertain a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1151, Credit Union Membership Access Act.

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

There was no objection.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GREENWOOD (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for after 5:00 p.m. today on account of official business.

## 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. CLEMENT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MASCARA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DOOLITTLE) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOEKSTRA, for 5 minutes each day, today and on April 1st.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SAXTON for 5 minutes today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, 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. CLEMENT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KIND.
Mr. MCDERMOTT.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. FILNER.
Mr. CRAMER.
Mr. BENTSEN.
Mr. LAFALCE.
Mr. ALLEN.
Mr. MOAKLEY.
Mr. VENTO.
Mr. KANJORSKI.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. WYNN.
Mr. RUSH.
Mr. SABO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOOLITTLE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. ROUKEMA.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. REDMOND.
Mr. WOLF.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. GEKAS.
Mr. KLUG.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1751. An act to extend the deadline for submission of a report by the Commission to Assess the Organization of the Federal Government to Combat the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition, to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, 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.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 1, 1998, at 10 a.m.

## EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the second quarter of 1997 and the first quarter of 1998 by various Committees of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, as well as consolidated report of foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-authorized official travel in the first quarter of 1998 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 22 AND JUNE 30, 1997

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |
| Hon. Tom Bliley | 3/22 | 3/25 | Brazil | | 850.00 | | | | | | 850.00 |
| | 3/25 | 3/28 | Argentina | | 822.00 | | | | | | 822.00 |
| | 3/28 | 4/1 | Chile | | 1,165.00 | | | | | | 1,165.00 |
| Hon. Henry Waxman | 3/22 | 3/25 | Brazil | | 850.00 | | | | | | 850.00 |
| | 3/25 | 3/28 | Argentina | | 822.00 | | | | | | 822.00 |
| | 3/28 | 4/1 | Chile | | 1,165.00 | | | | | | 1,165.00 |
| Hon. Billy Tauzin | 3/22 | 3/25 | Brazil | | 850.00 | | | | | | 850.00 |
| | 3/25 | 3/28 | Argentina | | 822.00 | | | | | | 822.00 |
| | 3/28 | 4/1 | Chile | | 1,165.00 | | | | | | 1,165.00 |
| Hon. Edward Markey | 3/22 | 3/25 | Brazil | | 850.00 | | | | | | 850.00 |
| | 3/25 | 3/28 | Argentina | | 822.00 | | | | | | 822.00 |
| | 3/28 | 4/1 | Chile | | 1,165.00 | | | | | | 1,165.00 |
| Hon. Michael Bilirakis | 3/22 | 3/25 | Brazil | | 850.00 | | | | | | 850.00 |
| | 3/25 | 3/28 | Argentina | | 822.00 | | | | | | 822.00 |
| | 3/28 | 4/1 | Chile | | 1,165.00 | | | | | | 1,165.00 |
| Hon. Paul Gillmor | 3/22 | 3/25 | Brazil | | 850.00 | | | | | | 850.00 |
| | 3/25 | 3/27 | Argentina | | 822.00 | | 1,767.55 | | | | 2,589.55 |
| Hon. Joe Barton | 3/22 | 3/25 | Brazil | | 850.00 | | | | | | 850.00 |
| | 3/25 | 3/28 | Argentina | | 822.00 | | | | | | 822.00 |
| | 3/28 | 4/1 | Chili | | 1,165.00 | | | | | | 1,165.00 |
| James Derderian | 3/22 | 3/25 | Brazil | | 850.00 | | | | | | 850.00 |
| | 3/25 | 3/28 | Argentina | | 822.00 | | | | | | 822.00 |
| | 3/28 | 4/1 | Chile | | 1,165.00 | | | | | | 1,165.00 |
| Edward Hearst | 3/22 | 3/25 | Brazil | | 850.00 | | | | | | 850.00 |
| | 3/25 | 3/28 | Argentina | | 822.00 | | | | | | 822.00 |
| | 3/28 | 4/1 | Chile | | 1,165.00 | | | | | | 1,165.00 |
| Patricia Paoletta | 3/22 | 3/25 | Brazil | | 850.00 | | | | | | 850.00 |
| | 3/25 | 3/28 | Argentina | | 822.00 | | | | | | 822.00 |
| David Schooler | 3/22 | 3/25 | Brazil | | 850.00 | | | | | | 850.00 |
| | 3/25 | 3/28 | Argentina | | 822.00 | | | | | | 822.00 |
| | 3/28 | 4/1 | Chile | | 1,165.00 | | | | | | 1,165.00 |
| Marie Burns | 3/22 | 3/25 | Brazil | | 850.00 | | | | | | 850.00 |
| | 3/25 | 3/28 | Argentina | | 822.00 | | | | | | 822.00 |
| | 3/28 | 4/1 | Chile | | 1,165.00 | | | | | | 1,165.00 |
| Patricia Paoletta | 4/14 | 4/17 | Mexico | | 400.00 | | 1,056.83 | | | | 1,456.83 |
| Edward Hearst | 4/13 | 4/17 | Mexico | | 500.00 | | 1,089.83 | | | | 1,589.83 |
| Hon. Anna Eshoo | 3/31 | 4/2 | Guatemala | | 378.00 | | | | | | 378.00 |
| | 4/2 | 4/6 | Jamaica | | 972.24 | | | | | | 972.24 |
| Hon. Bobby Rush | 5/25 | 5/25 | Cape Verde | | | | | | | | |
| | 5/26 | 5/28 | South Africa | | 501.00 | | | | | | 501.00 |
| | 5/28 | 5/30 | Angola | | 688.00 | | | | | | 688.00 |
| | 5/30 | 5/30 | Zaire | | | | | | | | |
| | 5/30 | 6/2 | Zimbabwe | | 1,122.00 | | | | | | 1,122.00 |
| Committee total | | | | | 36,275.24 | | 3,914.21 | | | | 40,189.45 |

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TOM BLILEY, Chairman, Apr. 17, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. AND MAR. 1998

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |
| Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner | 1/2 | 1/9 | India | | 1,570.00 | | 6,392.00 | | | | 7,962.00 |
| Todd R. Schultz | 1/2 | 1/9 | India | | 1,570.00 | | 6,392.00 | | | | 7,962.00 |
| Hon. George E. Brown | 2/13 | 2/18 | Mexico | | 1,084.00 | | 608.25 | | | | 1,692.25 |
| Michael Quear | 2/13 | 2/18 | Mexico | | 1,084.00 | | 556.25 | | | | 1,640.25 |
| Committee total | | | | | 5,308.00 | | 13,948.50 | | | | 19,256.50 |

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Chairman, Mar. 17, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY VISIT TO BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, FRANCE, AND THE U.K., HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 14 AND FEB. 22, 1998

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |
| Hon. Doug Bereuter | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | $540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/17 | France | | 287.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/21 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 354.00 | | | | | | $1,181.00 |
| Hon. Gerald Solomon | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Hon. Tom Bliley | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Hon. Paul Gillmor | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Hon. Porter Goss | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,027.00 | | | | | | 2,428.00 |
| Hon. Herb Bateman | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Hon. Scott McInnis | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Hon. Norm Sisisky | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY VISIT TO BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, FRANCE, AND THE U.K., HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 14 AND FEB. 22, 1998—Continued

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |
| Susan Olson | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Jo Weber | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Martin Sletzinger | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Robin Evans | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Linda Pedigo | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Jim Doran | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Ron Lasch | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Mark Gage | 2/14 | 2/16 | Belgium | | 540.00 | | (3) | | | | |
| | 2/16 | 2/19 | France | | 861.00 | | | | | | |
| | 2/19 | 2/22 | U.K. | | 1,062.00 | | | | | | 2,463.00 |
| Total | | | | | 38,091.00 | | | | | | 38,091.00 |

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOUGLAS BEREUTER, Mar. 5, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO FRANCE, VIETNAM, MALAYSIA AND HOLLAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND JAN. 12, 1998

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |
| Uyên T. Dinh | 1/ | 1/ | France | | | | | | | | |
| | 1/6 | 1/12 | Vietnam | | 1,300.00 | | | | | | 1,300.00 |
| | 1/12 | 1/1 | Malaysia | | 350.00 | | 20.00 | | | | 370.00 |
| | 1/1 | 1/13 | Holland | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | 1,650.00 | | 20.00 | | | | 1,670.00 |

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

UYÊN DINH, Mar. 9, 1998.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8307. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Service's final rule—Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Temporary Suspension of Continuing Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV98–925–1 FIR] received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8308. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—General Administrative Regulations; Nonstandard Underwriting Classification System (RIN: 0563–AB05) received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8309. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Mangement and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300629; FRL–5778–9] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8310. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the transfer of property to the Republic of Panama under the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3784(b); to the Committee on National Security.

8311. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Central Contractor Registration [DFARS Case 97–D005] received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

8312. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule—Reserve Requirement of Depository Institutions [Regulation D, Docket No. R–0988] received March 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8313. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule—Expanded Examination Cycle For Certain Small Insured Institutions [Regulation H; Docket No. R–0957] received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8314. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office's final rule—Expanded Examination Cycle For Certain Small Insured Institutions (RIN: 1550–AB02) received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8315. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Service, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Labeling: Nutrient Content Claims, Definition of Term: Healthy [Docket Nos. 91N–384H and 95P–0241] (RIN: 0910–AA19) received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8316. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Direct Food Substances Affirmed as Generally Recognized as Safe; Maltodextrin Derived From Rice Starch [Docket No. 91G–0451] received March 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8317. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Technical Requirements to Enable Blocking of Video Programming Based on Program Ratings [ET Docket No. 97–206] received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8318. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of the Commission's Rules Regarding Installment Payment Financing For Personal Communications Services (PCS) Licensees [WT Docket No. 97–82] received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8319. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 98–A, which relates to the Department of the Air Force's

proposed enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability of defense article(s) previously sold to Saudia Arabia, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(5); to the Committee on International Relations.

8320. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistant Agency, transmitting a report of enhancement or upgrade of sensitivity of technology or capability for Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. C–98), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(5)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

8321. 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 under a contract with the Netherlands, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8322. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Italy (Transmittal No. DTC–46–98), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

8323. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC–28–98), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

8324. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Switzerland (Transmittal No. DTC–29–98), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

8325. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Italy (Transmittal No. DTC–23–98), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

8326. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on nuclear nonproliferation in South Asia for the period of April 1, 1997, through September 30, 1997, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2376(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8327. 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 under a contract with Israel, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 118; to the Committee on International Relations.

8328. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report of enhancement or upgrade of sensitivity of technology or capability for United Arab Emirates (Transmittal No. B–98), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(5)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

8329. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Israel (Transmittal No. DTC–26–98), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

8330. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a list of all reports issued or released in February 1998, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8331. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to and Deletion from the Procurement List [98–004] received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8332. A letter from the Acting Inspector General, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Strategic Plan and Fiscal Year 1998 Annual Performance Plan, pursuant to Public Law 103—62; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8333. A letter from the Postmaster General, United States Postal Service, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8334. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Shenandoah National Park, Recreational Fishing Regulations (RIN: 1024–AC33) received March 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8335. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Revisions to the NASA FAR Supplement on Contract Administration and Audit Services [48 CFR Part 1842] received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

8336. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Revision to NASA FAR Supplement Clause— Submission of Vouchers for Payment [48 CFR Part 1852] received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

8337. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Last-in, first-out inventories [Revenue Ruling 98–20] received March 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8338. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Application Procedures for Qualified Intermediary Status and Witholding Agreement [Revenue Procedure 98–27] received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8339. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting contingent liabilities of the United States under the vessel war risk insurance program under title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, pursuant to Public Law 104—201, section 1079(a) (110 Stat. 2670); jointly to the Committees on National Security and Transportation and Infrastructure.

8340. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal or reduce various Congressionally mandated reporting requirements that the Department of Defense views as being obsolete, unnecessary or overly burdensome; jointly to the Committees on National Security and International Relations.

## 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. LIVINGSTON: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Totals for fiscal year 1998 (Rept. 105–475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 405. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2400) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 105–476). Referred to the House Calendar.

## TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker.

H.R. 1778. Referral to the Committees on Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Government Reform and Oversight extended for a period ending not later than April 1, 1998.

## 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. BOEHNER (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 3602. A bill to correct the tariff classification of 13″ televisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 3603. A bill to authorize major medical facility projects and major medical facility leases for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. THOMAS):

H.R. 3604. A bill to establish the Carrizo Plain National Conservation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CARSON, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINGE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL,

Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. ROTHman, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. THOMPSON, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WISE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 3605. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin):

H.R. 3606. A bill to provide for drug testing of and interventions with incarcerated offenders and reduce drug trafficking and related crime in correctional facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. HYDE):

H.R. 3607. A bill to provide grants to grassroots organizations in certain cities to develop youth intervention models; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. WICKER):

H.R. 3608. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that certain employees of Federal, State and local emergency management and civil defense agencies may be eligible for certain public safety officers death benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 3609. A bill to ban the importation of large capacity ammunition feeding devices, and to extend the ban on transferring such devices to those that were manufactured before the ban became law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself, Mr. MANTON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GEKAS, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BASS, and Mr. BALDACCI):

H.R. 3610. A bill to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance training, research and development, energy conservation and efficiency, and consumer education in the oilheat industry for the benefit of oilheat consumers and the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3611. A bill to prohibit United States citizens from traveling into or through a country or area for which a United States passport is invalid; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3612. A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 60 Third Avenue in Long Branch, New Jersey, as the ''Pat King Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MICA, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. METCALF, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. RYUN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. COOK, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. REDMOND, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Ms. GRANGER):

H.R. 3613. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain beneficiaries of the military health care system to enroll in Federal employees health benefits plans; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and 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. WOLF (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 3614. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain procedural and appeal rights to employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with regard to Lifer Groups; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H. Res. 404. A resolution commemorating 100 years of relations between the people of the United States and the people of the Philippines; to the Committee on International Relations.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 74: Mr. EVANS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 86: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 347: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 1047: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 1121: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 1126: Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 1154: Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 1173: Mr. BASS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1371: Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 1375: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 1376: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1531: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1858: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 2174: Mr. TORRES, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 2202: Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.R. 2365: Mr. QUINN and Mr. LAZIO of New York.

H.R. 2409: Mr. MCDADE.

H.R. 2568: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2665: Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 2760: Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 2819: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 2869: Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 2871: Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 2873: Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 2875: Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 2879: Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 2881: Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 2990: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 3081: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 3107: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 3140: Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. SHIMKUS Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 3168: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 3181: Ms. JACKSON-LEE and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 3205: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 3217: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 3279: Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 3290: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 3293: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3318: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JOHN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3376: Mr. UPTON and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 3382: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 3396: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KLINK, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 3400: Mr. THOMPSON and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3470: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3474: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 3506: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. QUINN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FROST, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 3513: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. WATERS, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 3524: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 3545: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 3551: Mr. FROST and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 3553: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 3567: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 3571: Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 210: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 247: Mr. FROST, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H. Con. Res. 249: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. COOK, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Con. Res. 250: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Con. Res. 252: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. WEYGAND.

H. Res. 399: Mr. MCINTOSH and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

## 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. J. Res. 111: Mr. PORTER.