

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 22, 1993

The House met at 12 noon.

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

We pray, O loving God, that our hearts grow in the spirit of thanksgiving and gratitude, the spirit that lifts us from the busy and cluttered moments of the day to see the grandeur and magnificence and splendor of every moment. We pray, O gracious God, that we will lift our vision to see more clearly the opportunities for service to others. May Your blessing, O God, which is new every morning, be with all Your people and may we so live our lives that we will find enthusiasm and strength to be faithful in the works of justice and good will. In Your name, we pray. 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.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. NUSSLE 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.

### CHICAGO BULLS BRING THREEPEAT TO CITY OF CHAMPIONS±

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to congratulate the Chicago Bulls for their threepeat NBA championship victory Sunday night, which secured them a distinguished place in NBA history as one of the league's best teams of all time. For the first time in 27 years, and only the third time ever, an NBA champion took home the coveted crown 3 years in succession—an un-BULL-ieveable feat in today's era of professional sports.

Throughout the playoffs, up until the final seconds ticked off the clock in Phoenix, the Chicago Bulls played with fiery spirit and determination. From

Michael Jordan's incredible talent and leadership, Scottie Pippen's all-around solid play, B.J. Armstrong's three pointers, Horace Grant's unwavering will to win and, of course, John Paxson's game winning three-point play, the Bulls won what will go down in the annals of history as one of the most exciting final series in NBA history. With the strong play of Bill Cartwright, Stacey King, Scott Williams, Trent Tucker, Darrell Walker, Will Perdue, and Rodney McCray, under the masterful coaching of Phil Jackson and his staff, the Chicago Bulls proved that teamwork is the key to continued success.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the Phoenix Suns also did a lot of great teamwork, and they are to be commended for playing masterfully.

But, the Chicago Bulls have established themselves as the NBA dynasty of the 1990's and have shown that Chicago is a "City of Champions." Mr. Speaker I look forward with excitement to seeing the Quad Squad back in action next year.

Mr. Speaker, I salute my Chicago Bulls.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the enthusiasm of the gentleman from Illinois, but admonishes other Members that the wearing of hats on the floor of the House, even to doff them in honor of a very successful team, is not permitted under the House rules.

### TAX FAIRNESS?

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, President Bill Clinton has consistently stressed the need for tax fairness. But I have some questions for the President about this term "tax fairness."

Is it fair to pass a tax which will hit not only the rich, but also the middle and lower classes? That is what the President's energy tax will do.

Is it fair to have a tax increase which will slow economic growth, kill jobs, and hurt the private sector? That is what the increase in the capital gains tax will do.

Is it fair to increase taxes on the elderly, some of whom struggle to make ends meet? That is what the Social Security tax will do.

Is this what the President means by tax fairness?

Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton's version of tax fairness reminds me of Winston Churchill's definition of socialism: An equal sharing of misery.

I don't think anything is really fair about more misery.

### CONGRATULATIONS TO JERRY ABRAMSON, NEW PRESIDENT OF THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Conference of Mayors is meeting in convention in New York City, and today will install as its new president the mayor of my hometown, Louisville, KY, Mayor Jerry Abramson. The mayor is finishing up his second term as mayor of our city and running for a third term virtually uncontested. I think this suggests the outstanding nature of his policies, many of which match President Clinton's with regard to economic development.

Mayor Abramson has been stalwart, and in the lead nationally, in urging enterprise zones for our communities, emphasizing the role of small business, emphasizing education and a trained work force, and emphasizing job training.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of any more important group for the future of America than the mayors of our Nation, and I cannot think of any better spokesperson for the mayors of the Nation than the mayor of Louisville, Mayor Jerry Abramson.

I wish the mayor every kind of good fortune and success in his tenure as head of the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

### COUNT CLINTON

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, with President Clinton's blessing, Democrat Members of the other body have put together a tax package that will severely damage our economy, and small business will bear the brunt of the pain.

Small business is the most productive, most energetic, and most fragile part of our economy. If we do not allow the small businesses of our Nation to

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

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

prosper and grow, we will not have any economic growth. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to puzzle at how Members of this Congress can stand here and wring our hands about jobs and about the economy, and pass bills that make it virtually impossible for the private sector, and small business in particular, to prosper. If this bill is signed into law, it will be like Count Dracula to the entrepreneurs of this land. This bill will suck the life blood out of small businesses. It will increase the effective small business tax rate by more than 30 percent. It will cut capital expenses. It will increase the capital gains tax by 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we need to put a stake in the heart of this Count Dracula tax bill before it sucks the blood out of our small business sector.

#### APPROVAL OF PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PACKAGE WOULD SERVE NATIONAL INTEREST

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, in approving the President's budget, the House dismissed the special interests and it advanced the national interest by cutting the deficit and slicing spending.

Since the plan was introduced, favorable interest rates have propelled mortgage rates to a 20-year low. The economy is on-track.

The President's plan will cut the deficit by \$500 billion and the American people know that national economic revitalization will not happen without substantial deficit reduction.

President Clinton's plan has \$100 billion more in deficit reduction than any other plan submitted this year.

The President's plan contains more than 100 budget cuts and each one will reduce spending by more than \$100 million.

Half of the \$500 billion in deficit reduction comes from these spending cuts.

Mr. Speaker, this week the other body has a historic opportunity to support the President's plan. It can move forward with the largest deficit reduction plan in U.S. history or it can let special interests shackle the national interest.

The President's economic plan means real progress for America. It will translate into more jobs and a better future for our children.

I urge my colleagues in the other body to follow the House's example and to approve President Clinton's economic package.

#### AMERICA NEEDS JOBS, MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUTS, AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, as we move through our districts throughout this country, it becomes very, very clear that what this country needs is jobs, and to get the economy moving again. What this country needs are middle class tax cuts, and what this country needs is more affordable health care. These are the themes, ironically, called for by the President in his last campaign.

□ 1210

Tragically, what we are getting is a job-killing gas tax, a job-killing capital gains hike, tax increases on senior citizens and families, and massive tax hikes to finance socialized health care.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to return to his campaign theme, to his promises to cut Government spending and reinvent Government to make it serve more effectively the interests of the American people.

#### THE PRESIDENT HITS HIS STRIDE

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's agenda on Capitol Hill moves forward. His campaign finance reform plan, his national service plan, his Supreme Court nominee, and most importantly, by the end of this week, his reconciliation economic plan will have passed the Senate.

The other side has smoke and mirrors. They are speaking simply to be negative. They have no plan. They have a lot of town meetings and a lot of press conferences. But where is the Republican plan to cut the deficit and improve the economy?

Mr. Speaker, on June 1 unemployment dipped below 7 percent for the first time in the last 18 months. Interest rates continue to drop with mortgage rates staying at 20-year lows. New home sales hit a 7-year high in April, and 775,000 new jobs have been created since January.

Mr. Speaker, these factors point to the start of more confidence in the economy, and President Clinton should get credit for that.

If you've watched TV, listened to the radio or looked at a newspaper in the last couple of days, you would have seen the President talking straight to the people. The President is carrying a message that is factual and on target. He has proposed an economic plan that cuts the deficit by \$500 billion, makes the rich pay their fair share, and forces us to make the tough choices we were elected to make.

It's clear—the other side has not joined the effort to get America going. Instead, they de-

pend on the hollow politics of opposition—opposing the President's plan and refusing to make a serious, good-faith effort of their own. They can argue and grumble all they want. The fact of the matter is that they talk a great game but, so far, haven't even stepped onto the playing field.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect more from us—and Bill Clinton is leading the way.

Mr. Speaker, these factors point to the start of more confidence in the economy. That means more jobs, higher wages, less inflation, and an increased opportunity for middle-class Americans to buy homes. Nobody doubts that we've got a long way to go but the numbers make the case—we're finally on our way.

#### PLAY BALL?

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, it has been widely reported that small business will not fare well under Bill Clinton's plan to revive the economy.

According to some sources, since small business would not "play ball" with the Clinton administration, they are going to be punished with higher taxes and more regulations.

On several occasions in the past, President Clinton acknowledged the role small business plays in expanding economic growth.

But those days are over. Now, small business is to be punished for not playing ball with an administration that is going nowhere.

Small business will create more than three-quarters of all jobs in the next decade. If the Clinton administration continues to be hostile toward that sector of our economy, those jobs will not be created.

Mr. Speaker, it is silly for the President to punish small business for not playing ball with his economic plan. If he wants really wants more jobs, he should listen to small business, not punish them.

#### FAST TRACK FOR URUGUAY ROUND OF GATT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the vote today on extending the deadline for fast-track authority for the GATT trade talks is really a vote about jobs.

In the last Congress, 192 Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, voted against granting the executive branch fast-track authority to negotiate two proposed trade agreements, one with Europe and one with Mexico. One hundred ninety votes against is hardly a vote of confidence.

I rise today to again oppose Congress ceding for only the fourth time in our

history, the history of the country, its constitutional authority in trade matters to the executive branch under the unacceptable rubric of fast track. Fast track, with its strict limits on debate of only 2 hours, no amendments allowed, and mandating votes after 60 legislative days is undemocratic and unacceptable.

Our trading partners do not impose the same constraints on themselves, so why should the United States put itself in a straitjacket?

By voting no on fast track, we can assure that Congress has a more equal role in the development of our trade rules that mean jobs here at home.

#### VOTE "YES" ON THE SPACE STATION—THE UNITED STATES CANNOT CEDE LEADERSHIP IN SPACE

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this week, we will be casting a vote that will tell us a great deal about the future of our Nation. Will we rededicate ourselves to looking forward, or will we lapse into a national lethargy where great undertakings seem beyond our will?

During consideration of the NASA authorization, each of us will be asked whether this Nation is still capable of blazing trails into the future.

When we vote on space station *Freedom* we should ask ourselves whether we are ready to allow this country's manned space station program to stop, to stop a vision.

The space station will be a great undertaking, a leap into the future where every challenge that is posed is met with innovation and dedication. It will add greatly to our scientific base of knowledge in areas such as physics, biotechnology, and environmental science. But, most of all, it will serve as the jumping-off point for our children's future and things we cannot even imagine today.

A generation has passed since man last walked on the Moon. Let's renew our commitment to the future, to science and to discovery and vote "yes" on the space station.

#### HOUSE IS FARM TEAM ON TAX BILL PLAYS

(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, the Constitution says that all bills for raising taxes shall originate in the House of Representatives. What a laugh.

Ladies and gentlemen, the House of Representatives has become a farm team, a farm team for the tax bills of

America. In fact, ladies and gentlemen, our mandate in the Constitution has become nothing more than a trial balloon for a bunch of fat cat politicians entrenched in powerplays.

The truth is when tax bills come back from the other body, we cannot even recognize them. Even our leaders, if the truth be known, do not know all that is in them. And this is one Member that is upset about the fact that just a few elite Members draft the tax bills that are sending our jobs overseas and destroying this economy.

I will have no more to do with it. I will vote no unless that process is opened up to participation in the House like the Constitution says.

I thought indentured servants were past history in America. Members of the House, we are second-class citizens on tax issues. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

#### THAT'S WHERE THE MONEY IS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, Willie Sutton, when asked why he robbed banks, replied: "That's where the money is."

Bill Clinton, when asked why he wants to increase taxes on the middle class, should reply the same way.

There is a great deal of money to be found in the middle class. But, Mr. Speaker, that money should stay with the middle class. It should not be directed to Washington to pay for the President's social programs.

Unfortunately, under Clintonomics, the middle class will pay the most.

From an increase in income rates to a new surtax on capital gains, from a broad-based energy tax to increased social security taxes, it is the middle class who will bear the burden of the Clinton plan.

President Clinton has talked a good game of tax fairness. But his vision of fairness will devastate the middle class.

#### VOTE "NO" ON FAST TRACK

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

Mr. APPELATE. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to be taking up world trade, what they call GATT, and we are going to be voting on it on a fast track, which is what we did with NAFTA. Fast track means that the bill comes up, there is absolutely no amendments, we vote what they want, either yes or no.

Americans deserve a vote through us to protect their jobs. This institution, my friends, is marching to a different drum and we had better start listening to the people of this country.

You want to balance the budget, you want to give back a quality of life that has been taken away from them? Then give Americans jobs.

I think our priorities are twisted. We keep importing refugees and we are exporting jobs. I think we better start thinking about it.

□ 1220

#### TAX AND SPEND, TAX AND SPEND

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, candidate Bill Clinton promised to "End welfare as we know it." The idea was to help people help themselves, prepare them to become productive citizens, and ultimately get them off public assistance. But now we read that once again those campaign promises will not be met.

Where candidate Clinton talked wonderful words of scaling back massive Federal aid programs, of saving money and of creating a more efficient system, now we read of bigger, not smaller Federal commitment, of more taxpayers' money, not less. In yesterday's New York Times, a key architect of, and spokesman for, President Clinton's welfare policy said, "nobody's talking about this as a way of saving money. We're talking about spending money." It seems that, once again, President Clinton has forgotten what candidate Clinton said in order to get elected. Tax and spend, tax and spend; where have we heard it before?

#### THE SINGLE PAYER HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, the prestigious New England Journal of Medicine has called our health care costs the "black hole" of our society and recently gave a vote of no confidence to any reform system that continues to reply on our failed system of competition.

The Journal endorsed the centerpieces of the Canadian health care system: Global budgets and a single-payer delivery system.

We will spend \$900 billion on health care this year, but does anyone think we are getting our money's worth? Canadians never worry about whether they can afford to take their kids to the doctor. Canadians know they can change jobs and keep their benefits. Canadians go to any doctor they want—not just those listed by their health plan.

It sounds too good to be true—but it is how Canadians have been living for

more than 30 years. Why can Americans not have that same health security?

Those who have vested interests in our current black hole health care system say it can't be done. But Canada and every other major industrial country has proven that health security can be provided for every citizen. Americans deserve health security at a price that does not bankrupt all of us.

#### RADIO FREE EUROPE BROADCASTS INTO BALKAN AREAS SEEN AS INSTRUMENT OF DEMOCRACY, LASTING PEACE

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

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, late last week I received word that Radio Free Europe had gotten the go-ahead to begin broadcasting into the former Yugoslavia.

Earlier in the session, I introduced a resolution urging the Board for International Broadcasting, the governing body of Radio Free Europe, to initiate RFE broadcasts in the former Yugoslavia. I was joined by a large number of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle and I thank each of them for their support.

Mr. Speaker, the Serbian Government continues to tighten its stranglehold on all media under its control and uses radio, television, and the printed press to stir hatred. This media policy is a huge factor in the success of the ruling party's ethnic cleansing strategy.

During the past year, the United States has watched helplessly as the body count in Bosnia has risen. Broadcasting into the former Yugoslavia is a step to ensure that events there are fully understood. Providing the voice of democracy is aid that cannot be counted in dollars or numbered in relief packages.

Radio Free Europe's success in fostering democratic values is well documented. I am confident that RFE will again perform admirably in its new role in the Balkans and help promote a lasting peace in the region.

#### TIME TO STOP CRITICIZING, SEEK SOLUTIONS WITHOUT POLITICAL POSTURING

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

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, the Old Book says "What profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his soul."

These past 3 days I traveled the length of my district, meeting with farmers, miners, laborers, and business leaders, and one refrain was common to

all of them. They said, "We know this debt is killing our country. We want to see this problem resolved but we are losing faith in the ability of our Government to resolve anything. All we see is you people standing in the Congress, savaging each other and each others' party. We want solutions, not political posturing." And the people are right.

Mr. Speaker, what profit us if we gain political popularity at home by demagoging very complex issues as though they had simple solutions, or tearing down the other party if, in the process, we denigrate this institution which we love and destroy the soul and the spirit of this country in the process?

It is time that all of us begin to enoble this institution and stop the criticism.

#### CLINTON'S T-REX: THE T STANDS FOR TAXES

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, this summer's blockbuster movie is "Jurassic Park." Well, President Clinton is not about to be outdone by his Hollywood friends and is already at work on a sequel.

Instead of a blockbuster, the President has decided to make a budgetbuster. The President's production costs of \$322 billion in new taxes and \$1 trillion in new debt dwarf Mr. Spielberg's.

"Jurassic Park" features the escape of a vicious meat-eating dinosaur called T-rex. President Clinton's production features a T-rex, too, only this time the "T" stands for taxes.

In "Jurassic Park" the T-rex has only one limitation: If you do not move, it cannot get you. Well, Director Clinton's Tax rex has only one limitation: If you do not earn, it cannot get you either.

Do not believe the billboard showing Tax rex eating only the rich. It eats the middle class, small business, jobs, investments, and will eat you as well. Dinosaurs are supposed to be extinct, as the idea of taxing your way to prosperity, but do not give away the ending.

If the polls are right, Mr. Clinton and his dinosaur are headed in that same direction.

#### LOCAL GERMAN GOVERNMENT SPURNS AMERICAN JAZZ GREAT CHICK COREA, CANCELS APPOINTMENT

(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, I take the floor today in solidarity with

American jazz great Chick Corea. Mr. Corea's contributions to the music industry have already granted him a place in music's history book.

This Boston native's career has spanned over 25 years and includes recording sessions and concerts with the giants of jazz such as Miles Davis, Sarah Vaughan, Stan Getz, and Mongo Santamaria.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that American jazz is this country's only true original musical form and that American jazz is performed and loved all over the world. In fact, the European Community has a passion and thirst for jazz and has a great respect for Mr. Corea's lifework.

So it came as a great surprise when I was informed that a German concert performance was canceled by a local German Government because of Mr. Corea's religious beliefs. In this enlightened day in age, especially after the fall of the Berlin Wall, a symbol of oppression and censorship, I believe it is shameful and disturbing that Mr. Corea be denied the opportunity to perform his music simply because of different religious and philosophical views that are questioned and not recognized by the County Government of Baden-Wuerttemberg.

Mr. Corea only wishes to play his unique and wonderful style of jazz before the German people. He is going as an ambassador of American culture, not as a representative of a religion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my distinguished colleagues, especially those who support the arts, to endorse Mr. Corea's effort to be heard in Germany and I ask that you contact members of the German Government and let them know that you condemn the treatment of Mr. Corea who only wishes to share his music with the world.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address my distinguished colleagues.

#### TAX SHAM

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the word "sham" is defined by Webster's dictionary as "a trick that deludes," "an imitation or counterfeit purporting to be genuine," and, "a hoax or cheap falsehood." Any of these definitions could describe the President's economic plan.

It is a sham that contains \$3 in tax increases for every \$1 in spending cuts;

It is a sham that does nothing to reduce the national debt; we keep talking deficit while we keep getting the Nation deeper in debt.

It is a sham involving a new "deficit reduction trust fund," A P.R. gimmick that's called a sham even by the President's own OMB staff.

It is a sham in which over 80 percent of the proposed spending cuts do not occur until 1996 or later, when the interest on debt will be out of control.

Mr. Speaker, this economic plan has turned into a national joke. Let us just call it what it is: The biggest tax increase in U.S. history, bar none.

#### THE GROWING FARM CRISIS

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, with all of the discussion regarding the budget and other issues before us, there is a growing crisis that has received little or no attention.

Farm prices have been falling drastically; wheat prices down from \$3.60 a bushel to \$2.40, far below the cost of production.

Now, for my colleagues who do not care about the price of wheat in Dodge City, let me put it in terms you care about, the budget. While the Trade Policy Review Group, the Domestic Economic Council, and the State Department lay claim to the farmer's grain and dawdle over making necessary decisions, farm program costs are soaring from \$13 billion to \$17 billion and climbing.

It is not necessary to experience another farm crisis, it is not inevitable that we break the budget with farm program payments due to low prices. The irony of this situation is that Agriculture Secretary Espy has urged the Clinton administration to use the Export Enhancement Program; but his proposal is now hung up in an inter-agency task force.

My message to the White House is simple. Act on Secretary Espy's export proposal. Make a decision on export policy. Avert a growing farm crisis and reduce the deficit. Those of us who are on the Agriculture Committee will help, Mr. President, but you have to get off of the export dime.

□ 1230

#### ANOTHER BROKEN PROMISE: PRESIDENT CLINTON'S AG EXPORT POLICY

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has broken so many of his campaign promises that it is often easy to forget some of the promises he made. During the campaign, Bill Clinton promised that he would increase exports for U.S. agricultural products. Five months into his administration, however, President Clinton's ag export policy is a shambles.

Many corn farmers in my State have been hoping for increased exports to

boost low prices, but President Clinton has done nothing to follow through on his promise.

The President's Russian aid package is a half-hearted effort that is unlikely to sufficiently increase sales of agricultural products to Russia. Also, it is becoming a real possibility that the Clinton administration may agree to a conclusion of GATT negotiations which would sell out U.S. farmers. President Clinton needs to stand up for American farmers against protectionist European agricultural policies.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton should begin to adopt policies which will make good on his promise to increase agricultural exports.

#### IN OPPOSITION TO ADMINISTRATION'S AGRICULTURE EXPORT POLICY

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is past time for the Clinton administration to develop a comprehensive agricultural export strategy, to counter falling grain prices.

The President has had 6 months to make good on his promise to improve farm export programs. But, like a mystery book, the suspense continues; however, we do have a murder victim—the wheat farmer. Yes, the suspense has dropped the wheat price in my hometown from \$3.58 to \$2.63 per bushel; that is almost \$1 since Inauguration Day.

The falling price is because of the administration's failure to seize opportunities to help the American farmer, such as the Russian aid package and the delayed announcement of the Export Enhancement Program credits.

The administration's "foot-dragging" and "paper-passing" has denied the delivery of any United States commodities to Russia, agreed to at the Vancouver summit, and has detained new EEP credits by more than a month behind the European Community.

I strongly urge the administration to write the final chapter on Russian aid and the 1993-94 EEP package mystery book to take some of the guessing out of farming.

#### AGRICULTURAL TRADE POLICIES

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, times are tough for Iowa farmers now. They are struggling with wet weather and low commodity prices. In fact, Iowa farmers are still struggling to plant crops that should have been in the ground 1 month ago.

Farmers are already facing a big hit with the House proposal to slash \$2.9

billion from farm programs. What they need now is a commitment by the U.S. Government to open up new markets and increase American exports. They need a Government that will go to bat for them when it comes to building trade opportunities overseas.

That's why it is so important that the House extend the fast-track policy for the Uruguay round. Critics of extending fast-track say enough is enough, and that these negotiations have been going on far too long. There is some merit to their point. And that is why we must make sure that our trading partners understand this is the last time we are coming to the table.

Moreover, the administration must not view GATT as a cure-all to enhance agricultural exports. What we need is a strong clear export policy that will move farmers' commodities overseas, including export enhancements currently bottled up.

Our farmers are the most efficient producers in the world. And they are not willing to stand by and watch the United States lose its market share overseas because of foot dragging by their own Government.

#### WHY ARE U.S. TROOPS GOING TO MACEDONIA?

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I was alarmed last week at a briefing by high-level administration officials on President Clinton's decision to deploy 300 United States troops to Macedonia, the first United States ground forces inserted into the Balkans' civil war.

Mr. Speaker, I was alarmed because no clear mission has yet been defined for United States troops in Macedonia. They will be under the U.N. command, and they will wear blue helmets for the first time in our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, the lessons of Vietnam should be clear. Our commitment of ground troops in Macedonia clearly threatens to escalate our military involvement in the Balkans' civil war.

Mr. Speaker, I am sending a letter to the President, which has already been cosigned by 60 Members on both sides of the aisle, expressing strong concerns about the lack of a well-defined mission for United States troops in Macedonia.

Gen. Colin Powell put it best when he said, "The first rule of military engagement must be this: Before deploying United States forces anywhere and putting American lives at risk, it is absolutely imperative to first define their mission."

Please, Members, join this bipartisan group in sending our letter to the President.

American troops must not be used anywhere in the world as symbolic sitting ducks.

#### MICHIGAN SEES GM JOBS RETURNING

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, "GM To Shift Jobs From Mexico to Michigan." That's the headline over a story in this morning's paper and on radio news accounts the last 24 hours.

Opponents of the North American Free-Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico have argued that NAFTA means jobs will go to Mexico. "A great sucking sound of jobs to Mexico," is how Ross Perot refers to it. Well, this morning's news gives the lie to those who say our manufacturers can't compete with low wages in countries like Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, they can compete. They do compete every day. In fact, this announcement is an example of what can happen when trade is rationalized by the market place—not by politicians or bureaucrats. Because Mexico has reduced its tariffs and eliminated the restrictions against imports, manufacturers like General Motors are no longer compelled to locate manufacturing facilities in Mexico in order to be in that market.

Freer trade works for workers and consumers alike. General Motors has demonstrated that today. Let's be sure NAFTA is approved so we can create more jobs in America.

#### MITTEN, MY KITTEN

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, one of the talented young people in my district is Miss Katy McCord. Katy is only 8 years old but obviously a gifted poet with profound political insights. Let me submit, for verification, her latest creative work which she shared with her grandmother, Kate Anderson, who has inspired her since her birth:

I have a kitten,  
Her name is Mitten,  
Who bit Bill Clinton.  
Because of my Mitten,  
Bill Clinton got bitten.  
That was my Mitten,  
And the end of Bill Clinton.

#### ADMINISTRATION FOUND WANTING IN SUPPORT OF U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member is extremely concerned about the administration's lack of commitment to ensuring that the United States remains the world's leading agricultural producer and exporters.

In addition to proposing taxes which would drastically erode the international competitiveness of America's agricultural industry, I regret to say that the administration has not demonstrated sufficiently that it is committed to maintaining foreign markets for an industry which currently has an \$18 billion trade surplus.

While commodity prices remain depressed and farm income is eroding, the administration is wavering on its necessary commitment to export programs which combat unfair agricultural trade policies throughout the world. Equally devastating is the administration's apparent lack of will, or intentional laziness, in aggressively negotiating for greater market access for U.S. agricultural products. While United States trade negotiators have taken tenacious and tough positions on current Uruguay round multilateral negotiations in textiles, steel, and maritime sectors, the United States agricultural industry now appears to have been forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, this Member urges the administration to unequivocally aggressively support agricultural export programs and to steadfastly negotiate for increased access for U.S. agricultural commodities. Our agricultural producers, and the American people, which benefit most from this important industry, deserve no less.

□ 1240

#### FREE TRADE CREATES JOBS

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, simply the prospect of free trade is creating jobs right here in the United States of America. We have all seen the news, the headlines reporting that General Motors plans to create 1,000 new jobs in Lansing, MI, to build the Chevy Cavalier.

It is obvious that we are in a position today where we must realize that the opportunity to export goods manufactured in the United States to Mexico is on the horizon if we can implement a North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Unfortunately, the naysayers are proclaiming that this move was simply made to try to encourage those of us here in the Congress to vote in favor of NAFTA.

Mr. Speaker, businesses do not make decisions based on their attempts to lobby the U.S. Congress. Last October, GM and the UAW commissioned a study to determine where it was most cost efficient to produce those cars. That study concluded that Lansing was the most efficient location. A thousand new jobs are going to be created in the United States because of the chance of selling automobiles in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, let us make sure we implement the North American Free-Trade Agreement so that we can export cars to Mexico, and continue to create jobs here in America.

#### FEDERAL MANDATES COST CITY GOVERNMENTS BILLIONS OF DOLLARS

(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, the Washington Post reported yesterday that Federal mandates are now costing city governments hundreds of billions of dollars annually.

The liberals who have controlled the Congress for 30 years or more now have gotten our Federal Government over \$4 trillion in debt; now they are bankrupting the States and cities, too.

Mayor Daley of Chicago is quoted as saying that Federal mandates cost his city \$160 million a year. He says these costs have to be passed on to the taxpayer in higher taxes and fewer services.

Almost every mayor quoted in the story is a Democrat.

My own Governor, Governor McWhorter, a Democrat and a fine man, has met with our delegation several times and has said, "Please, no more Federal mandates."

The mayor of Knoxville has spoken frequently of the problem created by unfunded mandates.

The people of this Nation need to know, however, that it is the liberals in Congress who are doing this to them. Those who believe in big government have an obligation to pay for it.

The problem is that the Congress is taking too much money from the people already, but it is even more harmful to pass these expenses on to our State and local governments.

This is now a tremendous problem, but it will not be solved until more conservatives are elected to the Congress.

#### URUGUAY ROUND OF MULTILATERAL TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 199 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 199

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1876) to provide authority for the President to enter into trade agreements to conclude the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to extend tariff proclamation authority to carry out such agreements, and to apply congressional "fast track" procedures

to a bill implementing such agreements. Debate on the bill shall not exceed one hour, with thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANNER). The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary one half hour of debate time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 199 is the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1876, to provide authority for the President to enter into trade agreements to conclude the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to extend tariff proclamation authority to carry out such agreements, and to apply congressional fast track procedures to a bill implementing such agreements.

The rule provides that the measure will be considered in the House, with 1 hour of debate time equally divided between the two committees of jurisdiction. Thirty minutes will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 30 minutes will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

No amendment is in order except through the motion to recommit, which this rule provides for.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which this rule makes in order provides a limited and narrowly drawn extension of trade agreement negotiating authority which will enable the President to conclude the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations this year. Fast track procedures would apply only if the President notifies Congress of his intent to enter into an agreement by December 15, 1993, and if he enters into the agreement by April 15, 1994. This authority would apply only to the result of the Uruguay round negotiations, not to any other trade pacts.

The Uruguay round negotiations, which began in 1986, are being conducted among more than 100 nations, to reduce tariff and nontariff barriers, and to establish new and improved international trading rules for manufactured goods, agricultural products, services, intellectual property, and in-

vestment. Extension of the U.S. trade agreement authority and fast track implementing procedures is essential to permit completion of these important negotiations.

The text of H.R. 1876 was included in H.R. 2264, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, which passed the House on May 27, and is currently under consideration in the other body. However, the administration is requesting expedited action on this measure so that it can be signed into law before the economic summit of the industrialized nations begins on July 7. Enactment prior to the convening of the summit would demonstrate to our major trading partners that the United States has the necessary authorities in place to conclude and implement the Uruguay round, which will enable major progress to be made at the summit toward the conclusion of these negotiations this year.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 199 reflects the desire of the bipartisan leadership of both of the committees of jurisdiction to keep debate on this measure confined to the subject before us: The administration's request for an extension of fast track trade authority for a short time period, and to apply to the Uruguay round only. I urge the adoption of this rule so that the House can proceed with consideration of H.R. 1876.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule for consideration of H.R. 1876, legislation extending the President's fast track authority so that he can conclude the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations. While I would not normally urge my colleagues to support a restrictive rule, in this case the legislation does not create a new fast track process, but simply as my colleague has said, extends for a short period of time current negotiating authority. Therefore, I am pleased to report that there is bipartisan leadership support for this process being used for what is a simple extension of fast track authority.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 1876. The evidence is overwhelming that the President requires the authority extended by H.R. 1876 to successfully carry out trade negotiations. For 7 years the President has had this fast track authority for the vitally important GATT talks, and the new administration has asked for an extension solely to finish this one very important trade negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule so that we can take up the bill, H.R. 1876, and give the President that very important negotiating authority.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 7 min-

utes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the test of any trade agreement's success must be that it produces economic growth and jobs for American workers. When the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations broke off last winter, the former administration, the Congress and virtually all U.S. business came to the unanimous conclusion that negotiations had failed to produce agreement that could pass this basic test.

Furthermore, by establishing generally weaker international standards for food safety and other issues, concerns have been raised that the current text of the agreement makes it possible for other countries to challenge U.S. health, safety, environmental and labor standards. For the past 3 years, the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Competitiveness, which I chair, has held hearings looking at the ability of the United States to maintain and enforce strong environmental and food safety standards under trade agreements being negotiated.

Last year, the subcommittee took a resolution to the floor which stated that Congress would not implement a trade agreement that compromises our country's health, safety, environmental and labor laws. That resolution was passed unanimously by the full House of Representatives. Our negotiators must make sure that any final agreement in no way qualifies the ability of the United States to establish and enforce standards it deems appropriate to protect the public interest.

By providing the President with authority to enter into trade agreements to conclude the Uruguay round and by extending fast track approval procedures, H.R. 1876 gives the United States a new opportunity to reach a successful agreement in the Uruguay round of talks under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT].

All American workers and business—that is producers of manufactured products, services, and agricultural goods—must have access to foreign markets to survive in today's world economy. Total world trade, which reached \$3.4 trillion in 1991 and grew by more than 60 percent since 1986, is clearly the world's primary generator of economic growth.

Since 1947, seven rounds of GATT negotiations have brought about huge reductions in tariffs on industrial products and have made a major contribution to the expansion of world trade. But, estimates are that about one-third of total world trade occurs totally outside the GATT framework of trade rules.

The Uruguay round was begun in 1986 largely in an effort to develop rules

that would promote trade in areas that currently are not dealt with on a comprehensive basis by GATT, such as services and agricultural goods. While this is certainly a desirable goal, it is important to remember that an agreement that hurts U.S. producers of manufactured goods is not an acceptable price to pay for success in services and agriculture. For example, the U.S. must avoid major concessions that threaten whole U.S. industries, like textiles and apparel.

Manufactured products accounted for 82 percent of our total merchandise exports in 1992, while agricultural goods accounted for only 10 percent. If the United States were to get everything it wants in agriculture and our services trade surplus were to increase 10 percent, there would only be about a \$6 billion improvement in the overall U.S. trade balance.

Unfortunately, many of our GATT partners have tried to use the Uruguay round to make changes that hurt, not help U.S. manufacturing. For example, it is generally recognized that GATT dispute settlement procedures need to be clarified and strengthened.

Our trading partners have tried to use the Uruguay round primarily to impose new restrictions to prevent the United States from using its unilateral authority under section 301 to retaliate against foreign unfair trade practices. Limitations on our ability to use 301 authority is too high a price to pay for improvements in GATT dispute settlement.

Similarly, U.S. efforts to reduce world subsidies and to prevent dumping have been distorted by countries that only want to legitimize subsidies they now extend to their industries and to make it more difficult for the U.S. to use its only defense against unfair subsidies, our countervailing duty law. The burden of proof must be on foreign concerns to prove that subsidies are not trade distorting, and we should not agree to any change that would force U.S. firms to meet higher standards of proof in their trade complaints under our countervailing duty laws.

In addition, estimates are that violations of U.S. intellectual property rights—copyrights, trademarks, and patents—has cost U.S. manufacturers about \$14 billion in trade. Despite this fact, the United States and the European Community have not agreed on what should be included in an agreement covering intellectual property.

It is clear that whatever is agreed to on intellectual property will not provide for effective worldwide enforcement. As a result, it will be very important that the final agreement coming out of the Uruguay round not prevent the United States from using authority like that under section 337 of the Tariff Act, which restricts the sale of imports that infringe on U.S. intellectual property rights.

It will also be important to retain our ability to use special 301 authority that allows the U.S. Trade Representative to retaliate against countries that violate U.S. intellectual property rights.

Mr. Speaker, these are a few of the areas that still need to be addressed in the final stages of the Uruguay round negotiations. Our negotiators must keep in mind that an agreement that hurts U.S. manufacturing is not acceptable. By giving the President authority contained in H.R. 1876, our negotiators have another opportunity to complete the Uruguay round in a way that benefits American workers and business, including America's manufacturing industries.

□ 1250

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule; I oppose the bill.

It is very simple:

I am not against giving the President the authority to proceed on trade agreements. I do not like the fact that, once these trade agreements are struck, we have no opportunity to basically offer any input or amendments to make any significant changes in these bills.

I am certainly not the most well-liked person by the House Committee on Ways and Means. But I think it is time to make this statement:

We have had a so-called free trade, laissez faire, trade policy in America. There has been no difference if it is a Democrat or Republican administration; I do not see much change. In fact, I do not see any difference anymore between the Democrat and Republican parties to be quite truthful. Take away the flag, and abortion, and school prayer, and show me the real differences in trade and macroeconomic policies.

There are several things we cannot divorce ourselves from here today. How can we reconcile the budget deficits of America if we continue to take on huge trade deficits?

Now, if it is because we are just not good enough and cannot compete, I could understand that; we have to become better. But that is not the case. Japan dumps in our market. Congress turns their back. China uses slave labor. China turns its back on us. Congress turns its back on the American worker, and, my colleagues, Congress gives China most-favored-nation trade status. Europe denies us access; Congress turns their back.

Ten percent of the American people are on food stamps. We have extended unemployment five times. America has slipped from No. 1 to No. 6 for quality of life. American workers are now No. 5 for wages in the world, and we have all these free traders on the Committee

on Ways and Means, and they keep telling us, "We'll destroy our economy if those cheaper-made foreign goods can't come in here." Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to say that we can get chairmen of these committees a hell of a lot cheaper, too.

I disagree with the trade policy of America. It has destroyed the steel industry. It has destroyed the manufacturing infrastructure of our Nation. Oh, there are a few token moves of companies coming back, but the truth is there is a hell of a lot more leaving. There are more government workers today than factory workers in America, and those robots are not even being made in America.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "The only thing fast about this bill is the greased lightning fast track that American companies and American jobs will keep leaving on, and I think it is time for this House to become embroiled in a serious debate. Lock the doors, throw the TV cameras out, and come up with a trade policy that does not reward slave labor, that takes a look at the concerns of the average American worker. And we are not doing that, and any Member of this House that votes for most-favored-nation status for China, they should have a whole pack of candidates chasing them. Seventeen cents an hour, folks. That is what it costs to build a product in China."

This is free trade?

This is not free trade, this is slave trade, and Uncle Sam has become an auctioneer.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I will yield to the gentleman on the gentleman's time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], my friend.

I would just like to ask my friend a brief question.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I will be happy to respond.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] and I agree on a wide range of issues; we happen to disagree on this issue of trade.

The gentleman was making the case about those of us here in the Congress who are strong free traders. Has the gentleman looked at the decade of the 1980's? There are clearly industries where we have imposed protectionist barriers, specifically the automobile industry, the steel industry to which my friend referred, and the motorcycle industry, and it seems to me that, as we look at those industries, tragically we have not seen great improvement here, having put into place things like voluntary restraint agreements and a wide range of other things, and I wonder if my friend might be able to share

with us what kind of protectionist barriers he believes would be beneficial both to the U.S. consumer and the U.S. worker.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield enough time to me so that I may be able to do that?

Mr. DREIER. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Fine.

Mr. Speaker, I am not for protectionist barriers, but I am not for other nations having protectionist barriers and unfair advantages in trade that Congress does not deal with.

What I am saying is: What's the difference if somebody puts up an illegal barrier against America if we don't deal with it?

Japan has been cited so many times in Federal court for dumping in America, and we have yet to evoke the super 301 trade provision that we have enacted. We have now documented the fact that the United States Army bought 15,000 hoists from China, which were made at a prison camp without any labor cost to them, and we are still proceeding with MFN for China.

□ 1300

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me ask this question of the gentleman.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want the gentleman to tell me, how can someone in California compete with a Chinese product made at 17 cents an hour.

I think it is within the rights and province of Congress that has a mandate saying that Congress must deal with foreign nations. We are not doing that. I am for free trade if it is a 2-way trade situation, but this is not a 2-way trade situation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to respond to the gentleman, and I would do so by saying simply that I am one who likes to look not solely at the U.S. worker but also at the U.S. consumer. What I have been trying to do is reduce the barriers that exist in other countries.

I know my friend is supportive of my legislation calling for the establishment of a United States-Japan free trade agreement which would reduce the barriers to the export of United States goods to Japan.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me an additional minute so I may respond?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], and let me say I was simply playing out our arguments.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman yielded me an additional minute?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair understands that the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has yielded 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. No. 1, Mr. Speaker, none of my remarks should be taken as directed personally toward the gentleman from California. I believe his efforts are honorable and are right, but we have to look at some of the gray area in between.

I would like to say this to the gentleman and to the Members of Congress: There will be no consumers in America if there are no workers in America, and the evidence is clear. These companies are leaving us. We do not build a telephone, we do not build a television, we do not build a typewriter, we do not build a VCR, and we invented all these things.

I think it is time for all of us to sit down and just debate this issue. I am not opposed to free trade.

I am opposed to stupid giveaway trade. That is what America has been practicing, and it has hurt us very much.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to respond to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I do so to simply say that my friend and I must today both be in ecstasy over the fact that General Motors, working in concert with the United Auto Workers, is now establishing 1,000 jobs at the Lansing plant, where they are going to be building the Chevy Cavalier.

I know my friend is just as pleased as I am. Why did they do this? Because we have found out once again that the American worker is by far the most productive in every way over workers in other parts of the world. I think this decision by General Motors, done in concert with the United Auto Workers, is a very clear and positive signal for the future.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I rise in strong support of this legislation that will extend to President Clinton the authority to conclude the Uruguay round of the GATT trade talks.

What we are simply doing in this legislation is giving the administration authority to negotiate. This administration has proven to be very strong in insuring the protection of American workers and products with the Europeans, with the Japanese, and with the Mexicans. What we are simply doing here is giving the administration this fast-track authority, and I want to congratulate Chairman GIBBONS and the Committee on Ways and Means for bringing a clean bill to the House for a vote. The President and U.S. Ambassador Mickey Kantor have made a successful conclusion of the Uruguay round a high priority, and by passing

this legislation we are simply going to give this administration the tools that it needs to bring back a trade agreement, to do exactly what my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, wants to achieve, and that is to recognize the protection of the American worker, American companies, the American trade posture, and American competitiveness.

What the new global trade pact will do is negotiate trade barriers and tariffs for the world's 107 nations, and it holds a promise, if successfully concluded, for as much as \$200 billion in new global commerce a year. In addition, the GATT agreement will apply free trade rules to agriculture and services for the first time.

Mr. Speaker, I do have some regrets. I would have liked fast-track authority to include Chile, the United States and Chile, but unfortunately, this did not happen. This will have to wait another year.

I see the world moving into trade blocs, with us and the Western Hemisphere, with Japan and Asia leading a group in Asia, and with the European community, each of us competing with the other. But even if we do have trade blocs, it makes sense that we establish rules of negotiation, that we proceed with negotiations on GATT. Perhaps we will not reach agreement. It is very tough to negotiate with the Europeans on agriculture, and it is very tough to negotiate with the Japanese on semiconductors. Perhaps we need some stronger measures.

What we are simply doing here in this bill is giving the administration the authority to negotiate fast-track authority to move ahead, give it more time to come through with some GATT negotiations that will allow us to be internationally more competitive.

I want to congratulate the Committee on Ways and Means and Chairman GIBBONS for exercising great leadership in bringing a clean bill to the House floor for a vote.

A new global trade pact will reduce trade barriers and tariffs around the world for GATT's 107 nations and holds the promise of creating as much as \$200 billion in new global commerce a year. In addition, the GATT agreement will apply free trade rules for the first time to agriculture and services.

I recognize the legitimate concerns that some Members of Congress have about parts of the GATT text as it currently stands. But voting against fast-track authority on GATT is the wrong way to respond. Denying the Clinton administration fast-track procedures to finish the Uruguay round guarantees that we get no deal. The United States gets nothing—except a continuation of the status quo which now works against the United States and against increasing U.S. exports.

The right way to respond to the stalled GATT talks and to the problems with the current GATT text is to

give the Clinton administration the power it needs to solve these problems and to bring back a better trade deal than the one we currently have. I urge my colleagues to support extending fast-track authority to the President and to vote "yes" on H.R. 1876.

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

Mr. Speaker, I simply say to my friend, the gentleman from Santa Fe, NM, that I totally concur with his remarks, and I hope very much that as we proceed next year, we will be able to expand negotiating authority to Chile, Japan, and other parts of the world, because clearly reducing trade barriers is the wave of the future. I congratulate my friend for his statement.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Santa Fe, NM.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made a very, very important point earlier when he mentioned that General Motors is moving to Lansing, MI, a plant of 1,000 workers. I want to say to my colleague that that plant was previously located in Mexico, so it is going from Mexico to the United States.

I saw the announcement this morning, and I think it is another example, a positive example, of free trade, especially as it relates to NAFTA and to this hemisphere.

Mr. DREIER. And also it demonstrates a very high level of productivity and the fact that the United Auto Workers, in concert with the management of General Motors, were able to come together with this kind of decision. I hope very much they will be able to realize, with the implementation of a North American Free-Trade Agreement, the opportunity to export those automobiles to Mexico.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the rule but against the bill to extend fast track for GATT.

Let me just begin by saying that those jobs are coming back from Mexico to the United States, from General Motors, simply because General Motors has to do something to cover itself during this period when we are going to be debating NAFTA here in Congress. General Motors is the largest employer in Mexico after the Government of Mexico itself. So it has plenty of explaining to do to the American people.

Let me say today that the vote on extending the deadline for fast track negotiating authority for GATT is really a vote about jobs. In the last Congress 182 of our Members, Democrats and Republicans together, voted against granting the executive branch, the

President and his Trade Ambassador, fast-track authority to negotiate two proposed trade agreements, the trade agreement with Europe which we call GATT and the one with Mexico which we call NAFTA. One hundred ninety-two votes against is hardly a vote of confidence for this fast-track procedure, which is only being used for the fourth time in U.S. history. It is interesting that it rose during the mid-1980's. For almost 200 years this country was able to deal with its trade matters without fast track. This is kind of a new phenomenon of which some people may not be aware.

□ 1310

I rise today again to oppose Congress ceding our constitutional authority in trade matters to the executive branch under the unacceptable rubric of fast track.

What does fast track mean? It means that when that treaty comes back here, if it does, we are limited to 20 hours of debate. Strictly limited. We can have no amendments. I have no right to speak out on behalf of the people of my district. And we have to vote after 60 legislative days.

The whole fast-track procedure is undemocratic, it is unrepresentative, and it makes me extremely uncomfortable as a Member of this Congress.

Our trading partners do not impose the same constraints on themselves. So why straitjacket the United States? In fact, the NAFTA treaty will not even be debated in the Mexican Parliament. The only people that will speak out on behalf of ordinary working people on this continent are Members of this Congress of the United States. Why straitjacket us on either the GATT talks or the NAFTA talks?

By voting no on fast track, H.R. 1876, we can assure that this Congress and our people have a more equal role in the development of trade rules.

Most of us do not sit on the Committee on Ways and Means. We do not have a right to hear those witnesses and develop those bills and they come before us.

Maybe it is also a way for us to send a message to the Clinton administration. We want no treaty with Mexico or Europe that cuts Congress out and sends our jobs someplace else. It is time to stand up for the American people. They are the reason we are here.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, but in opposition to the GATT fast-track procedure. There are few in this chamber here today and virtually no attention by the press on this issue. It is a seemingly obscure little procedural fast-track extension of GATT.

But Americans are waking up now, today, to the dangers of the North American Free-Trade Agreement with Mexico and the massive exportation of jobs and our economy and the importation of polluted products and pollution along the border.

Well, GATT will make NAFTA look really bush league. This is the greatest assault on American workers, consumers, and the environment, that this body has ever considered. If Americans understood what was at stake today, they would demand us to put the brakes on this so-called fast track.

Supporters say, "Well, this vote is just a formality, to give the President, the new administration, time to finish off the agreement."

That is not true. The extension is short, 1 year. Fast track just gives our negotiators time to tie up the loose ends of the Dunkel draft. The Dunkel draft is a 400-page document produced in secret by a Swiss trade bureaucrat who has Napoleonic visions of himself as world trade czar. That sounds pretty bizarre; the ravings of the right wing.

No, this draft would create something called a multilateral trade organization. The multilateral trade organization has the authority to meet in secret on any trade complaints and demand that the United States of America change any laws that protect consumers, workers, or the environment if they are found by the secret three-person tribunal to be barriers to trade.

It states:

The United States would be required to take all necessary steps where changes to domestic laws will be required to implement the provisions, to ensure conformity of our law with these multilateral agreements.

Say goodbye to the Marine Mammal Protection Act; say goodbye to our food safety laws; say goodbye to our laws regulating pesticides in foods; say goodbye to our ban on slave labor-produced goods; say goodbye to our restrictions on the export of raw logs off Federal lands in the Pacific Northwest to unfair trading partners like Japan, who are subsidizing a noncompetitive wood products industry.

This would undermine the constitutional authority and responsibility of the U.S. Congress. And to my friends on the other side, you hate closed rules. Why are you going to support the ultimate closed rule? A 400-page secretly negotiated document, brought to you up or down, no amendments, and limited debate. This is the ultimate closed rule coming before this body. It will affect everything that goes on in this country, everything that relates to the economy, everything that relates to consumer health and safety. Anything that these three trade bureaucrats who meet in secret and deliberate consider to be a barrier to so-called free trade, something that is talked about a lot, but does not exist anywhere except in the minds of a few ideologists in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues, no, this is dangerous. We must vote against extending this authority and get some rational trade policy for this country.

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. 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 resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule just adopted, I call up the bill (H.R. 1876) to provide authority for the President to enter into trade agreements to conclude the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to extend tariff proclamation authority to carry out such agreements, and to apply congressional fast-track procedures to a bill implementing such agreements, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1876

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

**SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF URUGUAY ROUND TRADE AGREEMENT NEGOTIATING AND PROCLAMATION AUTHORITY AND OF "FAST TRACK" PROCEDURES TO IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION.**

Section 1102 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (19 U.S.C. 2902) is amended by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) SPECIAL PROVISIONS REGARDING URUGUAY ROUND TRADE NEGOTIATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time limitations in subsections (a) and (b), if the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has not resulted in trade agreements by May 31, 1993, the President may, during the period after May 31, 1993, and before April 16, 1994, enter into, under subsections (a) and (b), trade agreements resulting from such negotiations.

"(2) APPLICATION OF TARIFF PROCLAMATION AUTHORITY.—No proclamation under subsection (a) to carry out the provisions regarding tariff barriers of a trade agreement that is entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) may take effect before the effective date of a bill that implements the provisions regarding nontariff barriers of a trade agreement that is entered into under such paragraph.

"(3) APPLICATION OF IMPLEMENTING AND 'FAST TRACK' PROCEDURES.—Section 1103 applies to any trade agreement negotiated under subsection (b) pursuant to paragraph (1), except that—

"(A) in applying subsection (a)(1)(A) of section 1103 to any such agreement, the phrase 'at least 120 calendar days before the day on which he enters into the trade agreement (but not later than December 15, 1993),' shall be substituted for the phrase 'at least 90 calendar days before the day on which he enters into the trade agreement,'; and

"(B) no provision of subsection (b) of section 1103 other than paragraph (1)(A) applies to any such agreement and in applying such paragraph, 'April 16, 1994,' shall be substituted for 'June 1, 1991,'.

"(4) ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS.—The report required under section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 regarding any trade agreement provided for under paragraph (1) shall be provided to the President, the Congress, and the United States Trade Representative not later than 30 days after the date on which the President notifies the Congress under section 1103(a)(1)(A) of his intention to enter into the agreement (but before January 15, 1994)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANNER). Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 15 minutes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 15 minutes, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1876 provides authority for the President to enter into trade agreements to conclude the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to extend tariff proclamation authority to carry out such agreements, and to apply congressional fast-track procedures to a bill implementing such agreements. Members will remember that the previous fast-track trade agreement authority, which was provided under the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, expired on May 31, 1993, before the Uruguay round negotiations could be completed.

The extension of trade agreement and proclamation authorities and fast-track procedures provided in this bill would apply only if the President provides Congress with at least 120 days advance notice, no later than December 15, 1993, of his intention to enter into an agreement, and only if he enters into that agreement no later than April 15, 1994.

Under this bill, private sector advisory committee reports on the results of the negotiations must be provided within 30 days after the notice to the Congress, or by January 15, 1994. In addition, the tariff proclamation authority may not take effect before enactment of implementing legislation for the nontariff barrier agreements. Finally, the extension of these authorities and fast-track procedures would apply only to the results of the Uruguay round negotiations.

H.R. 1876 reflects the legislative proposal of President Clinton which was transmitted to the Speaker on April 27. Identical provisions were included in section 13605 of the Omnibus Budget

Reconciliation Act of 1993, as passed by the House on May 27.

The U.S. Trade Representative has recently requested expedited action on H.R. 1876, to enable congressional passage before the economic summit of industrialized nations begins in Tokyo next month, on July 7. Enactment by that date would demonstrate to our major trading partners that the United States has the necessary authority to conclude and implement the Uruguay round. This should enable significant progress to be made at the summit toward the goal of concluding the negotiations this year.

Congress has supported the Uruguay round negotiations on a bipartisan basis since they began in 1986. The negotiations are being carried out in the GATT among more than 100 nations and aim to reduce and eliminate trade barriers and to establish new and improved international trading rules for industrial and agricultural goods, intellectual property rights protection, services, and investment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1876 to provide the President the necessary authorities to conclude these important negotiations by the end of this year.

□ 1320

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in supporting H.R. 1876 today we move to the final stretch of the negotiations on the Uruguay round, talks that have been underway for the last 7 years and which contain comprehensive reforms that will boost our Nation's economy and create thousands of new jobs. Although difficult issues remain to be decided, we cannot retreat from what could well prove to be our last opportunity to finalize this historic round.

H.R. 1876 also is a signal to our trading partners that the United States speaks with one voice on trade policy. Although we have vigorously debated our concerns and interests, Congress and the administration have worked together over the years to bring the Uruguay round to this point of resolution. Now the President will be able to go to the summit of industrialized nations in Tokyo in early July, armed with this legislation and a clear mandate to conclude the round by the end of this year.

Once the Uruguay round is finished, and the historic regional agreement, NAFTA, is implemented, the United States will be able to face new challenges and pursue new opportunities in world markets. To do this, we need the authority to negotiate a broad range of new trade agreements, whether bilateral, sectoral and structural, or multilateral. It is essential that our negotiators have the flexibility to resolve

trade problems as they arise and the authority to structure trade relationships in ways that best promote U.S. competitiveness.

H.R. 1876 is but the first step. It applies only to the Uruguay round. The administration has pledged to work with Congress to develop comprehensive mechanisms to negotiate and implement whatever future trade agreements that are necessary to effectively promote U.S. interests. Such authority is the foundation of U.S. trade policy and demonstrates our resolve to continue to play a major leadership role on trade issues.

But today, we must take the first step by passing H.R. 1876. Then we can focus our attention and efforts on fully implementing the two most important trade policy initiatives of the decade—the NAFTA and the Uruguay round. I am confident that the Congress will continue to embrace those free trade policies that enhance U.S. competitiveness, ensure economic growth, and create jobs.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1876.

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I voted against extending fast-track authority. Today, I rise in support of reauthorizing fast track.

I voted against extending fast track 2 years ago because I was concerned our negotiators were trading away an important and valuable industry base, the textile and apparel industries.

I am still very concerned about the outlook for this industry. As the third largest employer in the United States—with 1.6 million workers—I am concerned that tariff cuts currently under consideration would devastate workers, families, and communities dependent on textile and apparel jobs.

At the subcommittee and full committee level, I included report language stressing the importance of a fair and equitable trade agreement for textiles and apparel. I, also, received a letter from our Trade Representative, Ambassador Kantor, expressing the administration's strong support for textiles and apparel and its willingness to better address important concerns of the Dunkel draft and tariff reductions. I believe this is a step in the right direction.

In early May, the congressional textile caucus met with Ambassador Kantor to discuss our concerns about possible tariff reductions and other issues relating to the proposed Dunkel draft. This was a positive meeting and, I believe, another step in the right direction.

Last week, the officers and executive committee of the congressional textile caucus sent a letter to President Clinton

once again outlining our grave concerns about the tariff reductions currently under consideration in the Uruguay round. I would like to enter this letter into the RECORD.

Today, Ambassador Kantor is in Tokyo meeting with our trading partners about the ongoing market-access negotiations in the Uruguay round of the GATT. These talks are considered crucial to a successful conclusion of this multilateral round. However, we must remember bringing home no deal is better than bringing home a deal that could cost jobs to millions of American workers.

I believe the administration will remain tough with our trading partners and work for a successful trade agreement for millions of working Americans.

I will vote to reauthorize fast-track authority today. I look forward to seeing a fair and equitable agreement for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD I include the letters to the President from the congressional textile caucus and a letter from the U.S. Trade Representative, Mr. Kantor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 10, 1993.

President BILL CLINTON,  
The White House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As officers and members of the Executive Committee of the Congressional Textile Caucus, we would like to request a meeting with you to discuss our grave concerns regarding the current market-access negotiations in the Uruguay Round of the GATT. In particular, we would personally like to convey to you our view that tariff reductions currently under consideration will have a devastating impact on the U.S. textile and apparel industry.

The Dunkel Draft already provides for the phase-out of the Multifiber Agreement. Such a phase-out will liberalize the textile and apparel market by over 70%. No other industries are expected to open their markets to this extent. For this reason, we are strongly opposed to the tariff cuts. Even a tariff cut on so-called "peak products" would have a disastrous impact on jobs since peak products are the most import sensitive.

While our major concern at this time is tariff reduction, we are also disturbed by the phase-out schedule of the MFA in the Dunkel Draft. If the administration decides that MFA quotas on textiles and apparel must be phased out, then the quota phase-out period should be 15 years or longer. Just as important, quota elimination should be gradually staged during that period so that U.S. industry has time to adjust to the dramatic increases in U.S. imports.

In connection with any agreement on quota phase-out, the U.S. should require all exporting countries, particularly the major textile producers in Asia, to provide market opening for U.S. products. Unless markets in exporting countries are open to U.S. products, we believe access to the U.S. textile and apparel market should be closed.

Textile and apparel production is the third largest manufacturing employer in the U.S. with 1.6 million persons directly employed nationwide (BLS, 1993 data). If wool, cotton, and manmade fiber production are added

into the equation, the number of persons employed rises to over 2 million. This makes the textile, apparel and fiber industry complex first in manufacturing employment compared to 822,000 individuals employed in the manufacture of trucks and autos (BLS, 1993 data).

The U.S. textile and apparel market historically grows at an average annual rate of 1%, the same average rate of growth of the U.S. population. Yet, since 1980 textile and apparel imports have grown at an average annual of 10.82%. In fact, 64% of the U.S. textile and apparel fabric market has been taken over by imports.

This has resulted in a U.S. textile and apparel trade deficit for 1992 of \$29.2 billion—comprising 34.7% of the total U.S. trade deficit. The tariff cuts and the MFA phase-out under consideration will cause the textile and apparel trade deficit to skyrocket even further.

The results of these negotiations will determine our position towards the Administration's request for fast-track authority. We look forward to meeting with you to discuss this important matter.

Sincerely,  
John Spratt, Duncan Hunter, L.F. Payne,  
Marilyn Lloyd, George Darden, Butler  
Derrick, Barney Frank, Bill Hefner,  
Marcy Kaptur, Helen Delich Bentley,  
Charles Rangel, Cass Ballenger, Howard  
Coble, Bill Emerson, Ron Machtley,  
Harold Rogers, Olympia Snowe, John  
Lewis.

U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE,  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. L.F. PAYNE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PAYNE: The purpose of this letter is to respond to the concerns you have raised with me regarding the Uruguay Round and its impact on the textile and apparel industry. In specific, I want to respond to your concern about the combined effect of the ten-year phase-out of the Multifiber Arrangement [MFA] called for in the Dunkel draft and the tariff proposals that were explored with the European Community by the Bush Administration in January of this year.

I have been discussing a number of issues with the European Community in light of this Administration's desire to obtain significant market access for a number of American manufacturing and natural resource sectors. During the course of those discussions, the European Community has reiterated its request for significant cuts in tariffs on textiles and apparel. As I stated when I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee last week, the MFA phaseout provisions are an area that must be revisited if we are to address the European Community's tariff request. In particular, we will need to assure an adequate adjustment period for the MFA phaseout and I will work with you in resolving that issue.

In response to the EC's requests, I have expressed this Administration's strong support for the textile and apparel workers in this country. I have specifically stated that we will be seeking strong market access provisions for textiles and apparel that will materially help our industries gain sales overseas, thereby helping to keep textile and apparel jobs here at home. As you know, the United States has made its willingness to accept the Dunkel draft on textiles and apparel contingent upon receiving satisfactory market access for our textile and apparel exports. You

can rest assured that I will insist on adequate market access for our textile and apparel industries.

In addition, I have also insisted that the EC join us in seeking strong commitments to address the growing problem of the circumvention of our quota system through transhipped goods. As you know, the U.S. Customs Service has estimated that over \$2 billion worth of textiles and apparel were illegally sent to the United States from China alone and we know that goods are being transhipped from a number of other countries as well. I will insist that we obtain the strongest possible language to combat circumvention in both the Uruguay Round text and in any protocols to extend the Multifiber Arrangement and that we receive the maximum amount of cooperation from our trading partners to address this threat to our trading system.

With respect to tariff cuts, you can rest assured that I am well aware of the very sensitive nature of tariff cuts in textiles and apparel and I pledge to you my willingness to discuss this issue with you on a regular basis throughout the negotiations to complete a Uruguay Round. I will consult with you and will take into account your concerns before making any decisions regarding tariff cuts or the staging of any such cuts.

This Administration is committed to the completion of a Uruguay Round agreement that opens doors for American products and services abroad. Such an agreement will promote economic growth and the creation of jobs in this country. In order to complete such an agreement by the December 15, 1993 deadline outlined in the fast-track legislation now pending before the Ways and Means Committee, we need swift passage of that legislation without any amendments which could impede the progress of our negotiations. I hope that you can support this Administration in that endeavor. Let me reiterate that I understand your concerns regarding the textile and apparel portions of the agreement and will do my best to address them and to consult with you throughout this process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL KANTOR.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1876. In order to carry out meaningful negotiations to increase American access to lucrative foreign markets, the President requires the fast-track authority included in this bill. This legislation does not provide the President with any new authority nor amend in any way the fast-track process which has governed the GATT negotiations for the past 7 years. It is a fair process marked by thorough executive branch-legislative branch consultation throughout the negotiations, followed by expedited consideration in Congress. The new President has asked for an extension solely to finish this one very important trade negotiation, and we should give it to him.

Mr. Speaker, the United States stands to lose a lot if the Uruguay round is not successfully concluded. At stake are important new international trade rules and procedures for services, for the protection of international property rights, and for the treatment of foreign investments. The sectors af-

ected by these GATT talks—banking, insurance, advertising, software development, film and television production, just to name a few—are some of our Nation's most competitive and efficient industries. Protecting these businesses from unfair foreign trade barriers will pay real dividends in jobs and wealth here in the United States.

At least as important as the benefits that will accrue from the successful conclusion of the Uruguay round is the need to maintain American leadership in the international economy. Without this extension of fast-track authority, the United States will not be able to meaningfully negotiate in the GATT talks. Absent American leadership, it is difficult to see where leadership would come from.

The failure of Congress to extend fast track will cut off at the knees President Clinton's ability to be a player in the international economy. It will be an unmistakable signal to the international community that the United States has turned toward protectionism. The immediate result will be a failed Uruguay round. Over the longer term, the United States will no longer be able to shape the international economic agenda to expand commerce and promote U.S. national objectives.

Increasing American exports and opening foreign markets to competitive American products and services are the key to our economic growth. In the past decade, 70 percent of all new jobs created in our country were due to increasing exports. Therefore, our Nation's international trade agenda will not be complete even once the Uruguay round is successfully concluded.

While the President has dedicated 1993 to enacting the historic North American Free-Trade Agreement and finishing the GATT talks, he must look forward to expanding a free-trade regime to include other countries in Latin America and the Pacific rim. Chile and Japan immediately come to mind. Such agreements hold tremendous promise for expanding the economic welfare of Americans and for stabilizing the international community through mutually beneficial growth.

In order to undertake such negotiations, the President will require a further and more broad extension of fast-track authority next year, something which the administration has indicated it fully plans to request. I look forward to supporting a more broad extension of fast track next year and to working with the administration for the expansion of free trade and American export opportunities.

□ 1330

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1876. This is not about NAFTA, it is not about Chile, it is about GATT.

Several years ago when we voted on fast track we were talking about NAFTA proposed and about GATT. We are talking about GATT and not about NAFTA. We are talking about negotiations with over 100 nations, not negotiations essentially with one nation, Mexico.

So I think we should support this, because a good GATT agreement, and I emphasize good, is important for the United States and for the world at large. I am convinced the Clinton administration will take steps so that a GATT agreement is as good in practice as it is in theory.

The Bush administration often stated that a bad agreement was worse than none. But as election day neared, it rushed to reach an agreement that threatened to give up far too much to obtain far too little. This course was dictated both by ideology and a failure to rethink some of the basic assumptions on which the United States position in the Uruguay round was based.

When the Uruguay round was initially conceived, the challenge for America seemed primarily to achieve a breakthrough in agriculture and services, but that was before critical American manufacturing industries showed signs of serious erosion, and before Japan became such a critical player in world trade. Putting so many eggs in the agricultural basket, U.S. negotiators downplayed the importance in negotiations relating to barriers to trade in manufacturing, both formal and informal, and they were too willing, much too willing, to settle for general statements rather than specific commitments in the service negotiations.

As the new administration requests extension of fast-track authority for the Uruguay round, it is becoming clear that United States priorities for the Uruguay round are being modified to fit the realities of the 1990's instead of the early 1980's.

The administration has placed a premium on reaching a wide-ranging market access deal, both in the industrial sector and in the services, and there is reason to believe they will carefully scrutinize the antidumping, subsidies, and dispute settlement sections of the Dunkel text.

Not all of these points represent a major shift in policy from the last administration. But with the new administration there has been a welcome shift to a trade policy that is focused more on results and less on blind theory. This approach can produce a GATT agreement that really is good for the United States as well as other nations.

So I rise in support of this fourth Uruguay round. It does not relate, as I said, to others.

There has been some talk about a straitjacket. In other cases, in parliamentary systems, the negotiators bring back the text to the Parliament and there is no discussion at all, in essence. Parliament is a rubber stamp. We will not be a rubber stamp for the GATT negotiations. We are in touch with the administration. It has now a much more realistic, and I think hard-headed approach to the Uruguay round, so I think we should grant this extension of fast-track authority for the Uruguay round, and that is why I rise in support.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1876, a bill that reinstates the procedural mechanisms in the House for concluding and approving the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations. Today's expeditious consideration is necessary so that our President, when he attends the G-7 summit in Tokyo in early July, has the clear backing of the legislative branch in his efforts to bring the Uruguay round to a close.

H.R. 1876 is a narrowly constructed bill—and that also defines its shortcomings—but nevertheless provides an important opportunity for the United States to once again exercise a leadership role in the world trading community. Even though we have currently been preoccupied with self-reflection, our success lies in improving our vision as we look out beyond our borders. The United States can make no greater commitment to future prosperity at home or abroad than to guide the Uruguay round to completion.

Other challenges lie ahead. Following implementation of NAFTA—which is now threatened by this administration's endless contortions on side-deals—the United States will be pressed to consider similar arrangements with Chile and other emerging economies in this hemisphere and in Asia. If these countries are prepared to give U.S. exporters significant market opportunities, guarantee adequate intellectual property rights protection, comply with harmonized standards, and otherwise work to create an open and fair trading environment, then the United States must be prepared to exploit these opportunities.

The United States may also need to consider country or sector specific negotiations in order to pry open markets or to resolve any number of individual trade problems. Japan is a prime example of a country where flexible and focused negotiations are essential. Yet the ability to implement trade agreements, including the Uruguay round, has expired. This legislation renews it only for that one multilateral round and, therefore, leaves an unfortunate vacuum in U.S. trade policy.

The United States must be ready to respond in a dynamic trade environ-

ment. We need broader negotiating and implementing authority in order to achieve the greatest measure of success. The administration, although pursuing its trade policy agenda in tentative and piecemeal steps, agrees that broader authority is needed and has pledged to work with Congress to develop balanced procedures as soon as it is practical to do so. We need strong leadership from Ambassador Kantor and from the President.

H.R. 1876 is but the first step. It will help us conclude the ambitious and sweeping Uruguay round that has been under negotiation for the past 7 years. We also need to move to quick implementation of NAFTA, long languishing in the grip of special interests and suffering from a lack of focus on the part of this administration, then move on to other challenges that will invigorate economies, create jobs, and raise standards of living worldwide.

The world expects strong leadership from the United States, including both the Congress and the President, and passage of H.R. 1876 will provide a major signal to our trading partners that the United States is ready to accept its responsibility. Passage of NAFTA will be our next leadership challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 1876.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good faith support further extension of fast-track authority for the Uruguay round of GATT.

This most recent round began 7 years ago this September. Since that time, we have been through numerous compromises and year-end deadlines only to have agreements undermined by erratic and uncooperative behavior exercised by some of our foreign negotiating partners.

A 7-year GATT round is long enough. It is time for the United States to stop playing the game.

The initial objectives of the Uruguay round to increase discipline in agricultural trade, achieve meaningful reduction in subsidies and import protections were laudable. However, I am sorry to say these goals are unattainable at this juncture.

It is time for the United States to take a trade approach proven effective. It is time for the United States to aggressively pursue section 301 and Super 301 provisions which have effectively allowed the United States to induce various nations to reduce major trade barriers.

Section 301 successfully allowed negotiation of the United States-Japan Beef and Citrus Trade Agreement and prompted a solution to the EC-oilseed issue.

Recall that the European Community [EC] acted to modify its oilseeds agree-

ment only after the United States threatened to impose prohibitive duties on EC products. This was after a GATT panel twice found that the European Community's oilseed subsidies impair tariff-free access to the EC market.

After patiently pursuing the oilseed issue through GATT for 5 years, the United States was ultimately forced to resort to drastic measures.

If GATT negotiations are concluded this year, I will be the first to admit my misjudgment. However, having been involved in Geneva negotiations 3 years ago, it's doubtful the round will be completed by this December.

In the meantime, it is imperative for the United States to have available trade remedies through section 301 and Super 301 provisions.

□ 1340

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for his kindness, his generosity, and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. For American agriculture, trade is of utmost importance. We are the only nation in the world that basically has this efficiency for our use, the best-fed people in the world, in the history of the world, for the least amount of disposable income per family of the major industrialized countries in the world.

Yet, we have 18 billion dollars' worth of trade. The leaders of the world come through this capital, and they come and speak with me as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture about agriculture, about food, about not only necessarily of feeding the hungry, of trade with some degree of credit like we have with the former Soviet Union and some of the Eastern-bloc countries, but the fact is that pure, simple trade requires that we have a level playing field, and a level playing field hopefully will be the Uruguay round.

This is a tool which we use to see that our trading partners and the world knows that we are serious and that we will not change every agreement, that we will not add to any agreement, that we will be responsible, and this is the way to do so.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes also to my friend, the gentleman from Lincoln, Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my two colleagues for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1876. This important legislation to extend fast-track authority is absolutely necessary to facilitate a successful conclusion of the Uruguay round of the multilateral trade talks.

Mr. Speaker, in July, the leaders of the G-7 industrialized nations will be meeting to discuss how to better coordinate international economic policies. There is much at stake in these upcoming meetings for the United States, for the world's industrialized nations, and for the world's developing countries. Outdated trading rules are inhibiting the flow of trade among nations, and the United States and Australia are, perhaps, suffering the most among the developed countries from the current conditions where protectionist trade rules restrict the flow of our export throughout the world. Of course, the underdeveloped or developing nations are as a group, the most disadvantaged by the failure to successfully conclude the Uruguay round.

There can be no doubt that the world's most open economy, that of the United States, would stand to gain the most from further liberalization of trade worldwide. For the past half of the 20th century, the United States has been the world's engine of growth; now it is time to call upon the other developed countries, and especially those of the European Community, to reform their export subsidy programs and eliminate their most egregious tariff and nontariff barriers.

By protecting our intellectual property rights, reducing trade barriers, eliminating expensive and harmful export subsidy and dumping programs, and requiring that countries open their markets to United States and foreign exports of goods and services, the Uruguay round will do more to stimulate the global economy than any other action or program. For example, recently, United States Trade Representative Mickey Kantor stated before the bipartisan export task force that a successful conclusion of the Uruguay round could generate \$1 trillion for the United States economy and create 2 million American jobs through the year 2005. According to former U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Carla Hills, that translates into \$16,000 in additional income for a U.S. family of four over the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, this Member strongly supports this legislation which will allow for a successful conclusion of the Uruguay round negotiations. My only regret, echoing the sentiments of the distinguished ranking member of the House Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee, Mr. CRANE, is that this legislation does not extend authority for the President to negotiate bilateral trade agreements with those countries eager to trade with the United States under rules which are equally advantageous to both countries. That au-

thority, to negotiate bilateral agreements, would also put additional pressure on the more intransigent countries to be forthcoming and reasonable in negotiating an equitable, enlightened conclusion to the Uruguay round.

Mr. Speaker, in the strongest terms, I urge support of H.R. 1876.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1876 incorporates the President's request to extend trade agreement and proclamation authority and congressional fast track implementing procedures under sections 1102 and 1103 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 for the purpose of concluding the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations this year. This legislation is a narrowly drawn, short-term extension of such trade authority which would apply only if the President notifies Congress of his intent to enter into an agreement by December 15, 1993—and provides at least 120 days advance notice—and actually enter into an agreement no later than April 15, 1994.

Under this legislation, the usual 90-day notice requirement was changed to 120 days to ensure adequate time for full consultation of any proposed trade agreement with Congress, since the dates to which it would apply covers a period of time between sessions of Congress.

This legislation is needed because the negotiating authority and fast track implementing procedures Congress provided for the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, required the President to notify the Congress by March 2, 1993, of his intent to enter into agreements before June 1, 1993. Since the negotiations were not concluded and no notice was made by March 2, that authority expired.

Although the House of Representatives has already adopted provisions identical to H.R. 1876 as part of H.R. 2264, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, that bill is not expected to be enacted for several more weeks. The President has requested expedited action on H.R. 1876 so that it can be signed into law before the economic summit of industrialized nations begins in Tokyo on July 7. Enactment prior to the summit will demonstrate to our major trading partners that the United States Congress has provided the necessary authority to conclude and implement the Uruguay round, and will strengthen the President's hand in talks aimed at completing the agreement at the summit. It will send a clear message to our trading partners

that the United States is determined to help end the stalemate in the Uruguay round negotiations.

Extension of this trade authority, as Members are aware, does not provide approval of an agreement; it does nothing more than give the President the authority to negotiate an agreement with the assurance that the final product will be considered by Congress under fast track procedures. Extension of this authority will leave the approval of any agreement resulting from the Uruguay round to be decided in the future.

Fast-track procedures were designed to enable the United States to more effectively negotiate treaties by assuring other parties that an agreement will be implemented by the United States, if at all, expeditiously and without changes. Briefly, those procedures provide for mandatory consideration of the implementing legislation of a trade agreement, with deadlines for specific steps in the legislative process, a prohibition on amendments, and a final up-or-down vote.

It is important to note that this authority in no way limits the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change its rules. The fast-track procedures were enacted as an exercise in the rulemaking powers of each House and may be changed at any time by either House, with respect to its own procedure, in the same way and to the same extent as any other rule.

The Uruguay round, on which negotiations began in 1986 and which has been a major trade priority for three U.S. Presidents, is aimed at reducing tariff and nontariff barriers and establishing and improving international trading rules for manufactured goods, agricultural products, services, intellectual property, and investment among the 107 nations included in GATT. It holds the promise of substantial economic benefits for both the United States and other nations:

Lower tariff and nontariff barriers to manufactured products and other goods could lead to a very substantial increase in exports of U.S. products;

Rules to protect the intellectual property of U.S. entrepreneurs could save enormous amounts of money which is now lost through counterfeiting and theft;

More open markets in agriculture could create new opportunities for American farmers, who already lead the world in exports;

Stronger rules on dispute settlement, antidumping, subsidies, and trade remedy provisions would provide more predictability and certainty in access to foreign markets, while ensuring fair trade practices in our own market; and

Very importantly, a good agreement could bring the full participation of the developing countries into the global trading system which, along with increasing markets for U.S. exports,

would promote sustainable development in those countries.

In recent years, there has been a growing understanding of the concept that trade issues and global environmental issues are inextricably linked. If the Uruguay round is successfully concluded, the stage could be set for a new round of comprehensive multilateral negotiations to establish global standards for sustainable development and ecologically responsible trading practices. The process of involving developing nations in GATT may well turn out to be one of the most important means industrialized countries have to also address global environmental issues such as the depletion of the world's natural resources and the rapid growth of the world's population.

Finally, while the President is asking for limited trade authority at this time because of the advanced stage of the Uruguay round negotiations, the administration has recognized the importance of bilateral trade as a complement to multilateral efforts. The administration has indicated that it is prepared to work with Congress in developing broader authority to pursue further trade agreements as a high priority in the future.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to emphasize that the measure before us is very limited. It would provide fast-track trade authority only for the Uruguay round, and only until next April 15. I urge our colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1350

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my good friend and a hard-working member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], who is one of the greatest, most outspoken proponents of free trade.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1876, legislation extending the President's authority to conclude the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations.

Without a successful conclusion of the Uruguay round, the United States and the world will inexorably drift into a new era of protectionism.

At stake are greater U.S. export and job opportunities, higher real incomes for Americans, and lower prices for U.S. consumers. Let's not forget that it has been our exports that have enhanced and maintained U.S. economic growth over the last several years.

Between the fourth quarter of 1988 and the fourth quarter of 1991, U.S. exports measured in 1987 dollars grew at an annual rate of 8.6 percent.

Exports contributed, on average, more than a percentage point to growth to the U.S. economy per year during 1987 to 1992 and accounted for the vast majority of jobs created in our manufacturing sector in those 5 years.

A successful conclusion to the Uruguay round will provide a much needed

economic stimulus to the United States and world economy. Moreover, it is a stimulus without a budget deficit. The Uruguay round will mean:

Lower tariff and nontariff barriers to merchandise exports that could increase world output more than \$5 trillion, and U.S. output by more than \$1 trillion over the next 10 years, meaning an additional \$17,000 for the average family of four.

Rules to protect the intellectual property of U.S. entrepreneurs, who lose \$60 billion annually through the theft and counterfeiting of their ideas.

New markets for U.S. service firms, which export over \$163 billion annually.

Open markets and a more level playing field for American farmers who lead the world with almost \$40 billion in annual exports.

The full participation of developing countries in the global trading system, which could increase U.S. exports by \$200 billion over the next 10 years.

I wish this bill went beyond a simple extension for concluding the Uruguay round of GATT. The administration must make a stronger commitment to free trade, start campaigning for the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and push for broader negotiating authority to allow other countries like Chile and Venezuela to accede to NAFTA.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1876, fast track for the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. I cannot support any fast-track agreement until the problems that have been created by the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement are addressed.

History shows that fast-track has, in reality, led to a fast-track exodus of farming and agriculture-related jobs out of North Dakota.

In the mid-1980's, the Reagan administration was successful in securing fast-track authority for the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement. Promises from the administration that agriculture would not be included in the agreement were never kept. U.S. producers were then told that many of the obvious flaws would be corrected in the GATT negotiation. In fact, chapter 7, article 701 of the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement states that:

The Parties agree that their primary goal with respect to agricultural subsidies is to achieve, on a global basis, the elimination of all subsidies which distort agricultural trade, and the Parties agree to work together to achieve this goal, including through multilateral trade negotiations such as the Uruguay Round.

In fact, the trade agreements have disadvantaged our own producers.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that U.S. negotiators sold out agriculture.

North Dakota is now seeing unprecedented import surges in Canadian Durum wheat, spring wheat, and barley. United States Customs records show that Canadian wheat exports to the United States rose 183 percent in 1992 to 54.4 million bushels, enough to bake 3 million loaves of bread. Canadian spring wheat imports have doubled every year since the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement was implemented.

Now, in face of devastating results of Canadian fast track, we are being asked today to approve fast track for the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. And once again, they tell us not to worry. By now we should know better.

As currently negotiated, GATT would eliminate section 22, a provision of the Agriculture Adjustment Act that provides U.S. farmers with a stable market as they compete with cheap 59-cents-per-hour labor. North Dakota ranks fourth in the Nation in the production of beet sugar. The sugar industry, and the thousands of family farmers that comprise the industry, would be decimated by GATT.

Like Canadian fast track, fast track for GATT will prevent Congress from addressing and rectifying these flaws—flaws that North Dakota farmers were told would be directly addressed in GATT in the first place. I cannot, in good faith, represent the people of North Dakota by supporting fast-track authority for the Uruguay round of GATT.

I urge my colleagues to defeat H.R. 1876, fast track for the Uruguay round of GATT.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill and in favor of opening new markets for American exports.

Extending fast-track authority would simply allow the current administration to continue using a management tool which Congress has given to the last half-dozen Presidents.

I voted to give this authority to Ronald Reagan in 1988, to George Bush in 1991, and I will vote today to give it to Bill Clinton. The President has asked us for an extension of this authority so that Ambassador Kantor can try to conclude, at last, negotiations on improvements to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], the rule book for world trade.

The people of this country would be well served if an agreement could be reached which meets U.S. objectives set out nearly 7 years ago. Fast-track authority, while not ideal, is a practical and relatively fair way of negotiating agreements.

It is unfortunate that the extension of fast-track authority has become a controversial issue and, for some, a tough vote. If a particular trade agreement is of questionable merit, we can, and should, consider voting it down. What we must not do is link any particular trade agreement to the process by which this Government conducts trade negotiations with other countries.

Today we have heard, as we did during the 1991 debate, complaints that the elected representatives of the American people should not be barred from making changes in a trade agreement. I find it somewhat frustrating to be forced to wholly accept or reject a trade agreement. However, fast-track procedures do call for consultation with Congress, and I am confident that this House would appropriately reject any agreement that was negotiated without the proper consultations.

Perhaps most importantly, I do not believe that it would be possible for this Government to negotiate a market-opening trade agreement with any other nation if every one of the 535 Members of Congress were at the negotiating table. Think of it: we would be bickering with one another, with our President, and with the representatives of the other nations. It would be chaotic and impractical, and there would be no guarantee that the people of this country would be better served by such an arrangement.

The effort and international political capital that has already been expended in the hope that we might have a stronger world trading system should not, must not, be set aside. On the contrary, we should build on it. We have so much to gain: a world trade system that will finally cover trade in agricultural products, services, and investment; a system where the United States can obtain prompt relief when a trading partner violates the rules; a system that will deny profits to those who would produce cheap copies of software, music, pharmaceutical, and other products created by American talent and ingenuity.

If we are to improve our trade performance and open new markets for U.S. exports, we must strengthen the world trading system so that it protects honest traders. If we are to pave the way for new high-wage manufacturing jobs for American workers, jobs that would be created to meet the demand for U.S. goods in a less protectionist trading environment, we must strengthen the world trading system. If we are to continue to raise the U.S. standard of living, which would be a natural consequence of new markets and more jobs, we must strengthen the world trade system.

If we say no to fast track today, and thus no to any improvements in GATT, job opportunities will be lost and we will be a less prosperous nation.

I urge my colleagues to reject that scenario, and to vote to extend fast-track authority today.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill to provide the President with fast-track negotiating authority for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Fast-track authority would allow the President to submit a GATT accord to Congress for an up-or-down vote without amendment.

I oppose fast track because I believe Congress has all too often abdicated its authority over such important legislative matters like this trade agreement. The GATT will likely be a far-reaching measure with sweeping impact on the citizens and commerce of this great Nation. Despite all the attention and controversy focused on the North American Free-Trade Agreement, the GATT could have far greater impact on the everyday lives of our citizens.

For this reason, it is irresponsible for Congress to give up its constitutionally mandated oversight role over this issue. With so much at stake, Congress should train a careful eye on

any agreement that may be reached and take whatever steps necessary to protect the interests of our citizens. There is absolutely no good reason to do otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents did not send me to Washington in order to turn around and give the White House a free reign over the pressing issues facing this Nation. The administration should continue to negotiate, but without fast-track authority. If the ultimate GATT accord is a good one, then Congress can and should approve it. If not, we should reserve every right to amend it so that the interests of our citizens are properly protected. Fast track denies us that opportunity. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, as the House considers the administration's fast-track extension request for the Uruguay round, I would like to express my concerns regarding a recent European Council decision which could jeopardize the implementation of meaningful agricultural market access reforms pursuant to the GATT.

Recently, the European Council decided to impose a massive new tariff on bananas imported from Latin America. Under this new regime, only the first 2 million tons of Latin American bananas will be subject to a common tariff rate of approximately 20 percent. Imports of bananas above this quota will be subject to a massive ad valorem duty of approximately 170 percent. In effect, this means that a new quota system for Latin American bananas has been established for the benefit of EC producers and producers in the former African and Caribbean colonies, whose bananas will receive preferred duty-free access to the European market.

Left unchallenged, this decision sets a dangerous precedent which could prove disastrous for American farmers. The European Council claims this new quota system is consistent with the draft Uruguay Round agricultural market access principles. Furthermore, the decision appears to be the first attempt by the EC to impose a new tariff regime under these new principles. If this new quota system for bananas does become the model of how the draft Uruguay round principles are to be implemented, we risk seeing the EC and other countries establish similar trade restrictions for other agricultural commodities of particular concern to the United States.

While I support extension of the fast track authority, I believe United States negotiators should press this issue with their European counterparts. The United States entered the Uruguay round with a goal of expanding American farmers' ability to market overseas. The banana regime our European trading partners wish to employ represents a step away from that goal and our negotiators should call for its withdrawal.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for extending fast track authority for the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This bill extends trade agreement and proclamation authority to the President necessary to conclude the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations this year.

These negotiations began over 7 years ago when more than 100 countries came together in an attempt to lower tariff and nontariff bar-

riers around the world. If successful, this round would lower foreign trade barriers and open markets across the globe to U.S. manufactured goods, agricultural products, services, intellectual property, and investment. A more equitable world trade order should be established by a successful conclusion. These negotiations must emphasize fairness, ensure equitable access to markets, and prevent piracy and circumvention of trade rules.

A successful completion of this round is important to my State of Connecticut. Exports are a critical part of Connecticut's economic base and its economic health relies on its exports. Increased access for services and investment are vital to Connecticut's economy and a successful round will open up greater markets for Connecticut industry.

While many argue it may be difficult to complete these negotiations due to the complex nature of some issues yet to be resolved, it is essential that the discussions result in principled trade expansion and liberalization. I am confident that our administration will negotiate a successful round. Our Nation's ability to encourage more equitable trade, to gain access to once-protected markets will greatly boost this country's economy. Foreign trade must be considered an integral component of our Nation's economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1876, extension of fast-track authority for the Uruguay round.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, the decision to grant or deny the extension of the President's request for fast-track trade negotiating authority for GATT is a difficult one.

In general, we have much to gain through establishing a multilateral trading system. As the world's largest trader, the United States has an enormous stake in the future of the global trading system.

American workers, although their lead is slipping, are still the most productive workers in the world. Therefore, it is clear that by supporting positive trade initiatives, exports will continue to be a vital source of strength to the U.S. economy.

Indeed, this positive trend must continue. By extending the fast-track authority we will be able to continue our efforts to open world markets, thereby maintaining our leadership role in what is rapidly becoming a global economy.

We must seize this opportunity to promote trade policy which will contribute to our economic well-being by stimulating output of goods and services, creating good-paying jobs, and enhancing our international competitiveness.

The competition we face today is very different from what we have had to contend with in the past. We are facing increased competition from other integrated economies. As the European Community unites, and Japan increases its integration with other Asian countries, we need greater cooperation and greater trade opportunities to compete. It is vital that Congress and the administration work together to establish effective trade policy and agreements which reflects these developments.

By the same token, I will not vote for a trade agreement just because I vote for fast track. Any negotiated agreement that does not advance or serve our overall national interest will not receive my support.

Like many of my colleagues, I had serious concerns regarding the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] as it was signed by President Bush. The agreement was devoid of any text to protect the environment, strengthen worker standards and safety, and provide further safeguards against overwhelming surges in imports.

I commend President Clinton for calling for the negotiation of supplemental agreements to address these key concerns. I certainly support such efforts. In fact, my support for any future trade agreement is contingent on such assurances of congressional involvement in establishing trade policy which will not compromise our national interests.

I am also very happy that President Clinton recognizes how important it is for the administration and the Congress to work together in setting trade policy, and has included the Congress in the drafting of these critical supplemental agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for fast track, but it will be a conditional vote. The fast-track process requires us to trust that the administration will negotiate a sound international trade policy which supports our domestic, environmental, worker safety, trade adjustment assistance and minimum wage initiatives: one which will serve our overall economic and other national interests.

I understand that you cannot have 535 trade representatives negotiating an agreement, and that our trading partners will not give us their bottom line if they have to renegotiate line items with the Congress after the trade representative has completed his negotiating work.

Nevertheless, I fully expect that President Clinton, upon receiving an extension of the fast-track authority, will continue to work in alliance with the Congress in setting sound trade policy which will enable America to sustain its leadership position well into the 21st century. That expectation has won my support for fast-track authority.

If I find that is not the case, or that a trade agreement is presented to the Congress which does not deal with all of the areas which need to be addressed, I will certainly work to reject it.

I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 1876.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, today we are confronted with an issue with significant consequences for the future of our economy. As we struggle to create jobs and improve our competitiveness internationally, we are now asked to approve a trade pact negotiating procedure that does little to help hurting U.S. industries.

H.R. 1876, the fast track extension, is not a new concept. In May 1991, I joined many of my colleagues in opposition to this procedure because I believe it circumvents the proper review of Congress. This bill would allow the President to submit a final version of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], known as the Dunkel draft, to Congress for their approval on an up or down vote—no amendments, to chance of offering improvements.

Certainly we all believe that liberalizing trade between nations is a noble goal that could increase the amount of foreign markets open to U.S. exports. I applaud this goal. Un-

fortunately, the GATT agreement as currently written, will do more harm than good. There are two particular issues I would like to comment on which I believe must be revisited before the President approves a final draft and sends it to Congress.

As a Member with a considerable textile manufacturing base in their district, I am deeply concerned over what GATT will do to the industry. As written, GATT includes the phasing out of the multifiber agreement—an arrangement to control the amount of cheap textile imports. The U.S. textile industry has struggled lately to regain stability and competitiveness but to little avail. The MFA has been critical in helping what industry remains to stay somewhat competitive. The ultimate goal of eliminating the tariff barriers is not necessarily bad, but the textile industry needs a fair time period to adjust. The 10-year phaseout is unacceptable.

An equally disturbing aspect of the Dunkel draft is the suggested development of a multilateral trade organization [MTO]. The MTO, as I understand it, would essentially demand that the United States eliminate various trade laws should they be challenged as protectionist by any member nation unless all 108 GATT nations reject the claim. The chances of that happening are quite slim. It is understandable that some changes in U.S. trade laws will be needed as part of a compromise on a final agreement, but to circumvent U.S. laws and ultimately U.S. sovereignty is unacceptable policy. I find it hard to believe that other member nations would be amenable to the MTO.

Mr. Speaker, my statement should not be understood to be an indictment of the GATT process. Negotiations are ongoing and there is no final agreement yet. I hope we can have a successful pact worked out. But I must object to the process by which Congress may consider this agreement and probably NAFTA as well. I urge my colleagues to defeat H.R. 1876.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and if my friend has no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time and urge support of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. TANNER). Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the previous question is ordered.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 295, nays 126, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

YEAS—295

Ackerman	Fowler	Mazzoli
Allard	Frank (MA)	McCandless
Andrews (TX)	Franks (CT)	McCloskey
Archer	Franks (NJ)	McCollum
Army	Frost	McCrery
Bacchus (FL)	Gallely	McCurdy
Bachus (AL)	Gallo	McDermott
Baesler	Gejdenson	McHugh
Baker (CA)	Gekas	McInnis
Baker (LA)	Gephardt	McKeon
Ballenger	Geran	McMillan
Barca	Gibbons	McNulty
Barlow	Gilchrist	Meehan
Barrett (NE)	Gillmor	Meyers
Barrett (WI)	Gilman	Michel
Bartlett	Gingrich	Miller (FL)
Barton	Glickman	Mineta
Bateman	Goodlatte	Minge
Bellenson	Goodling	Moakley
Bereuter	Gordon	Mollinari
Berman	Goss	Montgomery
Bevill	Grams	Moorehead
Bilbray	Grandy	Moran
Billakis	Greenwood	Morella
Blackwell	Gunderson	Natcher
Bliley	Hall (OH)	Neal (MA)
Blute	Hall (TX)	Nussle
Boehlert	Hamilton	Olver
Boehner	Hancock	Ortiz
Bonilla	Hansen	Orton
Borski	Hastert	Oxley
Boucher	Hefley	Packard
Brewster	Hefner	Parker
Brooks	Herger	Pastor
Brown (CA)	Hoagland	Paxon
Bryant	Hobson	Payne (VA)
Bunning	Hochbrueckner	Pelosi
Burton	Hoekstra	Penny
Buyer	Hoke	Peterson (FL)
Callahan	Horn	Petri
Calvert	Houghton	Pickett
Camp	Hoyer	Pickle
Cantwell	Huffington	Pombo
Cardin	Hughes	Porter
Carr	Hutchinson	Portman
Castle	Hutto	Price (NC)
Chapman	Hyde	Pryce (OH)
Clement	Inslee	Quinn
Clinger	Istook	Ramstad
Coleman	Johnson (CT)	Reed
Collins (GA)	Johnson (GA)	Regula
Collins (IL)	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Combest	Johnson, Sam	Ridge
Condit	Johnston	Roberts
Cooper	Kasich	Roemer
Coppersmith	Kennedy	Rohrabacher
Cox	Kennelly	Rose
Coyne	Kim	Rostenkowski
Crane	King	Roth
Cunningham	Kiecicka	Roukema
de la Garza	Klug	Royce
DeLauro	Kolbe	Sabo
DeLay	Kopetski	Sangmeister
Deutsch	Kreidler	Santorum
Dickey	Kyl	Sarpallus
Dicks	LaFalce	Sawyer
Dingell	Lambert	Saxton
Dixon	Lantos	Schaefer
Dooley	LaRocco	Schiff
Doolittle	Laughlin	Schroeder
Dornan	Lazio	Scott
Dreier	Leach	Sensenbrenner
Dunn	Lehman	Sharp
Edwards (CA)	Levin	Shaw
Edwards (TX)	Levy	Shays
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Shepherd
English (AZ)	Lightfoot	Skaggs
Eshoo	Linder	Skeen
Everett	Livingston	Skelton
Ewing	Lowey	Slattery
Farr	Machtley	Slaughter
Fawell	Mann	Smith (IA)
Fazio	Manton	Smith (MI)
Fields (LA)	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Fields (TX)	Fields (TX)	Smith (OR)
Fish	Margolles-	Smith (TX)
Foglietta	Mezvinsky	Stenholm
Ford (MI)	Markey	Stokes
	Matsui	

Studds	Thomas (WY)	Watt
Stump	Torkildsen	Weldon
Sundquist	Torres	Wheat
Swett	Torrice	Wise
Swift	Tucker	Wolf
Talent	Upton	Woolsey
Tanner	Vento	Wyden
Tauzin	Visclosky	Young (FL)
Taylor (NC)	Vucanovich	Zelliff
Tejeda	Walker	Zimmer
Thomas (CA)	Walsh	

**NAYS—126**

Abercrombie	Hastings	Payne (NJ)
Andrews (ME)	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Andrews (NJ)	Hinchee	Pomeroy
Applegate	Holden	Poshard
Barcia	Hunter	Quillen
Becerra	Inglis	Rahall
Bentley	Jacobs	Rangel
Bishop	Jefferson	Ravenel
Bonior	Johnson, E. B.	Reynolds
Browder	Kanjorski	Rogers
Brown (FL)	Kaptur	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (OH)	Kildee	Rowland
Byrne	Kingston	Roybal-Allard
Canady	Klein	Sanders
Clay	Klink	Schenk
Clayton	Lancaster	Serrano
Clyburn	Lewis (FL)	Shuster
Coble	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Collins (MI)	Lipinski	Snowe
Costello	Lloyd	Solomon
Cramer	Long	Spence
Crapo	Maloney	Spratt
Danner	Martinez	Stark
Darden	McDade	Stearns
Deal	McHale	Strickland
DeFazio	McKinney	Stupak
Dellums	Meek	Taylor (MS)
Derrick	Menendez	Thurman
Diaz-Balart	Mfume	Towns
Duncan	Mica	Traficant
Durbin	Miller (CA)	Unsoeld
Engel	Mink	Valentine
English (OK)	Mollohan	Velazquez
Evans	Murphy	Volkmer
Fliner	Murtha	Washington
Fingerhut	Myers	Waters
Ford (TN)	Nadler	Waxman
Furse	Neal (NC)	Williams
Gonzalez	Oberstar	Wilson
Green	Obey	Wynn
Gutierrez	Owens	Yates
Hamburg	Pallone	Young (AK)

**NOT VOTING—13**

Conyers	Inhofe	Thompson
Flake	Knollenberg	Thornton
Harman	Rush	Whitten
Hayes	Schumer	
Henry	Synar	

**□ 1419**

Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. STUPAK, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Messrs. TOWNS, CLYBURN, DERRICK, WILSON, ROWLAND, and FORD of Tennessee, and Mrs. CLAYTON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MCINNIS, 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.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall 247, the vote on final passage of H.R. 1876—extension of fast-track procedure for the Uruguay round of the GATT talks. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

**MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

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

S. 3. An act entitled the "Congressional Spending Limit and Election Reform Act of 1993."

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-166, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, appoints Mrs. MURRAY as a member of the Glass Ceiling Commission, vice Ms. MIKULSKI.

**STATE DEPARTMENT, USIA, AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANNER). Pursuant to House Resolution 197 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2333.

**□ 1420**

**IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2333) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and related agencies, and for other purposes, with Mr. MFUME in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 16, 1993, amendment No. 6 printed in part 2 of House Report 102-132 offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] had been disposed of.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part 2 of House Report 103-132.

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON**

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which has been printed in the House report.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Page 66, after line 18, insert the following:

**SEC. 151. DRUG TESTING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—  
(1) the illegal sale, possession and use of drugs pose a pervasive and substantial threat to the social, educational and economic health of the United States;

(2) the impact of drug abuse is reflected in the criminal violence that it causes and in the disintegration of families, schools, neighborhoods, and workplace safety and efficiency;

(3) the effects of rampant illegal drug trafficking are amply illustrated by national crime statistics and prosecutions across the United States of persons at all economic and social levels, including prominent government leaders;

(4) the chronic problem of drug abuse has contributed to declining productivity levels, escalating health care costs, and the increasing inability of domestic industry to compete in the world market; and

(5) reasonable suspicion exists that the mission of the government to preserve the public health and safety, protect the national security, and maintain an effective drug interdiction program for the United States is being subverted by the possession, sale, and use of drugs by Federal personnel at all levels of government.

(b) RANDOM TESTING.—The Secretary of State, the Director of the United States Information Agency, and the Director of the Agency for International Development, and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency shall establish a program of random drug testing of the officers and employees of the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, respectively.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of State, the Director of the United States Information Agency, the Director of the Agency for International Development, and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency shall, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, issue regulations for carrying out this section.

(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "drug testing" means testing for the use of a controlled substance, as such term is defined in section 102(6) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(6)).

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirements of subsection (b) shall take effect upon the issuance of regulations under subsection (c).

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer today requiring random drug testing of State Department employees is an amendment I will offer to all authorization bills in an effort to eventually require random testing of all Federal employees.

It is necessary to offer these amendments individually to each department of Government because the Democrat leadership refuses to allow a bill to be considered on the floor of Congress requiring random drug testing of all Federal employees.

Why should we have random drug testing as a condition of employment for all Federal employees?

First, to get rid of law breakers.

Second, to improve efficiency in the workplace.

Third, to set an example that illegal drug use will not be condoned anywhere in America.

Why do we, the Federal Government, need to set the example?

The reason is that rampant illegal drug use is spreading like wildfire throughout our country, affecting not only the inner cities but spreading like wildfire into suburban and rural America.

A recent report even showed significant increases in drug use by sixth grade school children.

Where does the demand for illegal drugs come from?

It is not from inner city drug users.

It is not from drug addicts.

According to a study by the credible Rand Corp., 75 percent of the demand comes from upper middle class casual drug users living in the suburbs.

These suburbanites buy their drugs in the inner cities where there is chaos in the streets over drug sale territories and then drive back to the safe suburbs and spend the weekend casually smoking a little pot, popping a few pills, even sniffing a little cocaine, all the time saying this little bit of casual illegal drug use is harmless.

Harmless? It is hardly harmless when you realize their casual drug use creates 75 percent of the demand, which props up the price, which causes all the murders, robberies, and violent crime in our inner cities.

How do you stop all the illegal drug use? No matter how much interdiction, education, rehabilitation you come up with, it will never be enough, unless you eliminate the casual drug users that provides 75 percent of the demand.

And the only way to do that is to threaten to take away their jobs and that's exactly what random drug testing does.

A perfect example is our military. Back in 1983 a group of us worked with Ronald Reagan to implement random drug testing of all of our military personnel, where an admitted 25 percent were using illegal drugs.

Within 5 years that percentage had dropped to 4 percent. That's an 82-percent drop.

Why? Because random drug testing threatened their jobs.

If the Federal Government establishes, as a condition of employment, random drug testing, and if State or local governments do the same, and if they are joined by private business and industry across the Nation, we could all but wipe out casual drug use and 75 percent of demand for these illegal drugs.

And that would knock the bottom out of the price for these drugs.

It would also take away the profit to sell them and these drug lords would go back to raising coffee beans.

Mr. Chairman, there is a disturbing trend developing throughout the Federal Government and the administration.

A number of departments and agencies are no longer implementing the drug-free work place standards, and the State Department is one of them.

The Clinton administration doesn't seem to be interested.

They have virtually phased out the drug czar's office by reducing the staff from 164 employees down to 25.

There is even talk of legalizing drugs.

Mr. Chairman, that is no way to set an example for America.

That is why it is imperative that my amendment be adopted.

We need to send a message that we will not legalize these deadly drugs and that we will not tolerate the presence

of illegal drug users in the Federal workplace.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as I have remaining to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thought there were 10 minutes allowed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 4 minutes and 45 seconds, and the time was evenly divided, 5 and 5.

The Chair will state to the gentleman that he will be lenient.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had 20 years of service in the U.S. Navy and witnessed predrug and postdrug testing. We have a better quality of folk, and last year we offered this amendment. They said there were no users. This was prior to our finding that in our own post office they were dealing cocaine, and where there are dealers there are users. I have no doubt that their existence is still around us today. I think that the adoption of this amendment would help better the quality of all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair for being lenient on the time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the first minute of our time on this unconstitutional amendment to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York which would require random drug testing of all employees of the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency [USIA], the Agency for International Development [AID], and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency [ACDA]. As the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which has jurisdiction over drug testing of Federal employees, I take strong exception to the manner in which this proposal has been brought before the House. The Solomon amendment, without benefit of consideration by my committee, imposes an enormously costly and inefficient program requiring random testing of all current employees. In March 1991, the Subcommittee on the Civil Service released a staff report which disclosed that over a 1-year period the Government spent \$11.7 million testing 29,000 employees, to discover that only 153 employees tested positive. It cost the Federal Government \$77,000 to identify each employee who tested positive for illegal drug use. What an inordinate waste of money, time, and resources. If nothing else, the subcommittee staff report underscores the message that drug testing of Federal employees has proven to be a very expensive and unproductive use of taxpayer money. As if wasting money is not enough, we know that Government agencies al-

ready have the authority to implement, and are implementing, drug testing programs in a constitutional manner. By extending random drug testing to workers whose jobs have no bearing on health, safety, and security, the Solomon amendment jeopardizes the constitutionality of the existing Federal drug testing program. My colleagues need to know that the State Department currently has a drug testing program in effect which includes drug testing of applicants. The Solomon amendment, therefore, is unnecessary.

Mr. Chairman, in the last Congress, my colleagues soundly defeated an identical Solomon amendment. Let us do so again. Vote against the Solomon amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY], chairman of the Subcommittee on the Civil Service.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also urge strong opposition to the Solomon amendment. This amendment is blatantly unconstitutional, and surely my good and dear friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]—and he knows the high regard in which I hold him—does realize this.

We all know that the Supreme Court has promulgated standards for everyone. They involve safety, international security, transportation concerns, and other things of that nature. Already, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] knows, 90 percent of the people in the State Department are subject to random testing, and also all Federal employees are tested on entry to the service.

I think these procedures would be costly and unnecessary. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] has said, it would cost some \$77,000 per test. Each additional test is \$77,000.

□ 1430

There are surely better ways to spend such money. I would note also with the State Department the samples have to be sent overseas for testing in the United States. Ninety percent of the samples last year were defective upon arrival. So it is simply unfair, unnecessary, too costly, and unconstitutional.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am tested once a year. It costs \$11. If the Federal Government is paying \$77,000, that is what is wrong with the Federal Government today.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, however Members may feel about mandatory random drug testing, and whether or not it's an invasion of privacy or excessive government intrusion into people's lives and even their bodies; it is a

logistical nightmare and an unjustifiable waste of taxpayers' money.

The Federal Government has spent \$11.7 million testing 29,000 employees at a rate of \$77,000 for each positive drug test.

Testing only 15 percent of State Department employees would cost more than \$1 million per year. Testing them all would cost over \$10 million. The new hire testing that has gone on has cost \$150,000 per positive test.

On top of that more than half of all State Department employees are overseas. There no no HHS certified labs overseas, creating the spectacle of sending thousands and thousands of samples back to the United States for testing. A recent attempt to do just that had a 90 percent failure rate.

The Solomon amendment would require mandatory random drug testing for State Department employees. Can Members justify to your constituents spending \$150,000 for one positive drug test? How many youngsters could receive antidrug education for the same amount?

Cut Government waste.

Vote "no" on the Solomon amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to comment on my friend's amendment, because I am quite surprised the gentleman would offer an amendment like this. I know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has great regard for the concept of judicial restraint, and he wants his courts to defer to congressional action.

Well, not the Warren Court, not the Roosevelt Court, but the Rehnquist Court has spoken to the issue of random drug testing, and they have enunciated a balancing standard.

The Court says and a number of Court decisions have said that one balances the privacy of the individual against the compelling nature of the government interest.

Now, what are the facts in terms of State Department testing? Every single employee who has a job affecting national security, health, or safety, that is employed by the State Department, is subject to random testing.

In addition, every single Foreign Service officer and every single Foreign Service employee is required to submit to preemployment testing.

There is a nexus in the exiting program between the kind of a job that the individual is going to perform and the willingness to invade that person's privacy. That is the kind of standard that probably passes the Supreme Court's constitutional test.

The blanket random testing that encompasses all employees without regard to what kind of job they perform, without regard to whether or not their

job has any impact on national security, on health, or on safety, constitutes a constitutionally impermissible invasion of their privacy. Not by ACLU standards, not by Justice Warren standards, but by the Supreme Court that sat in 1989, who was appointed, seven of the nine members, by Republican Presidents.

Let us show some restraint in how we legislate so that we do not have the courts overreacting. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman knows as a condition of employment it is constitutional.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Solomon amendment once again.

Agencies are now drug testing Federal employees under the express authority of President Reagan's executive order and laws carefully adopted by the Congress which govern this program and ensure uniformity among agencies and protect the accuracy of the testing program.

This is not a vote on whether you support drug testing. The Government can and does randomly drug test any employee who now works in a sensitive position—over 400,000. If you carry a gun, hold a security clearance, are involved in narcotics enforcement, or affect the public health or safety, you are now subject to random testing. Court cases have upheld this law. This amendment, if adopted, would cloud the situation and throw into jeopardy and confusion the existing testing program.

This is a vote whether you believe we should spend precious dollars and invade the privacy of nonsensitive Federal employees by drug testing nonsensitive positions like secretaries, clerks, accountants, health researchers, teachers, linguists, and many others.

Keep in mind that even these employees can be drug tested if they are suspected of drug use. The only question is should they have to urinate in a bottle—and I say that only to make clear the reality of what we are talking about—on a random basis, solely to make a symbolic point?

I am second to no one in this House in my concern about the drug problem which we face in this country. I have made combating drug use and the resulting epidemic of crime my highest priority. But, Mr. Speaker, randomly drug testing Federal employees will not lead to victory in the war on drugs. And we should not subject nonsensitive employees to personal invasions of privacy merely to show how tough we are in this war.

Random drug testing for nonsensitive employees is demeaning.

It is demoralizing.

And it is deceptive to the American public. This House has spoken with recorded votes in favor of the existing drug testing process. This House rejected this amendment 145 to 265 on May 15, 1991. Uphold the existing law. Reject this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 235, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

AYES—184

Allard	Goss	Oxley
Applegate	Grams	Packard
Archer	Green	Parker
Armey	Greenwood	Paxon
Bachus (AL)	Hall (OH)	Payne (VA)
Baker (CA)	Hall (TX)	Penny
Baker (LA)	Hancock	Pombo
Ballenger	Hansen	Portman
Barlow	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Barrett (NE)	Hefley	Quillen
Bartlett	Herger	Quinn
Barton	Hoagland	Ramstad
Bateman	Hobson	Ravenel
Bereuter	Hoekstra	Regula
Bilbray	Holden	Roberts
Billrakis	Horn	Rogers
Bliley	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Blute	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Hutchinson	Roth
Bonilla	Hutto	Roukema
Brewster	Inglis	Rowland
Bunning	Inhofe	Royce
Burton	Istook	Santorum
Buyer	Johnson (CT)	Sarpalius
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Callahan	Kasich	Schaefer
Calvert	Kim	Sensenbrenner
Camp	Kingston	Shaw
Canady	Klug	Shays
Castle	Knollenberg	Shepherd
Coble	Kolbe	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Kyl	Sisisky
Combest	Lancaster	Skeen
Condit	Laughlin	Smith (MI)
Cooper	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Cox	Lewis (FL)	Smith (OR)
Crane	Linder	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Lipinski	Solomon
Cunningham	Lloyd	Spence
DeLay	Machtley	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Stenholm
Dickey	Mazzoli	Stump
Doolittle	McCandless	Sundquist
Dornan	McCollum	Talent
Dreier	McCrery	Tauzin
Duncan	McHugh	Taylor (MS)
Dunn	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	McKeon	Thomas (WY)
Everett	McMillan	Torkildsen
Ewing	McNulty	Trafficant
Fawell	Menendez	Upton
Fields (TX)	Meyers	Valentine
Fowler	Mica	Vucanovitch
Franks (CT)	Michel	Walker
Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Gallegly	Molinari	Weldon
Gekas	Montgomery	Young (AK)
Geren	Moorhead	Young (FL)
Gilman	Murphy	Zeliff
Gingrich	Myers	Zimmer
Goodlatte	Nussle	
Goodling	Orton	

NOES—235

Abercrombie	Boucher	Costello
Ackerman	Brooks	Coyne
Andrews (ME)	Browder	Cramer
Andrews (NJ)	Brown (CA)	Danner
Bacchus (FL)	Brown (FL)	Darden
Baesler	Brown (OH)	de la Garza
Barca	Bryant	de Lugo (VI)
Barcia	Cantwell	Deal
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	DeFazio
Becerra	Carr	DeLauro
Bellenson	Chapman	Dellums
Bentley	Clay	Derrick
Berman	Clayton	Deutsch
Bevill	Clement	Dicks
Bishop	Clinger	Dingell
Blackwell	Coleman	Dixon
Boehert	Collins (IL)	Dooley
Bonior	Collins (MI)	Durbin
Borski	Coppersmith	Edwards (CA)

Edwards (TX)	Lantos	Rahall
Engel	LaRocco	Rangel
English (AZ)	Lazio	Reed
English (OK)	Leach	Reynolds
Eshoo	Lehman	Richardson
Evans	Levin	Ridge
Farr	Levy	Roemer
Fazio	Lewis (GA)	Rostenkowski
Fields (LA)	Lightfoot	Roybal-Allard
Filner	Livingston	Sabo
Fingerhut	Long	Sanders
Fish	Lowe	Sangmeister
Foglietta	Maloney	Sawyer
Ford (MI)	Mann	Schenk
Ford (TN)	Manton	Schiff
Frank (MA)	Margolies-	Schroeder
Frost	Mezvinsky	Schumer
Furse	Markey	Scott
Gallo	Martinez	Serrano
Gejdenson	McCloskey	Sharp
Gephardt	McCurdy	Skaggs
Gilchrest	McDade	Skelton
Gillmor	McDermott	Slatery
Glickman	McHale	Slaughter
Gonzalez	McKinney	Smith (IA)
Gordon	Meehan	Snowe
Grandy	Meek	Spratt
Gutierrez	Mfume	Stark
Hamburg	Miller (CA)	Stokes
Hamilton	Mineta	Strickland
Hastings	Minge	Studds
Hefner	Mink	Stupak
Hillard	Moakley	Sweet
Hinchee	Mollohan	Swift
Hochbrueckner	Moran	Tanner
Hoke	Morella	Tejeda
Hoyer	Murtha	Thurman
Huffington	Nadler	Torres
Hughes	Natcher	Torricelli
Hyde	Neal (MA)	Towns
Inslee	Neal (NC)	Tucker
Jacobs	Norton (DC)	Underwood (GU)
Jefferson	Oberstar	Unsoeld
Johnson (GA)	Obey	Velázquez
Johnson (SD)	Oliver	Vento
Johnson, E.B.	Ortiz	Vislousky
Johnston	Owens	Volkmer
Kanjorski	Pallone	Waters
Kaptur	Pastor	Watt
Kennedy	Payne (NJ)	Waxman
Kennelly	Pelosi	Wheat
Kildee	Peterson (FL)	Williams
King	Peterson (MN)	Wilson
Kleczka	Petri	Wise
Klein	Pickett	Wolf
Klink	Pickle	Woolsey
Kopetski	Pomeroy	Wyden
Kreidler	Porter	Wynn
LaFalce	Poshard	Yates
Lambert	Price (NC)	

## NOT VOTING—20

Andrews (TX)	Harman	Synar
Clyburn	Hayes	Thomas (CA)
Conyers	Henry	Thompson
Faleomavaega	Matsui	Thornton
(AS)	Romero-Barcelo	Washington
Flake	(PR)	Whitten
Gibbons	Rose	
Gunderson	Rush	

□ 1453

Messrs. RICHARDSON, REED, WILSON, and POMEROY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KOLBE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part 2 of House Report 103-132.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KANJORSKI

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KANJORSKI: Page 98, strike lines 5 through 8; and redesignate paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Is there a Member who rises in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Does the gentleman from California wish to yield a portion of his time?

Mr. BERMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. As I understand the rule, the opposition is allotted 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes of my referred time to my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

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

Mr. Chairman, the new Members of the House, the 110 freshmen, may not be aware of the organization known as NED, the National Endowment for Democracy. It is a unique experiment, and perhaps it did have its time in glory or time in time, but this is not that time.

The National Endowment for Democracy was formed in 1984 with taxpayers' money, for the purpose of obtaining and performing functions that were thought to be unseemly or could not effectively and efficiently be performed by the State Department, or, I suspect, even the CIA.

Today the NED comes before us for reauthorization and refunding. It started, if I recall, with \$13 million, and even though the Wall has fallen and the Soviet Union has disappeared, NED is now requesting \$48 million for this year and \$50 million for next year.

Mr. Chairman, this is definitely a success story if we have ever heard it in terms of appropriations. This unseemly 60-percent increase in funding from last year to this year begs the question of why should this be done and why will it pass this Chamber, if in fact it will. I say to the freshman Mem-

bers that are here, as well as to Members that have listened to this argument before, NED is probably the most unholy alliance, and that this is the most unholy authorization ever passed by the House of Representatives. NED puts so many unfriendly parties in the bed together that it makes us wonder whether we in fact have not come together in a unicameral legislature.

We have the Republicans with the Democrats, we have the National Chamber of Commerce with the AFL-CIO, and then we have every political consultant of every philosophical stripe there is that needs a welfare fund provided to them, we take taxpayers' money, give it to a private organization, and empower that organization to carry on foreign affairs in the name of the United States of America without adequate control and accountability.

What we are arguing is two propositions. One, taxpayers' money should not be spent this way. If this authorization has merit, and in some instances it may, let the private sector of America fund this organization to carry on. Corporations all over America can make contributions of up to \$50 million to carry on their chore, but there is no reason that every taxpayer in America must fund this organization.

Two, the Constitution of the United States never contemplated that this Congress would take it upon itself to give taxpayers' money to a private organization to carry on the foreign affairs of the U.S. Government. That is an insult to the Constitution, and therefore, an insult to every one of us that believe in constitutional form of government such as we have here in America.

□ 1500

What we are asking our fellow colleagues to do today is stand tall and be recognized. Let me say, I never thought I would see that the chairman of the subcommittee here would join the minority whip and support the same authorization, I am amazed. It suggests that somehow bipartisanship is able to be built in this House.

I wonder. I wonder whether that bipartisanship would exist if millions of dollars did not go into the Democratic Institute to pay for trips around the world and to pay the fees of consultants in this town and throughout America, all around the world? And I wonder if those millions of dollars that go into the Republican Institute for the same purpose are not the reason that brings these two elements together? Is it the reason that the AFL-CIO thinks that this organization is akin to motherhood and apple pie and must go on, due to the fact that millions of dollars fund the AFL-CIO International Institute? Would, on the other hand, the National Chamber of Commerce join the AFL-CIO unless

they received millions of dollars for their institute?

What I urge my colleagues to do is to study what this is all about. We do not need, with the fall of the Berlin Wall to create a caricature of Americans as the "ugly American" or the police power of the world that is paid for and fostered by American taxpayer money through private organizations. If we are going to make fools of ourselves around the world with our foreign policy and our involvement in the internal political affairs of foreign nations, let our State Department and let our President make that mistake, but not a private entity funded by the money of the taxpayers of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to end this charade and join us once and for all in putting to sleep the NED. Let them exist by a blood transfusion of private funds if the merit of their existence is so great.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the chairman of the Congressional Support for the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time and I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman from Pennsylvania's amendment.

I would take the gentleman's weakness that he projects in terms of NED and suggest that instead it is one of NED's greatest strengths.

On this floor we debate the differences we have because the similarities and agreements we share are not worthy of debate. In point of fact, I believe the Chamber of Commerce and organized labor believe in democracy and they believe in freedom. Do we have different perceptions on the edges of those policies? Yes.

I believe Republicans and Democrats alike believe that democracy is the wave of the future and has been a major part of the successes in our world today. That is why NED works. That is why NED ought to be continued. That is why this President of the United States and two former Presidents of the United States have supported NED, because it is the premise of this country that democracy provides for the best human rights, the best political system and, yes indeed, the best economic system for the world.

Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support this very important authorization so that America can continue to stand strong for the emerging democracies of this world.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Kanjorski amendment.

We are witness to an unprecedented era of democratization across the globe. Happily, in our world today, more people than ever are living in free or partly free countries. We have seen the dramatic overthrow of communism in East-Central Europe. By 1992, the U.S.S.R.

no longer existed. Just 2 months ago Russia's voters came out and backed President Yeltsin's vision of a Russia moving toward market reform and privatization. We have seen free elections in Nicaragua, and the triumph of the democratic opposition. We have seen the bravery of men and women around the world, from Chile to China to Cambodia, raising their voices and risking their lives for freedom and justice and in some cases to exercise the fundamental right to vote for the type of government they choose to live under. To accept the proposed amendment would destroy an organization that has actively and constructively furthered democracy worldwide and seriously cripple a major U.S. foreign policy objective to shore up democracies worldwide.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to dilute our efforts at helping those activists and organizations who seek to promote and strengthen democratic institutions. This is not the time nor the program to scale back our efforts. If there is a cost-saving mechanism this is it. This is a small investment in people and programs that can yield extraordinary dividends in years to come if we but keep the vision within sight. The real fact is that we cannot afford the failure of those groups, individuals, and programs that NED supports. It is in our national interests that democracy be actively promoted abroad.

Mr. Chairman, NED was created by the Congress in 1983. It has the support and cooperation of members of both political parties, of conservatives and liberals, of business leaders and labor activists, and of thousands of citizens across the globe who are committed to democratic development. Since its inception, NED has successfully assisted hundreds of organizations working for freedom and democracy in dozens of countries worldwide. During the past year NED has provided assistance in almost 80 countries—in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East. It has supported women's leadership conferences, election monitoring activities, political party training programs, grassroots participation and technical assistance to local governments, political parties, parliaments, businesses, and civic groups. Our support for NED has been a small investment that has already delivered a tremendous return and promises much more.

As Cochairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I am particularly familiar with NED's work in East-Central Europe and in Russia. Nobody needs to be reminded of the sweeping changes we have seen in those regions—changes that continue to impress and inspire. But while communism seemed to collapse overnight, democracy will take years to secure. And while NED's assistance has directly contributed to the democratic changes that have already taken place in East-Central Europe, I want to stress that NED's continuing assistance will be vital to ensure that democracy survives.

Mr. Chairman, I understand my colleagues' concern that NED's funds be carefully and comprehensively accounted for and spent wisely. Certainly, we all have a responsibility to ensure that taxpayer dollars are responsibly spent. But killing the endowment is not the solution. It will send a terrible signal to the nu-

merous democratic organizations that depend on NED for assistance. It will send a terrible signal to the brave individuals around the world who rely on NED's commitment to democracy. It will send a terrible signal to the fledgling democracies at a time when they need our determined support. In short, it will be a terrible mistake.

In my experience, NED has been ready and willing to work with the Congress, not against us. I urge my colleagues to support the cause of democracy and vote against the Kanjorski amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI], because I believe he is right on the issue, based on morality and substances.

I have an extraordinarily difficult time understanding why the United States of America is funding the Republican Party and its leadership. I have a hard time understanding why the U.S. Government is funding the Democratic Party and its leadership and the AFL-CIO and U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The foundation which receives funds for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is the Center for International Private Enterprise. That is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, controlled by it. The Free Trade Union Institute is the AFL-CIO, controlled by the AFL-CIO. The International Republican Institute is controlled by the Republican Party. The International Democratic Institute is controlled by the Democratic Party.

I think it is morally wrong to have these private foundations conduct foreign policy around the world as they see fit with \$48 million of taxpayers' money.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Mr. Kanjorski's amendment to zero out funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

NED—as an independent organization—is a vital, cost-effective addition to the U.S. Government's support for democratic values around the world.

In this new era of democracy there is a surge toward more representative governments. The new rule in these formerly oppressed states is that governments are only legitimate if they rule with the consent of the governed.

That is why now, more than ever, we need to support democratic initiatives, at all levels. Strong institutions foster greater political stability which is essential to the success of the newly emerging democracies.

That stability can best be achieved through the expertise provided by the National Endowment and its over 200 grantees throughout the world who are working to build democratic institutions.

We are in a period of transition in many places around the world and the nature of our assistance should respond to the new needs.

The kinds of people-to-people programs sponsored by NED are aimed at developing indigenous expertise and democratic institutions. These are the foundations for stability which will sustain the major economic, social, and political reforms being undertaken in several countries.

As an independent bipartisan organization, NED has consistently proved its unique ability to work with grassroots organizations. It is this support at the grassroots that helps to cement the principles of participatory Government, by embracing the fundamentals of democracy and the basic human rights of the people to determine how they are governed.

The distinctive features of NED is that they choose to take on the tough tasks around the world.

They are working in some of the world's most difficult places such as Iraq, Iran, China, and the former Yugoslavia.

As an independent organization, they are able to reach areas our Government may not be able to. They can deliver the message of hope and the values we all share, to people who still are seeking the freedoms we most cherish in this country.

Africa is another region that is undergoing a Democratic transition. NED is at the forefront of providing support to the emerging democracies throughout Africa.

The current administration is pursuing democracy-building programs in this post-cold-war era, and with bipartisan support, has recommended continued funding for the National Endowment.

In fact NED programs are so highly regarded that it is one of the very few organizations to receive a modest increase; the committee authorized NED at \$48 million in fiscal year 1994 and \$49,296,000 in fiscal year 1995.

Accordingly, I urge a "no" vote on the Kanjorski amendment.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First of all, may I say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has, I think, performed a service in calling attention to the National Endowment for Democracy. But there are three reasons for supporting the National Endowment.

First of all, the principal plank of President Clinton is to encourage democracy in his foreign policy program,

and the National Endowment for Democracy is the principal vehicle by which he seeks to achieve that. He wants to strengthen these fragile democracies all around the world, and this is one of the principal ways he will try to achieve that.

Second, the National Endowment has done very effective work. The fact of the matter is, establishing a democracy is a tough, difficult task. It is far more than just running an election. You are building the institutions of democracy, and that is what this endowment has expertise in. It does effective work.

Third, they have made management reforms. There was a time when one could criticize the National Endowment for its management practices. Those times are behind us. They have made corrections, and they are making improvements.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

□ 1510

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI]. He, together with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], is offering a fiscally prudent amendment that I believe deserves broad support.

Earlier this year at the Budget Committee, I worked very closely with the cosponsor of the amendment, Mr. SHAYS. Together, we drafted the Republican alternative amendment to the budget resolution on the international affairs portion of the budget. That budget amendment included the provision now being jointly offered on a bipartisan basis by Mr. KANJORSKI and Mr. SHAYS.

The purpose of the National Endowment for Democracy is certainly laudable. Although NED is often thought of as the main entity working to promote democratic development around the world, there are in fact many different U.S. Government programs and funding mechanisms working in this field. These range from AID judicial reform programs to U.S. broadcasting services such as VOA and Radio Free Europe. Virtually all aspects of programs run by the U.S. Information Agency in some way address the issue of democratic development as well.

Moreover, NED has a long history of poor budgetary and administrative practices. In 1986, the GAO issued a harshly critical report, which NED promised to address. Then in 1991, the GAO issued a followup report, which found that NED had taken no real action to improve its budget and program oversight procedures. Faced with possible defunding 2 years ago, NED did adopt a plan to respond to the GAO's

criticism. A year ago, the GAO reported that if NED this time actually followed through, the plan had the potential of improving its financial operations.

This episode points to an increasing concern I have had with NED over the past few years. While I have no objection with the endowment's stated purpose, I believe that an annual legislative earmark for Federal funding of this private institution has actually harmed NED's effectiveness. Frankly, I believe that this earmark has not only reduced the incentive for NED to conduct rigorous evaluation of its own programs and their effectiveness. It has also led to a low level of Agency oversight and direction compared to programs directly administered by the U.S. Government.

I have also been concerned by the continued rapid growth of Federal funding for this private organization. From fiscal year 1990 to fiscal year 1993, spending on NED doubled to the current funding level of \$30 million. This bill proposed to increase NED's funding by another 60 percent to \$48 million. This is the single largest percentage increase contained in the entire bill.

I think we should be clear on what this amendment does not do. It does not terminate the National Endowment for Democracy. Despite the word national in its name, NED is a private organization. While most of NED's funding come from the U.S. taxpayers, the endowment and its four-core grantees do raise private funds for their work. Certainly, they could and should do more.

Also, it is still possible under this amendment for NED to receive Federal funding. All this amendment does is eliminate the \$48-million earmark for NED contained in this bill. The endowment could still compete with other organizations for specific grants through USIA or AID. Removing the earmark removes NED's sense of an ever-expanding entitlement to U.S. taxpayer funds. Having to compete on a level playing field for Federal funding will force NED to justify every proposed project. This will not only vastly improve oversight over the endowment's activities, but will help ensure that all such activities are fully compatible with U.S. foreign policy goals.

So again, I would like to acknowledge this amendment's fiscal responsibility. With its passage, it will further reduce this bill's authorization below the fiscal year 1993 appropriated level. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment and in strong favor of an unshakable American commitment to

democracy and freedom throughout the world.

Yes, the National Endowment for Democracy has been imperfect. Our military forces during the cold war were imperfect. We did not do away with our military forces. We corrected the problem.

The National Endowment for Democracy had some problems. Those problems have been corrected. The National Endowment for Democracy, during the cold war, played a vital role from El Salvador to Poland. In the transition out of the cold war, it plays even a more important role.

If we have democracy, we are going to have to work at it, and the American people, who else to champion the cause of democracy but the American people.

I am astounded by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who cannot understand that what unites us Republicans and Democrats, the AFL-CIO, the Chamber of Commerce is not some effort to do mischief around the world. What unites us is the commitment to democracy and freedom that united our forefathers so long ago that they carried the torch all of these years.

We are the ones who give hope to the people of the world that freedom is possible even in the darkest despotism, and it is our camaraderie among people who disagree on economic issues, among people who disagree as Republicans and Democrats, it is our camaraderie on these ideals of our forefathers and mothers that gives hope to the people of the world.

I strongly oppose this amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Kanjorski-Shays amendment to the State Department authorization bill. This amendment eliminates funding for the National Endowment for Democracy and will save American taxpayers almost \$50 million in fiscal year 1994. Funding for the National Endowment for Democracy has increased 50 percent from last year.

The National Endowment for Democracy distributes funds to four American groups—the National Democratic Party, the National Republican Party, the AFL-CIO, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—which use the funds to promote democracy in foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of promoting democracy around the world, and in this country for that matter. I have sponsored and cosponsored numerous measures in recent years to promote democracy around the world; however, I do not believe that this particular Federal expenditure is necessary in view of the current fiscal crisis in the United States. There are many ways in which our country

can help promote democracy in foreign countries without directly funding particular political parties and interfering in the electoral processes in foreign countries. In particular, the Agency for International Development could promote democracy by funding projects in foreign countries which encourage political development and promote democratic institutions. The State Department could increase its efforts to provide exchange opportunities for political and civic leaders in emerging democracies.

One of my primary concerns about the National Endowment for Democracy has been its interference in the electoral process in countries which are already democratic. In recent years, the National Endowment for Democracy has funded projects in Great Britain, France, and New Zealand. A few years ago, National Endowment for Democracy funds were used against Nobel Peace Prize winner, Oscar Arias, the former President of Costa Rica—a country which has been democratic for over 100 years.

Again, I urge my colleagues to end an unnecessary expenditure, to support fiscal responsibility, and to support the bipartisan, Kanjorski-Shays amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, in the early 1980's, I was not a strong proponent of this idea. Having gone through the process of observing these private organizations as they have moved throughout the world encouraging democratic expansion, I stand here as a very strong proponent of the National Endowment for Democracy.

I want to congratulate my friend, with whom I have traveled to Poland and other parts of Eastern and Central Europe, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI], for having raised this issue, because, yes, there have been bookkeeping problems, but the 1992 General Accounting Office study has stated very clearly that if the National Endowment for Democracy continues on the road toward the kinds of reforms that they have, they will have a clean bill of health.

It seems to me that democracies today are more fragile than they have been in the past. Look at Eastern and Central Europe today. Democracy is struggling. We do not have a clear bill of health for democracy throughout the world.

The best entity from which we can encourage this kind of expansion is the National Endowment for Democracy and their core organizations.

I urge a no vote on the Kanjorski amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman of the Africa Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak from personal experience. I was exactly where the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] was 5 years ago, violently against NED. I voted against it in committee and on the floor because of what happened in Costa Rica.

I became a convert. Four years ago the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and I were observers at OAU in Nicaragua, and time and time again observers came up to us from other countries and said, "If it were not for the National Endowment for Democracy and their counterparts, we would not have had free elections."

The Chileans said that in Chile they would have not had free elections without them.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] mentioned Africa, with Angola, with Nigeria, and other countries. We are in there in South Africa today training these people to have democratic elections.

I strongly oppose this amendment. Without the NED, without the National Democratic Institute, these countries would be in serious jeopardy.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The author has spoken eloquently about the specific reasons to adopt this amendment, \$50 million worth.

This is one of many programs that, it seems to me, were developed years ago for a good cause, but it is our purpose in this Congress, I think, to evaluate programs, to put some measurement to programs, to try and measure the accountability of programs.

We act like this is the only effort we are making at democratic institutions. It is not. Someone said all the private organizations are doing a great job. I suppose they would if you gave them \$50 million.

There are a couple of reasons why we should not do it. One is it is redundant. We are doing this. We have lots of bucks being spent for that. The other is that we need to evaluate every program and see if it is accomplishing the goals. Some we do not do so well, some we should not do at all.

This is one that we are doing other places. We do not need to do it. And we can save \$50 million.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Mr. Chairman, I rise against this amendment which would eliminate all Federal funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

Since the end of the cold war nations emerging from decades of totalitarian control struggle to establish democratic institutions, free market economies, and promote human rights. It is

a tall order. The endowment has supported these nations and people in their struggle to attain a stable government which will provide lasting freedom.

The fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union did not usher in a era of democracy and human rights in these former totalitarian nations. Instead there is a tremendous amount of uncertainty and instability in all areas of Government and society in many of these nations. We cannot now turn our back on these people when they continue to need our help, and when they are able to benefit from it most.

In addition to assisting the emerging democracies of the world, NED is able to monitor the human rights abuses in the remaining authoritarian regimes, disseminate news of democratic movements around the world and train future democratic leaders.

As a ranking Republican on the Commission for Security and Cooperation in Europe and as one of the ranking members of Foreign Affairs, I am personally aware of the influence that NED has in supporting the United States' commitment to democratic reform and securing our interests around the world. I have also experienced how people around the world look to the United States for our support in their aspirations to have free governments, free markets, and guaranteed human rights.

Fifteen years ago, a large number of Latin American countries were controlled by authoritarian regimes. Today, only one nation—Cuba—is not on the road from totalitarianism to democracy. As significant as this is, these emerging democracies still face serious threats to democratic reform. Without support these reforms could be derailed and opponents to democracy strengthened.

A major obstacle to democratic reform is the pervasive corruption in many governments. Corruption in government leads to weak democratic structures, political violence, and the abuse of human rights. As this corruption spreads and democratic reforms are weakened, antidemocratic forces gain influence and power and the interests and ideals of the United States are threatened. NED supports programs which strengthen constitutional governments, political movements and economic reforms which in turn strengthen democratic institutions and movements.

NED also supports a growing network of women's political movements, including *Conciencia*, which is carrying out civic programs in Argentina, Peru, and Colombia. It has grown from 22 members in 1980 to over 4,000 today. The influence of *Conciencia* is spreading beyond South America to Russia and South Africa.

To cut funding to NED now would send a signal to these people that we

are no longer interested in supporting the spread of democratic movements and ideals and in establishing stable democratic governments.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment. An investment in the National Endowment for Democracy is an investment in the interests and security of the United States.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kanjorski-Shays amendment to eliminate funding from the so-called National Endowment for Democracy, or NED.

Since its creation in 1983 by President Reagan, the NED has been an endless source of controversy and an embarrassment to United States foreign policy. The NED duplicates a number of services already provided by other Government agencies. And many of the activities funded by the NED would be illegal if they were carried out in the United States by a similar agency of a foreign government. Yet today we are being asked to approve \$48 million for this program—an increase of 60 percent over last year.

Mr. Chairman, less than a week ago, the Senate Finance Committee announced that they plan to propose cutting another \$19 billion from Medicare in the name of holding down the deficit. In 1990, Congress cut \$43 billion from Medicare—also in the name of deficit reduction. I recently had dinner with a group of senior citizens in Castleton, VT. They were deeply concerned about how the President's budget proposal would affect them. How can I possibly go back and explain to them why we can afford a 60-percent increase in funding for the NED when Congress is on the verge of cutting \$19 billion more from Medicare?

Mr. Chairman, to those who would describe the NED as cost effective, I would simply ask, how can they possibly know that? After all, although the NED receives 95 percent of its funding from the Federal Government, it is a private organization which funnels most of its budget to private groups and agencies that are accountable to no one. Neither the Congress nor the administration nor the American people can verify the NED's accomplishments or effectively trace where it spends its money. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the General Accounting Office has sharply criticized the NED for misuse and mismanagement of funds.

Mr. Chairman, many Members of Congress have expressed their strong opposition to any campaign finance proposal for our own country which includes Government funding of elections. Yet many of these same people will probably vote to support funding for the NED—which provides millions of dollars in Government funding to influence elections in other countries.

Mr. Chairman, we need to pay more attention to the health of our own democracy. During the last 10 years, the NED has funded so-called democracy-building activities in countries like Great Britain and France. This seems very difficult to justify when you consider that voter turnout in both of these countries is typically a full 50 percent higher than it is in the United States. Mr. Chairman, the United States ranks last among all industrialized nations in voter turnout. In Presidential elections, only about half of the people show up at the polls. In off-year congressional elections, only about 1 in 3 people bother to vote.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to support this amendment. If we want to use public money to build democracy, let us do it here at home and enact real campaign finance reform with public financing.

□ 1520

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] our friend, has rightly pointed out that democracy is the wave of the future. Since it is going to happen anyway, why throw money at it?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

Mr. KANJORSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a little of the argument. Too bad we do not have half an hour to discuss this. But what have we heard?

We heard first of all that there are other agencies and organizations that could do what NED, the National Endowment for Democracy is doing. The National Endowment for Democracy is not certainly responsible for all the successes in the world. It did not even exist when some of these successes started to occur.

Two, there are accountability problems here that are disasters in the making. If we think that the House bank was a disaster for this institution, just wait until the final accounting occurs, with the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been expended by the National Endowment for Democracy that have not yet been properly accounted to this Congress or the American people.

Finally, how in 1993, after the fall of the Soviet Union, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the birth of democracies around

the world, can we justify an increase of 60 percent in annual funding and say it is absolutely necessary for democracy?

I ask my colleagues to join me as reasonable participants on both sides of the aisle and vote down the public financing of the National Endowment for Democracy but allow them to exist on charitable funds that they can collect for themselves.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in passionate opposition to this amendment, not an amendment that lowers the increase or freezes the National Endowment but wipes it out completely.

The question that Mr. KANJORSKI asks should be turned around: How, in 1993, less than 2 years after dissolution of the Soviet Union, less than 4 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, less than 12 years after the National Endowment for Democracy started working with Lech Walesa and other believers in democracy in Eastern Europe, within 10 years after the National Endowment for Democracy went to the Philippines and went to Chile, went to Nambia, and went all over the world where the struggle for free elections and democracy was going on and winning support, how can we possibly contemplate wiping out the key part of America's program?

Mr. ROHRBACKER had it right: This is not the Republicans and Democrats, labor and business in bed together to feather their own nests; this is because there is a broad bipartisan consensus that there are certain enduring principles in American foreign policy, first and foremost of which is support for democracy and democratic institutions. We have chosen to manifest that support through the National Endowment for Democracy.

Please reject this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kanjorski amendment which would eliminate funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

I oppose the Kanjorski amendment because the endowment and its four core grantees—the National Democratic Institute, the International Republican Institute, the Center for International Private Enterprise, and the Free Trade Union Institute—provide the best kind of aid the United States can provide. They export democracy.

I know. I have seen the endowment's work.

In April, as a member of the Appropriation Committee's Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I participated in the leadership's study mission to Russia and Ukraine. When our delegation arrived in Kiev, in Ukraine, we were met by Sarah Farnsworth, who heads a two-person National Democratic Institute team in Kiev.

Sarah, a young political organizer from the United States, told us that her job in Ukraine is to teach Ukrainians how to run a modern democracy. She advises political parties and local officials. She works with city councils and with the Ukrainian Parliament.

And every Ukrainian we talked to told us how important her work is. After all, Ukraine is a new democracy and after decades under the Soviet boot, Ukrainians need American know-how to help them make democracy work.

Sarah's work is typical of programs the National Endowment for Democracy funds throughout the world.

In Cambodia, the National Democrat and Republican Institutes worked to organize the first democratic elections ever held in that country. Young Americans spent the last year living in Cambodia, risking their lives to give the people of that country a chance for peace and democracy after decades of war and genocide.

In Yemen, Americans affiliated with the endowment worked with a 4,000-member civic organization to conduct election monitoring.

In Russia, Americans helped ensure that April 25 referendum was free and fair.

In South Africa, the National Democratic and Republican Institutes are there helping to organize next April's election which will lead to the establishment of a democratic South Africa and the dismantling of apartheid.

In short, the endowment and its core grantees, are all over the world helping to create that New World order we talk about so much.

It is inconceivable that we would cut funding for a program that has done so much to build democracy in places that have never known democracy.

The National Endowment for Democracy deserves our support. It is one Government agency that would make Thomas Jefferson proud.

Defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 181, answered "present" 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

AYES—243

Allard	Bliley	Crapo
Andrews (ME)	Blute	Cunningham
Andrews (NJ)	Boehner	Danner
Applegate	Bonilla	de la Garza
Archer	Boucher	de Lugo (VI)
Armey	Brewster	Deal
Bachus (AL)	Browder	DeFazio
Baesler	Brown (OH)	DeLay
Baker (CA)	Byrne	Dellums
Baker (LA)	Callahan	Derrick
Barca	Camp	Dickey
Barca	Canady	Dooley
Barlow	Cantwell	Doolittle
Barrett (NE)	Carr	Duncan
Barrett (WI)	Chapman	Durbin
Bartlett	Clay	Edwards (TX)
Bateman	Clayton	Emerson
Becerra	Coble	English (AZ)
Bentley	Collins (GA)	English (OK)
Bevill	Combest	Evans
Bilbray	Condit	Everett
Bilbrakis	Cramer	Ewing
Blackwell	Crane	Fawell

Fields (TX)	Linder	Sangmeister
Fingerhut	Lipinski	Santorom
Fish	Lloyd	Sarpallus
Fowler	Long	Schaefer
Frank (MA)	Machtley	Schenk
Franks (CT)	Mann	Schroeder
Furse	Manzullo	Scott
Gallegly	Margolles-	Sensenbrenner
Gekas	Mezvinsky	Serrano
Geren	Martinez	Shays
Gilchrest	Mazzoli	Shepherd
Gillmor	McCandless	Shuster
Glickman	McCrery	Sisisky
Gonzalez	McHale	Skelton
Goodlatte	McHugh	Slattery
Gordon	McInnis	Slaughter
Grams	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Grandy	McKinney	Smith (OR)
Greenwood	McMillan	Smith (TX)
Gutierrez	McNulty	Snowe
Hall (OH)	Meek	Solomon
Hall (TX)	Mica	Spence
Hamburg	Miller (CA)	Spratt
Hancock	Minge	Stark
Hansen	Mink	Stearns
Hefley	Montgomery	Stenholm
Hefner	Murphy	Strickland
Herger	Nadler	Studds
Hoagland	Natcher	Stump
Hoekstra	Neal (NC)	Stupak
Hoke	Norton (DC)	Sundquist
Holden	Nussle	Swett
Huffington	Orton	Talent
Hughes	Oxley	Tanner
Hunter	Parker	Tauzin
Hutchinson	Paxon	Taylor (MS)
Hutto	Payne (VA)	Tejeda
Inglis	Penny	Thomas (WY)
Inslie	Peterson (FL)	Thurman
Jacobs	Peterson (MN)	Torkildsen
Johnson (GA)	Petri	Trafficant
Johnson, Sam	Pickett	Tucker
Kanjorski	Portman	Underwood (GU)
Kaptur	Poshard	Upton
Kasich	Pryce (OH)	Valentine
Kim	Quillen	Velazquez
Kingston	Quinn	Visclosky
Kleccka	Rahall	Volkmer
Klink	Ramstad	Walker
Klug	Ravenel	Walsh
Knollenberg	Reynolds	Washington
Kolbe	Roberts	Weldon
Kreidler	Romero-Barcelo	Wyden
LaRocco	(PR)	Yates
Laughlin	Roth	Young (AK)
Lazio	Roukema	Young (FL)
Lehman	Rowland	Zeliff
Lewis (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Zimmer
Lightfoot	Sanders	

NOES—181

Abercromble	Diaz-Balart	Hochbrueckner
Ackerman	Dicks	Horn
Bacchus (FL)	Dingell	Houghton
Ballenger	Dixon	Hoyer
Barton	Dornan	Hyde
Bellenson	Dreler	Inhofe
Bereuter	Dunn	Istook
Berman	Edwards (CA)	Jefferson
Bishop	Engel	Johnson (CT)
Boehlert	Eshoo	Johnson (SD)
Bontor	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Borski	Fazio	Johnston
Brooks	Fields (LA)	Kennedy
Brown (CA)	Filner	Kennelly
Bryant	Foglietta	Kildee
Bunning	Ford (MI)	King
Burton	Ford (TN)	Klein
Buyer	Franks (NJ)	Kopetski
Calvert	Gallo	Kyl
Cardin	Gejdenson	LaFalce
Castle	Gephardt	Lambert
Clement	Gibbons	Lancaster
Clinger	Gilman	Lantos
Clyburn	Gingrich	Leach
Coleman	Goodling	Levin
Collins (IL)	Goss	Levy
Collins (MI)	Green	Lewis (CA)
Cooper	Gunderson	Lewis (GA)
Coppersmith	Hamilton	Livingston
Cox	Hastert	Lowe
Coyne	Hastings	Maloney
Darden	Hillard	Manton
DeLauro	Hinchey	Markey
Deutsch	Hobson	Matsui

McCloskey	Pallone	Skaggs
McCollum	Pastor	Skeen
McCurdy	Payne (NJ)	Smith (IA)
McDade	Pelosi	Smith (NJ)
McDermott	Pickle	Stokes
Meehan	Pombo	Swift
Menendez	Pomeroy	Taylor (NC)
Meyers	Porter	Thomas (CA)
Mfume	Price (NC)	Thompson
Michel	Rangel	Torres
Miller (FL)	Reed	Torricelli
Mineta	Regula	Towns
Moakley	Richardson	Unsoeld
Molinar	Roemer	Vento
Mollohan	Rogers	Vucanovitch
Moorhead	Rohrabacher	Waters
Moran	Ros-Lehtinen	Watt
Morrell	Rose	Waxman
Murtha	Rostenkowski	Wheat
Myers	Royce	Williams
Neal (MA)	Sabo	Wilson
Oberstar	Sawyer	Wise
Obey	Saxton	Wolf
Olver	Schiff	Woolsey
Ortiz	Schumer	Wynn
Owens	Sharp	
Packard	Shaw	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Frost

## NOT VOTING—14

Andrews (TX)	Flake	Synar
Brown (FL)	Harman	Thornton
Conyers	Hayes	Whitten
Costello	Henry	
Faleomavaega (AS)	Ridge	
	Rush	

□ 1546

Messrs. KENNEDY, THOMAS of California, MCCOLLUM, RANGEL, and MFUME changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. BARCIA, LEHMAN, HAMBURG, and NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Messrs. DOOLITTLE, CUNNINGHAM, and OXLEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in bipartisan support for the language in this bill which puts the Congress on record in support for a revitalized, restructured and independent ACDA.

Support for ACDA has always been strongly bipartisan. My predecessor on this side of the aisle, Bill Broomfield, worked tirelessly with two former chairmen of this committee, Clem Zablocki and Dante Fascell. And I am pleased to join in that tradition to work with Chairman HAMILTON as we look for ways to support and strengthen this important agency.

As most Members know, the executive branch is nearing a decision on how best to reorganize the new administration to deal with arms control and nonproliferation policy, and particularly, the future of ACDA.

It is my understanding that the Secretary of State has endorsed a revitalized and independent ACDA. I am pleased by this decision. I trust that the President will shortly endorse the Secretary of State's views on this important matter.

I would urge all Members to support the ACDA provisions in this bill. For it is essential that we have an agency in this Government whose mission is dedicated to completing the implementation and ensuring compliance of those arms control agreements entered into during the Reagan-Bush years. These agree-

ments would include, among others, the INF Treaty, START I and II, and CFE Treaty, and the CWC Accord.

In addition, I believe that ACDA can play an important, even essential role, in both coordinating U.S. nonproliferation policy and backstopping vital negotiations, particularly the negotiations regarding the extension of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT]. Traditionally, of course, ACDA has been the lead agency within our Government to advance arms control issues. It must retain that role and it should be clear that arm control policy includes nonproliferation policy issues as well.

I would also point out to Members that this bill freezes ACDA's authorization at previous levels while providing \$16 million to support implementation of the CWC accord.

Finally, I would hope that with the passage of this legislation and with the Secretary of State's endorsement of a revitalized ACDA, the President will move forward in an expeditious fashion to name a Director for the Agency. In that vein it is appropriate that we commend ACDA's Acting Director Tom Graham for his fine stewardship over the past few months. He has done an admirable job under less than perfect circumstances.

Mr. FALCOMVAEGA. Mr. Chairman I rise today to strongly urge our colleagues to adopt H.R. 2333, as amended, the State Department and Related Agencies Authorization Act for fiscal years 1994 and 1995.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Operations, I have worked with Chairman HOWARD BERMAN and the distinguished ranking member, OLYMPIA SNOWE, in dealing with the myriad of issues presented in H.R. 2333 during this time of substantial reorganization of the State Department, USIA, and AID.

At this time of fiscal constraints, H.R. 2333 reflects the need to conserve financial resources. The State Department, in particular, needs changes. The senior Foreign Service System, for example, requires revision, as the cost of senior personnel has mushroomed to almost \$200 million. The bloated bureaucracy absorbs a disproportionately large share of the Department's budget. With U.S. Embassies in the South Pacific being closed as a cost-saving measure, along with several other U.S. posts throughout the world slated for closure, I find it difficult to understand why unneeded senior staff of the Foreign Service are being promoted. The measure before us will rectify this problem.

Along with Chairmen BERMAN and LANTOS, I am elated that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency [ACDA] has been revitalized. H.R. 2333 ensures that this process will continue. Under the measure, ACDA has been designated to play a crucial role in the formulation of America's policy and her conduct of bilateral and regional negotiations on arms control and nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us provides authorization funding also for one of the most cost-effective and important tools of foreign diplomacy, the educational and cultural exchange programs under the USIA, which includes the much heralded Fulbright program. I have always felt that the value of personal, face to face contact between U.S. citizens ad-

the peoples of the world is of immense benefit to our Nation.

In support of that principle, I have introduced two exchanged initiatives included in H.R. 2333, at section 239: First, the South Pacific Academic and Exchange Program, and second, the Sports America Youth Exchange Program for the South Pacific region.

Although there are some 23 island nations and territories that make up the South Pacific, a very small number of students have the means necessary to study in the United States. Consequently, the new generations of island leaders coming into power have little first-hand knowledge and experience with America when dealing with the social and economic interests of our country.

Under the scholarship and exchange program I have introduced, up to \$2 million in both fiscal years 1994 and 1995 is authorized to provide scholarships for Pacific island students for undergraduate and postgraduate study at American universities and colleges.

The intent of the program is that all scholarship recipients return home to the South Pacific after completion of their studies in the United States. With their degrees in hand, these graduates no doubt will come to play increasingly influential roles in both the public and private sectors of their countries.

The second initiative concerns funding authorization establishing a Sports America Youth Exchange Program in the South Pacific region. The USIA has in recent years administered the program in Africa, wherein the United States sends 15 coaches throughout the continent to conduct sports clinics. Utilizing the universal medium of sports, the program has generated a tremendous amount of friendship and goodwill towards America from participating third world nations. By assisting the development of young athletes, that oftentimes later excel in world-class competitions, the United States provides these third world countries a badly-needed avenue for enhancement of their sense of national pride and identity.

A number of the underdeveloped nations of the South Pacific have indicated a desire to likewise participate in a Sports America Program, possibly through links with the Peace Corps. The initiative I have introduced would authorize up to \$200,000 per fiscal year for the creation of a Sports America Youth Program in the South Pacific region. Mr. Chairman, I submit to my colleagues that some of the best athletes in the world come from the South Pacific region.

In looking at the international acclaim paid to western Samoa's famous rugby team, Manu Samoa, it is evident that even little island nations can command global respect through achievements in sports. Just a couple of days ago, the golf buffs of the world have come to recognize pro golfer Vijay Singh from Fiji, 30 years of age, who just won a major PGA tournament in New York for \$180,000. Mr. Chairman, the benefits from this program of public diplomacy should not be underestimated, either for the undeveloped nation whose athletes earn it world attention and respect or for the United States as the perceived benefactor.

The South Pacific Exchange Program, like all the other exchange programs administered by USIA, facilitates the vital contact and interchange between the citizens of our country and the people from this region of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Operations, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], and the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], for doing such an outstanding job in formulating this most comprehensive piece of legislation, H.R. 2333. I also want to acknowledge and thank the staff members of our subcommittee from both sides of the aisle for their work in this bill—staff director Bradley Gordon, staff consultants Amit Pandya, Eric Lief, and Graham Cannon, minority staffer Kenneth Peel, and my staff legislative counsel, Enere H. Levi.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot more strongly urge our colleagues to vote for adoption of the measure before us, H.R. 2333.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill, and I congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking Republican, the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], for good work. This is a good bill which deserves credit.

Mr. Chairman, the cold war ended nearly 4 years ago, yet many of our attitudes toward foreign relations are steeped in that bygone era. We deliberate today in order to reorient outdated foreign policies to conform with new realities. I commend my good friend and colleague, HOWARD BERMAN, our International Operations Subcommittee chairman, and Chairman HAMILTON for their keen insight which is reflected in H.R. 2333.

H.R. 2333 balances administrative flexibility with legislative oversight. It gives the President and Secretary of State the tools they need to promote peace and prosperity around the world while preserving the Congress' prerogatives as the coequal branch of Government which represents the views of the American people.

Most important to my mind, this act was crafted in the understanding that confidence-building is essential not only in our bilateral relations but to the conduct of all diplomacy.

In December 1991, in the aftermath of the Persian Gulf war, the United Nations unanimously adopted General Assembly Resolution 46/36L which created the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms. Designed to minimize dangerous misperceptions that lead to regional instability, conflict and war, the nations of the world are asked to voluntarily report all major conventional arms exports and imports to the Register. The United States demonstrated its commitment to this system of openness or transparency by providing the pertinent data by the first reporting date, May 31, 1993. To date, more than 50 member states have complied.

The U.N.-based register encourages countries to build partnerships and cooperative security arrangements instead of arms stockpiles. By stating that the United States should not sell weapons to nations that do not participate in the Register without good cause, America acts as a force for global peace and understanding.

Despite our position as the lone superpower, the United States still cannot act unilat-

erally to curb weapons proliferation. Recognizing this, again in the wake of Operation Desert Storm, the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council initiated a productive series of talks aimed at limiting the flow of arms to the developing world. Unfortunately, these talks stalled in the wake of an announced major U.S. weapons sale. We ask that the President try to bring to the table once more the Perm-5 to discuss how to stem the tragic flow of armaments to nations that should be investing in schools, roads, and housing rather than guns, tanks, and jet fighters.

Too many times in our history have we been drawn into open conflict by misperceptions, not only between nations, but about our own activities. The American people deserve to know what role the United States plays in other regions with regard to militarization among other things. Transparency serves domestic as well as diplomatic interests.

H.R. 2333 will refocus our foreign policies on the productive endeavors of the future rather than the destructive fears of the past. A vote in favor of this act will be testimony to a belief in the strength of understanding over anger. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2333.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] for 3 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the body giving me a chance, along with my ranking member, the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], to sort of lay the picture of what comes ahead on this bill.

The bill before us now, the bill that authorizes the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Agency for Independent Development, is now a bill that is more than \$50 million below last year's appropriated level. It provides unprecedented management flexibility. It provides a strengthening of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in pursuit of its mission. It has broad bipartisan support.

My colleagues will be asked shortly to cast a recorded vote for the amendment which cuts \$200 million from the original bill.

□ 1550

At the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], you will be asked to cast a separate vote on the amendment which cuts \$200 million from the level the bill came to the floor on.

Mr. Chairman, with that, and urging all Members for their support, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for final passage of the State Department authorization. This is a bipartisan, fiscally responsible bill that deserves broad support on both sides of the aisle.

This legislation is not the foreign aid bill. It authorizes the operating budgets, not programs accounts, of the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and AID. It also authorizes U.S. contributions to the United Nations and other international organizations.

This bill cuts \$246 million from the administration's \$7.4 billion fiscal year 1994 request. The cuts contained in this bill take it \$58 million below this year's appropriation.

While providing the administration with increased organization flexibility, the bill also reigns in the foreign affairs bureaucracy. It requires a 15-percent cut in the size of the bloated Senior Foreign Service. For the first time, it places caps both on the overall size of the Foreign Service and the size of the Senior Foreign Service. It sets limits on the numbers of Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries and requires a major reduction from 93 to 66 in the number of mid-level Deputy Assistant Secretaries.

The bill also contains important Republican initiatives. It calls for the establishment of inspectors general at all major international organizations to address serious problems of fraud, waste and abuse identified by Dick Thornburg, the outgoing U.N. Under Secretary General for Administration and Management. It also prohibits the State Department from acquiescing in the United Nations attempt to increase the United States share for international peacekeeping, and calls for a reduction in our current level. That level, at 30.4 percent, is already too high compared to our 25 percent share of the regular U.N. budget.

Another Republican initiative in this bill requires the State Department to modernize its antiquated terrorist lookout system. That system failed to catch the radical Egyptian Sheikh, Abodel Rahman, who has been implicated in the \$600 million bombing of the World Trade Center in New York. Sheikh Abodel Rahman repeatedly entered and exited the United States over a period of years—and was even granted a green card. All this happened while the Sheikh was on the State Department lookout list for his past terrorist associations.

Again, this bill is fiscally responsible, and is the result of genuine bipartisan cooperation among members of the Subcommittee on International Operations. I would like to think the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] for his willingness to work with all sides in fashioning this bipartisan bill. I would also like to thank Mr.

HAMILTON and Mr. GILMAN, the chairman and ranking Republican of the full committee, for their cooperation.

I urge an "aye" vote on final passage. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as modified, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. MFUME, 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. 2333) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and related agencies, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 197, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Roth amendment, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully demand a separate vote on the so-called Kanjorski amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

The clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment:  
Page 7, line 1, strike "\$1,687,797,000" and insert "\$1,667,584,000".

Page 7, line 2, strike "\$1,733,368,000" and insert "\$1,712,609,000".

Page 7, line 5, strike "\$464,203,000" and insert "\$481,416,000".

Page 7, line 6, strike "\$476,520,000" and insert "\$494,495,000".

Page 7, line 9, strike "\$406,481,000" and insert "\$381,481,000".

Page 7, line 10, strike "\$417,523,000" and insert "\$392,523,000".

Page 11, line 15, strike "\$940,885,500" and insert "\$865,885,000".

Page 11, strike lines 22 through 25.

Page 12, line 8, strike "\$619,736,000" and insert "\$597,744,000".

Page 13, line 8, strike "\$390,000,000" and insert "\$365,000,000".

Page 13, line 9, strike "\$390,000,000" and insert "\$365,000,000".

Page 14, line 23, strike "\$126,929,000" and insert "\$101,929,000".

Page 17, line 4, strike "\$14,780,000" and insert "\$14,790,000".

Page 97, line 16, strike "\$109,079,000" and insert "\$108,482,000".

Page 97, line 17, strike "\$111,835,000" and insert "\$110,731,000".

Page 9, after line 18, insert the following:

(4) Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for "Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad" under subsection (a)(3), \$95,904,000 is authorized to be available for the fiscal year 1994 and \$114,825,000 is authorized to be available for the fiscal year 1995 for Maintenance of Buildings and Facility Rehabilitation.

Page 15, strike lines 7 through 13, and insert the following:

(C) Of the funds authorized to be available under subparagraph (A), \$7,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1994 and 1995 may be available only if the President certifies to the Congress that the United Nations Development Program's programs and activities in or for Myanmar (Burma) promote the enjoyment of internationally guaranteed human rights by the Burmese people and do not benefit the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) military regime.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, is the first vote on the Berman-Snowe-Penny amendment that passed by voice vote and unanimously?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The first vote is on the Roth amendment, as amended by that substitute.

The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of rule XV, a recorded vote on the Kanjorski amendment, if ordered, will be reduced to a minimum of 5 minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 3, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 250]

AYES—418

Ackerman	Bevill	Camp	Huffington	Moran
Allard	Bilbray	Canady	Hughes	Morella
Andrews (ME)	Billrakis	Cantwell	Hunter	Murphy
Andrews (NJ)	Bishop	Cardin	Hutchinson	Murtha
Applegate	Blackwell	Carr	Hutto	Myers
Archer	Bliley	Castle	Hyde	Nadler
Army	Blute	Chapman	Inglis	Natcher
Bacchus (FL)	Boehlert	Clay	Inhofe	Neal (MA)
Bacchus (AL)	Boehner	Clayton	Inslee	Neal (NC)
Baesler	Bonilla	Clement	Istook	Nussle
Baker (CA)	Bonior	Clinger	Jacobs	Oberstar
Baker (LA)	Borski	Clyburn	Jefferson	Obey
Ballenger	Boucher	Coble	Johnson (CT)	Oliver
Barca	Brewster	Coleman	Johnson (GA)	Ortiz
Barcia	Brooks	Collins (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Orton
Barlow	Browder	Collins (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Brown (CA)	Collins (MI)	Johnson, Sam	Packard
Barrett (WI)	Brown (FL)	Combest	Johnston	Pallone
Bartlett	Brown (OH)	Condit	Kanjorski	Parker
Barton	Bryant	Cooper	Kaptur	Pastor
Bateman	Bunning	Coppersmith	Kasich	Paxon
Becerra	Burton	Costello	Kennedy	Payne (NJ)
Becerra	Buoy	Cox	Kennelly	Payne (VA)
Beilenson	Byrne	Coyne	Kildee	Pelosi
Bentley	Callahan	Cramer	Kim	Penny
Bereuter	Calvert	Crane	King	Peterson (FL)
Berman			Kingston	Peterson (MN)
			Kleczka	Petri
			Klein	Pickett
			Klink	Pickle
			Klug	Pombo
			Knollenberg	Pomeroy
			Kolbe	Porter
			Kopetski	Portman
			Kreidler	Poshard
			Kyl	Price (NC)
			LaFalce	Price (OH)
			Lambert	Quillen
			Lancaster	Quinn
			Lantos	Rahall
			LaRocco	Ramstad
			Laughlin	Rangel
			Lazio	Ravenel
			Lehman	Reed
			Levin	Regula
			Levy	Reynolds
			Lewis (CA)	Richardson
			Lewis (FL)	Ridge
			Lewis (GA)	Roberts
			Lightfoot	Roemer
			Linder	Rogers
			Lipinski	Rohrabacher
			Livingston	Ros-Lehtinen
			Lloyd	Rose
			Gekas	Rostenkowski
			Gephardt	Roth
			Geren	Roukema
			Gibbons	Rowland
			Gilchrest	Roybal-Allard
			Gillmor	Royce
			Gilman	Sabo
			Gingrich	Sanders
			Glickman	Sangmeister
			Gonzalez	Santorum
			Goodlatte	Sarpaluis
			Goodling	Sawyer
			Gordon	Saxton
			Goss	Schaefer
			Grams	McCloskey
			Grandy	McCullum
			Green	McCrery
			Greenwood	McCurdy
			Gunderson	McDade
			Gutierrez	McDermott
			Hall (OH)	McHale
			Hall (TX)	McHugh
			Hamburg	McInnis
			Hamilton	McKeon
			Hancock	McKinney
			Hansen	McNulty
			Hastert	Meehan
			Hastings	Menendez
			Hefley	Meyers
			Hefner	Mfume
			Herger	Mica
			Hillard	Michel
			Hinchey	Miller (CA)
			Hoagland	Miller (FL)
			Hobson	Mineta
			Hochbrueckner	Minge
			Hoekstra	Mink
			Hoke	Moakley
			Holden	Molinar
			Horn	Mollohan
			Houghton	Montgomery
			Hoyer	Moorhead

Stearns	Thompson	Waters
Stenholm	Thurman	Watt
Stokes	Torkildsen	Waxman
Strickland	Torres	Weldon
Studds	Torricelli	Wheat
Stump	Towns	Williams
Stupak	Trafcant	Wilson
Sundquist	Tucker	Wise
Swett	Unsoeld	Wolf
Swift	Upton	Woolsey
Talent	Valentine	Wyden
Tanner	Velazquez	Yates
Tauzin	Vento	Young (AK)
Taylor (MS)	Visclosky	Young (FL)
Taylor (NC)	Volkmer	Young (FL)
Tejeda	Vucanovich	Zeliff
Thomas (CA)	Walker	Zimmer
Thomas (WY)	Walsh	

NOES—3

Abercrombie	Leach	Washington
-------------	-------	------------

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews (TX)	Henry	Synar
Conyers	McMillan	Thornton
Flake	Meek	Whitten
Harman	Owens	
Hayes	Rush	

□ 1614

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 98, strike lines 5 through 8; and redesignate paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will announce that this will be a 5-minute vote. Following this, Members are requested to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 172, answered "present" 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]

AYES—247

Allard	Blackwell	Costello
Andrews (ME)	Bliley	Cramer
Andrews (NJ)	Blute	Crane
Applegate	Boehner	Crapo
Archer	Bonilla	Cunningham
Army	Boucher	Danner
Bachus (AL)	Brewster	Deal
Baesler	Browder	DeFazio
Baker (CA)	Brown (OH)	DeLay
Baker (LA)	Byrne	Dellums
Barca	Callahan	Derrick
Barcia	Camp	Dickey
Barlow	Canady	Dooley
Barrett (NE)	Cantwell	Doolittle
Barrett (WI)	Carr	Dornan
Bartlett	Chapman	Duncan
Bateman	Clay	Durbin
Becerra	Clayton	Edwards (TX)
Bentley	Clyburn	Emerson
Bevill	Coble	English (AZ)
Bilbray	Collins (GA)	English (OK)
Bilbrakis	Combest	Evans
Bishop	Condit	Everett

Ewing	Lightfoot	Sangmeister
Fawell	Linder	Santorum
Fields (TX)	Lipinski	Sarpalius
Fingerhut	Lloyd	Schaefer
Fish	Long	Schenk
Fowler	Machtley	Schroeder
Frank (MA)	Mann	Scott
Franks (CT)	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Furse	Margolies-	Serrano
Gallegly	Mezvinsky	Shays
Gekas	Martinez	Shepherd
Geren	Matsui	Shuster
Gilchrest	Mazzoli	Slisky
Gillmor	McCandless	Skelton
Glickman	McCrery	Slattery
Gonzalez	McHale	Slaughter
Goodlatte	McHugh	Smith (MI)
Gordon	McInnis	Smith (OR)
Grams	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Grandy	McKinney	Snowe
Greenwood	McNulty	Solomon
Gutierrez	Mfume	Spence
Hall (OH)	Mica	Spratt
Hall (TX)	Miller (CA)	Stark
Hamburg	Minge	Stearns
Hancock	Mink	Stenholm
Hansen	Montgomery	Strickland
Hefley	Moorhead	Studds
Hefner	Murphy	Stump
Herger	Murtha	Stupak
Hoagland	Natcher	Sundquist
Hoekstra	Neal (NC)	Swett
Hoke	Nussle	Talent
Holden	Orton	Tanner
Huffington	Owens	Tauzin
Hughes	Oxley	Taylor (MS)
Hunter	Parker	Taylor (NC)
Hutchinson	Paxon	Tejeda
Hutto	Payne (VA)	Thomas (WY)
Ingalls	Penny	Thurman
Inlee	Peterson (FL)	Torkildsen
Jacobs	Petri	Trafcant
Johnson (GA)	Pickett	Tucker
Johnson, Sam	Portman	Upton
Kanjorski	Poshard	Valentine
Kaptur	Pryce (OH)	Velazquez
Kastch	Quillen	Visclosky
Kim	Quinn	Volkmer
Kingston	Rahall	Walker
Klecicka	Ramstad	Walsh
Klink	Ravenel	Washington
Klug	Reynolds	Weldon
Knollenberg	Ridge	Wyden
Kolbe	Roberts	Yates
Kreidler	Rostenkowski	Young (AK)
LaRocco	Roth	Young (FL)
Laughlin	Roukema	Zeliff
Lazio	Rowland	Zimmer
Lehman	Roybal-Allard	
Lewis (FL)	Sanders	

NOES—172

Abercrombie	Diaz-Balart	Hochbrueckner
Ackerman	Dicks	Horn
Bacchus (FL)	Dingell	Houghton
Bailenger	Dixon	Hoyer
Barton	Dreier	Hyde
Bellenson	Dunn	Inhofe
Bereuter	Edwards (CA)	Istook
Berman	Engel	Jefferson
Boehlert	Eshoo	Johnson (CT)
Bonior	Farr	Johnson (SD)
Borski	Fazio	Johnson, E. B.
Brooks	Fields (LA)	Johnston
Brown (FL)	Filner	Kennedy
Bryant	Foglietta	Kennelly
Bunning	Ford (MI)	Kildee
Burton	Ford (TN)	King
Buyer	Franks (NJ)	Klein
Calvert	Gallo	Kyl
Cardin	Geddenon	LaFalce
Castle	Gephardt	Lambert
Clement	Gibbons	Lancaster
Clinger	Gilman	Lantos
Coleman	Gingrich	Leach
Collins (IL)	Goodling	Levin
Collins (MI)	Goss	Levy
Cooper	Green	Lewis (CA)
Coppersmith	Gunderson	Lewis (GA)
Cox	Hamilton	Livingston
Coyne	Hastert	Lowe
Darden	Hastings	Maloney
de la Garza	Hilliard	Manton
DeLauro	Hinchev	Markey
Deutsch	Hobson	McCloskey

McCollum	Payne (NJ)	Skaggs
McCurdy	Pelosi	Skeen
McDade	Peterson (MN)	Smith (IA)
McDermott	Pickle	Smith (NJ)
Meehan	Pombo	Swift
Menendez	Pomeroy	Thomas (CA)
Meyers	Porter	Thompson
Michel	Price (NC)	Torres
Miller (FL)	Rangel	Torricelli
Mineta	Reed	Towns
Moakley	Regula	Unsoeld
Molinar	Richardson	Vento
Mollohan	Roemer	Vucanovich
Moran	Rogers	Waters
Morella	Rohrabacher	Watt
Myers	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
Nadler	Rose	Wheat
Neal (MA)	Royce	Williams
Oberstar	Sabo	Wilson
Obey	Sawyer	Wise
Olver	Saxton	Wolf
Ortiz	Schiff	Woolsey
Packard	Schumer	Wynn
Pallone	Sharp	
Pastor	Shaw	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Frost

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews (TX)	Hayes	Rush
Brown (CA)	Henry	Synar
Conyers	Kopetski	Thornton
Flake	McMillan	Whitten
Harman	Meek	

□ 1625

Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

NATCHER CASTS 18,000TH CONSECUTIVE VOTE

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this moment to make note of a very important fact that just happened.

On January 6, 1954, Chairman BILL NATCHER of Kentucky made his first vote in the House. And on this last vote he just cast his 18,000th consecutive vote.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE BILL NATCHER

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to add my little tribute to BILL NATCHER, not only for the number of consecutive votes that he has cast in this body, but probably much more important, the very demeanor with which he acquits himself on a day-to-day basis in this body. He gives credit to the institution and to each and every one of us; I guess if each and every one of us wanted to have a role model, or someone we would like to emulate, it would be BILL NATCHER.

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

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE BILL NATCHER

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, to put this vote in perspective, there are great records in sports: Henry Aaron's home runs, Joe DiMaggio's consecutive games, Rocky Marciano's undefeated streak.

There is no greater record right now that BILL NATCHER's 18,000 consecutive votes, and that means he has never missed a vote.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman NATCHER was elected on August 1, 1953, but because Congress had already adjourned, he could not be sworn in until January 6, 1954. Since he took office, Chairman NATCHER has cast 13,779 roll call votes and answered 4,231 quorum calls for a total of 18,000 consecutive votes, a record that has earned him a place in the "Guinness Book of World Records."

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, Chairman NATCHER has never accepted a campaign contribution. He has written 15,000 letters to his grandchildren since he has been in office, and furthermore, he spent less in the last election than any other candidate, only \$6,600.

□ 1630

That translates to one nickel per vote. In fact, in the month of November, election month, Chairman NATCHER's campaign spent \$20.16.

In spite of the fact that he chairs one of Congress' most challenging committees, he maintains the smallest personal staff on the Hill.

Chairman NATCHER has had some few close calls, but he advises Members not to follow his example. He claims that his record "gets right around your neck."

This is an unbelievable record by an unbelievable Member of this body.

Chairman NATCHER, you are a legend. We respect you. Congratulations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of our distinguished colleague from the State of New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

All of us know, Mr. Speaker, with the conflicting responsibilities we all owe to our committees and subcommittees, as well as the wealth of activities in our home districts which require our attention—not to mention the problems and delays we encounter commuting to and from our districts—how difficult it is to be in attendance for each and every rollcall vote.

When the great State of Kentucky first sent BILL NATCHER to the House in 1953, 40 years ago, Dwight Eisenhower was just beginning his long tenure in the White House, young Elizabeth II had just been crowned Queen of England, the television screen was still an exciting black and white novelty in American homes, and the triumph of modern medical science over polio was still in the future. Since that time, BILL NATCHER has been an inspiration to all of us.

Not the least aspect of BILL's outstanding leadership is his impeccable record of answering consecutive rollcall votes.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that Representative NATCHER has this week passed the 18,000 mark of consecutive rollcall votes. This record deserves the attention and applause of not only his colleagues in this Chamber, but also of all Americans.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FOR OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NATCHER was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the majority leader, DICK GEPHARDT, my friend, BOB MICHEL, the minority leader, my friend, BILL RICHARDSON, and all of you. You have been good to me all down through the years, and from the bottom of my heart, I appreciate it.

It is a distinct honor and a privilege to serve in the House of Representatives, the greatest legislative body in the world and the most powerful legislative body in the world.

I have six grandsons, one granddaughter. I have written them a letter every week since they were born. My grandchildren say to me, "Why, BILL, I don't think that is so wonderful about not missing a vote. I thought that is what we sent you up there to do. I thought that is why we sent you up here."

I have served with nine Presidents since I have been here, and I have gotten along with every one of them. I have served with seven Speakers, and none better than my friend, TOM FOLEY.

I want to thank the leadership on the Democratic side of this House and the Republican leadership in this House for all of the times that they have helped me. I had only been here, Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks, and I learned that when you can walk across the center aisle and you have friends on both sides, you are a Member of the House.

I learned early as a new Member, Mr. Speaker, that there are just as many smart people that sit on the left-hand side of this aisle as sit on the right-hand side. I need help every day that I am a Member of Congress, and you have helped me.

I have made 18,000, and, Mr. GEPHARDT, I do not know whether I can make 18,000 more, but I am going to try.

Thank you very much.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Speaker FOLEY joins the majority leader and the minority leader and all of the Members of the House in saluting Congressman NATCHER on this special day.

The question is on the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended, 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 273, noes 144, answered not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 252]

YEAS—273

Abercrombie	Gilchrist	Mineta
Ackerman	Gilman	Mink
Andrews (ME)	Gingrich	Moakley
Andrews (NJ)	Glickman	Mollohan
Bacchus (FL)	Gonzalez	Montgomery
Baesler	Gordon	Moran
Barca	Grandy	Morella
Barcla	Green	Murtha
Barlow	Gunderson	Myers
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Nadler
Bateman	Hall (OH)	Natcher
Becerra	Hall (TX)	Neal (MA)
Bellenson	Hamburg	Oberstar
Bentley	Hamilton	Obey
Bereuter	Hastings	Olver
Berman	Hefner	Ortiz
Bevill	Hilliard	Orton
Bilbray	Hinchey	Owens
Bishop	Hoagland	Pallone
Blackwell	Hochbrueckner	Parker
Bliley	Holden	Pastor
Bonior	Horn	Payne (NJ)
Borski	Houghton	Payne (VA)
Boucher	Hoyer	Pelosi
Brewster	Huffington	Penny
Brooks	Hughes	Peterson (FL)
Browder	Hutto	Pickett
Brown (CA)	Inslee	Pickle
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Brown (OH)	Johnson (CT)	Porter
Bryant	Johnson (GA)	Poshard
Byrne	Johnson (SD)	Price (NC)
Calvert	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Cantwell	Johnston	Reed
Cardin	Kanjorski	Reynolds
Carr	Kaptur	Richardson
Clay	Kennedy	Ridge
Clayton	Kennelly	Roemer
Clement	Kildee	Rose
Clyburn	Kim	Rostenkowski
Coleman	King	Roth
Collins (IL)	Kiecicka	Roukema
Collins (MI)	Klein	Rowland
Condit	Klink	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kolbe	Sabo
Coppersmith	Kopetski	Sanders
Costello	Kreidler	Sangmeister
Coyne	LaFalce	Sawyer
Cramer	Lambert	Saxton
Danner	Lancaster	Schenk
Darden	Lantos	Schiff
de la Garza	LaRocco	Schroeder
Deal	Laughlin	Schumer
DeFazio	Leach	Scott
DeLauro	Lehman	Serrano
Dellums	Levin	Sharp
Derrick	Levy	Shays
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Shepherd
Dicks	Lightfoot	Sisisky
Dixon	Lipinski	Skaggs
Dooley	Livingston	Skeen
Durbin	Long	Skelton
Edwards (CA)	Lowe	Slattery
Edwards (TX)	Machtley	Slaughter
Engel	Maloney	Smith (IA)
English (AZ)	Mann	Snowe
English (OK)	Manton	Spratt
Eshoo	Margolies-	Stark
Evans	Mezvinsky	Stenholm
Farr	Markey	Stokes
Fazio	Martinez	Strickland
Fields (LA)	Matsui	Studds
Filner	Mazzoli	Stupak
Fingerhut	McCloskey	Swett
Fish	McCurdy	Swift
Foglietta	McDade	Tejeda
Ford (MI)	McDermott	Thompson
Ford (TN)	McHale	Thurman
Fowler	McKinney	Torres
Frank (MA)	McMillan	Torricelli
Frost	McNulty	Towns
Furse	Meehan	Tucker
Gallo	Menendez	Unsoeld
Gelderson	Meyers	Valentine
Gephardt	Mfume	Velazquez
Geren	Michel	Vento
Gibbons	Miller (CA)	Vislosky

Volkmer	Wheat	Wynn
Washington	Wilson	Yates
Waters	Wise	Young (FL)
Watt	Woolsey	
Waxman	Wyden	

**NAYS—144**

Allard	Goodling	Petri
Applegate	Goss	Pombo
Archer	Grams	Portman
Armey	Greenwood	Pryce (OH)
Bachus (AL)	Hancock	Quillen
Baker (CA)	Hansen	Quinn
Baker (LA)	Hastert	Rahall
Ballenger	Hefley	Ramstad
Barrett (NE)	Hergert	Ravenel
Barton	Hobson	Regula
Billrakis	Hoekstra	Roberts
Blute	Hoke	Rogers
Boehner	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Bonilla	Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Hyde	Royce
Burton	Inglis	Santorum
Buyer	Inhofe	Sarpaluis
Callahan	Istook	Schaefer
Camp	Jacobs	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Castle	Kasich	Shuster
Clinger	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Coble	Klug	Smith (NJ)
Collins (GA)	Knollenberg	Smith (OR)
Combest	Kyl	Smith (TX)
Cox	Lazio	Solomon
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Crapo	Lewis (FL)	Stearns
Cunningham	Linder	Stump
DeLay	Lloyd	Sundquist
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Talent
Dickey	McCandless	Tanner
Dingell	McCollum	Tauzin
Doolittle	McCreery	Taylor (MS)
Dornan	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	McKeon	Thomas (WY)
Dunn	Mica	Torkildsen
Emerson	Miller (FL)	Trafficant
Everett	Minge	Upton
Ewing	Molinar	Vucanovich
Fawell	Moorhead	Walker
Fields (TX)	Murphy	Walsh
Franks (CT)	Neal (NC)	Weldon
Franks (NJ)	Nussle	Williams
Gallely	Oxley	Wolf
Gekas	Packard	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Paxon	Zeliff
Goodlatte	Peterson (MN)	Zimmer

**NOT VOTING—17**

Andrews (TX)	Flake	Rush
Bartlett	Harman	Synar
Boehlert	Hayes	Thomas (CA)
Chapman	Henry	Thornton
Conyers	McHugh	Whitton
Dreier	Meek	

□ 1650

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2333, STATE DEPARTMENT, USIA, AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995**

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill (H.R. 2333) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, related agencies, and for other purposes, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, cross references, punctuation, and grammatical and spelling errors, to make appro-

appropriate revisions in the table of contents, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary.

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

There was no objection.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 2333, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise because I am somewhat embarrassed over the fact that I missed rollcall vote No. 252, which was the State Department authorization bill. I am embarrassed because it was Chairman NATCHER's 18,001st vote. I was downstairs at a meeting of our Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress taking testimony from the likes of former Attorney General Dick Thornburgh, the former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Paul Volcker, and the former distinguished whip in the House, Mr. Brademus of Indiana.

Had I made it upstairs for the vote, I would have cast, along with the majority of my California Republican colleagues, a no vote. I would appreciate it if my statement could appear in the RECORD immediately following that vote.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 2445, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1994**

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-147) on the resolution (H. Res. 203) waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 2446, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1994**

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 103-148) on the resolution (H.Res. 204) waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2446) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 201 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2403.

□ 1652

**IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2403) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with Mr. STUDDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, June 18, 1993, the bill had been read through page 53, line 3.

The Clerk will read.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a unanimous consent request, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] was given the opportunity to offer an amendment out of order. I believe the gentleman seeks recognition at this time before we read further in title V.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] seek recognition?

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JACOBS**

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACOBS: page 41, line 25, strike out "\$2,833,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,435,736."

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, this is what you could call a conforming amendment.

On Friday last, the House adopted a measure by which former Presidents would not have their freebies, or slush funds or whatever you call them, office expenses, I guess, in one case where you go out of office in this country and right back into it, private citizens in public office, for 5 years, none of them would have more than 5 years.

It is a conforming amendment because several of them have had their 5 years already.

The spirit of that amendment was 5 years, not 5 more years.

Now I hear it said that the former Presidents need these staffs and these offices so they can answer the torrent of mail that pours in to them.

The only thing is that as nearly as I can tell, they usually do not, unless it is a letter from Aunt Minnie or somebody.

We have tried it for 2 or 3 years. We write to each of the former Presidents.

I will say one thing. I believe it was former President Ford who sent back a postcard saying he was too busy to answer the letter; but apart from that, we never heard anything back at all.

The fact is that the former Presidents have become big business. These former Presidents are multimillionaires, with the possible exception of Mr. Bush, not because of private enterprise or inheritance, but precisely because the American people have given them the privilege of serving in the highest office in the land. They become instantly at command of handsome speakers' fees, ranging from \$20,000 to \$40,000 a pop.

If you think back over our former Presidents and you include extemporaneousness as a qualification, you tell me which is a great orator who could command a fee of \$20,000 or \$40,000.

Obviously, they are ornaments at somebody's convention where a committee that is not paying the money itself decides its membership will pay to aggrandize the membership of the organization.

I hear it said that few Americans have the dignity of former Presidents. I suggest to the committee that a person is dignified, not according to what is supplied to him or her as a private citizen as a freebie from the taxpayers, but according to Dr. King, "The contents of that person's character."

Mother Teresa is a wonderful person, too, they tell me, and so was Ghandi and so, too, was Jesus Christ, but none of them got office expenses from the taxpayers.

This does not affect the pensions of the former Presidents one iota, nor does it affect the Secret Service protection.

So the question is, why do the current Presidents require all this tax-paid expense when they can pay their own secretaries easily and pay for their own office expenses easily themselves, when the Presidential giants, Jefferson, Washington, Truman, and others never would have dreamed of imposing on the taxpayers in this way.

Thomas Jefferson when he left the White House said, "I go forth to accept a promotion from servant to master."

The taxpayers are not the servants of the former Presidents.

Finally, as I say, this is only a conforming amendment. It allows the money in the spirit of the vote on Friday in the House fully for President Bush, who has not had 5 years of it yet, and partly for President Reagan who

has a few months to go for his 5 years, but in the case of the others who have already had 5 and more than 5 years of freebies from the taxpayers as private citizens, what this amendment really does is give the taxpayers credit for time served.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last Friday we adopted an amendment which had the effect of saying prospectively that we would limit the expenses which are allowed to former Presidents to 5 years, but it was prospective to put on notice former Presidents, including Mr. Nixon, Mr. Ford, Mr. Carter, Mr. Reagan, and Mr. Bush, that they would have 5 years of expenses from the passage of this bill and thereafter they would have to make arrangements privately.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we all know that Presidents become very special people in this society, which an awful lot of people look up to.

As a matter of fact, in our committee, we had testimony that Ronald Reagan, who would have about 6 months left of entitlement to expenses, is probably one of the most prominent people in this country, more so than any of the other former Presidents, in terms of the public's notice of him and the public's attention to him.

Because Presidents are so well-known to the American public, they receive large volumes of mail and they do, in fact, have many contacts from the public who seek their views.

Now, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] is always delightful to listen to in debate. I always enjoy it. Even when I oppose the gentleman's amendments, I love to have him offer amendments because his debate is so delightful.

But Mr. Chairman, we have already effected a limitation of 5 years. That limitation is a substantial change from our present policy.

□ 1700

What the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] now seeks to do is not to carry forward that amendment, but to, in effect, change it and to say that the office staff is only available to Mr. Reagan for the next 6 months, and then only to Mr. Bush. So that Mr. Carter and Mr. Ford, a Democrat and a Republican, would be summarily, as of September 30, denied that which they have expected in terms of serving the public. So this is not a partisan issue.

Now I do not think anybody can gainsay the fact that, for instance, President Carter has been one of the most extraordinary public servants as a former President that, I think, many of us have seen, perhaps the most extraordinary former President of all times, at least in recent memory in terms of his involvement in carrying out what he perceives to be for the public benefit, using the status he has as a former

President, not only to bring peace around the world, but also to bring relief to the needy in this country and around the world.

So, I hope the House would reject this amendment. I hope that they would say we have set a policy prospectively. If the Shepherd amendment becomes the law, the former Presidents need to make plans over the next few years to have that law implemented. But we ought not to say, to two individuals and a third, President Reagan, that this Congress has made a determination that, notwithstanding the fact they have been the most significantly well-known public figures in the world, that we will not provide them the ways and means to communicate and respond to the correspondence, the telephone calls, the requests from historians and academicians, as well as the public, and for personal interviews. We ought not to tell them that they will not have the capacity to do that other than fund it themselves.

Now I would say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] that, yes, there is no doubt that former Presidents have the ability to earn money. As a matter of fact, I have been critical, quite critical, of some of those earnings in terms of foreign payments to some of our Presidents. But notwithstanding that, I think it would be not a wise policy, not in the best interests of the people of the United States, not to allow former Presidents this expense allowance and to allow it prospectively for the next 5 years.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I am more than pleased to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. My friend from Maryland, I just want to point out that the Presidential libraries are not touched by this. The gentleman mentioned scholars who wanted to research the administrations. That is also being paid for by the taxpayers, so that is not touched by this amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, what I tried to say was that, in terms of scholars wanting to interview Presidents, obviously they go through a secretary to set up an appointment. That was my point, and that they could do that through the library. But I would presume, and without contesting it in any way, my good friend, that they call up the Presidential office to set up the appointment.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would further yield, I would remit to the gentleman a quarter for every scholar that gets in to see Reagan in the next 5 years.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I will call the former President and see if I can make some money. Maybe I would be in good shape.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. Chairman, I have often supported the efforts of my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], because I think they are sincere efforts to save the taxpayers money and to eliminate abusive Government spending. There are a number of issues that he and I see eye to eye on. However, Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I think, is a bit harsh in that we have supported the compromise amendment that was offered by our colleague to phase out the allowance after 5 years. I think that makes ultimate good sense.

Former Presidents, as our chairman has stated, do have a certain stature that other people do not have, and I would say that our chairman has, from a fiscal position, been very supportive of the Office of the President in the past and has seen to it that the Presidents had what they needed so that they could operate in their own fashion. I believe with the amendment that we considered here on Friday that, by phasing out this side of the spending equation they will have their libraries up, they will have offices to operate from, which takes time to put in place, and, of course, many of them command rather sizable speaking fees, that a 5-year limit of time is appropriate.

But what our friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], wants to do, I think, is a bit harsh today, and, therefore, I reluctantly rise in opposition to his amendment.

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

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to our friend from Michigan who, I think, has a different point of view.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] for yielding to me, and I want to say that I rise in strong support of this amendment.

As I talk to my constituents back home, those all across the State of Michigan, they want something done about this \$300 billion deficit, and the first thing I hear at town meetings, and everywhere else I go, is that there have got to be some sacrifices made, and it has got to start with Congress, and that means it also has to start with the White House.

For so many of our former Presidents, they are able to command speeches for \$80,000 to \$100,000 a pop. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] just asked if he could have only a quarter for every individual that gets an audience with former President Reagan. I am even told that some of these former Presidents, and I say this is all due respect, would not even sign an autographed picture. That is ridiculous.

Tonight the Tigers are playing the Orioles, and I bet some of my staff that

are going up to the game tonight, if they get there in time or stay there late, they will be able to get a baseball signed by Cecil Fielder or some of the other stars.

I know baseball stars are earning millions of dollars, like Michael Jordan. They are able to get autographs. And yet we provide these former Presidents with literally now millions of dollars, and it has accumulated, and we cannot even get an autographed picture.

Well, that is bogus. I mean that is. And I rise in support. Here is an area where we can have the White House sacrifice a little bit, the executive branch. Congress, too. We tried a couple weeks ago. But I would rise in strong support, and I hope we have a recorded vote on this, and I hope we can save the taxpayers some money in an area that does not impact the poor, or lower, or middle-income families across this great Nation.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], and, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, have enjoyed the wit and wisdom of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], and I count him as a friend. However, as the gentleman knows and as our chairman knows, I opposed the original amendment last week, and I must say that this amendment today strikes me as going beyond wit and is very light on wisdom, and it has moved, I am sorry to say, into the area of sarcasm, and even contempt, for the Office of President.

I will not stand here and defend what any given President may or may not do with respect to receiving fees for speeches or anything of that nature. But I do know that something terrible is happening to our country, something terrible is happening to the institution of government.

I do know that when I was given a copy of the Constitution by the late Spark M. Matsunaga in 1974, when I began my electoral career that has culminated in my acceptance in this House, taking the oath of office, that I still have that Constitution. When I accepted that Constitution from him, he said:

Here, you read this. This is what it's all about, and the President, no matter who that person is, represents the institution of freedom in this country, no matter how bad our problems might be and no matter how difficult the path might be before us.

Mr. Chairman, are we going to resolve anything by trying to disembowel ourselves in terms of our principles, in terms of our respect for the institution and the people who represent the institution of free government? This is the oldest republic in the history of the world, and we stand and speak in con-

temptuous terms about our former Presidents, regardless of their party and regardless of who they might be.

But I will say that with respect to President Carter, he has exemplified, as much as it is possible for a human being to do who has held that high office, the highest office that freedom has had to offer ever in the history of the world, a compassion and regard for the average person throughout the world struggling for justice against oppression as well or better than anyone, certainly Thomas Jefferson, who was quoted previously, would approve.

□ 1710

He has come to my State, to my city, to build homes. I know he was in Washington, DC, to build homes for poor people who could not otherwise afford it. He is always available in areas where people have not experienced freedom such as we have on the floor of this Congress.

I ask Members to remember that we are able to stand here, and the people who were cited previously, in townhall meetings are able to stand up and indicate how much they dislike former Presidents or dislike what the Congress is doing. They are able to do that because of this Constitution and the Presidency that is at the apex of what this democracy stands for.

We have made in my judgment a very bad vote, which I hope the Senate will not approve. I hope this will die out in the Senate. I hope it will not survive our legislative process here.

I hope that when we consider what is being asked of us today, that we are somehow to punish Presidents, punish them for being our representatives, I think that it is a reflection of our disappointment in ourselves. We are the ones who need to bring respect back to this institution. We are the ones that by our actions show whether we have true respect for what democracy is all about.

Making what I consider to be, with all due respect to my good friend from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], making a gesture which is empty in nature, which leaves us with no sense of advancing the cause of democracy, of advancing whatever policies might end up in some fashion being able to show that we have acted more responsibly, how does attacking the Presidency, how does holding it up to further contempt and derision, advance that cause? I cannot see that.

I think at the very minimum, with the passage of this bill, I accept the fact that I was on the short end of that vote. I do not accept that the reasoning was sound, and that is my right as a Member of this body.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that today we would not go further then and say that retrospectively we are going to go back and make absolutely sure that every President understands, who would be affected by this, that we hold

them in contempt. That is the effect of the passage of this amendment. So I ask that we defeat it.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, as I did to the original amendment last Friday.

Mr. Chairman, what is it within us that makes us tear down our leaders, that makes us attempt to detract from the dignity of the Office of President?

Today there has been a tone of contempt. There have been expressions used such as slush fund. Anyone listening to this who is not familiar with the facts would think that we are talking about putting former Presidents in mansions, on yachts, giving them trips around the world. That we are asking the taxpayers to subsidize a lavish style of living.

What are we talking about? We are talking about an office. We are talking about desks. We are talking about secretaries. We are talking about file cabinets. So that these former chiefs of state and heads of government can respond to letters from their constituents, can meet with historians, can provide their knowledge, the resources of their talents, to the people who perhaps were not even born when they were President.

Now, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] said that he has written to Presidents and not gotten a response. I can say myself that I had the opportunity on another matter to visit the office of former President Nixon in New Jersey, and I can tell you that they receive boxes of mail every week, if not every day. I have known people who worked in that office and know the attempts that they make to respond to that mail. I know that mail is received, not only from around the country, but from around the world.

Why is it that we are treating these men, who have given their lives in dedication to the country, with such derision? Is it to appeal to voters back home, so we can say we were tough on spending?

Now, I am speaking as a Republican, and I mentioned President Nixon. But the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] mentioned former President Carter.

I cannot think of any former President who has given so much of his own time and effort to the struggle for human rights, to eradicate poverty, to alert the American people to the problems of housing, to the problems of our inner cities, as President Carter.

Why do we treat him with derision? Why do we want to take away his desk, and his chair, and his secretary, and his file cabinet? Will that make us feel better?

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

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, we do not want to take them away. We want them to pay for their own. They are private citizens.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I say that is a distinction, rather than a difference. We are taking it away. And I am saying they are not working as private citizens, they are working on behalf of the Office of the President of the United States. They are public figures. We put them in that position. They have an obligation to us.

Yes, we have an obligation to them, but they have an obligation to us. And I know the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] made the point that Jesus Christ was not given a staff.

I would remind the gentleman that Jesus Christ was crucified, and I ask, is the gentleman saying we should crucify our ex-Presidents, if you want to make the analogy complete?

I would say, without being humorous, I know there has been attempted humor here today, and I like a laugh as much as anyone. In fact, I have been accused sometimes of putting perhaps too much humor into things.

But I see nothing funny about this. There is nothing funny at all about degrading the Office of President of the United States. It is not funny when we use words such as "slush funds" and "bogus" when we are talking about men who have given so much of their time.

I think it cheapens us as a body. I think it diminishes us as Government officials.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is not our finest hour. I dreamt for many years of perhaps being a Member of the Congress of the United States. I did not think that I would ever be on the floor of the Congress of the United States defending former Presidents, to protect their desks, their chairs, their stationery, and their secretaries. And I certainly do not want it written on my tombstone whenever I leave here, whether it is this term, or next term, or whenever, that I was ever part of such a demeaning process.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself sometimes in great agreement with my friend from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], and sometimes opposed. Today I rise in agreement with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS]. Not because he is in any way wanting to be insulting to any existing or former President of the United States or any future or existing former President of the United States.

What the gentleman is attempting to do, I think, is to indicate to the American people that those of us in the Congress and in Government have heard the word, and that is that there must be constraints put on Federal expendi-

tures. And, further, is there a need for the largesse that the Government provides to former Presidents?

Now, I wish my friend from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] had included Secret Service protection so we would reanalyze the expense of the amount of protection we give to former Presidents.

I do not want to deny former Presidents the safety or protection of their lives or their families, for that matter, for the safety or protection of their lives. But it does offend me when I read of a former President leaving office and going to Japan and getting a \$2 million fee, that costs the United States taxpayers \$10 or \$12 million for security protection to send him there so that he may personally benefit by that fee.

I do have great admiration for a former President of the United States of the other side of the aisle, and a former Member of this House, the Honorable Richard Nixon, who sees fit to provide for his own personal protection and stand that cost out of his pocket. I see no reason that there is any former President that does not have the personal wherewithal to provide for his own office staff or, in most instances, for his own safety.

I have the greatest admiration for former President Carter, who to this day has not commercialized on the Presidency. But I think I share with a lot of Americans a great deal of disappointment in some former Presidents that have literally taken the Office of President and commercialized it like we have never seen it happen in the history of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I was proud today when I saw the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] celebrate his 18,000th vote on this floor, particularly since he voted yes on my amendment on that 18,000th vote. But I was here 39 years ago when the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] cast his first vote on this floor, as a congressional page. At that time the President of the United States was Ike Eisenhower, and President Eisenhower retired from that Office to Gettysburg, receiving no expenditures or any payments for cutting ribbons at A&P stores or department stores or doing what else or charging \$80,000 for speeches. He wrote, he spoke, and he visited with scholars, and he provided the highest regard for the Presidency and the great example that should have been sent.

I saw Harry Truman live in very modest means in Independence, MO. Not with a great office, but using his library to meet with people and to share the values and the worth of the Presidency with scholars and average people.

There is no reason that the Presidents that have come since cannot perform in the same way. To my knowledge, there is not one of them that does not have a net worth in excess of \$1 million, far in excess of the average

American, and generally some of them have earnings in excess of \$1 million a year, and can afford their wherewithal.

□ 1720

I support the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] because of that.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman aware, for instance, that President Nixon has given up his Secret Service protection?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, yes.

Mr. KING. I think that should be put in the RECORD as an example of people who are not necessarily trying to enrich themselves.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, so that the gentleman understands, I have risen on this floor many times. I cannot think of a more outstanding American example of fineness than Richard Nixon performed when he gave up the payment for protection and paid for it himself. I cannot think of anything more embarrassing to me than a President who would commercialize on the Presidency and cost the American taxpayers \$10 million so he could earn \$2 million from a foreign country.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think it is important to put that in the RECORD since there is a certain amount of derision being directed at former Presidents, as an example of someone who is giving up a service that is very costly and very expensive.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I really think that we may be making a very serious mistake with what the intent of this amendment, which I am sure is well-intentioned, is.

The Presidents, the heads of state of our Republic, are the embodiment of our Nation. Examples have been brought up of unfortunate things that may have taken place by human beings, acts that may have taken place and been carried out by human beings that have been Presidents, that are former Presidents of the United States. But to use examples of unfortunate acts to attack, in effect, the institution of the former Presidency is something that I think is a mistake.

I remember some years back, when I visited a much younger republic in South America, the Republic of Venezuela. I was impressed that in their constitution they have a measure by which all former Presidents for life are members of the senate. And they, in their very difficult process of building their democracy, have looked upon that institution of the former Presidency, as a senator, as one way to contribute to the strengthening of the democratic process.

We have been fortunate that our Republic has lasted over 200 years. I think one of the reasons that our Republic has lasted over 200 years is because there is legitimacy in this Nation, legitimacy being defined as respect for our institutions and, of course, our highest institution is the Presidency of the United States.

I am reminded, by this amendment, of an anecdote from a very peculiar army regiment that was talked about for years in Spain. They had parties. It had become known in the press that they were involved in many things which were not common for an army regiment.

When those irregularities hit the press, the officers called in the press and said, "Don't worry. We have taken care of the situation."

The parrot that the regiment had, used to be given very fancy chocolate every day, and they told the press, "The parrot will no longer have chocolate."

I think that we should not be taking away the chocolate of the parrot to satisfy some, when we are causing aggression to the highest institution of our democracy. I think that we should defeat this amendment, and I would have liked to see the defeat of the amendment last week, which I thought was an affront to our institutions, one of our most sacred institutions.

I choose to recall an anecdote such as President Truman, when he left and not only did not go and accept speaking engagements for fees but never accepted anything, any fee, because he used to say,

They don't want to hire me because I am Harry Truman. They want to hire me because I am a former President of the United States and so I won't accept it.

That is what I remember. That is the kind of, I think, image that we have to keep in mind of the Presidency of the United States. So I think that we should be forthright and reject an amendment that is contrary to a sacred institution and that I think hurts our democracy.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I will just take a couple of minutes to make a point.

When I referred to the great moralists of history, I merely referred to the fact that one of the essential elements of moral leaders is frugality and sacrifice. That is the only reference I made.

As far as respect for the former Presidents, my father and Richard Nixon were close friends. They served in this House in the same committee together. I do not think anybody in the United States, with the possibility of Mr. Nixon's immediate family,

sorrowed more than my father did at Mr. Nixon's misfortunes.

I would also add that Mr. Nixon has not accepted a speaker's fee since he left the Presidency. I consider that admirable, as well.

Years ago, when they took a vote in this House to provide offices for former Speaker John McCormack of Massachusetts, I was one of the comparatively few who cast a vote against it. Not because of disrespect, I loved him like a second father. I only suggested that if we were going to do something nice and generous to show respect for a former officeholder, we should dig into our own pockets and not those of the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 258, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 253]

AYES—160

Allard	Gallegly	Meyers
Andrews (NJ)	Gekas	Mica
Andrews (TX)	Geren	Miller (CA)
Applegate	Glickman	Miller (FL)
Bachus (AL)	Goodlatte	Minge
Baker (CA)	Grams	Moran
Baker (LA)	Grandy	Murphy
Barlow	Green	Nussle
Barrett (NE)	Gunderson	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Hall (OH)	Orton
Becerra	Hall (TX)	Owens
Bereuter	Hamilton	Packard
Bilirakis	Hancock	Pallone
Bliley	Hansen	Parker
Bonilla	Hefley	Penny
Borski	Herger	Peterson (MN)
Brown (OH)	Hoagland	Petri
Burton	Hoekstra	Pombo
Byrne	Holden	Porter
Canady	Hutchinson	Poshard
Cantwell	Inglis	Quinn
Carr	Inhofe	Ramstad
Clement	Inslee	Roberts
Coble	Jacobs	Roemer
Combest	Johnson (SD)	Rohrabacher
Condit	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Costello	Kanjorski	Roth
Cox	Kaptur	Royce
Crane	Kasich	Sanders
Crapo	Kim	Sarpalius
Cunningham	Kingston	Schaefer
Danner	Klink	Schroeder
DeFazio	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Dickey	Knollenberg	Sharp
Dreier	Kolbe	Shays
Duncan	Kopetski	Shuster
Dunn	Kreidler	Slatery
Durbin	Kyl	Smith (OR)
Emerson	Lancaster	Snowe
English (OK)	LaRocco	Solomon
Eshoo	Laughlin	Spratt
Evans	Leach	Stark
Everett	Lloyd	Stenholm
Ewing	Long	Strickland
Fawell	Manzullo	Stump
Fish	McCloskey	Swett
Ford (TN)	McCrery	Talent
Frank (MA)	McInnis	Tanner
Franks (CT)	McMillan	Tauzin
Franks (NJ)	Meehan	Taylor (MS)

Taylor (NC)  
Upton  
Valentine  
Vento

Volkmer  
Wyden  
Yates  
Young (FL)

## NOES—258

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Archer  
Army  
Bacchus (FL)  
Baesler  
Ballenger  
Barca  
Barcia  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bateman  
Bellenson  
Bentley  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Bishop  
Blackwell  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonior  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Brooks  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Cooper  
Coppersmith  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Darden  
de la Garza  
de Lugo (VI)  
Deal  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Edwards (CA)  
Edwards (TX)  
Engel  
English (AZ)  
Farr  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Fields (TX)  
Filner  
Fingerhut  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Fowler  
Frost  
Furse  
Gallo  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor

Gilman  
Gingrich  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Greenwood  
Gutierrez  
Hamburg  
Hastert  
Hastings  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hobson  
Hochbrueckner  
Hoke  
Horn  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Huffington  
Hughes  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
King  
Klecza  
Klein  
LaFalce  
Lambert  
Lantos  
Lazlo  
Lehman  
Levin  
Levy  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Lowe  
Machtley  
Maloney  
Mann  
Manton  
Margolles-  
Mezvinsky  
Markey  
Martinez  
Matsui  
Mazzoli  
McCandless  
McCollum  
McDade  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Michel  
Mineta  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollnari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myers  
Nadler  
Natcher  
Neal (MA)  
Neal (NC)  
Norton (DC)

Zeliff  
Zimmer

Andrews (ME)  
Conyers  
Faleomavaega  
(AS)  
Flake  
Harman  
Hayes  
Henry

## NOT VOTING—21

Hunter  
Istook  
McCurdy  
Meek  
Rangel  
Ridge  
Rush  
Santorum

Schumer  
Synar  
Thomas (WY)  
Thornton  
Washington  
Wilson

□ 1748

Mr. HYDE, Mr. DOOLEY, Ms. LAMBERT and Messrs. GUTIERREZ, PAXON, and HILLIARD changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. MCCLOSKEY, PALLONE, HANCOCK, EVERETT, DICKEY, BECERRA, and KYL changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

## DEATH OF MRS. PAT NIXON

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, it was with a great deal of personal sadness and regret that we learned earlier today of the death of former First Lady Pat Nixon.

This great lady was one of our Nation's most popular and beloved First Ladies.

Her personal graciousness and charm were evident to all, and she also possessed a kind and loving heart.

I can recall her many kindnesses to BOB and Corinne MICHEL over the years.

And I know there are many Members in the House, on both sides of the aisle, who recall her with great personal fondness and affection.

Many Americans who had never had the opportunity to meet her in person recognized from her public appearances that this indeed was a very special lady.

Throughout the years Pat Nixon came to symbolize a kind of quiet, enduring quality of dignity.

Someone once defined courage as "the quality of grace under pressure."

If that is true, Pat Nixon was the embodiment of courage.

Our hearts go out to President Nixon, to his daughters, and the entire family in this hour of loss.

□ 1750

## TRIBUTE TO MRS. NIXON

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, on behalf of all of us who sit on this side of the aisle, and clearly there is no partisanship as relates to this issue, Pat Nixon, as you know, was, indeed, a gracious human being who showed a great deal of courage, who went through great difficulty.

All of us, particularly those of us who are men in this House whose spouses support them, know how difficult it is for them. I know it has been difficult for my wife over the years and

for my family. Pat Nixon embodied the courage that it takes to be the spouse of a public person, a spouse, if you will, who performs a critically important function for this country and who stood by Richard Nixon at times of great personal pain for him and for his family.

I join my good friend and the distinguished minority leader in expressing the deep sadness that all of us feel at the passing of this good and gracious lady.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 502. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 503. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 504. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the procurement of, or for the payment of, the salary of any person engaged in the procurement of any hand or measuring tool(s) not produced in the United States or its possessions except to the extent that the Administrator of General Services or his designee shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of hand or measuring tools produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when needed from sources in the United States and its possessions, or except in accordance with procedures prescribed by section 6-104.4(b) of Armed Services Procurement Regulation dated January 1, 1969, as such regulation existed on June 15, 1970: *Provided*, That a factor of 75 per centum in lieu of 50 per centum shall be used for evaluating foreign source end products against a domestic source end product. This section shall be applicable to all solicitations for bids opened after its enactment.

SEC. 505. None of the funds made available to the General Services Administration pursuant to section 210(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 shall be obligated or expended after the date of enactment of this Act for the procurement by contract of any service which, before such date, was performed by individuals in their capacity as employees of the General Services Administration in any position of guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians, at said date, would be terminated as a result of the procurement of such services, except that such funds may be obligated or expended for the procurement by contract of the covered services with sheltered workshops employing the severely handicapped under Public Law 92-28.

SEC. 506. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used for administrative expenses to close the Federal Information Center of the General Services Administration located in Sacramento, California.

SEC. 507. None of the funds made available by this Act for the Department of the Treasury may be used for the purpose of eliminating any existing requirement for sureties on customs bonds.

SEC. 508. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available for any activity or for paying the salary of any Government employee where funding an activity or paying a salary to a Government employee would result in a decision, determination, rule, regulation, or policy that would prohibit the enforcement of section 307 of the 1930 Tariff Act.

SEC. 509. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available for the purpose of transferring control over the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center located at Glyncro, Georgia, Tucson, Arizona, and Artesia, New Mexico, out of the Treasury Department.

SEC. 510. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not heretofore authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 511. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the payment of the salary of any officer or employee of the United States Postal Service, who—

(1) prohibits or prevents, or attempts or threatens to prohibit or prevent, any officer or employee of the United States Postal Service from having any direct oral or written communication or contact with any Member or committee of Congress in connection with any matter pertaining to the employment of such officer or employee or pertaining to the United States Postal Service in any way, irrespective of whether such communication or contact is at the initiative of such officer or employee or in response to the request or inquiry of such Member or committee; or

(2) removes, suspends from duty without pay, demotes, reduces in rank, seniority, status, pay, or performance of efficiency rating, denies promotion to, relocates, reassigns, transfers, disciplines, or discriminates in regard to any employment right, entitlement, or benefit, or any term or condition of employment of, any officer or employee of the United States Postal Service, or attempts or threatens to commit any of the foregoing actions with respect to such officer or employee, by reason of any communication or contact of such officer or employee with any Member or committee of Congress as described in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

SEC. 512. Funds under this Act shall be available as authorized by sections 4501-4506 of title 5, United States Code, when the achievement involved is certified, or when an award for such achievement is otherwise payable, in accordance with such sections. Such funds may not be used for any purpose with respect to which the preceding sentence relates beyond fiscal year 1994.

SEC. 513. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of the Treasury by this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended to contract out positions in, or downgrade the position classifications of, members of the United States Mint Police Force and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing Police Force, or for studying the feasibility of contracting out such positions.

SEC. 514. The Office of Personnel Management may, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, accept donations of supplies, services, and equipment for the Federal Executive Institute, the Federal Quality Institute, and Executive Seminar Centers for the enhancement of the morale and educational experience of attendees.

SEC. 515. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the

procurement of, or for the payment of, the salary of any person engaged in the procurement of stainless steel flatware not produced in the United States or its possessions, except to the extent that the Administrator of General Services or his designee shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of stainless steel flatware produced in the United States or its possessions, cannot be procured as and when needed from sources in the United States or its possessions or except in accordance with procedures provided by section 6-104.4(b) of Armed Services Procurement Regulations, dated January 1, 1969. This section shall be applicable to all solicitations for bids issued after its enactment.

SEC. 516. The United States Secret Service may, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, accept donations of money to off-set costs incurred while protecting former Presidents and spouses of former Presidents when the former President or spouse travels for the purpose of making an appearance or speech for a payment of money or any thing of value.

SEC. 517. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to withdraw the designation of the Virginia Inland Port at Front Royal, Virginia, as a United States Customs Service port of entry.

SEC. 518. None of the funds made available to the Postal Service by this Act shall be used to transfer mail processing capabilities from the Las Cruces, New Mexico postal facility, and that every effort will be made by the Postal Service to recognize the rapid rate of population growth in Las Cruces and to automate the Las Cruces, New Mexico postal facility in order that mail processing can be expedited and handled in Las Cruces.

SEC. 519. None of the funds in this Act may be used to reduce the rank or rate of pay of a career appointee in the SES upon reassignment or transfer.

SEC. 520. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary for any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service and has within ninety days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Office of Personnel Management as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 521. None of the funds made available to the United States Customs Service may be used to collect or impose any land border processing fee at ports of entry along the United States-Mexico border.

SEC. 522. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to plan, administer, or otherwise carry out a move of the Internal Revenue Service's Automated Collection Unit from the borough of Manhattan, New York City, New York, without prior approval of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

SEC. 523. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may, with respect to an individual employed by the Bureau of the Public Debt in the Washington Metropolitan Region on April 10, 1991, be used to separate, reduce the grade or pay of, or carry out any other adverse personnel action against such individual for declining to accept a directed reassignment to a position outside such region, pursuant to a transfer of any such Bureau's

operations or functions to Parkersburg, West Virginia.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any individual who, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, declines an offer of another position in the Department of the Treasury which is of at least equal pay and which is within the Washington Metropolitan Region.

SEC. 524. In consideration of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) modifying its requirement for acquisition of General Services Administration (GSA) property at the Suitland Federal Center in Suitland, Maryland, GSA shall transfer to WMATA, at no cost, approximately sixteen (16) acres of GSA property to allow WMATA to construct its proposed Suitland Metrorail Station and related surface facilities. GSA will bear no additional costs, as a result of this transaction. The property to be transferred is located at the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Suitland Parkway at Silver Hill Road and is the southeastern most portion of the Suitland Federal Center Complex. It is bounded by Silver Hill Road on the southeast, Suitland Parkway property owned by the National Park Service on the southwest, the existing stream valley between Suitland Parkway and the historic Suitland House on the northwest and on the northeast a line just south of and parallel to a line from the Suitland House to the existing Federal Office Building along Silver Hill Road at Randall Road.

SEC. 525. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any other law which requires that property of the United States be used for a particular purpose, the Administrator of General Services shall convey the property described in subsection (c) to the State of Maryland.

(b) TERMS.—A conveyance of property under this section shall be—

- (1) by quitclaim deed;
- (2) without monetary consideration; and
- (3) subject to such other terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be appropriate.

(c) PROPERTY DESCRIBED.—The property referred to in subsection (a) known as the "Chesapeake Bay Study Site" is property located in the State of Maryland, Queen Annes County, which—

(1) is part of the same land which, by quitclaim deed dated August 25, 1970, and recorded among the land records of Queen Annes County, Maryland, at Liber 53, Folio 200, was granted and conveyed by the State of Maryland, Maryland State Roads Commission, to the United States of America.

(2) contains 55 acres more or less according to a survey prepared by McCrone, Inc., in July 1968 and amended on May 26, 1992.

SEC. 526. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide any non-public information such as mailing or telephone lists to any person or any organization outside of the Federal Government without the approval of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

SEC. 527. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, sick leave provided by section 6307 of title 5, United States Code, may be approved for purposes related to the adoption of a child during fiscal year 1994.

(b) Subsection (a) shall cease to be effective as of September 30, 1994.

SEC. 528. The Administrator of the General Services Administration, shall enter into an agreement to transfer at no cost, to the City of Waltham, Massachusetts, title to a parcel of land located at 424 Trapelo Road for the purpose of establishing the New England

Center for Environmental Education by a nonprofit institution adjacent to the site: *Provided*, That the Administrator and the city of Waltham, shall mutually agree to the amount of land to be transferred to the city for this purpose.

Mr. HOYER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title V of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against title V?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, on Thursday, June 17, I made a commitment to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, that I would make a point of order for him on a provision in this bill and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the language contained in section 527 on page 62 of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would concede my own point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone wish to be heard on the point of order?

Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] wish to be heard?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. When you are winning, why interrupt?

The CHAIRMAN. If not, for obvious reasons, the language in question clearly constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill. The point of order is conceded, and is valid, and the language in question is stricken.

Are there any additional points of order to the title?

If not, are there any amendments to the title?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: At the end of Title V, add the following new sections:

SEC. . COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.

No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. . PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or sub-contract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio has reviewed this amendment with the majority, and we have no objection.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, we, too, have looked at the gentleman's amendment; we think it is very wise, and we are in support of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds had made a 10-percent cut on courthouse projects under our jurisdiction.

With that we assigned the money that was the fruit of those cuts, about \$44 million, to a building purchase fund, with the glut of buildings that are available out there, so that the GSA could go out and engage in, perhaps engage in purchasing and save some money.

I know that we are limited on funds in the appropriation bill, and we want to commend the chairman for a fine bill.

But I want to know what would be the prospects if there are any further cuts or unallocated moneys that might develop in the process at conference with the other body, that some of those moneys can be placed toward that building purchase fund so GSA might be able, in fact, to buy some of these

buildings and save an awful lot of money with the costs of construction today.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee for raising this point. It is a point similar to the point that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] raised on this floor with respect to the availability of either purchase or lease of space that has been depressed in the marketplace and where the Federal Government could get a good buy. I think the gentleman's idea is a good idea. We will focus on it from this point on and in conference, and in the future.

I think the gentleman raises a good point.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I appreciate the gentleman's support. I wanted to let the gentleman and the ranking member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], know this, that we do like, as a committee, to see that building purchase fund and give GSA that option. We think it is very cost-effective. I appreciate the gentleman's support on that issue.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the opinion of the gentleman from Ohio. We have discussed this off the floor together, and I think it makes eminently good sense at a time when we do have a real estate market overloaded with a lot of very valuable property that can be bought a few cents on the dollar, and that it is only wise and prudent that we take that route when we are dealing with public funds. It seems to me it makes a great deal of sense.

That may be the thing that is wrong with it, that it makes too such sense.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I appreciate that.

I want to first of all thank Chairman HOYER for the excellent job he has done on this bill and the leadership he has shown.

As the gentleman is aware, the Public Works Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds—which I chair—and the full Committee on Public Works and Transportation, reduced the authorized funding level for seven Federal courthouse projects by 10 percent during the subcommittee's markup of GSA's fiscal year 1994 Capital Improvement Program.

I was pleased to see that the Appropriations Committee agreed with these spending cuts and included them in this bill.

My subcommittee and the full committee also adopted a resolution that authorized GSA to use the \$44 million in savings derived from the 10-percent cut exclusively for its building purchase program.

As the gentleman knows, GSA has the authority, under section 3 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, to "Acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise,

any building" to meet the housing needs of the Federal Government.

Unfortunately, in recent years Congress has not provided GSA with funds to implement this worthwhile program.

The result has been a number of lost opportunities by GSA to purchase buildings at bargain prices and get out from under costly long-term lease arrangements.

H.R. 2403 does not include any appropriations for GSA's building purchase program.

I'd like to ask the gentleman if he would be willing, in conference, to work with our friends in the other body to include in the conference report some funds for GSA's building purchase program?

The CHAIRMAN. Are there additional amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE VI—GOVERNMENTWIDE GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

SECTION 601. Funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to pay travel to the United States for the immediate family of employees serving abroad in cases of death or life threatening illness of said employee.

SEC. 602. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States receiving appropriated funds under this or any other Act for fiscal year 1994 shall obligate or expend any such funds, unless such department, agency, or instrumentality has in place, and will continue to administer in good faith, a written policy designed to ensure that all of its workplaces are free from the illegal use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances (as defined in the Controlled Substances Act) by the officers and employees of such department, agency, or instrumentality.

SEC. 603. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of September 13, 1982 (Public Law 97-258, 31 U.S.C. 1345), any agency, department or instrumentality of the United States which provides or proposes to provide child care services for Federal employees may reimburse any Federal employee or any person employed to provide such services for travel, transportation, and subsistence expenses incurred for training classes, conferences or other meetings in connection with the provision of such services: *Provided*, That any per diem allowance made pursuant to this section shall not exceed the rate specified in regulations prescribed pursuant to section 5707 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 604. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of buses, ambulances, law enforcement, and undercover surveillance vehicles), is hereby fixed at \$7,100 except station wagons for which the maximum shall be \$8,100: *Provided*, That these limits may be exceeded by not to exceed \$3,700 for police-type vehicles, and by not to exceed \$4,000 for special heavy-duty vehicles: *Provided further*, That the limits set forth in this section may not be exceeded by more than five percent for electric or hybrid vehicles purchased for demonstration under the provisions of the Electric and Hybrid Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1976: *Provided further*, That the limits set forth in this section may be exceeded by the incremental cost of clean alternative fuels vehicles acquired pursuant to

Public Law 101-549 over the cost of comparable conventionally fueled vehicles.

SEC. 605. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 5992-24.

SEC. 606. Unless otherwise specified during the current fiscal year no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in the continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, has filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date and is actually residing in the United States, (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States, (4) is an alien from Cuba, Poland, South Vietnam, or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or (5) South Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian refugees paroled in the United States after January 1, 1975, or (6) nationals of the People's Republic of China protected by Executive Order Number 12711 of April 11, 1990: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his or her status have been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of Ireland, Israel, the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the current defense effort, or to international broadcasters employed by the U.S. Information Agency, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

SEC. 607. Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for payment to the General Services Administration for charges for space and services and those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 749), the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972 (87 Stat. 216), or other applicable law.

SEC. 608. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to chapter 91 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 3109; and the objects specified under

this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 609. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve the nomination of said person.

SEC. 610. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including currencies) owed to or owned by the United States may be used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which appropriations are made for the current fiscal year (including the carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That such credits received as exchanged allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may be used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by law, without reimbursement to the Treasury.

SEC. 611. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be available for interagency financing of boards, commissions, councils, committees, or similar groups (whether or not they are interagency entities) which do not have a prior and specific statutory approval to receive financial support from more than one agency or instrumentality.

SEC. 612. Funds made available by this or any other Act to the "Postal Service Fund" (39 U.S.C. 2003) shall be available for employment of guards for all buildings and areas owned or occupied by the Postal Service and under the charge and control of the Postal Service, and such guards shall have, with respect to such property, the powers of special policemen provided by the first section of the Act of June 1, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 281; 40 U.S.C. 318), and, as to property owned or occupied by the Postal Service, the Postmaster General may take the same actions as the Administrator of General Services may take under the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of the Act of June 1, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 281; 40 U.S.C. 318a, 318b), attaching thereto penal consequences under the authority and within the limits provided in section 4 of the Act of June 1, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 281; 40 U.S.C. 318c).

SEC. 613. None of the funds made available pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be used to implement, administer, or enforce any regulation which has been disapproved pursuant to a resolution of disapproval duly adopted in accordance with the applicable law of the United States.

SEC. 614. No part of any appropriation contained in, or funds made available by, this or any other Act, shall be available for any agency to pay to the Administrator of the General Services Administration a higher rate per square foot for rental of space and services (established pursuant to section 210(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended) than the rate per square foot established for the space and services by the General Services Administration for the fiscal year for which appropriations were granted.

SEC. 615. (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no part of any of the funds

appropriated for the fiscal year ending on September 30, 1994, by this or any other Act, may be used to pay any prevailing rate employee described in section 5342(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code—

(A) during the period from the date of expiration of the limitation imposed by section 616 of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1993, until the first day of the first applicable pay period that begins on or after July 1, 1994, in an amount that exceeds the rate payable for the applicable grade and step of the applicable wage schedule in accordance with such section 616; and

(B) during the period consisting of the remainder of fiscal year 1994, in an amount that exceeds, as a result of a wage survey adjustment, the rate payable under paragraph (1) by more than the percentage adjustment taking effect in fiscal year 1994 under section 5304 of title 5, United States Code (if any) with respect to General Schedule positions located within the boundaries of the wage area (or local wage area, as applicable) of such prevailing rate employee.

(2) If the application of paragraph (1)(B) with respect to a particular wage area (or local wage area) would cause more than 1 percentage limitation being applicable with respect to such area, rates for prevailing rate employees (as described in paragraph (1)) within such area shall be subject to such limitation or limitations as shall apply under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no prevailing rate employee described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 5342(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, and no employee covered by section 5348 of such title, may be paid during the periods for which subsection (a) is in effect at a rate that exceeds the rates that would be payable under subsection (a) were subsection (a) applicable to such employee.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the rates payable to an employee who is covered by this section and who is paid from a schedule that was not in existence on September 30, 1993, shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates of premium pay for employees subject to this section may not be changed from the rates in effect on September 30, 1993, except to the extent determined by the Office of Personnel Management to be consistent with the purpose of this section.

(e) The provisions of this section shall apply with respect to pay for services performed by any affected employee on or after October 1, 1993.

(f) For the purpose of administering any provision of law (including section 8431 of title 5, United States Code, and any rule or regulation, that provides premium pay, retirement, life insurance, or any other employee benefit) that requires any deduction or contribution, or that imposes any requirement or limitation, on the basis of a rate of salary or basic pay, the rate of salary or basic pay payable after the application of this section shall be treated as the rate of salary or basic pay.

(g) Nothing in this section shall be considered to permit or require the payment to any employee covered by this section at a rate in excess of the rate that would be payable were this section not in effect.

(h) The Office of Personnel Management may prescribe any regulations which may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 616. During the period in which the head of any department or agency, or any other officer or civilian employee of the Government appointed by the President of the United States, holds office, no funds may be obligated or expended in excess of \$5,000 to furnish or redecorate the office of such department head, agency head, officer or employee, or to purchase furniture or make improvements for any such office, unless advance notice of such furnishing or redecoration is expressly approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. For the purposes of this section the word "office" shall include the entire suite of offices assigned to the individual, as well as any other space used primarily by the individual or the use of which is directly controlled by the individual.

SEC. 617. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 112 and 113 of title 3, United States Code, each Executive agency detailing any personnel shall submit a report on an annual basis in each fiscal year to the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations on all employees or members of the armed services detailed to Executive agencies, listing the grade, position, and offices of each person detailed and the agency to which each such person is detailed.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to Federal employees or members of the armed services detailed to or from—

- (1) the Central Intelligence Agency;
- (2) the National Security Agency;
- (3) the Defense Intelligence Agency;
- (4) the offices within the Department of Defense for the collection of specialized national foreign intelligence through reconnaissance programs;
- (5) the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State;

(6) any agency, office, or unit of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Drug Enforcement Administration of the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Energy performing intelligence functions; and

(7) the Director of Central Intelligence.

(c) The exemptions in part (b) of this section are not intended to apply to information on the use of personnel detailed to or from the intelligence agencies which is currently being supplied to the Senate and House Intelligence and Appropriations Committees by the executive branch through budget justification materials and other reports.

(d) For the purposes of this section, the term "Executive agency" has the same meaning as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code (except that the provisions of section 104(2) of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply) and includes the White House Office, the Executive Residence, and any office, council, or organizational unit of the Executive Office of the President.

SEC. 618. No funds appropriated in this or any other Act for fiscal year 1994 may be used to implement or enforce the agreements in Standard Forms 312 and 4355 of the Government or any other nondisclosure policy, form or agreement if such policy, form or agreement does not contain the following provisions:

"These restrictions are consistent with and do not supersede conflict with or otherwise alter the employee obligations, rights or liabilities created by Executive Order 12356; section 7211 of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures to Congress);

section 1034 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by the Military Whistleblower Protection Act (governing disclosure to Congress by members of the military); section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by the Whistleblower Protection Act (governing disclosures of illegality, waste, fraud, abuse or public health or safety threats); the Intelligence Identities Protection Act of 1982 (50 U.S.C. 421 et seq.) (governing disclosures that could expose confidential Government agents), and the statutes which protect against disclosure that may compromise the national security, including sections 641, 793, 794, 798, and 952 of title 18, United States Code, and section 4(b) of the Subversive Activities Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. section 783(b)). The definitions, requirements, obligations, rights, sanctions and liabilities created by said Executive Order and listed statutes are incorporated into this Agreement and are controlling."

SEC. 619. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no executive branch agency shall purchase, construct, and/or lease any additional facilities, except within or contiguous to existing locations, to be used for the purpose of conducting Federal law enforcement training without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 620. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be expended by any Federal agency to procure any product or service that is subject to the provisions of Public Law 89-306 and that will be available under the procurement by the Administrator of General Services known as "FTS2000" unless—

(1) such product or service is procured by the Administrator of General Services as part of the procurement known as "FTS2000"; or

(2) that agency establishes to the satisfaction of the Administrator of General Services that—

(A) the agency's requirements for such procurement are unique and cannot be satisfied by property and service procured by the Administrator of General Services as part of the procurement known as "FTS2000"; and

(B) the agency procurement, pursuant to such delegation, would be cost-effective and would not adversely affect the cost-effectiveness of the FTS2000 procurement.

(b) After July 31, 1994, subsection (a) shall apply only if the Administrator of General Services has reported that the FTS2000 procurement is producing prices that allow the Government to satisfy its requirements for such procurement in the most cost-effective manner.

SEC. 621. (a) No amount of any grant made by a Federal agency shall be used to finance the acquisition of goods or services (including construction services) unless the recipient of the grant agrees, as a condition for the receipt of such grant, to—

(1) specify in any announcement of the awarding of the contract for the procurement of the goods and services involved (including construction services) the amount of Federal funds that will be used to finance the acquisition; and

(2) express the amount announced pursuant to paragraph (1) as a percentage of the total costs of the planned acquisition.

(b) The requirements of subsection (a) shall not apply to a procurement for goods or services (including construction services) that has an aggregate value of less than \$500,000.

SEC. 622. Notwithstanding section 1346 of title 31, United States Code, or section 611 of this Act, funds made available for fiscal year

1994 by this or any other Act shall be available for the interagency funding of national security and emergency preparedness telecommunications initiatives which benefit multiple Federal departments, agencies, or entities, as provided by Executive Order Numbered 12472 (April 3, 1984).

SEC. 623. Notwithstanding any provisions of this or any other Act, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, any department, division, bureau, or office may use funds appropriated by this or any other Act to install telephone lines, necessary equipment, and to pay monthly charges, in any private residence or private apartment of an employee who has been authorized to work at home in accordance with guidelines issued by the Office of Personnel Management: *Provided*, That the head of the department, division, bureau, or office certifies that adequate safeguards against private misuse exist, and that the service is necessary for direct support of the agency's mission.

SEC. 624. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be obligated or expended by any Federal department, agency, or other instrumentality for the salaries or expenses of any employee appointed to a position of a confidential or policy-determining character excepted from the competitive service pursuant to section 3302 of title 5, United States Code, without a certification to the Office of Personnel Management from the head of the Federal department, agency, or other instrumentality employing the Schedule C appointee that the Schedule C position was not created solely or primarily in order to detail the employee to the White House.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to Federal employees or members of the armed services detailed to or from—

- (1) the Central Intelligence Agency;
- (2) the National Security Agency;
- (3) the Defense Intelligence Agency;
- (4) the offices within the Department of Defense for the collection of specialized national foreign intelligence through reconnaissance programs;
- (5) the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State;
- (6) any agency, office, or unit of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Drug Enforcement Administration of the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury, and the Department of Energy performing intelligence functions; and
- (7) the Director of Central Intelligence.

SEC. 625. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be used to relocate the Department of Justice Immigration Judges from offices located in Phoenix, Arizona to new quarters in Florence, Arizona without the prior approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Mr. HOYER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VI of the bill through line 3, page 81, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I would offer. It is a limiting amendment and, therefore, comes at the conclusion of the bill. Therefore,

the chairman of the subcommittee would most properly move to rise, and the amendment would not be in order.

So I choose at this moment to rise to explain that amendment and why I would seek to defeat the motion for the Committee to rise so that this amendment might be made in order.

Let me just explain very briefly what the amendment would do. It is an amendment that deals, and we have had some discussion with this last week when we were debating this appropriation bill, this amendment deals with the levels of White House staff and the cuts that might be made to that. I want to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that I do not offer this amendment in a mean-spirited way.

I believe the President of the United States, whoever that may be, should have whatever staff he needs, and I would vote to do that, to give him that staff, if he asks us for it. I will vote to give him 100 percent of the fiscal year 1993 numbers, and I will vote to give him whatever he says he needs as long as he is straightforward in asking for it.

But the President has campaigned on the notion that he would ask for a 25-percent reduction, and my amendment would do that. It would reduce the White House staffing by 25 percent from the fiscal year 1993 levels, 408 to 306 full-time equivalent employees in 1994. That is as President Clinton promised that he would do. My amendment would simply help him fulfill that promise.

The administration and this bill claim that it already achieves a 25-percent staff cut in the Executive Office of the President. But a closer look at the numbers reveals that a shell game is really being played, and that there is nowhere near a 25-percent reduction.

Here is how that shall game is played: First, the Clinton budget reduces the staff baseline by excluding the Office of Management and Budget and the U.S. Trade Representative staff, whose 800 employees make up 36 percent of the Executive Office of the President budget. This makes the reported 350-employee cut appear to be a greater percentage than it actually is. Including those employees in the baseline figure drops the purported reduction from 25 to 16 percent.

The administration has implied that OMB and USTR are excluded from the baseline figure because both are Cabinet-level offices, but as the Congressional Research Service, no partisan organization that I know of, as the CRS has pointed out in its study, the Office of Drug Policy is also a Cabinet-level office, but its staff is to be reduced by 83 percent. That reduction gets counted in the overall number of the employees that the President is reducing.

In other words, offices that are being cut are part of the White House. Offices

that are not being cut are going to be excluded for purposes of counting how we are going to achieve a 25-percent reduction.

Moreover, as the Congressional Research Service pointed out, both OMB and USTR are integral units of the Executive Office of the President, funded with EOP appropriations, and playing important roles helping the President to implement programs and policies.

Second, the baseline number of White House employees does not exclude all the people working at the White House. It does not include a category called nondetailees. Such employees are not carried on the roster of the White House or other EOP units. There is no way of knowing how many of them are working at the White House and what they are doing, and that is why the GAO said in its report that the number of nondetailees should be reported to Congress.

□ 1800

With the 3,092 nondetailees who have traditionally worked at the White House properly added to the employment roster and on the USTR, the 25 percent reduction that the President is talking about shrinks to a mere 6.6 percent in this legislation. The White House employees, this ever-changing group of White House employees, is then expanded in the next step in this ruse. A group of people known as the assignees who perform normal duties at the White House while permanently or temporarily assigned to the White House are included in the non-detailee category; that is, they are not counted on the White House staff. So even the GAO questions whether these assignees do fall correctly into that non-detailee category.

Through hocus-pocus that would have made Houdini proud, the administration has made the number of employees smaller which, in turn, allows it to claim bigger reductions in staff. It has expanded the definition of people who are not White House employees and thereby increased the number of uncounted employees.

Even the White House staff within the EOP gets to play a role in this game. Clinton claimed that he would reduce his staff by 419 by October 1 of this year, claiming this would cut 42 employees, or 9 percent, from his staff. But the White House staff is normally around 419, not the 461 counted by Clinton on the eve of the Presidential election.

The new President and many Members of Congress seem committed to continually improving our vocabulary. Mr. Chairman, I urge we defeat the motion to rise so that this amendment can be considered and voted upon.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk on this House floor about hocus-

pocus and about taking very loosely what the facts on page 43 of the report show very clearly.

Now, you can include figures and exclude figures and come up with different percentages. But the fact of the matter is irrefutable. However you include all of the agencies included within the Executive Office of the President accounts—and of course OMB is in fact a Cabinet agency—the fact of the matter is there are fewer employees funded in this budget for fiscal year 1994 for President Clinton than there were for President Bush in fiscal year 1993, period. There are fewer people.

Let me go over it for you so you know it when this motion comes up which we will oppose.

There were actually in the White House, people working in the offices which the gentleman referred to, excluding OMB, U.S. Trade Representative, and OFPP, 1,394 people. There will be 1,044 people funded under this budget. That is 350 fewer people.

That is a 25.1-percent reduction in the employees included in that category. Now, of course you can add others in there, and of course they added them in a way that served their interest. But let us go to the next category, the category that was not included.

There were 800 employees under President Bush, either actual OMB, OFPP, or U.S. Trade Representative employees or other employees and detailees. There will be under this budget, 763 employees. That is 37 employees less.

Now, obviously that is only a 5-percent reduction in those categories. If you add them together, you come up with a smaller percentage, and we can all play games. And I can exclude some and come up with a higher percentage than 25 percent.

The bottom line is it is not a service to Washington, our institutions or the respect of the American public for their Government, as Mr. KING so eloquently stated, to continue to play these silly games. They were not played, I suggest to you, with Mr. Reagan. They were not played. And I have been on this committee for 12 years.

Now, I understand that the last year of the Bush administration we had a fight. We had a fight about a substantive issue, whether an office was in fact subverting the regulatory process. We disagreed on that. And that Council was funded at the level of \$87,000. Very strenuously, from the other side of the aisle, we heard, "You ought not to get in this; the President ought to have the flexibility." Clearly the President ought to have some flexibility to manage the Office to which he is constitutionally elected. It is the only other office in the Government of the United States like ours, elected by the people, responsible to the people.

I will oppose this amendment. I will make the motion to rise and I will op-

pose this amendment if we do not rise. I think it is unfortunate that we continue to berate and misrepresent. I understand if you put  $x$  number of figures in here, you come up with a different percentage; if you read page 43, that is what the President will be limited to. And it is a 25-percent reduction in those offices as set forth.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

First of all, let me say that I would concede that there are less numbers here. That is not the issue. I said that at the outset. There are less numbers.

Second point: I do not believe, despite what the gentleman said, that I am offering this in the sense of—I am trying to be as nonpartisan as possible in offering that. I say that because President Bush, President Reagan did not campaign on a 25-percent reduction; yet the current President of the United States did do that.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, if he did campaign on that, he has done it. If you believe page 43 misrepresents the figures we are funding, that is one thing. But if you believe it is an accurate representation of the figures—you may not like which offices are in which columns, I understand that. But I do not know that you have a piece of paper on which Mr. Clinton said when he was a candidate, "I am going to include this office in and that office out." He does in fact reduce 25 percent in the White House and in the Executive Offices of the President the net number of employees. I think that is conceded. This is his list. This is how he wants to manage the White House to serve the people who have elected him. We think he ought to have that opportunity.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we are kicking a lot of dust up in the air. We are almost playing a shell game here. I think the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], has put his finger on the button. The White House Office is being cut by 2 percent.

But the promise of the President of the United States was to cut the White House staff by 25 percent.

I used to work on the White House staff, and it is interesting for me to note that throughout that period of time the Congress complained that the White House was overstuffed. I have to tell you that I have voted consistently since I have been here to reduce that staff as well as to reduce our own because I agree. Franklin Roosevelt ran World War II out of the West Wing.

Not too long ago, not too many years ago, the Old Executive Office Building was named the War, Navy, and State buildings. Now the President of the United States has put his staff in

there. It spilled over to fill up that entire building. And they had to construct another building across the street called the New Executive Office Building. This is not helpful to the mission of the President of the United States. We can actually assist in good Government by helping President Clinton fulfill this campaign pledge to cut not by 2 percent but by 25 percent.

President Clinton repeatedly said for weeks, "I promise to cut the White House staff by 25 percent, and I did it." Then it turned out that the newspapers got on his case and explained that, no, he did not do it, he did not do it at all; he, in fact, increased spending.

Then the President and the Members of this body said, "Well, we will do it next year." This is our opportunity to do it for next year. But instead of cutting by 25 percent, we are cutting by 2 percent.

Unless we pass the Kolbe amendment, we will once again fuel the cynicism abroad in America about the way this body operates.

Let us be honest for a change, let us cut by 25 percent.

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

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read just one paragraph from the Congressional Research Service report and then I would like, if the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] would yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for a question, which I would pose. This is the paragraph:

On February 9, 1993, President Clinton announced he was fulfilling a campaign promise with his proposal to reduce the 'White House staff' by 25 percent. The President said the cuts would also reduce the 'White House budget' by five percent. The goals and effect of the proposed action are unclear, however, because staff and budget baseline numbers used are selective and the terms 'White House staff' and 'White House budget' have been redefined. If White House staff is defined in its normally accepted manner, i.e., to include staff only in the White House Office, the actual proposed reduction is 9.1 percent. That percentage would be lower if the baseline count had not excluded many employees working in and supporting the White House. Independent verification of the actual percent reduction is not possible because the exact number of personnel working in and supporting the White House has yet to be released.

Now, that was in May of this year.

The question I would pose to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] if he is yielded to by the gentleman from California for this purpose, the gentleman referred to page, I think he meant 43—

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. KOLBE. And the gentleman is correct, it shows a 25.11-percent reduction. But is it not accurate that that excludes the Office of Management and Budget and the United States Trade

Representative, which are labeled apparently as Cabinet-level offices, but includes the reductions in the Drug Policy Office? And what is the reason for including Drug Policy and excluding the others in counting the reduction?

Mr. COX. Reclaiming my time, and I will yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for the purpose of answering that question, I would add simply this: I have also moved to help the President fulfill his campaign pledge to cut congressional spending on itself by 25 percent. I went to the Rules Committee and sought the opportunity when we did legislative appropriations on this floor to bring that amendment here.

□ 1810

That opportunity was denied on a rather partisan basis. I hope we do not do that again here today.

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

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the denial of the right to offer amendments, this is an open rule. We have had a number of amendments to cut this provision by percentages and by money. They were not passed. The opportunity was there.

Mr. COX. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I just hope we can have an up or down vote on the Kolbe amendment and that we will not have to resort to a procedural ruse.

Mr. HOYER. It is not a procedural ruse, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox]. These are the rules of the House. It is not a procedural ruse.

We have to stop accusing our institutions of flimflam and ruses and fraud and things like that. We only demean ourselves.

Stop it. Stop demeaning this institution. Stop demeaning the Presidency. Stop demeaning what you are doing. Stand up for what you are doing.

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

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman gets upset by this, but the fact is that a few years ago the rules of the House were changed to prevent this kind of amendment from coming up. It was specifically done to prevent us from being able to offer amendments that said none of the funds may be spent in particular areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. WALKER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. COX was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that in years past this would have been an entirely legitimate amendment to bring to the House floor, and we would not have had to go through the motion to rise.

So while the gentleman makes an emotional point about the demeaning of the institution, the fact is that the institution has demeaned itself by taking a lot of liberties with the ability of Members to bring cutting amendments to the floor.

We would be far better off if we allowed these kinds of limiting amendments and allowed the American people to decide whether or not this institution was doing its job well.

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

Mr. COX. The gentleman from Arizona, I think, had me originally yield for the purpose of getting an answer to his question about the OMB, USTR, and the selectivity of including parts of the White House, and not other parts in this cut.

Mr. HOYER. The President made a determination as to how he wanted to present his budget.

The OMB obviously is a Cabinet agency and he projected it as such. The Trade Representative is as well.

The President has often made a judgment with respect to the Office of National Drug Control Policy and substantially reduced their personnel because he believes that is something he ought to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. KOLBE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. COX was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I am essentially finished. The President decided that is the way he wanted to configure the Executive Office.

The Executive Office is his organizational mechanism of carrying out policy. It is any President's organization; I do not mean just President Clinton, and that is the way he has projected it.

Now, the gentleman can disagree, as I indicated. The gentleman can argue that he ought to have this office or that office in one column or the other, and obviously I agree with what is incontrovertible, that if you change one from another, it changes the percentages; but the point is he has in fact carried out his pledge.

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentleman from California will continue to yield Mr. Chairman, in the remaining time I just want to make it clear to the chairman of the subcommittee that whatever has been said here, I did not claim this was a ruse by rising. I simply said that I wanted to rise under striking the last word to explain the amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I was not referring to my distinguished friend.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ORTON

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ORTON: Page 81, at the end of line 9, add the following:

SEC. 626. None of the funds made available in this act for "Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents" may be used for partisan political activities.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. It simply indicates that the funds which we have allowed and appropriated under this act for use by the offices of former Presidents would be available for their use; however, should be limited to their use in official duties of an ex-President, not including any political activities.

It is clear to me, and I believe to the American taxpayers, that the taxpayers of this country should not be subsidizing the expenses of an ex-President when he is involved in partisan political activities.

This amendment is very simple and to the point. I believe it should not be opposed by any Member from either side of the aisle.

I would just like to cite from an Associated Press article reported today, wherein the discussion in the article has to do with a stipend presented by the GOP political party to Presidents Reagan and Bush. The Chairman of the RNC stated the following in justifying the stipend that it "was felt \* \* \* they should not spend taxpayers' money on their office accounts for their political work."

I think this is agreed upon by everyone that the taxpayer funds should not be used for partisan political purposes, and this amendment would eliminate that.

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

Mr. ORTON. I will yield for a question.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. We agreed, Mr. Chairman, to accept the gentleman's amendment without raising a point of order if we did not get into some partisan bantering, and I believe the gentleman has stepped over the line, I say to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

Mr. ORTON. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, that is what I was whispering to the gentleman when I was listening to him.

What he was saying is that the RNC apparently has funds available for former Presidents for this purpose because they do not believe they ought to use the public funds that we are providing.

So what the gentleman is saying in effect is that the RNC policy agrees with this amendment.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. In theory, Mr. Chairman, we agree with what the gentleman is trying to do, I will say that. I agree with what the gentleman is trying to do, because I do not think taxpayer money should be used for any kind of political purposes by anybody.

Mr. ORTON. Certainly my point, Mr. Chairman, was that this issue I believe is one that is not partisan, and in fact the principle is agreed to by both parties.

Mr. Chairman, if there is no further discussion, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting that we allowed that funding amendment to come up, but the gentleman from Arizona is probably going to have a problem getting his funding limitation amendment to the floor.

In other words, we are being selective about what we are going to permit to come to the floor in terms of fund limitations.

But I do wonder about this page 43 that got referred to fairly often.

Do I understand that everything on page 43 is what consists of the Executive Office of the President, that the committee is in fact saying that virtually everything on page 43 is the Executive Office of the President, that the committee is in fact saying that virtually everything on page 43 is the Executive Office of the President?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, what I would represent to the gentleman is that this is the presentation of the President for the executive branch as to their configuration of their budget, yes.

Mr. WALKER. So the White House says, and the committee agrees, that what we have on page 43 is what consists of the Executive Office of the President?

Now, is that not typically what we call the White House?

Mr. HOYER. No.

Mr. WALKER. Oh, it is not?

Mr. HOYER. It is the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. WALKER. Which lines of this do we typically call the White House, the thing up there that says White House?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. WALKER. All right, that is reduced by 8.5 percent.

Mr. HOYER. Correct.

Mr. WALKER. That is not 25 percent. What I remember is the President campaigning around the country saying he was going to cut the White House by 25 percent, or at least he was going to cut the Office of the Presidency, he was going to cut something by 25 percent.

Mr. HOYER. Correct.

Mr. WALKER. Now, what we have here is a lot of places where he cut, all of a sudden we have a listing that he cut a bunch of places by 100 percent. That gives you a pretty good percentage when you are cutting things by 100 percent, including, for instance, the Council on Environmental Quality. If you absolutely eliminate every employee of the Council of Environmental Quality, call that a piece of the White House and then say you have reduced the whole thing by 25 percent, you come up with a pretty good figure; but the fact is that it is hard to tell here whether we have fish or fowl.

We have a page that says Executive Office of the President. It turns out that is not a 25-percent cut. It does not come close to being a 25-percent cut.

The only way to get to the 25-percent cut is by juggling some offices up into the category and juggling other offices down out of the category, and it happens to be that the ones who got juggled up in have 33-percent cuts, 19-percent cuts, 100-percent cuts, 100-percent cuts, 100-percent cuts. There are all kinds of 100-percent cuts in there is what gets them to the 25-percent figure.

□ 1820

All I am concerned about is the fact that this is kind of a game of charades, when we play this kind of a game in order to come up with a figure that evidently sustains a political need, because what we have seen over the last few weeks is the President consistently going across the country saying, "I've made my sacrifice. I took a 25-percent cut in the White House, and so, therefore, when I'm asking the country to make a sacrifice as well, believe me I know what the pain is because I've done it."

Mr. Chairman, what he has done is juggled figures, and that is what disturbs us a little bit when the gentleman from Arizona wants to offer an amendment and he does not get a chance to do so on the floor.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Very quickly, Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is driving at is precisely what I tried to get at in my amendment by dealing only with line 1 on page 43. That is the line labeled "White House," to reduce that by 25 percent. I realize that with the signees, nonsignees, detailees, nondetailees, they will have whatever number they need in the White House, and we cannot really get at that figure. But all we are trying to drive at with this amendment is the White House number itself.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, just in closing, these are the usual, normal Executive Office of the President accounts, and I have submitted that they can be organized in ways that change the percentages. The gentleman is correct on that.

Mr. WALKER. Have we ever organized it this way before on that page?

Mr. HOYER. These are all the traditional agencies—

Mr. WALKER. No, but have we ever had this line in the middle that divides it out, and then gives us a 25-percent cut figure, and then lists some of the rest of them below that? Have we ever done that in the budget before?

Mr. HOYER. I frankly do not know, and frankly, from my standpoint, it does not matter. Let me tell the gentleman why.

The President of the United States has certain funds to run the Executive Office of the President. He has chosen to rearrange some of the priorities differently from Mr. Bush, and I do not have a specific comparison. Mr. Bush did it slightly different than Mr. Reagan. I am sure Mr. Reagan did it slightly different than Mr. Carter.

My point is: Let us forget about the percentages by account.

Mr. WALKER. We cannot forget about the percentages because that is the basis on which the President has made the judgment. He was the one that told us he was going to cut 25 percent.

Mr. HOYER. And he is the one that gave us this list with a total reduction of 25 percent.

Mr. WALKER. And the list shows something completely different than we have ever had before in order to give him the figures he needs. That is what we are complaining about.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to title V, the Clerk will complete the reading of title VI.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1994".

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 171, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

AYES—241

Abercrombie	Glickman	Ortiz
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Orton
Andrews (ME)	Gordon	Owens
Andrews (NJ)	Green	Pallone
Andrews (TX)	Gutierrez	Parker
Applegate	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Bacchus (FL)	Hall (TX)	Payne (NJ)
Baesler	Hamburg	Payne (VA)
Barca	Hamilton	Pelosi
Barcia	Hastings	Penny
Barlow	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Hinchee	Pickett
Bellenson	Hoagland	Pickle
Berman	Hochbrueckner	Pomeroy
Bevill	Holden	Poshard
Billbray	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bishop	Hughes	Rahall
Blackwell	Hutto	Rangel
Bonior	Insee	Reed
Borski	Jefferson	Reynolds
Boucher	Johnson (GA)	Richardson
Brewster	Johnson (SD)	Roemer
Brooks	Johnson, E. B.	Romero-Barcelo
Browder	Johnston	(PR)
Brown (CA)	Kanjorski	Rose
Brown (FL)	Kaptur	Rostenkowski
Brown (OH)	Kennedy	Rowland
Bryant	Kennelly	Roybal-Allard
Byrne	Kildee	Sabo
Cantwell	Kiecicka	Sanders
Cardin	Klein	Sangmeister
Carr	Klink	Sarpalius
Chapman	Kopetski	Sawyer
Clay	Kreidler	Schenk
Clayton	LaFalce	Schroeder
Clement	Lambert	Scott
Clyburn	Lancaster	Serrano
Coleman	Lantos	Sharp
Collins (IL)	LaRocco	Shepherd
Collins (MI)	Laughlin	Sisisky
Condit	Lehman	Skaggs
Cooper	Levin	Skelton
Coppersmith	Lewis (GA)	Slattery
Costello	Lipinski	Slaughter
Coyne	Lloyd	Smith (IA)
Cramer	Long	Spratt
Danner	Lowey	Stark
Darden	Maloney	Stenholm
de la Garza	Mann	Stokes
de Lugo (VI)	Margolies-	Strickland
Deal	Mezvinsky	Studds
DeLauro	Martinez	Stupak
DeLums	Matsui	Swett
Deutsch	Mazzoli	Swift
Dicks	McCloskey	Tanner
Dingell	McCurdy	Tauzin
Dixon	McDermott	Tejeda
Dooley	McHale	Thompson
Durbin	McKinney	Thurman
Edwards (CA)	McNulty	Towns
Edwards (TX)	Meehan	Trafficant
Engel	Menendez	Tucker
English (AZ)	Mfume	Underwood (GU)
Eshoo	Miller (CA)	Unsoeld
Evans	Mineta	Valentine
Farr	Minge	Velazquez
Fazio	Mink	Vento
Fields (LA)	Moakley	Visclosky
Filner	Mollohan	Volkmer
Fingerhut	Montgomery	Washington
Foglietta	Moran	Waters
Ford (MI)	Murphy	Watt
Ford (TN)	Murtha	Wheat
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Williams
Frost	Natcher	Wilson
Furse	Neal (MA)	Wise
Gedjenson	Neal (NC)	Woolsey
Gephardt	Norton (DC)	Wyden
Geren	Obey	Wynn
Gibbons	Oliver	Yates

NOES—171

Allard	Barton	Bonilla
Archer	Bateman	Bunning
Armey	Bentley	Burton
Bacchus (AL)	Bereuter	Buyer
Baker (CA)	Billirakis	Callahan
Baker (LA)	Bliley	Calvert
Ballenger	Blute	Camp
Barrett (NE)	Boehlert	Canady
Bartlett	Boehner	Castle

Clinger	Huffington	Pombo
Coble	Hunter	Porter
Collins (GA)	Hutchinson	Portman
Combest	Hyde	Pryce (OH)
Cox	Inglis	Quillen
Crane	Inhofe	Quinn
Crapo	Istook	Ramstad
Cunningham	Jacobs	Ravenel
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Regula
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Roberts
Dickey	Kasich	Rogers
Doolittle	Kim	Rohrabacher
Dornan	King	Ros-Lehtinen
Dreier	Kingston	Roth
Duncan	Klug	Roukema
Dunn	Knollenberg	Royce
Emerson	Kolbe	Saxton
Everett	Kyl	Schaefer
Ewing	Lazlo	Schiff
Fawell	Leach	Sensenbrenner
Fields (TX)	Levy	Shaw
Fish	Lewis (CA)	Shays
Fowler	Lewis (FL)	Shuster
Franks (CT)	Lightfoot	Skeen
Franks (NJ)	Linder	Smith (MI)
Gallegly	Livingston	Smith (NJ)
Gallo	Machtley	Smith (OR)
Gekas	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Gilchrest	McCandless	Snowe
Gilman	McCollum	Solomon
Gingrich	McCrery	Spence
Goodlatte	McDade	Stearns
Goodling	McHugh	Stump
Goss	McInnis	Sundquist
Grams	McKeon	Talent
Grandy	McMillan	Taylor (MS)
Greenwood	Meyers	Taylor (NC)
Gunderson	Mica	Thomas (WY)
Hancock	Michel	Torkildsen
Hansen	Miller (FL)	Upton
Hastert	Molinari	Vucanovich
Hefley	Moorhead	Walker
Herger	Myers	Walsh
Hobson	Nussle	Wolf
Hoekstra	Oxley	Young (AK)
Hoke	Packard	Young (FL)
Horn	Paxon	Zelliff
Houghton	Petri	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—27

Conyers	Henry	Synar
DeFazio	Manton	Thomas (CA)
Derrick	Markey	Thornton
English (OK)	Meek	Torres
Faleomavaega	Morella	Torricelli
(AS)	Oberstar	Waxman
Flake	Ridge	Weldon
Gillmor	Rush	Whitten
Harman	Santorum	
Hayes	Schumer	

□ 1841

Messrs. MCINNIS, EWING, and JACOBS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MURTHA and Mr. EDWARDS of California changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to rise was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the strong advocates of a 15-minute vote taking place in 15 minutes. I have to tell the Speaker that upon leaving my office in the Rayburn House Office Building, there was no Member elevator available. The operator was gone.

I took one of the normal banks of elevators. I was stopped on the third floor, the first floor, the basement. I got off at G-3, went over to the subway. Both of the subway cars were at this end of the track. No one had the presence to have a car at the end when Members need to get it.

There were a number of Members with me. If we are going to adhere to the 15-minute rule, I expect the structure to be supportive as well.

Mr. Chairman, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR) having assumed the chair, Mr. STUDDS, 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. 2403) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 201, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL]; the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY]; the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY]; and the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows: Amendment: Page 6, line 20, strike "\$366,372,000" and insert "\$364,245,000".

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

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will announce that any subsequent RECORD votes on the three other ordered amendments will be reduced to 5 minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 353, nays 62, answered, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

YEAS—353

Abercrombie	Andrews (NJ)	Archer
Allard	Andrews (TX)	Armey
Andrews (ME)	Applegate	Bacchus (FL)

Bachus (AL)	Franks (CT)	Margolles-	Shepherd	Studds	Valentine	Ballenger	Hamilton	Neal (NC)
Baker (CA)	Franks (NJ)	Mezvinisky	Shuster	Stump	Vento	Barca	Hancock	Nussle
Baker (LA)	Frost	Markey	Sisisky	Stupak	Volkmer	Barca	Hansen	Oberstar
Ballenger	Furse	Martinez	Skaggs	Sundquist	Vucanovich	Barlow	Hastert	Obey
Barca	Galleghy	Matsui	Skeen	Swett	Walker	Barrett (NE)	Hefley	Orton
Barcia	Gallo	Mazzoli	Skelton	Swift	Walsh	Barrett (WI)	Hefner	Owens
Barlow	Gejdenson	McCandless	Slattery	Talent	Waters	Bartlett	Herger	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Gekas	McCloskey	Slaughter	Tanner	Watt	Bentley	Hilliard	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Geren	McCollum	Smith (IA)	Tauzin	Weldon	Bereuter	Hinchey	Parker
Bartlett	Gibbons	McCrery	Smith (MI)	Taylor (MS)	Williams	Bevill	Hoagland	Paxon
Bateman	Gilchrest	McCurdy	Smith (NJ)	Taylor (NC)	Wilson	Bilbray	Hobson	Payne (VA)
Becerra	Gillmor	McDermott	Smith (OR)	Tejeda	Wise	Bishop	Hochbrueckner	Penny
Bentley	Gilman	McHale	Snowe	Thomas (CA)	Woolsey	Biiley	Hoekstra	Peterson (FL)
Bereuter	Gingrich	McHugh	Solomon	Thomas (WY)	Wyden	Blute	Hoke	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Glickman	McInnis	Spence	Thompson	Wynn	Boehlert	Holden	Petri
Bevill	Gonzalez	McKeon	Spratt	Thurman	Young (AK)	Boehner	Houghton	Pombo
Bilbray	Goodlatte	McKinney	Stearns	Torkildsen	Young (FL)	Borski	Hughes	Pomeroy
Billrakis	Gordon	McMillan	Stenholm	Trafficant	Zeliff	Boucher	Hutto	Porter
Bishop	Goss	Meehan	Strickland	Tucker	Zimmer	Brewster	Hyde	Portman
Billey	Grams	Meyers				Browder	Inglis	Poshard
Blute	Green	Mfume				Brown (OH)	Inslee	Price (NC)
Boehlert	Greenwood	Mica	Ackerman	Goodling	Pelosi	Burton	Istook	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Gunderson	Michel	Baesler	Grandy	Quillen	Byrne	Jacobs	Quillen
Bonilla	Gutierrez	Miller (CA)	Barton	Hastings	Rahall	Camp	Jefferson	Ramstad
Bonior	Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)	Bellenson	Hefley	Rangel	Cantwell	Johnson (CT)	Ravenel
Borski	Hall (TX)	Minge	Blackwell	Horn	Reynolds	Cardin	Johnson (GA)	Reed
Boucher	Hamburg	Mink	Bryant	Hoyer	Sabo	Castle	Johnson (SD)	Regula
Brewster	Hamilton	Moakley	Bunning	Jefferson	Serrano	Clayton	Johnson, Sam	Richardson
Brooks	Hancock	Molinar	Carr	Johnson (SD)	Smith (TX)	Clement	Kanjorski	Roemer
Browder	Hansen	Mollohan	Clay	Johnson, E.B.	Stark	Clinger	Kaptur	Rogers
Brown (CA)	Hastert	Montgomery	Coleman	Kildee	Stokes	Clyburn	Kasich	Rohrabacher
Brown (FL)	Hefner	Moorhead	Collins (IL)	Lazio	Torres	Coble	Kennedy	Roth
Brown (OH)	Herger	Morella	Combest	Lewis (GA)	Towns	Combest	Kennelly	Rowland
Burton	Hilliard	Murphy	Coyne	Lightfoot	Upton	Condit	Kim	Royce
Buyer	Hinchey	Murtha	DeFazio	Livingston	Velazquez	Cooper	Kingston	Sangmeister
Byrne	Hoagland	Natcher	Hoagland	McDermott	Visclosky	Coppersmith	Klecza	Sarpallus
Callahan	Hobson	Neal (MA)	Diaz-Balart	McNulty	Washington	Costello	Klein	Sawyer
Calvert	Hochbrueckner	Neal (NC)	Edwards (CA)	Mineta	Waxman	Cox	Klink	Schaefer
Camp	Hoekstra	Nussle	Evans	Moran	Wheat	Cramer	Klug	Schiff
Canady	Hoke	Oberstar	Fazio	Myers	Wolf	Crane	Knollenberg	Scott
Cantwell	Holden	Obey	Foglietta	Nadler	Yates	Danner	Kopetski	Sensenbrenner
Cardin	Houghton	Oliver	Fowler	Payne (NJ)		Darden	Kyl	Serrano
Castle	Huffington	Ortiz				Deal	Lambert	Sharp
Chapman	Hughes	Orton				DeFazio	Lancaster	Shays
Clayton	Hunter	Owens	Conyers	Owens	Synar	DeLauro	Lantos	Shepherd
Clement	Hutchinson	Oxley	Derrick	Menendez	Thornton	Deutsch	LaRocco	Shuster
Clinger	Hutto	Packard	Flake	Ridge	Torricelli	Dickey	Laughlin	Sisisky
Clyburn	Hyde	Pallone	Gephardt	Roberts	Unsoeld	Dicks	Leach	Skaggs
Coble	Inglis	Parker	Harman	Rush	Whitten	Dooley	Lehman	Skelton
Collins (GA)	Inhofe	Pastor	Hayes	Santorum		Dorman	Levin	Slattery
Collins (MI)	Inslee	Faxon	Henry	Schumer		Dreier	Lewis (FL)	Slaughter
Condit	Istook	Payne (VA)				Duncan	Linder	Smith (IA)
Cooper	Jacobs	Penny				Dunn	Lipinski	Smith (MI)
Coppersmith	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (FL)				Durbin	Lloyd	Smith (NJ)
Costello	Johnson (GA)	Peterson (MN)				Edwards (TX)	Long	Smith (OR)
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Petri				Emerson	Lowey	Snowe
Cramer	Johnston	Pickett				Engel	Machtley	Solomon
Crane	Kanjorski	Pickle				Eshoo	Maloney	Stenholm
Crapo	Kaptur	Pombo				Everett	Mann	Strickland
Cunningham	Kasich	Pomeroy				Ewing	Manton	Studds
Danner	Kennedy	Porter				Farr	Manzullo	Stupak
Darden	Kennelly	Portman				Fawell	Margolles-	Sundquist
de la Garza	Kim	Poshard				Fazio	Mezvinisky	Swett
Deal	King	Price (NC)				Fields (LA)	Markey	Talent
DeLauro	Kingston	Pryce (OH)				Fingerhut	Mazzoli	Tanner
DeLay	Klecza	Quinn				Foglietta	McCandless	Tauzin
Deutsch	Klein	Ramstad				Franks (CT)	McCloskey	Taylor (MS)
Dickey	Klink	Ravenel				Franks (NJ)	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Dicks	Klug	Reed				Frost	McCurdy	Thomas (CA)
Dingell	Knollenberg	Regula				Gallo	McDade	Thurman
Dixon	Kolbe	Richardson				Gejdenson	McHale	Torkildsen
Dooley	Kopetski	Roemer				Gekas	McHugh	Trafficant
Doolittle	Kreidler	Rogers				Geren	McInnis	Upton
Dorman	Kyl	Rohrabacher				Gibbons	McKinney	Valentine
Dreier	LaFalce	Ros-Lehtinen				Gilchrest	McNulty	Velazquez
Duncan	Lambert	Rose				Gillmor	Meehan	Vento
Dunn	Lancaster	Rostenkowski				Gingrich	Meyers	Volkmer
Durbin	Lantos	Roth				Glickman	Mfume	Vucanovich
Edwards (TX)	LaRocco	Roukema				Gonzalez	Miller (CA)	Walker
Emerson	Laughlin	Rowland				Goodlatte	Minge	Walsh
Engel	Leach	Roybal-Allard				Gordon	Montgomery	Watt
English (AZ)	Lehman	Royce				Grams	Moorhead	Weldon
English (OK)	Levin	Sanders				Grandy	Morella	Wilson
Eshoo	Levy	Sangmeister				Greenwood	Murphy	Wise
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Sarpallus				Gunderson	Murtha	Wyden
Ewing	Lewis (FL)	Sawyer				Hall (OH)	Natcher	Zeliff
Farr	Linder	Saxton				Hamburg	Neal (MA)	Zimmer
Fawell	Lipinski	Schaefer						
Fields (LA)	Lloyd	Schenk						
Fields (TX)	Long	Schiff						
Fliner	Lowey	Schroeder						
Flingerhut	Machtley	Scott						
Flsh	Maloney	Sensenbrenner						
Ford (MI)	Mann	Sharp						
Ford (TN)	Manton	Shaw						
Frank (MA)	Manzullo	Shays						

NAYS—62

NOT VOTING—19

□ 1902

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TOWNS and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TRAFICANT changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 8, line 13, strike "\$1,315,917,000" and insert "\$1,311,819,000".

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 269, noes 141, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—269

Allard	Andrews (TX)	Armey
Andrews (ME)	Applegate	Bacchus (FL)
Andrews (NJ)	Archer	Baker (LA)

Abercrombie	Bateman	Bonilla
Ackerman	Becerra	Bonior
Bachus (AL)	Bellenson	Brooks
Baesler	Berman	Brown (CA)
Baker (CA)	Billrakis	Brown (FL)
Barton	Blackwell	Bryant

NOES—141

Bunning Hufflington Pickle  
 Buyer Hunter Quinn  
 Callahan Hutchinson Rahall  
 Calvert Inhofe Rangel  
 Canady Johnson, E. B. Reynolds  
 Carr Johnson Ros-Lehtinen  
 Chapman Kildee Rose  
 Clay King Rostenkowski  
 Coleman Kolbe Roukema  
 Collins (GA) Kreidler Roybal-Allard  
 Collins (IL) LaFalce Sabo  
 Collins (MI) Lazio Sanders  
 Coyne Levy Schenk  
 Cunningham Lewis (CA) Schroeder  
 de la Garza Lewis (GA) Shaw  
 DeLay Lightfoot Skeen  
 Dellums Livingston Smith (TX)  
 Diaz-Balart Martinez Spence  
 Dingell Matsui Spratt  
 Dixon McCollum Stark  
 Doolittle McDermott Stearns  
 Edwards (CA) McKeon Stokes  
 English (AZ) McMillan Stump  
 English (OK) Menendez Swift  
 Evans Mica Tejada  
 Fields (TX) Michel Thomas (WY)  
 Filner Miller (FL) Torres  
 Fish Mineta Towns  
 Ford (MI) Mink Tucker  
 Ford (TN) Moakley Visclosky  
 Fowler Mollinari Washington  
 Furse Mollohan Waters  
 Gallegly Moran Waxman  
 Gilman Myers Wheat  
 Goodling Oliver Williams  
 Goss Ortiz Wolf  
 Green Packard Woolsey  
 Hall (TX) Pastor Wynn  
 Hastings Payne (NJ) Yates  
 Horn Pelosi Young (AK)  
 Hoyer Pickett Young (FL)

Page 31, line 13, strike "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$9,800,000".  
 Page 31, line 14, strike "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$9,800,000".  
 Page 31, line 17, strike "\$9,553,000" and insert "\$9,361,940".  
 Page 31, line 21, strike "\$4,381,200" and insert "\$4,293,576".  
 Page 31, line 23, strike "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$29,400,000".  
 Page 32, line 7, strike "\$4,725,000" and insert "\$4,630,500".  
 Page 32, line 9, strike "\$86,751,000" and insert "\$85,015,980".  
 Page 32, line 13, strike "\$12,340,000" and insert "\$12,093,200".  
 Page 32, line 16, strike "\$3,047,000" and insert "\$2,986,060".  
 Page 39, line 8, strike "\$5,198,311,000" and insert "\$5,185,611,000".

Grandy Manzano Rostenkowski  
 Green Margolis Roth  
 Greenwood Mezvinsky Roukema  
 Gunderson Markey Rowland  
 Hall (OH) Martinez Roybal-Allard  
 Hall (TX) Mazzoli Royce  
 Hamburg McCandless Sabo  
 Hamilton McCloskey Sangmeister  
 Hancock McCrery Sarpalius  
 Hansen McCurdy Sawyer  
 Hastert McDade Schaefer  
 Hefley McHale Schenk  
 Hefner McHugh Schiff  
 Herger McInnis Schroeder  
 Hilliard McKeon Scott  
 Hinchey McMillan Sensenbrenner  
 Hoagland McNulty Serrano  
 Hobson Meehan Sharp  
 Hochbrueckner Menendez Shaw  
 Hoekstra Meyers Shays  
 Hoke Mfume Shepherd  
 Holden Mica Shuster  
 Horn Michel Siskis  
 Houghton Miller (CA) Skaggs  
 Hoyer Miller (FL) Skeen  
 Hufflington Minge Skelton  
 Hughes Mink Slatery  
 Hunter Molinari Slaughter  
 Hutchinson Mollohan Smith (IA)  
 Hutto Montgomery Smith (MI)  
 Hyde Moorhead Smith (NJ)  
 Inglis Morella Smith (OR)  
 Inhofe Murphy Smith (TX)  
 Inslee Murtha Snowe  
 Istook Myers Solomon  
 Jacobs Natcher Spence  
 Jefferson Neal (MA) Spratt  
 Johnson (CT) Neal (NC) Stark  
 Johnson (GA) Nussle Stearns  
 Johnson (SD) Oberstar Stenholm  
 Johnson, Sam Obey Strickland  
 Johnston Olver Studds  
 Kanjorski Ortiz Stump  
 Kaptur Orton Stupak  
 Kasich Owens Sundquist  
 Kennedy Oxley Swett  
 Kennelly Packard Talent  
 Kildee Pallone Tanner  
 Kim Parker Tauzin  
 Kingston Pastor Taylor (MS)  
 Kleczka Paxon Taylor (NC)  
 Klein Payne (VA) Tejada  
 Klink Payne (VA) Thomas (CA)  
 Klug Pelosi Thomas (WY)  
 Knollenberg Penney Thompson  
 Kolbe Peterson (FL) Thurman  
 Kreidler Peterson (MN) Torkildsen  
 Kyl Petri Torres  
 LaFalce Pickett Trafficant  
 Lambert Upton  
 Lancaster Pomo Valentine  
 Lantos Pomeroy Vento  
 LaRocco Porter Visclosky  
 Laughlin Portman Volkmer  
 Leach Poshard Vucanovitch  
 Lehman Price (NC) Walker  
 Levin Pryce (OH) Walsh  
 Lewis (CA) Quillen Waxman  
 Lewis (FL) Quinn Weldon  
 Lightfoot Ramstad Wheat  
 Linder Ravenel Wilson  
 Livingston Reed Wise  
 Lloyd Fish Wolf  
 Long Ford (MI) Richardson Wynn  
 Lowey Ford (TN) Rogers Young (AK)  
 Machtley Frank (MA) Rohrabacher Zelliff  
 Maloney Franks (CT) Ros-Lehtinen Zimmer  
 Mann Franks (NJ) Rose

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 361, noes 50, not voting 23, as follows—

[Roll No. 257]

AYES—361

Allard Bunning Dreier  
 Andrews (ME) Burton Duncan  
 Andrews (NJ) Byrnes Dunn  
 Andrews (TX) Callahan Durbin  
 Applegate Calvert Edwards (CA)  
 Archer Camp Edwards (TX)  
 Arney Canady Emerson  
 Bacchus (FL) Cantwell Engel  
 Bachus (AL) Cardin English (AZ)  
 Baesler Carr English (OK)  
 Baker (CA) Castle Eshoo  
 Baker (LA) Chapman Everett  
 Ballenger Clayton Ewing  
 Barca Clement Farr  
 Barlow Clyburn Fawell  
 Barrett (NE) Clyburn Fazio  
 Barrett (WI) Coble Fields (LA)  
 Bartlett Coleman Fields (TX)  
 Barton Collins (GA) Fingerhut  
 Bateman Combust Fish  
 Becerra Condit Ford (MI)  
 Bellenson Cooper Ford (TN)  
 Bentley Coppersmith Frank (MA)  
 Bereuter Costello Franks (CT)  
 Berman Cox Franks (NJ)  
 Beville Cramer Frost  
 Billray Crane Gallegly  
 Billrakis Crapo Gallo  
 Bishop Cunningham Gekas  
 Bliley Danner Gephardt  
 Blute Darden Geren  
 Boehlert de la Garza Gilchrist  
 Boehner DeFazio Gillmor  
 Bonilla DeLauro Gilman  
 Bonior DeLay Gingrich  
 Borski Deutsch Glickman  
 Boucher Dickey Gonzalez  
 Brewster Dicks Goodlatte  
 Brooks Dicks Goodling  
 Browder Dixon Gordon  
 Brown (CA) Dooley Doolittle  
 Brown (OH) Doolittle Dorman  
 Bryant

Greenwood Gunderson Hall (OH) Hall (TX) Hamburg Hamilton Hancock Hansen Hastert Hefley Hefner Herger Hilliard Hinchey Hoagland Hobson Hochbrueckner Hoekstra Hoke Holden Horn Houghton Hoyer Hufflington Hughes Hunter Hutchinson Hutto Hyde Inglis Inhofe Inslee Istook Jacobs Jefferson Johnson (CT) Johnson (GA) Johnson (SD) Johnson, Sam Johnston Kanjorski Kaptur Kasich Kennedy Kennelly Kildee Kim Kingston Kleczka Klein Klink Klug Knollenberg Kolbe Kreidler Kyl LaFalce Lambert Lancaster Lantos Lantoro Laughlin Leach Lehman Levin Lewis (CA) Lewis (FL) Lightfoot Linder Livingston Lloyd Long Lowey Machtley Maloney Mann Margolis Mezvinsky Markey Martinez Mazzoli McCandless McCloskey McCrery McCurdy McDade McHale McHugh McInnis McKeon McMillan McNulty Meehan Menendez Meyers Mfume Mica Michel Miller (CA) Miller (FL) Minge Mink Molinari Mollohan Montgomery Moorhead Morella Murphy Murtha Myers Natcher Neal (MA) Neal (NC) Nussle Oberstar Obey Olver Ortiz Orton Owens Oxley Packard Pallone Parker Pastor Paxon Payne (VA) Pelosi Penney Peterson (FL) Peterson (MN) Petri Pickett Upton Pomo Pomeroy Porter Portman Poshard Price (NC) Pryce (OH) Quillen Quinn Ramstad Ravenel Reed Regula Richardson Richardson Rogers Rohrabacher Ros-Lehtinen Rose

NOES—50

Abercrombie Furse Mineta  
 Ackerman Gibbons Moakley  
 Blackwell Gekas Moran  
 Brown (FL) Hastings Nadler  
 Buyer Johnson, E. B. Rahall  
 Clay King Kopetski  
 Collins (IL) Lazio Reynolds  
 Collins (MI) Levy Sanders  
 Coyne Lewis (GA) Stokes  
 Diaz-Balart Lipinski Swift  
 Dingell Manton Towns  
 Evans Matsui Velazquez  
 Filner McCollum Washington  
 Foglietta McDermott Waters  
 Fowler McKinney

NOT VOTING—24

Conyers Hayes Saxton  
 Crapo Henry Schumer  
 Derrick Meek Synar  
 Flake Nadler Thompson  
 Frank (MA) Ridge Thornton  
 Gephardt Roberts Torricelli  
 Gutierrez Rush Unsoeld  
 Harman Santorum Whitten

□ 1910

Messrs. MARTINEZ, PACKARD, and SPENCE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments: Page 29, line 16, strike "\$5,198,311,000" and insert "\$5,185,611,000".

Page 29, line 17, strike "\$307,994,000" and insert "\$295,294,000".

Page 29, line 18, strike "\$833,176,000" and insert "\$820,476,000".

Page 29, line 25, strike "\$5,195,000" and insert "\$5,091,000".

Page 30, line 3, strike "\$14,098,000" and insert "\$13,816,040".

Page 30, line 6, strike "\$146,002,500" and insert "\$143,082,450".

Page 30, line 8, strike "\$1,866,000" and insert "\$1,828,680".

Page 30, line 10, strike "\$151,200,000" and insert "\$148,176,000".

Page 30, line 16, strike "\$6,194,000" and insert "\$6,070,120".

Page 30, line 17, strike "\$68,058,000" and insert "\$66,696,840".

Page 30, line 19, strike "\$51,000,000" and insert "\$49,980,000".

Page 31, line 9, strike "\$19,000,000" and insert "\$18,620,000".

Page 31, line 12, strike "\$3,900,000" and insert "\$3,822,000".

Watt Williams Woolsey Wyden Yates Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—23

Barcia Conyers Dellums Derrick Flake Gutierrez Harman Hayes  
Henry Meek Ridge Roberts Roemer Rush Santorum Saxton  
Schumer Synar Thornton Torricelli Tucker Unsoeld Whitten

□ 1916

Mr. WYDEN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the last amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 43, after line 22, insert the following new section:

SEC. 6. (a) The Act entitled "An Act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1958 (3 U.S.C. 102 note), is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The entitlements of a former President under subsections (b) and (c) of the first section shall be available—

"(1) in the case of an individual who is a former President on the effective date of this section, for 5 years, commencing on such effective date; and

"(2) in the case of an individual who becomes a former President after such effective date, for 4 years and 6 months, commencing at the expiration of the period for which services and facilities are authorized to be provided under section 4 of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note)."

(B) Section 3214 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "A former President" and inserting "(a) Subject to subsection (b), a former President"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) Subsection (a) shall cease to apply—

"(1) 5 years after the effective date of this subsection, in the case of any individual who, on such effective date—

"(A) is a former President (including any individual who might become entitled to the mailing privilege under subsection (a) as the surviving spouse of such a former President); or

"(B) is the surviving spouse of a former President; and

"(2) 4 years and 6 months after the expiration of the period for which services and facilities are authorized to be provided under section 4 of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note), in the case of an individual who becomes a former President after such effective date (including any surviving spouse of such individual, as described in the parenthetical matter in paragraph (1)(a))."

(C) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on October 1, 1993.

Mr. HOYER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 298, noes 115, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

AYES—298

Allard English (OK) Kildee  
Andrews (ME) Eshoo Kim  
Andrews (NJ) Evans Kingston  
Andrews (TX) Everett Kleczka  
Applegate Ewing Klein  
Archer Farr Klink  
Army Fawell Klug  
Bacchus (FL) Fazio Knollenberg  
Bachus (AL) Fields (TX) Kolbe  
Baesler Filner Kopetski  
Baker (CA) Fingerhut Kreidler  
Baker (LA) Fish Kyl  
Ballenger Fowler Lambert  
Barca Frank (MA) Lancaster  
Barcia Barcia Franks (CT) Lantos  
Barlow Franks (NJ) LaRocco  
Barrett (NE) Frost Laughlin  
Barrett (WI) Furse Leach  
Bartlett Gallegly Lehman  
Bateman Gallo Levin  
Becerra Gekas Lewis (FL)  
Bereuter Gephardt Linder  
Bevill Geren Lipinski  
Bilbray Gilchrest Lloyd  
Bilirakis Gingrich Long  
Bliley Glickman Lowey  
Blute Goodlatte Machtley  
Boehlert Goodling Maloney  
Boehner Gordon Mann  
Bonilla Goss Manzullo  
Borski Grams Margolies-  
Boucher Grandy Mezvinsky  
Brewster Green Markey  
Browder Greenwood Martinez  
Brown (OH) Gunderson Mazzoli  
Burtin Gutierrez McCandless  
Buyer Hall (OH) McCloskey  
Byrne Hall (TX) McCollum  
Canady Hamburg McCrery  
Cantwell Hamilton McCurdy  
Chapman Hancock McDade  
Clement Hansen McHale  
Coble Hastert McInnis  
Collins (GA) Hefley McKeon  
Combest Hefner McMillan  
Condit Herger Meehan  
Cooper Hilliard Menendez  
Coppersmith Hinchey Meyers  
Costello Hoagland Mica  
Cox Hoekstra Miller (CA)  
Cramer Holden Miller (FL)  
Crane Huffington Minge  
Crapo Hughes Montgomery  
Cunningham Hunter Moorhead  
Danner Hutchinson Moran  
Deal Hutto Morella  
DeFazio Hyde Murphy  
DeLauro Inglis Myers  
DeLay Inhofe Neal (NC)  
Deutsch Inslee Nussle  
Dickey Istook Oberstar  
Dicks Jacobs Obey  
Dixon Jefferson Ortiz  
Dooley Johnson (CT) Orton  
Dorman Johnson (GA) Owens  
Dreier Johnson (SD) Oxley  
Duncan Johnson, Sam Packard  
Dunn Kanjorski Pallone  
Durlin Kaptur Parker  
Edwards (TX) Kastch Paxon  
Emerson Kennelly Payne (NJ)

Penny Schaefer Tanner  
Peterson (MN) Schenk Tauzin  
Petri Schiff Taylor (MS)  
Pickle Schroeder Taylor (NC)  
Pombo Sensenbrenner Tejeda  
Pomeroy Sharp Thomas (CA)  
Porter Shaw Thomas (WY)  
Poshard Shays Thurman  
Price (NC) Shepherd Torkildsen  
Pryce (OH) Shuster Torres  
Quinn Siskis Tucker  
Ramstad Skelton Upton  
Ravenel Slatery Valentine  
Reed Slaughter Vento  
Richardson Smith (MI) Volkmer  
Roemer Smith (NJ) Walker  
Rohrabacher Smith (OR) Walsh  
Ros-Lehtinen Smith (TX) Waters  
Rose Snowe Weldon  
Rostenkowski Solomon Williams  
Spence Roth Wilson  
Roukema Spratt Wise  
Rowland Stark Woolsey  
Roybal-Allard Stenholm Wyden  
Royce Strickland Wynn  
Sabo Stump Young (FL)  
Sanders Stupak Zelliff  
Sangmeister Sweet Zimmer  
Sarpallus Talent

## NOES—115

Abercrombie Gejdenson Neal (MA)  
Ackerman Gibbons Olver  
Barton Gillmor Pastor  
Bellenson Gilman Payne (VA)  
Bentley Gonzalez Pelosi  
Berman Hastings Peterson (FL)  
Bishop Hobson Pickett  
Blackwell Hochbrueckner Portman  
Bonior Hoke Quinn  
Brooks Horn Rahall  
Brown (CA) Houghton Regula  
Brown (FL) Hoyer Reynolds  
Bryant Johnson, E. B. Rogers  
Bunning Johnston Sawyer  
Callahan Kennedy Scott  
Calvert King Serrano  
Camp LaFalce Skaggs  
Cardin Lazio Skeen  
Carr Levy Smith (IA)  
Castle Lewis (CA) Stearns  
Clay Lewis (GA) Stokes  
Clayton Lightfoot Studds  
Clinger Livingston Sundquist  
Coleman Manton Swift  
Collins (IL) Matsui Thompson  
Collins (MI) McDermott Towns  
Coyne McHugh Trafficant  
Darden McKinney Velazquez  
de la Garza McNulty Visclosky  
Dellums Mfume Vucanovich  
Diaz-Balart Michel Washington  
Doolittle Doolittle Watt  
Edwards (CA) Mink Waxman  
Engel Moakley Wheat  
English (AZ) Molinari Wolf  
Fields (LA) Mollohan Yates  
Foglietta Murtha Young (AK)  
Ford (MI) Nadler  
Ford (TN) Natcher

## NOT VOTING—21

Clyburn Henry Saxton  
Conyers Meek Schumer  
Derrick Rangel Synar  
Dingell Ridge Thornton  
Flake Roberts Torricelli  
Harman Rush Unsoeld  
Hayes Santorum Whitten

□ 1923

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR). The question is on 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 RECOMMEND OFFERED BY MR. MYERS  
OF INDIANA

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am, in its present form.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Myers of Indiana moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2403, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 63, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except for the amount provided under "United States Customs Service Salaries and Expenses", "Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Salaries and Expenses", and "General Services Administration Federal Building Fund", each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 2 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I will not use the 5 minutes because the hour is late. This is a simple 2 percent reduction, not a meat-ax approach.

But we exclude from the reduction the U.S. Customs, which has already taken a \$4 million cut; Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, which has taken a \$2 million cut; and also the General Services Administration, where we did cut out of new projects \$12 million.

The bill is down from last year's outlays, yes, and it is down because we had an outlay adjustment last year; a technical change of \$198 million; we reduced this year by \$97 million for the drug czar. So it is down some, but not as much as far as the taxpayers are concerned. We have not really saved the taxpayers as much money as we can.

We are below, the present bill is \$2 million below last year. Two percent would cut another \$200 million out of that fund. We still leave \$11.1 billion. We have 18 new projects for the courthouses, Federal buildings, we have \$829 million for these projects.

We have left the money for IRS modernization of \$1.4 billion. We have left the tax law enforcement \$3.9 billion, and we have left the war on drugs an additional \$116 million.

The President has promised to cut 25 percent from his budget, from his personnel. We now give him additional money of 8 percent in the White House. We cut the Vice President's Office even though he has more people, 2 percent. So we have been very generous, even with my cuts.

Mr. Speaker, 110 Members were elected last year on reform. One of the ideas is that we are going to cut spending. This is a simple, very small cut, but it

is headed in the right direction. If the President is going to reduce the work force in the Federal Government by 200,000 people that he says he would do in 4 years, we cannot wait until next year to start. This is the year to start reducing.

A simple cut, it does not hurt anybody. There is not a person in this appropriation bill, not an agency that cannot afford a 2-percent cut. I hope you will support the cut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I rise in opposition to this motion. As it stands now, this bill is \$463 million under what we spent in 1993, \$463 million under a hard freeze. This is not a generous bill.

BATF was cut \$2 million, as you know; Customs, \$61 million. You voted on a \$4 million cut, but we had cut an additional \$57 million in our committee.

Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, \$5 million under 1993; financial management, \$4 million under a hard freeze; Bureau of Public Debt, \$5 million under a hard freeze. Even the Secret Service is under a hard freeze by \$11 million. The Postal Service, revenue foregone is \$30 million under a hard freeze. The executive office of the President is \$10 million below fiscal 1993. Independent agencies, we eliminated four, one on this floor and three in committee. OPM is half a million dollars below a hard freeze.

In total, discretionary budget authority is \$20 million under 1993. Discretionary budget outlays, as I have told you, is \$463 million, almost half a billion under 1993 discretionary outlays not the President's proposal, but under 1993 outlays.

Why have we done this? We have done this because we have a deficit problem. We have done it because our committee felt we had a responsibility, not only to all of you in this House but, more importantly, to the American people. We need to bring down the deficit.

We were given very tight numbers, as all of you know, in the 602(b) allocations, but we still thought we had more to do, and we did our job.

□ 1930

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I simply would like to commend the gentleman for an outstanding job in bringing this bill under last year's number, bringing it in well within the budget totals of the 602(b) allocations to the committee, which are very, very tight.

But there are also things we do which are penny-wise and pound-foolish at

times. One of those things is to cut enforcement. My understanding of the impact of this amendment would also be to cut IRS enforcement.

I wonder if the gentleman has any projections from the IRS what the impact of this amendment would be in reducing revenues collected by the Federal Government?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his question.

The Internal Revenue Service, so you understand where they are, is \$120 million under what the President asked for IRS for fiscal year 1994.

IRS is \$168 million over fiscal year 1993 in part because we have \$130 billion in taxes due which are not being paid.

If we pass this amendment, and it applies to the IRS, the IRS says it will cost \$1 billion in lost revenue for the \$145 million "savings" in appropriations we effect; so it will cost over six times—over six times the "savings" of this amendment by the loss in revenue that the Internal Revenue Service projects.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his response, and urge defeat of the motion to recommit.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I apologize, but I did not use all my time.

In the tax law enforcement, after this provision of 2 percent would still allow a \$92 million increase from last year or 2.4 percent.

The tax law processing would be a \$28 million increase, a 1.8 percent increase even after this.

So the IRS gets more money to modernize as well as enforce the law, which we should do.

Mr. HOYER. And which everybody on the committee agrees we should do, because we need to collect that additional revenue so we do not have to tax those who are honestly paying their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I know that it sounds easy, just 2 percent, but the fact is we have come to you with a bill after months of hearings which consisted of very serious consideration of the objectives that you and I want to accomplish in these agencies. The bill is \$463 million under last year's expenditures. And I remind you that we have had an open rule. Anybody could have offered any cut in any agency, and in fact there were a number of cuts adopted.

This was not a closed rule. Anybody could have come here and said, "Let's cut IRS \$200 million, \$500 million. Let's cut Customs. Let's cut ATF," as was done.

Nobody was precluded from offering those amendments.

An across-the-board cut is simple, but it is also simplistic and it is bad

policy. There are some items which have a higher priority and some items which have a lower priority. Across-the-board cuts do not take those into consideration.

Now, let me tell you what will happen if we have these across-the-board cuts.

I could have, and my committee could have, added money to this bill and then come here and said, "Let's cut across the board." We did not do that. We brought the agencies budgets down before we brought the bill to the floor.

I ask you to reject this cut. This is a good bill. It is a fiscally responsible bill. It is below the 1993 expenditures. It is in the best interests of the taxpayers of this country.

Vote no on the motion to recommit. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote. A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the final passage of the bill, following the vote on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 235, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

AYES—180

Allard	Cooper	Grams
Archer	Cox	Grandy
Armey	Crane	Greenwood
Bachus (AL)	Crapo	Gunderson
Baker (CA)	Cunningham	Hall (TX)
Baker (LA)	DeLay	Hamilton
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Hancock
Barrett (NE)	Dickey	Hansen
Bartlett	Doolittle	Hastert
Barton	Dorman	Hefley
Bateman	Dreier	Henger
Bereuter	Duncan	Hobson
Billrakis	Dunn	Hoekstra
Bliley	Emerson	Hoke
Blute	Everett	Horn
Boehlert	Ewing	Houghton
Boehner	Fawell	Huffington
Bonilla	Fields (TX)	Hunter
Bunning	Fingerhut	Hutchinson
Burton	Fish	Hyde
Buyer	Fowler	Inglis
Callahan	Franks (CT)	Inhofe
Calvert	Franks (NJ)	Inslee
Camp	Gallely	Istook
Canady	Gallo	Jacobs
Cantwell	Gekas	Johnson (CT)
Castle	Gilchrest	Johnson, Sam
Clinger	Gillmor	Kasich
Coble	Glman	Kim
Collins (GA)	Gingrich	King
Combest	Goodlatte	Kingston
Condit	Goss	Klug

Knollenberg	Oxley	Smith (MI)
Kolbe	Packard	Smith (NJ)
Kyl	Paxon	Smith (OR)
Lazio	Penny	Smith (TX)
Leach	Petri	Snowe
Levy	Pombo	Solomon
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Spence
Lewis (FL)	Portman	Stearns
Lightfoot	Pryce (OH)	Stenholm
Linder	Quillen	Stump
Machtley	Quinn	Sundquist
Manzullo	Ramstad	Talent
McCandless	Ravenel	Tauzin
McCullum	Regula	Taylor (NC)
McCrery	Rogers	Thomas (CA)
McDade	Rohrabacher	Thomas (WY)
McHugh	Ros-Lehtinen	Torkildsen
McInnis	Roth	Upton
McKeon	Roukema	Volkmer
McMillan	Royce	Vucanovich
Meyers	Schaefer	Walker
Mica	Schiff	Walsh
Michel	Sensenbrenner	Weldon
Miller (FL)	Sharp	Weldon
Molinar	Shaw	Young (AK)
Moorhead	Shays	Young (FL)
Myers	Shuster	Zeliff
Nussle	Skeen	Zimmer

NOES—235

Abercrombie	Farr	Martinez
Ackerman	Fazio	Matsui
Andrews (ME)	Fields (LA)	Mazzoli
Andrews (NJ)	Filner	McCloskey
Andrews (TX)	Foglietta	McCurdy
Applegate	Ford (MI)	McDermott
Bacchus (FL)	Ford (TN)	McHale
Baesler	Frank (MA)	McKinney
Barca	Frost	McNulty
Barcia	Furse	Meehan
Barlow	Gejdenson	Menendez
Barrett (WI)	Gephardt	Mfume
Becerra	Geren	Miller (CA)
Bellenson	Gibbons	Mineta
Bentley	Glickman	Minge
Berman	Gonzalez	Mink
Bevill	Gordon	Moakley
Bilbray	Green	Mollohan
Bishop	Gutierrez	Montgomery
Blackwell	Hall (OH)	Moran
Bonior	Hamburg	Morella
Borski	Hastings	Murphy
Boucher	Hefner	Murtha
Brewster	Hilliard	Nadler
Brooks	Hinchee	Natcher
Browder	Hoagland	Neal (MA)
Brown (CA)	Hochbrueckner	Neal (NC)
Brown (FL)	Holden	Oberstar
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Obey
Bryant	Hughes	Oliver
Byrne	Hutto	Ortiz
Cardin	Jefferson	Orton
Carr	Johnson (GA)	Owens
Chapman	Johnson (SD)	Pallone
Clay	Johnson, E.B.	Parker
Clayton	Johnston	Pastor
Clement	Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)
Clyburn	Kaptur	Payne (VA)
Coleman	Kennedy	Pelosi
Collins (IL)	Kennelly	Peterson (FL)
Collins (MI)	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Coppersmith	Klein	Pickett
Costello	Klink	Pickle
Coyne	Kopetski	Pomeroy
Cramer	Kreidler	Poshard
Danner	LaFalce	Price (NC)
Darden	Lambert	Rahall
de la Garza	Lancaster	Rangel
Deal	Lantos	Reed
DeFazio	LaRocco	Reynolds
DeLauro	Laughlin	Richardson
Dellums	Lehman	Roemer
Deutsch	Levin	Rose
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Rostenkowski
Dingell	Lipinski	Rowland
Dixon	Livingston	Roybal-Allard
Dooley	Lloyd	Sabo
Durbin	Long	Sanders
Edwards (CA)	Lowey	Sangmeister
Edwards (TX)	Maloney	Sarpaluis
Engel	Mann	Sawyer
English (AZ)	Manton	Schenk
English (OK)	Margolies-	Schroeder
Eshoo	Mezvinsky	Scott
Evans	Markey	Serrano

Shepherd	Swift	Visclosky
Sisisky	Tanner	Washington
Skaggs	Taylor (MS)	Waters
Skelton	Tejeda	Watt
Slatery	Thompson	Waxman
Slaughter	Thurman	Wheat
Smith (IA)	Torres	Williams
Spratt	Towns	Wilson
Stark	Trafiacant	Wise
Stokes	Tucker	Woolsey
Strickland	Unsoeld	Wyden
Studds	Valentine	Wynn
Stupak	Velazquez	Yates
Swett	Vento	

NOT VOTING—19

Conyers	Klecza	Schumer
Derrick	Meek	Synar
Flake	Ridge	Thornton
Goodling	Roberts	Torricelli
Harman	Rush	Whitten
Hayes	Santorum	
Henry	Saxton	

□ 1949

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Flake against. Mr. Saxton for, with Mr. Schumer against.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XXV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 263, noes 153, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

AYES—263

Abercrombie	Bryant	Dixon
Ackerman	Byrne	Dooley
Andrews (ME)	Cantwell	Durbin
Andrews (NJ)	Cardin	Edwards (CA)
Andrews (TX)	Carr	Emerson
Bacchus (FL)	Chapman	Engel
Baesler	Clay	English (AZ)
Barcia	Clayton	English (OK)
Barlow	Clement	Eshoo
Barrett (WI)	Clyburn	Evans
Bateman	Coleman	Farr
Becerra	Collins (IL)	Fazio
Bellenson	Collins (MI)	Fields (LA)
Bentley	Condit	Filner
Berman	Cooper	Fingerhut
Bevill	Coppersmith	Fish
Bilbray	Costello	Foglietta
Bishop	Coyne	Ford (MI)
Blackwell	Cramer	Ford (TN)
Bliley	Danner	Fowler
Boehliert	Darden	Frank (MA)
Bonior	de la Garza	Frost
Borski	Deal	Furse
Boucher	DeFazio	Gallo
Brooks	DeLauro	Gejdenson
Browder	Dellums	Gephardt
Brown (CA)	Deutsch	Geren
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Gibbons
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Gilchrest

Gilman	Margolies-	Rostenkowski
Glickman	Mezvinsky	Rowland
Gonzalez	Markey	Roybal-Allard
Gordon	Martinez	Sabo
Grandy	Matsul	Sanders
Green	Mazzoli	Sangmeister
Gutierrez	McCloskey	Sawyer
Hall (OH)	McCurdy	Schenk
Hamburg	McDade	Schiff
Hamilton	McDermott	Schroeder
Hastings	McHale	Scott
Hefner	McHugh	Serrano
Hilliard	McKinney	Shaw
Hinchey	McNulty	Shepherd
Hoagland	Meehan	Sisisky
Hobson	Menendez	Skaggs
Hochbrueckner	Mfume	Skeen
Holden	Mica	Skelton
Horn	Miller (CA)	Slattery
Houghton	Mineta	Slaughter
Hoyer	Mink	Smith (IA)
Inlee	Moakley	Solomon
Istook	Mollohan	Spratt
Jefferson	Montgomery	Stark
Johnson (CT)	Moran	Stenholm
Johnson (GA)	Morella	Stokes
Johnson (SD)	Murtha	Strickland
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Studds
Johnston	Natcher	Stupak
Kanjorski	Neal (MA)	Swett
Kaptur	Neal (NC)	Swift
Kennedy	Oberstar	Tanner
Kennelly	Obey	Tauzin
Kildee	Olver	Tejeda
Kingston	Ortiz	Thompson
Klecza	Orton	Thurman
Klein	Owens	Torres
Klink	Parker	Towns
Kolbe	Pastor	Traficant
Kopetski	Payne (NJ)	Tucker
Kreidler	Payne (VA)	Unsoeld
LaFalce	Pelosi	Valentine
Lambert	Penny	Velazquez
Lancaster	Peterson (FL)	Vento
Lantos	Pickett	Visclosky
LaRocco	Pickle	Walsh
Laughlin	Pomeroy	Washington
Lehman	Poshard	Waters
Levin	Price (NC)	Watt
Lewis (CA)	Quillen	Waxman
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Wheat
Lightfoot	Ravenel	Williams
Lipinski	Reed	Wilson
Livingston	Regula	Wise
Long	Reynolds	Wolf
Lowey	Richardson	Woolsey
Maloney	Roemer	Wyden
Mann	Rogers	Wynn
Manton	Rose	Yates

NOES—153

Allard	DeLay	Hunter
Applegate	Diaz-Balart	Hutchinson
Archer	Dickey	Hutto
Armey	Doolittle	Hyde
Bachus (AL)	Dornan	Inglis
Baker (CA)	Dreier	Inhofe
Baker (LA)	Duncan	Jacobs
Ballenger	Edwards (TX)	Johnson, Sam
Barca	Everett	Kasich
Barrett (NE)	Ewing	Kim
Bartlett	Fawell	King
Barton	Fields (TX)	Klug
Bereuter	Franks (CT)	Knollenberg
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	Kyl
Blute	Gallely	Lazio
Boehner	Gekas	Leach
Bonilla	Gillmor	Levy
Brewster	Gingrich	Lewis (FL)
Bunning	Goodlatte	Linder
Burton	Goss	Lloyd
Buyer	Grams	Machtley
Callahan	Greenwood	Manzullo
Calvert	Gunderson	McCandless
Camp	Hall (TX)	McCollum
Canady	Hancock	McCrery
Castle	Hansen	McInnis
Clinger	Hastert	McKeon
Coble	Hefley	McMillan
Collins (GA)	Herger	Meyers
Combest	Hoekstra	Michel
Cox	Hoke	Miller (FL)
Crane	Huffington	Minge
Crapo	Hughes	Molinari
Cunningham		Moorhead

Murphy	Roth	Stump
Myers	Roukema	Sundquist
Nussle	Royce	Talent
Oxley	Sarpalius	Taylor (MS)
Packard	Saxton	Taylor (NC)
Pallone	Schaefer	Thomas (CA)
Paxon	Sensenbrenner	Thomas (WA)
Peterson (MN)	Sharp	Torkildsen
Petri	Shays	Upton
Pombo	Shuster	Volkmmer
Portman	Smith (MI)	Vucanovich
Pryce (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Walker
Quinn	Smith (OR)	Weldon
Rahall	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Ramstad	Snowe	Young (FL)
Rohrabacher	Spence	Zeliff
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—18

Conyers	Henry	Santorum
Derrick	Meek	Schumer
Flake	Porter	Synar
Goodling	Ridge	Thornton
Harman	Roberts	Torricelli
Hayes	Rush	Whitten

□ 1957

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:  
Mr. Derrick for, with Mr. Roberts against.  
Mrs. Meek for, with Mr. Santorum against.

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 2403, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAESLER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained while three rollcall votes were held. I was at a meeting with Base Closure Commissioner Byron during which rollcall votes Nos. 257, 258, and 259 were called.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, due to a personal family matter in my district, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes numbered 247 to 260. Had I been here I would have cast the following votes:

- Roll No. 247, "aye."
- Roll No. 248, "no."
- Roll No. 249, "aye."
- Roll No. 250, "aye."
- Roll No. 251, "aye."
- Roll No. 252, "aye."
- Roll No. 253, "no."
- Roll No. 254, "aye."
- Roll No. 255, "aye."
- Roll No. 256, "aye."
- Roll No. 257, "aye."
- Roll No. 258, "aye."
- Roll No. 259, "no."

Roll No. 260, "aye."

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and other offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEWIS of California reserved all points of order on the bill.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLF reserved all points of order on the bill.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAESLER). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b) of Public Law 93-191, the Chair announces the Speaker's additional appointment as members of the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards the following Members of the House:  
Mr. FORD, Michigan.  
Mr. KLECZKA, Wisconsin.  
Mr. YOUNG, Alaska.  
Mr. ROBERTS, Kansas.  
There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE LESLIE L. BYRNE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable LESLIE L. BYRNE, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L of the "Rules of the House of Representatives," that a member of my staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. This subpoena is related to the former employment of the staff member.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

LESLIE L. BYRNE,  
Member of Congress.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF CONGRESS-BUNDESTAG YOUTH EXCHANGE PROGRAM

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 10th anniversary of the inauguration of the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange Program, a program that has given thousands of young Americans and Germans the opportunity to visit each other's countries and be exposed to another culture. As Dr. Rita Sussmuth, the President of the German Bundestag, has said, this program "has become one of the cornerstones of German-American friendship." I join Dr. Sussmuth and her colleagues in the Bundestag in celebrating this important anniversary, and I salute the many fine achievements this exchange has produced and will in the future continue to produce.

I include at this point in the RECORD the text of a message Dr. Sussmuth has sent me in recognition of the program's 10th anniversary. I have sent Dr. Sussmuth a similar expression of support and appreciation for the essential involvement of the Bundestag.

MESSAGE OF GREETING  
(By Prof. Rita Sussmuth)

The German Bundestag and the Congress of the United States of America are celebrating the 10th anniversary of the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange Program this year.

Our common aim is to contribute towards more tolerance, peace and freedom in our world. An indispensable condition for peaceful and friendly relations is that we get to know each other and understand shared values and differences in the social and cultural fields.

We therefore regard it as an important task to enable the young generation in our two countries to build bridges between peo-

ple in the USA and Germany. Our two parliaments therefore decided in 1983, against the background of the tricentennial of the arrival of the first German immigrants in North America, to give fresh impetus to the friendship between our two peoples by launching the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange Program, which is jointly sponsored by our two parliaments. The interesting and stimulating youth exchange program is intended to help make the young generation in our two countries appreciate the importance of friendly cooperation.

We are pleased that almost 7000 young Americans and Germans have already taken part in the Youth Exchange Program and thus had an opportunity to experience their host country at first hand and make friends with people there. Moreover, in the past ten years almost 7000 host families have been willing to receive a young person from the partner country. Today it is no exaggeration to say that the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange Program has become one of the cornerstones of German-American friendship.

We expect German and American participants in the program to help, as young "ambassadors" of their countries, to reduce prejudices and find ways of establishing contact and forming friendships to further develop our common tradition. These numerous personal links between the people of our two countries constitute the necessary basis of the friendship between the United States of America and Germany.

Over the past ten years the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange Program has made a very important contribution to German-American friendship and international understanding. We are firmly convinced that it will continue to play a major role in future too. At a time when the current and future generations face problems which concern mankind as a whole and which no state can solve alone it is more important than ever before that as many people as possible from our countries make a contribution, through personal contacts across borders, to getting to know and understanding other nations and the social and political situation in their countries. May the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange Program continue to strengthen the friendship which exists between the people of the United States of America and Germany.

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN JOSEPH R. MCLEARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Capt. Joseph R. McCleary, U.S. Navy, as he retires upon completion of over 30 years of faithful service to our Nation.

A native of Montclair, NJ, Captain McCleary was inducted into the Regular Navy Reserve Officer Training Corps as a midshipman at Tufts University and was commissioned an ensign upon graduation in June 1963.

Captain McCleary, a submarine warfare qualified officer has performed in a consistently outstanding manner under the most challenging of circumstances. From 1963 to 1976, Captain McCleary served with the surface and submarine

fleets in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. He gained extensive experience aboard U.S.S. *Abbott*, (DD 629), U.S.S. *Tusk* (SS 426), U.S.S. *Caiman* (SS 323), U.S.S. *Bonefish* (SS 582), and U.S.S. *Bluejack* (SS 581). After serving on the staff of Commander, Submarine Group Eight, Naples, Italy, Captain McCleary returned to and commanded the U.S.S. *Bonefish* from 1976 to 1978. He subsequently became the executive assistant to the Commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

From 1980 to 1984, Captain McCleary was assigned to the Secretary of the Navy's Office of Legislative Affairs as the congressional liaison officer for submarines, communications, shipyards and intelligence. In 1984, he transferred to the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations and served as Deputy Director of the Defense Liaison Division. Captain McCleary left the Pentagon in 1987 and reported for duty in London as the U.S. Naval Attaché where he later also assumed the position of U.S. Defense Attaché.

He returned to Pentagon in July 1990 where he has served as the Deputy Chief of Legislative Affairs. In this capacity, he has been a major asset to the Navy, Marine Corps, and Congress. He is considered a valued advisor to the very top echelons of the Navy and Congress. His consummate leadership, energy and integrity ensured that the morale and effectiveness of the Navy-Marine Corps team reached heights otherwise thought to be impossible to achieve in such an austere budget climate. During a period of significant change and restructuring of Naval Forces, Captain McCleary obtained congressional support for a strong and balanced Navy and Marine Corps. Through his brilliant insight, he has directly contributed to their future readiness and success.

Captain McCleary's distinguished awards include the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with two gold stars, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Navy Commendation Medal with one gold star and the Navy Achievement Medal.

A man of Capt. Joe McCleary's talent and integrity is rare indeed. While his honorable service will be genuinely missed, it gives me great pleasure to recognize him before my colleagues, and to wish him "fair winds and following seas," as he concludes a long and distinguished career in the U.S. Naval Service.

HOMOSEXUALS IN THE MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, it has become fairly clear today, through news reports, that the President, the Secretary of Defense and the Department

of Defense are on the verge of putting forth a policy with respect to allowing homosexuals to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States.

This is an issue that has been debated at great length in the various committees and subcommittees of this body and the other body.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to talk a little bit about the hearings that have been held on the Republican side of the aisle and the testimony that has come forth in the full hearings that we have held on the House Committee on Armed Services and the importance of this decision and the potential damage of this decision by President Clinton to the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Now, the small unit commanders who testified and the retired NCO's who testified, to both the Republican Research Committee task forces and the full Committee on Armed Services on the homosexuals in the military issue, basically laid out the problems that this country is going to acquire with respect to the readiness of our Armed Forces, if this happens.

One thing that they went to was unit cohesion. The point is that American military men and women go forth in battle and in certain times die in battle because they feel that they have common cause with the United States of America and that their own set of values, Judeo-Christian values that have evolved over the years, are in concert with the values of this country.

□ 2010

When those values come into conflict there is a great damage to morale. We have said that, of course, when we have had massacres in the past and units have been involved in those things. We have seen the morale go straight downhill in those units that were involved.

The facts are, as has been illustrated by all of the polls that have been taken since this issue arose, the American fighting forces, the men and women who make up the fighting forces, overwhelmingly do not want to see the present ban on homosexuals in the military lifted. They have made that very clear, and that has been posted in such newspapers as the Los Angeles Times and many others.

If we change this ban in any way, if we erode it, if we allow it to be compromised, we are going to see young men and women who serve in the Armed Forces because they feel it is consistent with their values finding that it is not consistent with their values, and we are going to see a degradation of morale and a degradation of unit cohesion. That, I think, has been the great weight of the testimony that has come forth.

Second, in the area of recruitment, we understand now that the decision to go into the military is a family decision in many cases. America's families

send their young people to serve in the Armed Forces because they believe that the Armed Forces are a wholesome environment for their young people. If they come to the conclusion that the Armed Forces is not a wholesome environment for their young people, and all the information we have is, if we lift the ban on homosexuals in the military, America's families that traditionally send their young people to the Armed Forces will come to that conclusion, will feel that the environment is no longer wholesome, is no longer good for their young person, then we are going to see a downward spiral in the volunteering for America's military that has made our modern military forces the best in the world. That is going to greatly damage our capability to project power around the world, to protect our own freedom, and to protect the freedom of our allies.

I want to simply say, duty, honor, and country are the three pillars on which our military is based. Our military leaders, whose assent must be taken, must concur before the American people will agree to any change in this policy. I would pray that they would look long and hard at any decision to in any way compromise the ban that is in place now that serves all of the fighting personnel in our Armed Forces.

#### AUTHORIZING SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes, and I am quite sure I will not use nearly all of that time.

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

There was no objection.

#### THE BAN ON GAYS IN THE MILITARY MUST REMAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and best friend in the House here for taking this special order out tonight, because we do not have the written documents in front of us as to what the White House has announced. There is a suspicion that our distinguished colleague in the Senate, who has been a stalwart on maintaining the ban, Senator NUNN of Georgia, may have signed off on this policy.

However, we do have the front page of the Washington Times to go on, which had what looked like a very valid leak, because it had a photograph of a memo of Les Aspin, the Secretary of Defense, with a marginal notation changing the tense and grammar on one of the verbs.

Here is what I understand the policy to be. It is very close to the ban we have now. Under what has loosely been described as the Nunn, Senator NUNN, "Don't ask, don't tell" plan, here is the way it appears to come down, and why the homosexual activist community, those people who organized this exceedingly bizarre march on the city of 300,000 lesbians and male homosexuals April 29, they are going ballistic because here is what it appears to say: "we will not ask, as has been the policy on and off for over 50 years, 'Are you a homosexual or a female homosexual, lesbian,' but it will put in front of them a piece of paper that a recruit must sign, male or female, that says, 'I acknowledge that homosexuality is not compatible with military service.'"

Barbara Streisand and the whole Hollywood community and David Mixer and all of these people I mention here, because she came to these hearings in our Committee on Armed Services and sat in the front row for about 40 minutes, they are going to go ballistic, get very angry, over that.

No. 2, after you have seen this acknowledgment statement, you are in the military functioning, and at one point you mention that you are a homosexual, that is grounds for dismissal, honorable discharge, but you are out the door, Katy, that is it.

Now, they are going crazy over that. They do not want that. Then it also says, "A commander does have the discretion"—they are trying to stop what they call witch hunts, but what they call witch hunts are not what most of us would describe as a witch hunt.

For example, 27 women were put out of the military at Quantico, most of them DI's, drill instructors, with tremendous authoritarian power over young 17-year-old female recruits, and you can come into the Marine Corps at 17 as a young woman with your parents' permission, too young to vote, too young to buy liquor, too young to buy cigarettes, but old enough to serve the Marine Corps, very rare with women but not so rare with young men, particularly in the Marine Corps, but an 18-, 19-year-old recruit, we still call that a teenager in any culture, and these young women, some people call a 17-year-old a girl, if she is hit by a car it is certainly a young girl, they were being brutalized by much older Marine women DI's in a lesbian group called "the family," ugly name to apply to a group of lesbian activists who are hassling recruits.

Twelve resigned of their own free will, 12 were forced out, some of them under less-than-honorable conditions, and three went to jail and are still in jail.

Sam Donaldson tried to mock this investigation of Quantico and called it a witch hunt, but when 27 women leave the Marine Corps because they are hassling recruits, that is not a witch hunt.

That type of investigation will be allowed under this policy that the White House has put out tonight. It says that a commander—Navy, Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, Coast Guard—will have the discretion to initiate an investigation if he, the commander, or she, the commander, feels there is sufficient evidence. It looks like we are OK there, too.

Why would we not withdraw my Dornan bill that the gentleman is an original cosponsor of, 667, and say, "OK, we will go along with this 'Don't ask, don't tell,' because it is so bloody close?" I would say to the gentleman, to the current policy that it is Congress' authority to implement, that they are opening up the door a crack. For what? To be nice to people and not ask them? But we are making them sign a statement that they acknowledge that it is not compatible, a homosexual orientation.

What we are doing is opening the door a crack for people to slide down a very slippery slope of litigation. For example, there was an Army sergeant who was let go in his 17th year because of acknowledged homosexuality. He claimed that he was never asked his first couple go-rounds, and on his third or fourth re-up in the Army, by now a sergeant, he told them and they said, "We do not care," and they are putting him out in his 17th year, which looks like they are cheating him out of a 20-year retirement.

What they did not tell people on 60 Minutes, Ed Bradley was the one who did the interview on this sergeant, was he had a medical file 18 inches thick with syphilis of the throat, which sounds horrible, I never heard of that, and it went downhill from there. He infected all sorts of fellow people in the Army, but he becomes a court cause celebre for homosexual activists. He is glorified on CBS's 60 Minutes, and in the end, I think just to get rid of him, the Army paid him a huge chunk of money.

This is going to put out Jeffrey Thorne, one of the poster boys in the homosexual activist movement, never paid back a day of expensive Navy flight officer, bombardier-navigator training, never worked a day. He will be out on this.

Another poster boy, the gay midshipman was the way they always described him, and I considered that a musical in the late 1930's, a Dick Powell musical, "The Gay Midshipman," that is Joseph Steffens. He is finished. All his court cases will end.

□ 2020

He was put out in April of his senior year at the Naval Academy in Annapolis.

So what I am saying, and I would like to hear your comment on this, why are we changing the policy up to 99 percent of what it is if this little 1

percent, to make nice nice with homosexual activists, who are going bananas anyway they are so angry at this, is it nothing more than a fig leaf, funny term in this case, a fig leaf for the President of the United States so that it is not a total defeat for him? And we are going to open up the door to all of this litigation. That is my feeling, until we see the document from the White House tomorrow morning.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield, I think that we are also establishing, if the President establishes this as a policy, and if he does I hope the Congress defeats it, but if he establishes this as a policy there is an implication, a message here that it is OK to lie.

Mr. DORNAN. Or there is something wrong with our policy.

Mr. HUNTER. Precisely, because if it is still a ban, if it is still grounds for expulsion to be a homosexual in the military forces of the United States—

Mr. DORNAN. For just saying it.

Mr. HUNTER. Then why not address the question as to whether or not you are one when you enter?

Mr. DORNAN. Exactly.

Mr. HUNTER. If you now take away this requirement to answer the question, the implication is that you can wink at the question, you can tell a little lie on the way in and it is OK.

Mr. DORNAN. And you can lie about the "acknowledge." You can say that "I acknowledge that it is not compatible with military life," but in your head you say of course you disagree with this.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is absolutely right.

What impressed me I say to my friend during the testimony that we heard, and also all of the young people in uniform who testified about this, is that they have to live in very close quarters. They cannot go home if they want to. They cannot leave, or they cannot quit their job if they want to. That is called desertion. They live in very tight, small places, and sometimes they die in very tight, small bases.

We had some very compelling testimony. We had a gentleman who was with the operation when the *Mayaguez* was captured by the North Koreans and when we tried to free an island where we thought the hostages were being held, and the prisoners were being held, and the marines met great resistance and took over 30 casualties. They were brought back to the ship, and the blood that was used to save them was pumped directly out of the arms of the sailors.

Mr. DORNAN. Right on the deck of the ship.

Mr. HUNTER. Absolutely. And I would just say that to do that you have to have great confidence, you have to have great confidence in the person

standing beside you. And you have to have great confidence in the fact that his blood is not polluted, that it is healthy, and that it will keep you alive. And in those kinds of circumstances, I saw people being brought in from police departments and fire departments where they have homosexuals in fire departments in certain cities in the United States, and they laid out all of the precautions that they take before they transfer blood. And they also laid out all of the facts with respect to having medical facilities available within a 5- or 10-minute life flight if something happens so that you do not have to rely on the person next to you for the blood supply.

From that it was very clear that military activities, especially combat activities are actually unique. It is not like being a policeman in San Francisco or a firefighter in Seattle.

Incidentally, one gentleman who was a firefighter testified very strongly that we should not change this policy with respect to the armed services. So the testimony that I saw was testimony that was very fundamental, that came from the people, not only the people who serve in the Armed Forces, but from the families of people who served in the Armed Forces, people who have sent five, six, or seven young men or young women to serve in the Armed Forces, put themselves in harm's way because they feel that their values are consistent with the values of the military.

Mr. DORNAN. Let me underscore something you just said. I sat through all 2 days, morning and afternoon sessions of the Armed Services Committee, our committee hearings. I went over and sat in on some of the Senate hearings that Chairman NUNN was conducting, and I listened to others on C-SPAN II in that little room there, or in your room when somebody was not watching some other program, and I watched it back in my office. But the most compelling morning of hearings was the one you set up for the Republican Research Committee, and it was one that had eight chaplains sitting in front of us, three retired, five active duty. One was a Catholic priest, and he sat in the middle with three Protestant ministers on one side and four on the other. And I asked a round robin question. I do not remember if duties called you off somewhere else, because you brought down the gavel to start that hearing. But all of these chaplains who were expressing love for every young man or woman who thought they were homosexual, or who were acting out that homosexual orientation, they expressed love for these people and they said, and I made each one of them comment on this, that their advice, their counseling, and that is what chaplains do mostly in the military, besides give Sabbath services, or synagogue services, or have Mass and hear confessions, what they do mainly is mostly

counseling young people in trouble. It is the chaplain that is the lightning rod or focal point, you will recall from your Army service, of all emergency leaves. When someday dies at home, they call the base, and the first thing they do is to call the chaplain to go to the Red Cross, and that is what they do. All eight chaplains, one right after the other, said when we are counseling someone about homosexuality, and they are on active duty, what we tell them, for their own mental stability, physical safety, emotional stability, and here is what we did not get in the rest of the hearings on the other side of the Hill, spiritual stability and well-being, we counseled them to get out of the military. You must get out of the military for your physical health before you get a disease or pass it on to somebody else. You must worry about your spiritual well-being which is locked in with your emotional well-being, and you must for your own mental well-being get out of the military because you are in a cohort, a universe of people your own age. You are young, whether you are heterosexual or homosexual, and have what the liberals call raging hormones, you have the shower situation, the close quarters, the too much drinking off the base. You have got all of the off-limit places that are drawing you like a magnet. The younger you are, the more you want to defy the "adults only" or the "off limits" label. And they said never has there been an exception that someone who had a homosexual orientation or was acting out a homosexual orientation was anything but a wreck in the military, and that is what brought them to the chaplain in the first place.

Of course, what the homosexual activists will say is that is somebody who is not proud of their orientation or is confused about his homosexuality, so he is going to the chaplain. But what about those who are not? Those who are not are obviously going to violate the policy that the White House has put out through Les Aspin. Now, I am curious tomorrow if we do a round robin of our chiefs of staffs, Chief of Naval Operations, Commandant of the Corps, because I am hearing conflicting reports that they have not all rolled to the policy, that they have not all agreed with Les Aspin. And we will not know until late tonight on one of the talk shows if Senator NUNN buys off on this.

Mr. HUNTER. I want to thank the gentleman for taking this time, because I think it is important for every one of those military leaders to do some soul-searching. And it is easy for us as Representatives to say this may put your career on the line, and in many cases it might.

Mr. DORNAN. Let me discuss the health aspect.

Mr. HUNTER. The very well-being of literally hundreds of thousands of

young people who are serving and would serve in the U.S. military is at stake with respect to this question.

And please talk about the health aspects, because the health aspect is something that touches on the lives of all of the young people who serve, who none of the social experimenters seem to care about. The one person we never see them focus on was the person who lives in that bunk. If it is a submarine bunk, it is a hot bunk where two people sleep in the same bunk, and they go in and out, or if you're on a carrier they are sleeping literally 8 to 10 inches apart, or the young person who is in a platoon where the entire barracks is one large bedroom and there is forced intimacy. We never saw a bit of concern on the behalf of those people in the testimony that come from the advocates of change in the policy.

Mr. DORNAN. Listen to this, and we will probably have to end on this, but the three Surgeons General, and what most Americans do not realize is that the doctors, medics and chaplains are all Navy, but the three-star Air Force general and the three-star Army general, they were not called on by either side to testify. But I spoke to them personally, and here is what we have serving in the Army right now, HIV-positive, the virus that gives you AIDS: 466.

□ 2030

That is an odd figure. That is February. As of today, the Marines have 91 HIV-positive, the Navy has 741, and the Air Force is about 400 to 500. They are going to give me an exact figure tomorrow, and we will have a special order.

These people cannot have been assigned overseas. They cannot be in an airplane, helicopter, a ship. They cannot be in a tank. They cannot even work with recruits on a firing range. They cannot be around tanks or artillery.

Why are they being kept in the service?

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman. Let me close by saying this: Our military leaders have a great weight on them tonight and over the next week. I hope they remember their obligation: Duty, honor, and country. And when they make that decision, I hope that they search their souls and do what is right and do not give in.

Mr. DORNAN. The Congress owns the right in our Constitution to raise armies and navies, and since then, that means air forces. It is our call how we recruit people, and we cannot be worried about a fig leaf for a Presidential campaign promise. We have to do what is right by our young men and women and our career people and those that come in for a short term as you and I did to serve duty, honor, country.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman.

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ASSIST MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AFFECTED BY DEFENSE REDUCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce H.R. 2474 today on behalf of myself and 14 colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, liberals, conservatives, Members of this body from the North, Midwest, and West.

This legislation would assist members of the Armed Forces affected by defense reductions in obtaining employment with law enforcement agencies. Today, there are thousands of talented, highly educated, highly trained, highly motivated men and women out of work due to defense cutbacks.

As a cochairman of the California Delegation's Task Force on Defense Reinvestment and Economic Development, and as a U.S. Representative from Long Beach and Los Angeles, CA urban communities struggling with military cutbacks and increasing crime rates, I feel that our Nation has a unique opportunity to encourage, throughout America, these highly skilled people toward a career in law enforcement. Police and sheriff's departments are understaffed and overworked. Since 1988, the Department of Defense has put 530,000 active duty and civilian personnel out of work. Last year alone, the military cut 178,000 active duty personnel. Estimates of private sector defense-related lay-offs, resulting from the last 6 years of defense cuts, approach 1 million individuals. To put these figures into perspective, the country was shocked following General Motor's announcement in 1991 that it would lay off 75,000 people over a 4-year period.

Laying off 1½ million to 2 million people in terms of civilian and military personnel is certainly the equivalent to 20 to 30 General Motors announcements.

I am introducing this legislation for two reasons: First, to assist the dedicated men and women who have been affected by defense reductions, and second, but not least, to put more police on the streets in order to protect our neighborhoods, our schools, and our businesses. We have a unique opportunity to channel the talents of those who once worked to keep this country and this globe safe from aggression toward efforts to make our local communities safe from internal aggression once again.

Whether in Charleston, SC, or Los Angeles, CA, able and imaginative police chiefs have shown that community-based policing and more police on the streets works. During the recent potential for disturbances in Los Angeles, the very able chief of police of Los Angeles, Chief Willie Williams showed

that more police on duty and visible to the community is a deterrent to crime.

Under this proposal, a member of the military who has been involuntarily separated from the Armed Forces may apply for law enforcement training and employment. The local jurisdiction must hire participants in the program for at least a period of 2 years. The Department of Defense would reimburse 100 percent of the participants' salary for the first year of employment; 80 percent in the second year, with 20 percent from the locality; 60 percent in the third year, with 40 percent from the locality; 40 percent in the fourth year, with now 60 percent from the locality; and 20 percent in the fifth year, with 80 percent from the local jurisdiction, and then, of course, in the sixth year the responsibility is completely that of the county or city which is responsible for that law enforcement service.

Individuals accepted into this program must agree to serve at least 2 years as a law enforcement officer for the jurisdiction that provided the training.

Three-quarters of the resources of this program will be allocated to the States on the basis of population. That is, if a State has 4 percent of the Nation's population, then that State will receive up to 4 percent of the resources available under this portion of the act. For one-quarter, 25 percent of the resources, priority will be given to jurisdictions experiencing an especially high crime rate, as determined by the Attorney General of the United States. Finally, at least one jurisdiction per State will be made eligible to participate in the high crime rate portion of this program.

I am pleased that President Clinton recognizes the need for law enforcement expansion. The White House Domestic Policy Council is currently looking into a police corps program for retraining veterans and discharged military. Last year, Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman SAM NUNN introduced legislation with much the same purpose as what I and my colleagues are introducing today. His proposal, which was approved as part of the Defense authorization bill, provides retirement benefits to encourage and assist separating military personnel to enter public or community service jobs such as education and health care, as well as law enforcement. The legislation we are introducing today builds upon the program established by Senator NUNN by training a greater number of those affected by the defense cutbacks exclusively for law enforcement.

If you knock on the door in most urban neighborhoods, they will say there are two problems that confront them: One is the level of crime, and the other is the quality of their children's education. Both are related. To have

learning occur in our schools, we need to control the criminal activity that surrounds all too many of our schools.

If all of the resources available under this act are not used by members of the Armed Forces who are involuntarily separated, the Secretary of Defense may extend the program to include Department of Defense civilians and defense contractor employees who have lost their jobs due to defense cutbacks.

There has been increasing concern about incidents of crime in the United States, and correctly so. In Los Angeles and other major cities, there are repeated incidents of violent crimes, murder, rape, robbery, assault, and the new phenomenon of carjackings which has also resulted in deaths of the drivers and sometimes the passengers involved.

There is a clear need for more law enforcement on our streets, and our proposed program can help accomplish just that.

In recent years, drugs and violence have taken over too many of our streets, too many of our neighborhoods, too many of our housing projects, and even infiltrated our schools.

The chance of being a victim of a violent crime is greater than that of being hurt in a traffic accident.

Between 1990 and 1991 the number of violent crimes attempted against our residents went up 11 percent. That is a significant increase.

Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing an article from today's Washington Post on gang violence, long associated with major urban areas. Now it is spreading even to Midwestern cities such as Wichita, KS.

Currently, many of our cities are under serious desperate financial constraints. Recently, the National Association of Chiefs of Police surveyed every chief of police and sheriff in the United States. Almost 74 percent of those sheriffs and chiefs of police believe that their law enforcement department is presently undermanned to carry out the duties expected of the elected officials and expected of them by the citizens.

□ 2040

Keep in mind that more police will save money. We must not forget that crime costs money in a variety of areas: medical costs, property damage, court costs, jail costs, and costs of police work associated with each crime. Additionally, there are the intangible costs of lost sales in the area, and lost productivity of victims and witnesses to the crime.

The connection between peace in the streets and economic growth is clear. As Richard Riordan, the recently elected mayor of Los Angeles, has said, "No business wants to locate in a war zone." Because more police will mean less crime, the economic climate in our

hard-hit urban areas will improve. It will reduce the rationale for businesses to leave, and it will increase the chances that businesses will locate there. It will also provide struggling businesses and new businesses with a better chance to survive.

This bill will also provide jobs for many outstanding members of ethnic and racial minorities who, in turn, will serve as vitally needed role models for our inner city youth. Black and Hispanic individuals are certainly affected by defense cutbacks since black Americans comprise approximately 23 percent of our enlisted force and 7 percent of the military officer corps. Similarly, Hispanic Americans constitute 5 percent of the enlisted force and 2 percent of the military officer corps.

This Nation has been looking for a plan to attack violent crime. Men and women who are displaced as a result of the defense cuts can help tip the balance against the criminals who have declared war against those who live in urban America.

This is a worthy proposal that all Members can support, regardless of party or ideology. It fulfills several of the most basic functions for which our Government was established: To establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Nothing will aid us to achieve these noble goals more than helping our citizens overcome the threat to their lives, liberties, and pursuit of happiness that results from the epidemic of crime that is rampant in too many and too much in our cities.

Crime is not a partisan issue. This is a bill that Democrats and Republicans, conservatives and liberals, can support. It is a vitally needed measure at a very critical time.

This proposal is in the national interest because it helps offer protection for our children, our homes, and our neighborhoods.

I am pleased that this bill has the support of the Non Commissioned Officers Association.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note my colleagues who joined in this effort. The principal coauthor is EDOLPHUS TOWNS, Democrat of New York, and he is joined by BEN GILMAN, Republican of New York; DAVID HOBSON, Republican of Ohio; NANCY JOHNSON, Republican of Connecticut; JOSEPH MCDADE, Republican of Pennsylvania; HOWARD "BUCK" MCKEON, Republican of California; CARLOS MOORHEAD, Republican of California; ED PASTOR, Democrat of Arizona; CHARLES RANGEL, Democrat of New York; CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Republican of Connecticut; ESTEBAN TORRES, Democrat of California; JAMES TRAFICANT, Democrat of Ohio; FRED UPTON, Republican of Michigan; and HENRY WAXMAN, Democrat of California.

They see in this legislation as I see in this legislation and I hope all in this

Chamber and all Americans will see, an opportunity to deal with one of the most serious problems that affects millions of Americans either through violent crimes having been committed upon hundreds of thousands of them or the fear of crime that keeps citizens from going out and enjoying the quality of life that our cities do offer.

We need to overcome the fear citizens have who would stay in their homes, and we need to once again assure there are safe streets, safe neighborhoods, and a safe society.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I offer the article from the Washington Post entitled "Gangs Carve 'New Frontier' on the Old."

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1993]

GANGS CARVE 'NEW FRONTIER' ON THE OLD—AS VIOLENCE RIDES IN, WICHITA RELIVES BYGONE ERA WITH URBAN TWIST

(By Gary Lee)

WICHITA, KS.—Police Officer Brad Carey can pinpoint the evening that urban America's most dreaded scourge arrived here.

It occurred in December 1989 when a young man was spotted selling crack outside a squat tenement on the northeast side, Carey recalled. Identifying himself as a member of the Los Angeles-based Crips, the suspect warned arresting officers that a flood of others like him would follow. Carey said, "but we thought that was all a lot of bluster."

Were they ever wrong. In three years, the number of gangs marauding Wichita streets has burgeoned to 90, according to police, and drive-by shootings have become commonplace. Last year, despite a massive crackdown against gang violence, there were 14 gang-related homicides.

Surrounded by miles of wheat farms and cattle ranches, Wichita is an overgrown town of 300,000. Ice-cream trucks trill daily through neighborhood streets. The most popular weekend hangout is the Marriott hotel disco. And there is one church for every 500 locals, as many as four in one block in some cases.

But Wichita also is the nation's ninth largest haven for gangs, according to a study last year at Pepperdine University.

Long associated exclusively with major urban areas, gangs are expanding their turf into the heartland. In 1991, police reported 12 gang-linked homicides in Omaha and eight in Oklahoma City. This year, gangs have appeared even in the sleepy Kansas town of Dodge City, famous for cowboy gangs of another era.

"As far as street gangs are concerned," said Carl Upchurch, organizer of a major "gang summit" in Kansas City, Mo., last month, "middle America represents the new frontier."

Big-city gangs branched into Minneapolis, Denver and other mid-size cities in the late 1980s, largely in reaction to aggressive police tactics against them in Los Angeles and elsewhere, according to Upchurch and other urban-affairs experts.

The onslaught has caught Wichita off-guard. "People here are God-fearing," said the Rev. L.C. Drew, pastor of Grant African Methodist Episcopal Church. "They are also laid-back and self-content. They work hard at keeping this a calm place."

But the quiet was broken on Easter Sunday 1990 when one gang member gunned down a rival at Joyland, a popular amusement park, in the first display of open gang warfare.

Any illusion it was an isolated incident was shattered a few months later in an isolated park on the city's edge. There, on a sultry August evening, four local youths kidnapped, raped and stomped a young mother to death in what turned out to be an act of retaliation by members of the Insane Crips, a local gang.

"That was one of the biggest shocks the city ever had," said Cammie Funston, an administrator at Project Freedom, an anti-gang community organization. "It woke me up to the fact that something around here had gone very wrong."

The incident hit Funston particularly close to home. One youth convicted and jailed in this case was Rodney Hicks. A junior high student council leader and after-school playmate of Funston's son, he was 14 years old.

Since then, public gang feuding has become more commonplace here. Initially motivated by the drug market, it now seems driven more by tit-for-tat violence, according to Officer Kent Bauman of the police gang unit, although, like most big cities with violence problems, there are many neighborhoods that are calm and safe.

Last year, Wichitans reported 237 robberies and other gang-related armed assaults. They also reported more than 300 drive-by shootings, more than half of them were gang-related and many more gang-inspired, police said.

In one case recently, a gang leader answering a knock at the door of his motel room was shot in the mouth with a shotgun. In another, a gang member suspected of withholding money was burned repeatedly on the back with a clothes iron.

Police and the sheriff's department of surrounding Sedgwick County have joined to create special narcotics and gang units. Project Freedom, founded by local community activists, declared its own grass-roots war against gangs.

For three years, authorities and gangs have fought an open tug of war, with each seeking to stake out turf across the city's sprawl of homes and stores.

When police realized that members of the Bloods and Crips gangs were commuting from Los Angeles and nearby Tulsa, Okla., and tutoring gangs here, they organized a regional anti-gang police network with Tulsa, Oklahoma City and Kansas City, Mo.

Since then, however, out-of-town gang members largely have left town, police said, but gang membership continues to grow. While gangs based in Chicago, Los Angeles, Boston and Tulsa have chapters here, police said, most of the city's 90 street gangs are home-grown.

When gang members first concentrated drug sales in a back street dubbed "Crack Alley," police closed it down in a series of busts. But the crack trade expanded to other areas here and remains a focus of gang activity, police said.

This year, gangs have responded with increased efforts to cover houses and abandoned buildings with graffiti, including eulogies for slain members and death threats for rivals, as a way of claiming the surrounding neighborhoods.

Funston, in turn, organized "paint-outs," at which volunteers painted over the graffiti on more than 100 houses.

Peeved by the gangs' persistence, police launched a gang-intelligence unit. Its officers circulate nightly throughout the city's northeast section, largely African American and low-income, with note-books containing biographies of 500 gang members, including their street names.

"The idea is to gather as much information as we can about the culture that created the gangs and what keeps them going," Carey said. "Over time, we have a little something on the majority of gang members here."

When Cornelius Baker, a 2nd Street gang member, was gunned down last month, uniformed officers and a police helicopter were at the funeral. While some officers staked out entrance ways and parking lots, other photographed gang members.

This head-on approach has resulted in arrest and conviction of several hundred gang members in the last three years. Nevertheless, gang membership has increased from 980 to 1,250 in that time, police said.

Although initially composed almost exclusively of African-American males, the gangs now include more whites, Hispanics, Asians and women, according to Carey, and the average age of members has dropped from 18 to 14.

African Americans make up about one-third of Wichita's population, and gangs affect nearly every black family in some way, said the Rev. T.L. Wade, pastor of New Jerusalem Baptist Church. "We used to consider gang members fringe elements," he said. "But now we recognize that they are our sons and nephews."

Cory Menefee, 15, is one example. He was raised by his mother after his father left home. For several years, he bounced among schools, skipping classes and falling others while trying to play quarterback.

Two years ago, Menefee was approached by a member of the Black Gangster Disciples, the local branch of a Chicago gang. "All my home boys were signing up" Menefee said. "So I did too."

After his best friend was shot in the head and killed in a gang fight, Menefee started carrying a gun. Targeted by a rival gang, he was shot in the foot last December in a drive-by incident.

Although the incident turned Menefee's graceful athlete's stride into a hobble, he is undeterred. "Once you join," he said, "you're in for life."

Indeed, Wichita's die-hard gang members use Draconian tactics to keep others from leaving.

Two years ago, Reginaldo Cruz, 15, was taken to a park, forced to his knees and shot in the head with a shotgun. Police believe that he was slain for trying to leave the Vato Loco Boyz gang. In another case, gang leaders searching for one of their members broke down the door of his grandmother's house and shot her three times.

Incensed by gangs' apparent hammerlock on so many youths, the Rev. Sylvia Farmer Drew, a Methodist minister, founded an underground railroad to relocate gang members and their families who want to escape. The organization has assisted about 15 gang members, Drew said.

Earlier this year, it moved a girl, 14, being sold by gangs as a prostitute. Last month, a gang member, 16, and his family were put on a bus to Mississippi. Other gang members have been moved for a few weeks to another side of town for a cooling-off period.

A major reason that gangs are so resilient, according to African-American activists, is what Wichita is not addressing root causes of the gang problem, including widespread joblessness, divided families and lack of role models.

"Many of the gang members come from broken homes," said Wade, whose church is in the middle of an area favored by gangs. "They have been failed by their families,

their schools and their churches too. What they desperately need is some support system to back them up. The gangs are the only ones offering them that."

Joblessness also has apparently compelled young Wichitans to join gangs. At 5 percent, the overall unemployment rate here is lower than the national average of nearly 7 percent. But joblessness is estimated to be much higher among blacks, and drug dealing has provided an alternative means of making a living.

"You could buy an ounce [of cocaine] for \$300 in L.A. and sell it for \$1,500 here," said a gang member who asked not to be identified. "It was a business opportunity waiting to be taken advantage of."

After midnight on almost any night in northeastern Wichita, gang members hang out in the parking lot of Quik Trip, an all-night convenience store at 13th and Oliver streets. On Sundays, gangs head for Riverside, a park near downtown.

One recent evening near there, Roy Nesbith, 14, raised his shirt to show friends where he was shot by a rival three weeks earlier.

Around the corner, another youth stood next to his late-model yellow Cadillac. A decal across the top of the windshield read: "Original Gangster."

A few blocks away, Jerry McCray complained that business at his convenience store has dwindled because elderly customers, daunted by gang violence, are afraid to shop day or night.

"It used to be a rare thing to hear gunfire at night in my neighborhood in Wichita," said Steve Gray, a public school social worker. "Now it's a rare thing to get through a night without it."

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DERRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 6:15 p.m., and June 23, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. SYNAR (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. HINCHEY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for June 23 and 24, on account of death in the family.

#### 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. DREIER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GINGRICH for 5 minutes each day on June 22, 23, 24 and 25.

Mr. GOSS for 5 minutes on June 23.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG for 60 minutes on July 1.

Mr. KIM for 5 minutes on July 30.

Mr. MCCOLLUM for 60 minutes on June 28.

Mr. HUNTER for 5 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PICKETT) to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida for 5 minutes each day on June 22, 23 and 24.

Mr. SCOTT for 5 minutes today.

Mr. STARK for 5 minutes today.

Mr. DURBIN for 60 minutes today.

Mr. LAFALCE for 60 minutes today.

Mrs. MEEK for 60 minutes on June 23.

Mr. UNDERWOOD for 60 minutes on June 23.

Mr. MCDERMOTT for 60 minutes each day on June 24, 28, 29 and 30.

The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material:

Mr. DORNAN for 15 minutes today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GILMAN, concerning the tribute to Mr. NATCHER.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. ZELIFF.

Mr. LEWIS of California in two instances.

Mr. CALLAHAN.

Mr. KINGSTON.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. CASTLE.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

Mr. THOMAS of California.

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. PICKETT) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. NADLER in two instances.

Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. GLICKMAN.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. HOLDEN.

Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. SHEPHERD.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. WILSON.

Mr. BARCA.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. MORAN.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mrs. LLOYD.

Mr. POSHARD.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HORN, Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 23, 1993, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1465. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the fiscal year 1994 request for appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 103-103); to the Committee on Appropriations ordered to be printed.

1466. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(d)(3) (103 Stat. 1812); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1467. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to cover civilian faculty of the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1468. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a copy of the study of the cost and feasibility of tracking the insured and uninsured deposits of any individual and the exposure, under any act of Congress or any regulation of any appropriate Federal banking agency, of the Federal Government with respect to all insured depository institutions, pursuant to Public Law 102-242, section 311(d)(6) (105 Stat. 2367); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1469. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of the antiterrorism training courses to be offered to the civilian security forces of the Government of Ghana, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-3(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1470. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the quarterly reports in accordance with sections 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, the March 24, 1979 report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the seventh report by the Committee on Government Operations for the second quarter of fiscal year 1993, January 1, 1993 through March 31, 1993, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1471. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting text of agreements in which the American Institute in Taiwan is a party between January 1, 1991 and December 31, 1992, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1472. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1473. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting notification of the determination that it is in the public interest to make a proposed contract award to the Charles

County Community College to establish a pilot telecommuting center in southern Maryland, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 253(c)(7); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1474. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a proposed report of the Chief of Engineers for the Great Lakes, particularly Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1962d-5(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1475. A letter from the Chairman, Environmental Research Institute, Inc., transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Productivity-Inducing Competition, The Key to Universal and Affordable Quality Health Care"; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 203. Resolution waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-147). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 204. Resolution waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2446) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-148). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CARR: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2490. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STOKES: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2491. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### 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. HORN (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McKEON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 2474. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a program to assist members of the Armed Forces who are involuntarily separated from active duty to obtain training and employment as law enforcement officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2475. A bill to provide for congressional approval of a nuclear aircraft carrier waste disposal plan before the construction of CVN-76, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BROWN of California, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 2476. A bill to prohibit the Department of Defense from contracting with foreign contractors for ship repair until a certification is made to Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey:

H.R. 2477. A bill to amend the Federal Law Enforcement Pay Reform Act of 1990 to provide that Federal police officers be treated in the same way as other Federal law enforcement officers for purposes of that act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATEMAN:

H.R. 2478. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and to convey certain lands or interests in lands to improve the management, protection, and administration of Colonial National Historical Park and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 2479. A bill to amend the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 to establish an entitlement of States and certain political subdivisions of States to receive grants from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the abatement of health hazards associated with lead-based paint, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax and establish a trust fund to satisfy the Federal obligations arising from such entitlement; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 2480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion for all dividends and interest received by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. BUYER):

H.R. 2481. A bill to provide funding for an examination of the possible health effects of exposure to depleted uranium of U.S. military personnel in the Persian Gulf war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. FOWLER (for herself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. CANADY, Mr. WELDON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. KYL, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. TALENT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. REVENEL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. EVERETT):

H.R. 2482. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit the transfer of Department of Defense funds to other departments and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAZZOLI (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 2483. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make changes in the

laws relating to nonimmigrants and immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 2484. A bill to provide equal leave benefits for adoptive parents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAMSTAD:

H.R. 2485. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Bisphenol AF; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2486. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on octadecyl isocyanate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2487. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on certain ceramic ferrules and sleeves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BERMAN,

Mr. BLACKWELL, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Ms. FURSE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLING, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. MALONEY, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MFUME, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REED, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. SCHENK, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TORRES, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 2488. A bill to establish certain requirements with respect to solid waste and hazardous waste incinerators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SKEEN (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 2489. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Claims Court with respect to land claims of Pueblo of Iseta Indian Tribe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution relating to the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation organization; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

208. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to the Fitzsimmons Army Medical Center; to the Committee on Armed Services.

209. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to the 1990 Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

210. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to the Electric and Magnetic Fields Research and Public Information Dissemination Program; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 28: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.  
 H.R. 65: Mr. CRANE and Mr. UNDERWOOD.  
 H.R. 108: Mr. MACHTLEY and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.  
 H.R. 127: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. HOBSON.  
 H.R. 238: Mr. MICHEL, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. CASTLE.  
 H.R. 273: Mr. BACCHUS of Florida.  
 H.R. 303: Mr. MINETA and Mr. UNDERWOOD.  
 H.R. 311: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.  
 H.R. 369: Mr. BOEHRNER.  
 H.R. 546: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. LAMBERT, and Mr. DARDEN.  
 H.R. 563: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana and Mr. FAWELL.  
 H.R. 667: Mr. ROBERTS.  
 H.R. 684: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.  
 H.R. 760: Mr. STUDDS.  
 H.R. 799: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. COSTELLO.  
 H.R. 823: Mr. VENTO.  
 H.R. 911: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. MURTHA.  
 H.R. 921: Mr. PALLONE.  
 H.R. 962: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KASICH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KIM, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SAXTON, and Ms. LAMBERT.  
 H.R. 1012: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SPRATT, and Ms. WATERS.  
 H.R. 1078: Mr. GILMAN.  
 H.R. 1079: Mr. GILMAN.  
 H.R. 1082: Mr. GILMAN.  
 H.R. 1111: Mr. MINETA.  
 H.R. 1133: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ORTON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Ms. SHEPHERD, and Mr. VISLOSKEY.  
 H.R. 1181: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. DEFAZIO.  
 H.R. 1200: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H.R. 1295: Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. SHAW, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. PORTER.  
 H.R. 1349: Mr. PETRI, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. HYDE.  
 H.R. 1360: Mr. NADLER.  
 H.R. 1442: Ms. MALONEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. VENTO.  
 H.R. 1476: Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FISH, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. CANADY.  
 H.R. 1490: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 1504: Mr. LEVY, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. SERRANO.  
 H.R. 1508: Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H.R. 1549: Mr. MACHTLEY and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.  
 H.R. 1580: Mr. STENHOLM.  
 H.R. 1583: Mrs. MEEK, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 1670: Mr. SAM JOHNSON and Mr. ROHRBACHER.  
 H.R. 1697: Mr. NADLER, Mr. DURBIN, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SWETT, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. BROWN of California.  
 H.R. 1709: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. ZELIFF.  
 H.R. 1738: Mr. PENNY.  
 H.R. 1800: Mr. BECERRA, Ms. THURMAN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.  
 H.R. 1814: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. OWENS.  
 H.R. 1841: Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H.R. 1874: Mr. CRANE.  
 H.R. 1900: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.  
 H.R. 1910: Mr. KYL, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. DOOLEY.  
 H.R. 1935: Mr. MORAN.  
 H.R. 1989: Mr. BAKER of California.  
 H.R. 2002: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. WOLF.  
 H.R. 2043: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. SWETT, Mr. STARK, Mr. FLAKE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.  
 H.R. 2053: Mr. BAKER of California.  
 H.R. 2113: Mr. BUNNING and Mr. CRAPO.  
 H.R. 2124: Mr. MACHTLEY.  
 H.R. 2241: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. LEVIN.  
 H.R. 2245: Mr. KASICH, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. COX, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. HOKE.  
 H.R. 2253: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. GRAMS.  
 H.R. 2286: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. MANN, and Mr. ROTH.  
 H.R. 2315: Mr. BALLENGER.  
 H.R. 2331: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 2354: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. BOEHRNER.  
 H.R. 2365: Mr. PENNY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. SANTORUM.  
 H.R. 2414: Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 2415: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GOSS, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 2417: Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 2461: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.  
 H.R. 2467: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut and Mr. KINGSTON.  
 H.J. Res. 11: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BROWDER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPERSMITH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EWING, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.  
 H.J. Res. 86: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LEVY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.  
 H.J. Res. 142: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. SLAUGH-

TER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. WAXMAN.  
 H.J. Res. 145: Mr. HUGHES.  
 H.J. Res. 155: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.  
 H.J. Res. 190: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. VALENTINE, and Ms. WATERS.  
 H.J. Res. 204: Mr. KASICH, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. LEVIN.  
 H.J. Res. 212: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. VENTO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. REGULA, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. LAFALCE.  
 H.J. Res. 213: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COX, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DEAL, Mr. DE LUZO, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. FROST, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HOBEY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEVY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOWEY, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. POSHARD, Mr.

PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REED, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SISISKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. THORNTON, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. VALENTINE, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLF, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H. Con. Res. 76: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. VENTO.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. TORRES, Mr. HASTERT, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KREIDLER, and Mr. OWENS.

H. Res. 32: Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 135: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H. Res. 151: Mr. STUMP.

H. Res. 156: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H. Res. 165: Mr. VENTO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. KREIDLER.

H. Res. 174: Mr. MCCREERY and Mr. TALENT.

H. Res. 184: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. PARKER.

H. Res. 194: Mr. STUMP, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. BAKER of California.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

47. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of Davao, Republic of the Philippines, relative to the Filipino Veterans Equity Act of 1991; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

48. Also, petition of the County of Wayne, NC, relative to the proposed increase in taxes by the U.S. Government on the sale of cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2200

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:  
—Page 48, after line 10, insert the following new section:

#### SEC. 316. REMOTE SENSING FOR AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the use of remote sensing data is potentially a valuable resource to anticipate potential food, feed, and fiber shortages or excesses, and provide this information to the agricultural community in time to assist farmers with planting decisions;

(2) remote sensing data can be useful to predict impending famine problems and forest infestations in time to allow remedial action;

(3) remote sensing data can inform the agricultural community as to the condition of crops and the land which sustains those crops;

(4) remote sensing data can be useful to allow farmers to apply pesticides, nutrients, and water, among other inputs, to farmlands in the exact amounts necessary to maximize crop yield, thereby reducing agricultural costs and minimizing potential harm to the environment;

(5) remote sensing data can be valuable, when received on a timely basis, in determining the needs of additional plantings of a particular crop or a substitute crop; and

(6) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, using the expertise of the Earth Observations Commercialization Applications Program, and the Department of Agriculture should work in tandem to aid

farmers to obtain data conducive to sound agricultural management and greater crop yields.

(b) INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, maximizing private funding and involvement, shall provide farmers and other interested persons with timely information, through remote sensing, on crop conditions, fertilization and irrigation needs, pest infiltration, soil conditions, projected food, feed, and fiber production and any other information available through remote sensing.

(c) ENHANCED REMOTE SENSING PROGRAM.

(1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly evaluate the need for a radar imaging platform that could enhance U.S. remote sensing capability by providing information and data relating to agricultural resources, and which may have other commercial and research applications.

(2) In the event there is a finding of need for a platform as set forth in paragraph (1), the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly develop a proposal, which maximizes private funding and involvement in the launch and operation of such platform, and in the management and dissemination of the data from such platform. The Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly submit the proposal, within 30 days of its development, to the House Committee on Agriculture, the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

(d) TRAINING.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly develop a proposal to inform farmers and other prospective users concerning the use and availability of remote sensing data.

(e) SUNSET.—The provisions of this section shall expire 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.