

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 29, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

As the Sun lifts high in the sky and shows its light and warmth to the whole world, so may Your good spirit, O God, send its eternal light and its truth to each person. Fill our hearts with the bounty of every blessing and permeate our very souls with the assurances that Your word alone can give. May we go about our responsibilities this day with vigor and energy knowing that our contributions for justice and peace can become extraordinary when strengthened by the brightness of Your presence in our lives. Bless us this day and every day, 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 gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois 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.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize 15 Members on each side for 1-minute requests.

### TRIBUTE TO SGT. EUGENE WILLIAMS: A FALLEN SOLDIER

(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, Sgt. Eugene Williams, a 26-year-old man who grew up in my district in Chicago was one of the three soldiers who gave their lives to the cause of peace in Somalia. This young man who was able to escape the daily violence and realities of urban life for young African-Americans, and who was able to survive a 7-month tour of duty in the Per-

sian Gulf war, was unable to escape the danger in the streets of Mogadishu, where his U.S. Blackhawk helicopter was shot down by Somali guerrillas with a rocket-propelled grenade.

Sergeant Williams was the second oldest son of Mr. and Mrs. Johnnie Williams. As a youngster on Chicago's West Side, he chose the Boy Scouts over gangs and joined the Explorer Scout Troop sponsored by the Chicago Police Department. He was a graduate of the Victor Herbert Elementary School and a football player at Crane High School.

He joined the military in 1985 and served in South Korea and Germany. Earlier this year he reenlisted in the service of his country. In the words of his father, "he died fighting for others. He was just proud to be a soldier and to be in the Army. He loved his job." Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to Sergeant Williams and send my heartfelt condolences to his family.

### CONGRESS SHOULD NOT BE STAMPEDED INTO ONE HEALTH CARE PLAN

(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, we need fundamental change in the health care program in this country. Everyone agrees with that. We need to have a basic health care program that is extended to all citizens of this country.

But the drive for fundamental change does not mean we should embrace a federally controlled system of medical bureaucracy just to be able to say that we have made a change. The administration says they favor a simple system, a system that is free of bureaucracy. I wish that were so. Let us take a look for just a second at the hierarchy that is being put into place if we follow that system. A national health board appointed on a national basis to oversee health care. State alliances operated under Federal rules and regulations. A global budget enforced by the Federal Government. Price controls to be enforced by a national board of health care, and the Labor Department to monitor all of these activities, to deliver a federally supervised health care system.

Mr. Speaker, we need reform. But we need to have a reform that is developed in the private sector, that maintains choice, that maintains the best part of

the system that we have, and we can do this, if we are not stampeded into going over the cliff for a federally controlled health care program.

### LET RUSSIA FINANCE THEIR OWN DEMOCRACY

(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, Uncle Sam wants to send another \$2.5 billion to Russia. I think it is time to check this out.

Rebels control one of the cities in Georgia. Armenians and Azeris are involved in a bloody war. The President of the Ukraine has taken control of the Ukrainian Parliament. The whole Russian Confederation they say is falling apart. And Boris Yeltsin has taken control and had military troops surround the Russian Parliament.

I say maybe this will be the first time in history that Uncle Sam gives foreign aid to a country that has not one, but two Presidents, ladies and gentlemen. Russia now has two Presidents.

I say let Uncle Sam step back and let the Russian people finance democracy in Russia. Maybe Congress would be wise to advise the administration instead of sending hard-earned taxpayer dollars we could use for health care, maybe we should send over a team of Dr. Ruth and Dr. Spock. That would be more helpful for the Russians.

### "NO BLOODY WAY" IS SUGGESTED RESPONSE TO FRENCH ON TRADE ISSUES

(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, recently an Australian Ambassador summed up how to best deal with the French in the Uruguay round world trade negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Responding to France's reneging on the much-heralded Blair House compromise on agricultural subsidies, the ambassador said, "No bloody way" to France's demands to renegotiate.

Mr. Speaker, "No bloody way," should become the rallying cry of the United States and the unsubsidized agricultural exporting countries of the Cairns group. Farmers in these nations have suffered along with U.S. producers

☐ 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.

from absurd French agricultural policies. In November last year, these farmers finally thought the devastating agricultural subsidy war had ended and they were excited to concentrate on earning a decent living. However, French politicians have nearly destroyed those hopes by caving in to the terroristic threats of a group of militant French farmers dependent on rural French welfare.

Now, the French have blatantly reneged on a US-EC compromise in a way that was all too predictable. After accepting concessions from United States oilseed and soybean producers, who had patiently won recognition of their trade rights following a long dispute, the French agreed to accept that part of the compromise while clearly reneging on their written agreement to adhere to agreed upon cuts in the volume of subsidized agricultural exports.

Mr. Speaker, the intransigent French are not only sharing responsibility for forcing thousands of American and Australian farmers and millions of third-world farmers off of the land—they alone, are holding the world hostage by blocking, perhaps, the only international action able to end a world recession—that is completion of the Uruguay round of GATT. Consequently, U.S. trade officials should say, "No bloody way," to the French while unequivocally rejecting their completely unacceptable demands.

□ 1010

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM: KEEP THE GOOD, FIX THE BAD

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago President Clinton presented his plan to reform our Nation's health care system. People in my district and people across the country tuned in on Wednesday night in record numbers to hear the President describe the National Health Security Act.

As the debate moves to Congress, public attention will now focus here as well. It would be a grave disservice to the American public to allow partisan bickering or special interest lobbying to sidetrack the debate on health care reform. Our mission in designing a health reform package should be clear: To preserve what is right with our health care system and to fix what is wrong.

Preserving what is right means ensuring that Americans have access to the quality care that we have come to expect. The Health Security Act will build upon that system and allow our medical institutions to continue to flourish.

Preserving what is right in our health care system also means retain-

ing the right to choose your own physician.

The Health Security Act will guarantee every American a comprehensive benefits package that can never be taken away. To fix what is wrong with our health care system means we must cover the 37 million Americans who are currently without health insurance and the millions more who are underinsured.

To fix what is wrong with our health care system means a guarantee that no American family will lose coverage because of a lost job.

To fix what is wrong with our health care system means that no American will ever again be denied health coverage because of a preexisting condition.

In the coming weeks we will debate the Health Security Act. Undoubtedly we will make some changes to the President's plan. But let us be guided by two core goals: Preserving what is right and fixing what is wrong with health care in America.

#### THE HEALTH CARE PLAN WILL DESTROY JOBS

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

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Surgeon General should slap a warning on the President's health plan: This proposal may be hazardous to your job.

I say this because the heavy new regulations the President wants to place on small businesses across America will in fact destroy over 3 million jobs.

Last year, the highly respected Employee Benefits Research Institute conducted a study on the job-loss effect of an employer health insurance mandate—a mandate similar to the one the President is now proposing.

Its conclusion: A small business health insurance mandate will destroy 1.2 million jobs in America.

Mr. Speaker, there are better ways to extend insurance to the uninsured that will not destroy their jobs.

For employees and employers alike, let us reject this new Federal mandate on America's small businesses and low-wage workers.

#### HEALTH CARE IS A RIGHT, NOT A PRIVILEGE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the American Health Security Act. The people of my district whom I represent overwhelmingly asked me to reform health care and provide coverage for all of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, these people work hard to pay their bills and care for their

families yet they are unable to meet the demands of our current health care system because of skyrocketing cost.

There are those who believe that the Government should stay out of health care completely because they believe that the market should set the cost of health care. What these people fail to realize is that market forces break down when life and death decisions are made. We simply cannot ask families to continue to make health care decisions based on the same way they choose what brand of peanut butter they buy.

Health care decisions are the most important ones a family will make which is why the system we establish must recognize, that the health and safety of our citizens is the first duty of our Government. This is why health care is a right and not a privilege.

Last year this sign was given to me by one of my constituents. The Health Care Security Act is a way to fulfill our obligation to promote the general welfare, providing for our citizens a true health security.

#### DISTINGUISHING THE MESSAGE FROM THE MESSENGER

(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, Americans can distinguish the message from the messenger—we are now reading the fine print behind the lofty principles. And the President's health care message is indeed very mixed: Claiming to encourage simplicity while creating an enormous new bureaucracy; claiming to boost the economy while charting a dangerous course toward major job loss from burdensome mandates; and claiming to produce savings while generating tremendous costs that inevitably will lead to higher taxes. In a major southwest Florida newspaper survey only days after the President made his pitch, only 2 of 10 people approved the Clinton plan. Americans see through slick marketing campaigns, want to fix what is broken by building on what works. We must invite the President to take a look at the Republican leader's message on health care. It is a message more than 2 of 10 Americans respond to favorably.

#### VOTE "NO" ON DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, today we resume debate on the defense authorization bill, which proposes \$263 billion in military spending. I will vote against this bill and urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the cold war is over, and our major enemy in the world today is not Russia, not the Warsaw Pact, and not communism. Our major enemy is the hopelessness and despair felt by tens of millions of American workers who are either unemployed or are seeing their standard of living decline; our major enemy is the pain experienced by senior citizens who are unable to survive with dignity on their meager Social Security benefits; and by young people who are unable to afford the cost of a higher education. Our enemy today and the threat to our national security is the rage and the frustration being felt by millions of young people who may never have a decent job in their lives and the waste of having millions of Americans sleep out on our streets.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need star wars, we need educational opportunity for all. We do not need the D-5 missile program, we need to put millions of Americans to work rebuilding our Nation and constructing the affordable housing we desperately need. We do not need to spend over \$100 billion a year defending Western Europe and Japan; we need to make certain that our children, our veterans, and our senior citizens live in dignity.

Mr. Speaker, let us vote "no" on the defense budget and "yes" for new priorities in America.

#### UNNECESSARY TORPEDO IN HEALTH CARE DEBATE

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton came to us claiming two things: He would lift the ban on gays in the military, to allow homosexuals to serve in the armed services; he said, "I will lift the Henry Hyde amendment to permit Medicaid funds," taxpayer dollars, "to finance abortions."

On these two subjects, the will of the American people through the Congress has spoken: The House yesterday moved off of the Senate initiatives and codified the ban on gays in the military into law. The Senate yesterday moved on the House initiatives and overwhelmingly passed the Hyde amendment to ban the use of taxpayer dollars to finance abortions.

Despite this signal, President Clinton in the health care debate wants to finance abortions through his health care plan. Wait until the American people see that a female veteran can choose a VA health care plan and obtain an abortion from a VA clinic.

Mr. Clinton, that is an unnecessary torpedo into the health care debate.

#### INTERMOUNTAIN HEALTH CARE

(Ms. SHEPHERD asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Speaker, as we undertake health care reform in the coming months perhaps we must focus on achieving savings in the system by eliminating waste, curtailing fraud, and improving cost effectiveness. The experiences of Intermountain Health Care [IHC] in Utah suggest that we can meet this challenge by making a serious commitment to improving quality of care.

By establishing a computerized database to monitor and analyze health care outcomes, IHC doctors have improved their effectiveness while dramatically reducing costs. In one stunning example, IHC physicians were able to reduce their infection rates by more than 75 percent by moving forward the time antibiotics are administered before surgery. This measure saved \$14,000 per avoided infection.

If every U.S. hospital achieved these standards, nationwide savings could exceed \$1.5 billion. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that we can achieve great savings by renewing our commitment to quality. I urge my colleagues to join me in working with the President to accomplish this critical goal.

#### TERROR IN WASHINGTON, DC

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, last night in Washington, DC, I went to sleep again to the wail of police and ambulance sirens. This morning's headlines and news stories chronicle the pain and suffering of this wounded city. The savage murders, violence and lawlessness on the streets of our Nation's Capital must come to an end.

My God, if it takes bringing out the National Guard as Mayor Kelly has suggested, I say act now. Act now before another night of terror on our streets. Act now before another innocent child bystander's life is snuffed out, another merchant brutally slain.

I say act now to stop the genocide of a generation of young male African-Americans. I say act now to bring out the National Guard, enact a Federal crime bill or take whatever measures necessary to bring this senseless killing to an end.

□ 1020

#### NOT ENOUGH TIME FOR NAFTA

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

Mr. APPLGATE. Mr. Speaker, from the very beginning I have been against NAFTA, and I still am, but I have read some of the agreement and some of the

arguments for it. I can see where benefits will come forth for the United States, for Mexico and for Canada, in about 10 or 12 years; but Mr. Speaker, the United States does not have the time, the industry or the jobs to sacrifice over 10 to 12 years.

If Mexico is sincere in free trade with the United States, they must then prove their mettle and show by example, not just agreements, before we enter into any free-trade agreement; but for now we should agree on no less than fair and equal trade that will phase in free trade when Mexico has shown her willingness to cooperate.

#### TIME TO BE DISGUSTED, NOT AMUSED

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, yesterday as I was coming down the stairway in the Cannon Building with those great brass rails, I knocked off the rail a little poster. I picked it up, and it reads, "I used to be disgusted. Now I try to be amused."

That reminded me that it was disgust in large measure with the American voters which sent me here, and I needed to recommit myself to their trust.

It is tempting to be amused because of the shameless pork and the trampling of democracy in this body are so ludicrous.

I now need to recommit myself to not be amused, but to continue to be disgusted and to work with increasing Members on both sides of the aisle to make the necessary changes to eliminate the shameless pork and to restore democracy to this body.

Thank you. I do not know who put it there, but thank you for this note.

#### HEALTH SECURITY

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the debate on health care reform is now well underway. But as we proceed with hearings and consider the issues, and as we debate regulatory mechanisms and scoreable savings, let us not forget why we have undertaken this very important effort.

Plain and simple, far too many Americans either have no access to health care or live with the worry they may lose the access they have. My own State of Connecticut has one of the highest rates of individuals with private health insurance. Yet we have been battered by recession, and have struggled with layoffs. As we speak, 259,000 people—well over a quarter million, have no health insurance in Connecticut.

This is a difficult time for many. We can no longer feel secure about many of the things we used to take for granted. And that applies to health as well. Too many Americans no longer have the security of knowing that a serious illness will not devastate a family. Too many feel they cannot change jobs because they will jeopardize their health coverage. Too many defer important preventive care for lack of coverage.

Mr. Speaker, one important reason for tackling health care reform is to provide this kind of security for American families. The time for health security is now.

#### STRONG MESSAGE ON HEALTH CARE

(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, last Friday evening I had the thrill of addressing the commencement of the ITT Technical Institute in West Covina, CA. There were nearly 2,000 people in the audience, and I did not know what the political makeup of it was, so I decided to spend my time talking about the fact that I have joined with President Clinton doing everything I possibly can to try to decrease trade barriers and expand exports to Mexico and other parts of the world.

I received a favorable response from that, but I was rather stunned when the graduates came by, and I shook each of their hands. While many of them said to me they supported our efforts to bring about a North American Free-Trade Agreement, I was very shocked when an overwhelming majority of those who spoke to me as they went through the line said—and I had not spoken about this issue at all—“Please do everything that you can to insure that this program which will bring about socialized medicine that President Clinton has supported is defeated.”

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that provides a very strong message to us here that we need to find a market-oriented approach to deal with this issue.

#### HIGH COPAYMENTS FOR RURAL AREAS IN PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE PLAN

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

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Speaker, the President has promised to work with Congress to pass health care legislation that will guarantee health security to all Americans. The principle of universal access means that regardless of your income, comprehensive health benefits will be there for you. I applaud the President for his commitment to

this goal and I will work with him to achieve it.

But I am concerned that many families in my district and across this country would not be able to afford the high costs they would have to pay under the President's proposal. The President proposes low copayments for people in HMO's and high copayments for everyone else. In a rural district like mine, many communities do not have ready access to HMO's. Residents living in such remote areas, often the least able to afford them, would be saddled with high copayments by default. Under the President's proposals, they would have to pay 20 percent of the cost for all hospital and physician services. This copayment could make health care affordable for many people in rural areas and undermine the goal of universal access.

Mr. Speaker, to guarantee every American health security we must guarantee that copayments will be affordable. I look forward to working with the President toward this goal.

#### ONE MORE SCANDAL

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I was in the White House when I saw reputations ruined, life savings drained, and yes, pensions threatened, and who were the victims? They were President Reagan's own staff members and who were doing little more than trying to follow out the President's directive to try to stop a Soviet takeover of Central America, but there were Members of the Congress who disagreed with the President and were willing to ruin reputations, call special prosecutors in to try to get their way.

Well, now with a new Democratic administration, what do we see? We see a scandal at the Presidential Travel Office, the White House Travel Office where the President's relatives were trying to get a job and willing to ruin the careers of civil servants to do it.

Now we see a Cabinet member accused of taking \$700,000 in order to facilitate the lifting of the embargo against Vietnam.

We need a special prosecutor. We need to stop this hypocrisy and the double standard. What was totally unacceptable for the Republicans and required the destruction of people's careers is being whitewashed and ignored by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, let us end the hypocrisy. Let us have a special prosecutor and let us set things straight.

□ 1030

#### LY BINH TO BE IN MY OFFICE TOMORROW

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration has taken two giant steps toward normalizing relations with Vietnam and lifting the embargo. One step was taken in July, and one was taken in September.

Now we find out that a Cabinet official, Mr. Ron Brown, the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, is accused of taking \$700,000 to influence these decisions. He has said in the past that he never met with the conduit, the gentleman who is the conduit from the Vietnamese Government to our Government, but now he admits he has met with him, not once, not twice, but three times, once at the Department of Commerce.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has made these accusations has taken an FBI lie detector test and passed it.

We have demanded an investigation into this, not unlike the Watergate or the Iran-Contra investigations, because it involves our foreign policy and a Cabinet official who may have influenced these decisions even though there are 2,200 POW/MIA's still unaccounted for in Vietnam.

Now the gentleman who has made these accusations is going to be in the Capitol tomorrow in my office. His name is Mr. Ly Binh. He will be in my office at 2:30, so any Member of this House, Democrat or Republican, who wants to get to the bottom of this alleged scam ought to be at my office at 2:30. It is 2411 Cannon Building.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

(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, over the past 50 years the Federal Government has increased the number of public health programs that have been designed to try to prevent disease and illness, particularly among members of the population who do not have ready access to health care.

Each time I return to my district I see evidence of these very important public health programs. Community health centers and important outreach programs provide primary care to impoverished children and adults.

The Health Security Act of 1993, introduced last week by President Clinton, promises to improve our public health system by making community health centers essential providers of care. This will provide badly needed security to people who rely on community health centers for their care.

There should be no closed doors to people who are ill. Community health centers have always kept their doors open wide. I applaud the President's efforts and encourage my colleagues to make certain that the doors of community centers stay open to all who rely on their care for years to come.

#### KEEP PAC'S OUT OF HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, last week, we heard our President deliver a call to reform our Nation's health care system.

We have also heard the President call for reform of the way we finance our political campaigns.

As Congress begins to seriously attack both of these issues, I believe it is important that we do not aggravate one problem in our attempt to solve another one.

I have grave concerns about the regional and corporate alliances that would play such an important role in the President's health care plan.

And, if they are formed, I am afraid they could interject themselves into partisan politics.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution which would bar any national health board established to oversee or set Federal standards regarding elements of the health care system—from forming a political action committee and from making contributions to Federal candidates.

A similar ban would apply to regional or corporate alliances.

This resolution will preserve the necessary neutrality of any new health-care bureaucrats.

#### CONGRESS MUST HELP SMALL BUSINESS TO PROVIDE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR ITS EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, in his address to the joint session the President outlined six basic principles upon which national health care reform must be based. Of these six principles the sixth, responsibility, is the most basic of all. We, in Congress, have a responsibility to address the concerns of small business men and women of our Nation who are the very backbone of our country. We must ensure that small business employers will be able to obtain health insurance for their company at reasonable rates and will no longer be denied coverage because an employee has a sick child or spouse.

Mr. Speaker, small business owners have been telling me that they are fac-

ing the decisions between providing health care coverage for their employees or closing down their business. It is an essential feature of the President's program that 100 percent of the health care insurance premium be deductible. The changes we make to the system must take these factors into consideration and ensure that these men and women who provide jobs and make a significant contribution to our economy are not faced with the choice of providing health care or closing their business.

#### COST IMPACT LEGISLATION

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about reinventing government these days, but, as my colleagues know, it is not the Federal Government that has the most profound impact upon people's lives. It is State and local governments that determine how well their children are educated, how well their families are protected by their police and fire departments, how difficult it is to travel from one place to another, and yet local and State governments today spend more money trying to meet unfunded Federal mandates than all the money they try to spend for those democratically determined priorities at the local and State level.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to recognize that, if we do not have the money in the appropriations bills to pay for the legislation that we pass, we ought not be imposing those costs on local and State governments.

I urge my colleagues to support the fair act which requires that legislation, before it reaches the House floor, contain just what the cost impact will be on local and State governments, as well as the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor that legislation and to truly reinvent government where it really counts.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICHARDSON). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, what is the process by which we begin to deal with the issue raised by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] a few moments ago? The gentleman from Indiana has made a statement which goes to the very heart of the integrity of governance in this country, and also it goes to the very heart of our foreign policy.

By what process can the House of Representatives begin an investigation of this very serious matter where we

can be assured that the investigation will take place?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman that committees of jurisdiction can initiate investigations on matters such as this.

Mr. WALKER. Well, Mr. Speaker, the problem is that the gentleman from Indiana has already written the committees of jurisdiction and is being stonewalled. My question is:

By what means can we ensure that, if the chairmen of those committees refuse to hold hearings on this matter of major significance, the House of Representatives can order such an investigation to take place?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot respond more fully to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] at this time.

Mr. WALKER. What strikes me as strange, Mr. Speaker, is when we had the chief of staff in the previous administration have a problem with driving a White House car to New York for some personal business, that could, in fact, be investigated almost immediately in the House of Representatives. Now we have a matter that goes to the heart of the governance of our society, and it does not sound to me as though there is any means by which we can get it investigated, and I am seeking to know whether or not there is a resolution of some sort that can be brought to the floor that would force this investigation to take place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot respond beyond the fact that a resolution can be introduced and referred to the appropriate committee of jurisdiction.

Mr. WALKER. But there is no privileged resolution that can be brought to the floor that would force the investigation to take place, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot comment on such an issue until seeing such a resolution.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for his question.

I sent a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs asking for an investigation. That appeared to me to be the committee of jurisdiction. He has indicated that he did not think he should do that, and he named a litany of other committees that ought to be notified, and that is what prompted the gentleman from Pennsylvania to ask these questions, and so we just want to know, if this merits an investigation, how do we do it?

□ 1040

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICHARDSON). If the gentleman wants to introduce a resolution, the Chair

will refer it to the appropriate committee.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we will do that.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of House Joint Resolution 267, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House on Monday, September 27, 1993, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 267) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

##### H.J. RES. 267

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1993 for continuing projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1993 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriations Acts:

The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994;

The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994, notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 and section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948;

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1994, notwithstanding section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947;

The District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1994;

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1994;

The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994;

The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994;

The Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1994;

The Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994;

The Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1994; and

The Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994:

*Provided,* That whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted in these Acts is greater than that which would be available or granted under current operations, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate.

(b) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this section as passed by the House as of October 1, 1993, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of October 1, 1993, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the House or the Senate, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1993: *Provided,* That where an item is included in only one version of an Act as passed by both Houses as of October 1, 1993, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1993.

(c) Whenever an Act listed in this section has been passed by only the House as of October 1, 1993, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the House, at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1993: *Provided,* That where an item is funded in applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1993 and not included in the version passed by the House as of October 1, 1993, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1993 at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1993.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the amount which would otherwise be made available or the authority which would otherwise be granted under subsection (a), (b), or (c) for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency shall be no higher than the amount or authority necessary to support the personnel level resulting from an overall fiscal year 1993 personnel reduction of 1 percent from each department or agency's base level of full-time equivalent employment consistent with 1993 enacted appropriations, pursuant to Executive Order 12839, issued February 10, 1993.

SEC. 102. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 1993 or prior years, for the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 1993 funds, or to initiate, resume, or continue any project, activity, operation, or organiza-

tion which are defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element and for investment items are further defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item which includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account, for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1993: *Provided,* That no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1993.

SEC. 105. No provision which is included in an appropriations Act enumerated in section 101 but which was not included in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1993 and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) the enactment of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) October 21, 1993, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 107. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 108. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 109. No provision in any appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1994 referred to in section 101 of this joint resolution that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 106(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 110. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 111. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, activities funded in the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality account shall be maintained at the current rate of operations.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, activities funded in the Selective Service System, Salaries and expenses account shall be maintained at the current rate of operations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, September 27, 1993, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

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

Mr. Speaker, today we bring to the House a continuing resolution for fiscal year 1994 appropriations.

This joint resolution provides temporary, restrictive financing for programs covered under 11 of the 13 regular appropriations bills that have not yet been enacted into law. No extraneous issues are included in this resolution. The provisions of this continuing resolution apply until midnight October 21, 1993, or until the regular annual appropriations bills are enacted into law, whichever comes first.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution is required because not all 13 regular appropriations bills that provide for the operation of the Government will be signed into law by the beginning of fiscal year 1994.

While conference action is occurring on bills after Senate passage, there is insufficient time to complete congressional action prior to the beginning of the fiscal year, and this resolution is therefore needed.

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 1994 has been enacted into law and, accordingly, no provisions for programs funded in this act have been included in this resolution. The Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of 1994 is expected to be enacted into law prior to the beginning of the fiscal year and is not included in this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee continues to be dedicated to the traditional appropriations process which means individual appropriations bills. Therefore, it will continue its efforts to get regular bills enacted as soon as possible. Based on current activities, the committee sees no need for any extension of this resolution beyond October 21 to get all regular appropriations bills enacted into law.

Section 101 of the resolution provides restrictive funding for 11 appropriations measures. Generally, projects or activities are continued at the lesser amount of either the House bill, the Senate bill or the current rate.

Mr. Speaker, this section also provides that the rate of operations for civilian personnel compensation cannot exceed the amount necessary to support the overall fiscal year 1993 personnel reduction level. This locks in the 1993 personnel savings called for in the

President's reinventing government proposal started in an Executive order dated February 10, 1993.

Section 106 of the resolution provides that funds made available by this resolution continue to be available until midnight October 21, 1993, or until the enactment of the regular appropriations acts, whichever comes first. I emphasize that when regular bills are signed into law, the provisions of the continuing resolution automatically disengage and the regular appropriations bills then become the funding device.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is clean of extraneous matter. This approach offers the best hope of achieving speedy congressional and executive branch approval and avoiding unnecessary Government disruptions, payless paydays, suspension of activities, and needless expense to the Nation.

In summary, this continuing resolution provides funding for 11 of the 13 regular appropriations bills at restrictive rates of operation for an interim period to allow for the smooth and continuous operation of the Government until final appropriations decisions are agreed upon by the Congress and the administration.

I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to thank all of the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle for helping us with our appropriation bills. They have all helped us.

Mr. Speaker, last year the House passed all 13 of these bills and sent them to the other side in short order. We had a short term continuing resolution that only went for a brief period so that we could complete conference action.

Mr. Speaker, this year we only want one short term continuing resolution too. We want all 13 of these bills to go to the White House. We want the President to examine each one of them. If he wants to sign them, he can sign them. If he wants to veto them, he can veto them.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the continuing resolution is concerned, as I said, it is a clean resolution. There is nothing in there except the continuation of current year, ongoing programs and activities that will continue in fiscal year 1994 in these bills.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and every member of our committee on his side, including the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], one of the ablest Members of this House, the ranking member, for working with us on all of these bills. We would not have progressed this far without that cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am a substitute today, as the chairman has stated. Our ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], is unable to be here today, so I will attempt to fill his shoes in some capacity.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman has stated, we once again find ourselves in a predicament, not an unfamiliar one on this Committee on Appropriations. It is one that has been forced upon us, where we must ask for a continuing resolution to fund every agency, to fund every department in the executive branch. As of midnight tomorrow, every one of the executive agencies runs out of money.

Mr. Speaker, that has not been the fault of the House of Representatives, nor the Committee on Appropriations, for most of these. In fact, by the August recess we in this House had completed 11 of the 13 major appropriations bills and sent them to the Senate. Unfortunately, we have been unable to get the Senate to act with the expeditiousness with which we acted. So we find ourselves in a situation today, through no fault of the Committee on Appropriations nor the House of Representatives, that we must ask for a continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman has said, this is as clean as it can be. To make it very simple, this resolution provides that the agencies of government shall continue operating at last year's level, the Senate-passed version, or the House-passed version, or by their Committees on Appropriations, whichever of those three is the lowest.

Mr. Speaker, it is very simple, and I think very important. Every agency is required to continue the programs at no higher a level than last year and no greater extent covering any of the programs that may have been in the appropriations. They cannot, even though we may in some instances have programs in either the Senate or House-passed versions for the 1994 appropriations, they cannot expand those or develop new programs until there is an appropriation bill passed for that agency.

Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of our ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], there is a provision on page 5 of this legislation providing that under the executive order signed by President Clinton, there is an agreement that Federal agencies shall be reduced in the next 3 years by 4 percent.

□ 1050

In order to accomplish this, we have put a provision in here that they must start 1994 by having achieved a reduction in these agencies of at least by 1 percent. So we are trying to make every maximum effort to hold down spending, to make sure that we conserve every dollar, that we save the

American taxpayers dollars. And we cannot wait for 1997 or 1998 to do that.

Our Committee on Appropriations realizes this. We are making every effort to accomplish just that.

Mr. Speaker, I completely support this effort to continue our Government. We just cannot put the country in chaos by not passing this continuing resolution. We hope that every Member can support it, but we understand some Members may find it necessary not to vote for this. But, if we do not pass this resolution today, there would be many agencies of the Federal Government that would be put into a very severe situation.

That has happened in the past, but nothing would be gained by that. We must keep the Government running. We have more Government maybe than we need, but at least we cannot afford at this point not to have it function and to continue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we all support this.

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

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

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

I would like to state full praise for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and for all those who have worked on that process in the House of Representatives and, indeed, the leadership of the House of Representatives.

This is a very difficult process of handling 13 different budgets that we go through, very unique for me, as a freshman, to be able to handle this.

But I have to rise today to say that a continuing resolution today is an admission of failure of the budget process of the United States of America, and we should not forget that. Across this country, States and local governments have passed various measures to help them in their budgeting processes, a line-item veto, balanced budget amendments, capital budgets separate from their ongoing budgets, and it has worked. Practically in every State and local government and probably in every household and in every business across the United States of America, budgets are adopted on time because everybody understands the repercussions if they are not adopted on time.

Here in Congress, we have developed the most Byzantine process I have ever seen to get through the budget process, going through authorizations, appropriations, going from the House to the Senate. And the Senate is where the problems are right now. And then back through conference into the House and the Senate again and, finally, over to the President who will then sign it.

This continuing resolution, which gives us some extra days, basically, does not give the executive branch any time to consider the repercussions of

what may be in those various budget measures that will go through.

So we have a tremendous problem in doing all this. It is very difficult, I think, for a lot of particularly new Members of this Congress to understand this process. It is even more difficult, I believe, for the press to be able to explain it properly, and I do not believe that the public, the people who really count in the United States of America, who are tired of tax increases, who are tired of a Congress which has overspent, to have any input whatsoever, and that is a tremendous problem in terms of what we are doing today.

The time has come to end this process. The time has come to simplify it, to put in the constitutional limitations as Members of Congress to speak to this, to let it never happen again, to make sure that the Senate understands what this message is loud and clear.

My final thought is that, and it is a warning, I have understood that in past years in the continuing resolution, a lot of different amendments have been attached to it, which have obtained things that might not otherwise be able to be done. I hope we do not see that this year, and I hope we never see that again.

I congratulate the chairman. He has done a wonderful job of this. But I would point out that this is not the way to do business. Hopefully, Congress can change its way in the future.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] seemed to be defending the action of the executive branch and we are putting them in a bind. Actually, they put us in a bind. We did not get the President's budget until the middle of April. So one of the reasons this committee has been a long time getting here is the fact we did not have all the information coming out of the executive branch so we could not write legislation.

I share the gentleman's concerns that we need to change the budget system around here. In fact, I have got probably more radical changes I would recommend to change the budget system than maybe the gentleman would even recommend.

Nevertheless, this is not to say that the executive branch is entirely free of blame. We can only do what we can with what we have to work with. Again, we did not get the budget until April.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

One of the big concerns that I have had since I came to Congress is every single year we continue to pass what is known as short-term CR's to keep Government running. That is a heck of a

way to run a railroad, let alone a government.

We have 13 appropriations bills, and I want to commend the chairman and the ranking Republican and the members of the Committee on Appropriations for doing their dead-level best to get those 13 appropriations bills passed and sent to the Senate, passed by the Senate and then sent on to the President.

But the fact of the matter is, here we are again with a 3-week short-term CR, and it is something this Government should not be doing.

In addition to that, I would like to raise an issue. My colleague from Pennsylvania is going to ask a question here in a minute about the White House cutting 25 percent of their staff, as they said that they were going to do, I think by October.

This resolution, I understand, takes steps toward cutting overall executive branch Government by 4 percent over 4 years, 1 percent a year. But that is a far cry from the 25 percent cut that the President said he was going to institute at the White House in the past. I have problems with a continuing CR. I would like to question the White House on whether or not they are going to live up to their commitment to cut their staff by 25 percent, as they promised.

If they do not do that, then we must question whether or not they are going to follow through on cutting the overall staff in the Government and the bureaucracy.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

I would like to raise a couple of questions, as I go through this particular bill. I look at section 101 on page 5, regarding the 1-percent reduction in personnel.

I see that we are implementing that particular authority in the bill. And then I also look over at section 112, and I find that there we say, "notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, salaries and expenses account shall be maintained at the current rate of operations."

My first question is, which is it? Is section 101 the governing section with regard to salaries and expenses with a 1-percent reduction, or is section 112 the governing chapter of this particular bill?

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the provision in section 101 dealing with the rate for civilian personnel compensation has been included because of an agreement worked out between the

chairman of our committee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDABE], the ranking member. That is the reason it is in there. It should be in there.

As far as the section that the gentleman called attention to, 112, that deals only with the rate of operations for the Selective Service System.

I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the 1 percent civilian personnel reduction rate is the controlling factor of this resolution.

Mr. WALKER. So the Selective Service is not included in section 101?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the Executive order that causes the 1 percent personnel reduction applies to the Selective Service System, therefore that agency's rate for operation for civilian personnel is reduced by 1 percent.

Mr. WALKER. Then it seems to me it is a little confusing. On one hand we are saying that is there to reduce it 1 percent. On the other hand, the gentleman is saying "Keep it as it is."

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Executive order, as the gentleman knows, would pertain to the entire Government except for a few small independent agencies and we have included a 1-percent rate reduction to account for this.

Mr. WALKER. So section 112 is not operative here. Section 101 is the governing section?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Selective Service System rate for operation for personnel compensation is only the amount needed consistent with the overall provision of the 1 percent reduction.

Mr. WALKER. The other question I have is with regard to the White House. As the gentleman from Indiana pointed out, as I understand it, this resolution says that the lower of the figures of either the Senate resolution, the House resolution or last year's spending will govern.

Do any of those resolutions contain the 25 percent reduction that the President has promised in the White House staff?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, that will be in the Treasury, Postal Service appropriation bill, which will be on the House floor tomorrow. That will be in that conference report. It will be in that conference report tomorrow.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman saying that in the conference report tomorrow, the figures in there are a 25-percent reduction in the White House staff?

□ 1100

Mr. NATCHER. I think the gentleman will find that is correct.

Mr. WALKER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman, but I just want to clarify my point. So in other words, because it is in the conference report,

will that be the standard as of October 1 under the continuing resolution? In other words, we will have cut the White House staff 25 percent by passing this continuing resolution?

Mr. NATCHER. I would advise the gentleman as soon as the President signs the Treasury-Postal bill, that is it. It is in there.

Mr. WALKER. What about the continuing resolution, because the continuing resolution is going to govern us for at least a few days there probably? Does that include the 25 percent as well?

Mr. NATCHER. The continuing resolution provides that as each bill is signed that bill then drops out of the continuing resolution. It disengages.

Mr. WALKER. So it is the gentleman's intention and the committee's intention, as of October 1 the White House staff will be reduced 25 percent?

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. And as far as you know, the administration is going to comply with that and, in fact, on October 1 will have a staff 25 percent less than it was when they took office?

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. That is very helpful. I appreciate the information.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], a member of the committee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise in opposition to this resolution but I do rise in opposition to the events which have led to it.

Once again, this body is forced to pass a resolution to continue the functions of Government because the Congress and the President have failed to enact the 13 regular appropriations bills on time and within budget.

I do not find fault with the chairman of our Committee on Appropriations on this matter. Indeed it has always been his intent to avoid this occurrence.

And I am sure that the chairman is anguished by it. He has done everything he can to avoid having a CR.

Rather, this body has been repeatedly forced to wait to act. We had to wait for the President's budget, which—in violation of the Budget Act timetable—was very very late. Then, once we received that budget, and learned that the numbers contained within it did not meet the constraints of the budget resolution—we had to wait again for the administration to tell us what to keep and what to discard. In many cases, we made those decisions for the administration, exercising as we should our power of the purse. We also had to wait for the authorizing committees, who in turn in many circumstances had to wait for the administration.

Mr. Speaker, considering these impediments, I think it is a credit to the committee that we are only 2 weeks be-

hind schedule. And I understand that a new administration may need some time to get its feet under it, and move forward in a timely manner.

But, 2 weeks—only 2 weeks—is still not acceptable. And it is not encouraging that the new administration is getting started with a CR, the same device that was relied on all too often in the past two administrations.

Continuing resolutions, Mr. Speaker, are not an appropriate way to govern. They are an admission of failure, a confession of irresponsibility.

This continuing resolution is a clean CR, and that is a good thing. But we cannot control the other body, and experience counsels that they will be tempted to muddy this document with pet projects and initiatives irrelevant to its central purpose.

CR's do not help Federal managers plan an annual budget. They are a major impediment to long range planning, to responsible budgeting, to reinventing Government. They promote waste because they force the bureaucracy to think in extremely short-range terms.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago I collected 147 signatures on a letter to Ronald Reagan. The signers pledged to vote to uphold a veto of any continuing resolution. We also asked the President to pledge not to sign one if Congress sent it to him. This strategy worked: The President announced in his State of the Union address that he would not sign a CR. The result was that this body passed 13 bills on time and within budget. And indeed, the Congress passed all 13 bills on time, within budget, for the first time in almost 40 years.

I urge President Clinton to take seriously the importance of abiding by budget timetables. I urge the President to do everything in his power to ensure that not one more CR clouds the record of his administration. And I encourage this body—Members on both sides of the aisle—to do all we can to make sure that there are simply no more CR's.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I had requests for time but the requestee is not here. So I yield myself 1 minute to summarize here some of the remarks made.

First, last year at this time, as the chairman stated, we only had one appropriation bill that had been sent to the White House. That was the agriculture bill.

This year, through no fault of ours, the scenario is the same. Only the legislative branch bill has been sent downtown. By not enacting this continuing resolution, we are sending a signal that we will fund ourselves, but not keep other Federal workers going.

I also want to emphasize that this year the action of this continuing resolution would be \$9 billion in budget authority under the 1994 total 602(b) allocation. For those who are not familiar

with what a 602(b) is, that is the projection from the Budget Committee of how much we should be spending in these various categories. And on outlays where we are actually spending the money, we would be \$8 billion below the 1994 total 602(b) allocation.

So this continuing resolution is making an effort to cut Federal spending. Maybe not as much as some of us would like to see. Ideally, if I were writing the bill, I would make much larger cuts than this. But we are a body where we have to cooperate, we have to compromise with not only ourselves in this body, but with the other body, the Senate across the Capitol.

So this is a good continuing resolution, as good as you can have. It is as clean as it possibly can be.

I urge that all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I find it unfortunate that 2 days before the beginning of the new fiscal year, we are faced with a continuing resolution because only 1 of the 13 regular appropriations bills has been signed into law.

The failure to complete the 13 regular appropriations bills by October 1, is one of the reasons that I recommended a 2-year budget cycle when I testified before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress earlier this year.

The only time in recent history that all regular appropriations bills were completed by October 1, was in 1988—the second year of the 2-year budget agreement of 1987.

The positive aspect of the continuing resolution before us today is that the basic bill provides spending at the lower level of the House-passed, Senate-passed, or last year's level, for each program through October 21.

It also goes further in an attempt to initiate some of the personnel savings envisioned in Vice President GORE's National Performance Review by reducing personnel levels percent below 1993 levels.

Last spring, President Clinton called for a 4-percent reduction in Federal personnel by fiscal year 1995. Subsequently, the Vice President's National Performance Review, issued September 7, recommended a larger, 12-percent reduction in Federal personnel by fiscal year 1999.

I strongly support at least a 1-percent reduction from 1993 levels provided in this continuing resolution which is the exact downpayment on the personnel reductions that was recommended by the President.

This action signals that we are willing to work with the President to implement Government savings and reforms. I pledge to continue to work toward implementing the total 5-year savings of \$108 billion recommended in the Vice President's National Performance Review.

I will support the continuing resolution today because it is a clean bill that initiates some National Performance Review personnel savings.

In addition, to totally disrupt the Federal Government would place undue hardship on many individuals that rely on services from the Federal Government.

But, I would hope that there is serious consideration given to congressional reform pro-

posals that improve the efficiency of Congress so that work can be completed in a timely fashion in the future.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this clean, continuing resolution today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, here we go again.

Congress is required to pass 13 appropriations bills before the start of the new fiscal year. Since 1974, we have only succeeded in meeting that deadline twice—1977 and 1989. Once again, we will fail to meet this important deadline and have to pass another continuing resolution.

What many people do not realize, however, is that funds for Congress' own operations were approved in June and July by the House and Senate. In other words, while the budget for Congress is settled and approved—the rest of the Federal programs that people depend on are in financial limbo.

I believe that the funding requirements of Congress should only be considered after the needs of all other Americans are met to the best of our ability. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 1922, which would force Members of Congress to earn their own paychecks. Like every other wage earner and the salaried employee, I propose that Congress only be paid when it has completed its most basic work—to approve the general budget for the Federal Government, to discharge fully its responsibility over the Nation's pursestrings.

To accomplish this end, I would withhold our own paychecks and the money to run our offices until action is completed—on time—on all other general appropriations bills for the next fiscal year. Thus, instead of securing its own funding well in advance, Congress would be dead last in line for Federal spending.

My bill would effectively outlaw continuing resolutions, the huge spending bills that have been subject to widespread abuse. The proposal would also help to prevent the possibility of Government grinding to a halt, Social Security checks being threatened, and other programs held in limbo until appropriation bills are finally approved in the dead of night.

This proposal would not cure all institutional flaws or tackle broader ethical concerns, but I believe it would be a step in the right direction. I believe it would represent a change in thinking and attitude. I think people would prefer to see Congress step to the back of the line for a change.

If Congress was faced with the prospect of being shut down, then perhaps it would more seriously weigh the results of its inaction.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICHARDSON). Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, September 27, 1993, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 274, nays 156, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

YEAS—274

Abercromble	Filner	Lowey
Ackerman	Fingerhut	Maloney
Andrews (ME)	Fish	Mann
Andrews (NJ)	Flake	Manton
Andrews (TX)	Foglietta	Margolies-
Applegate	Ford (MI)	Mezvinsky
Bacchus (FL)	Ford (TN)	Markley
Baessler	Frank (MA)	Martinez
Barca	Frost	Matsui
Barcia	Furse	Mazzoli
Barlow	Gallo	McCloskey
Barrett (WI)	Gejdenson	McCurdy
Bateman	Gephardt	McDermott
Becerra	Geren	McHale
Bellenson	Gibbons	McKinney
Bentley	Glickman	McNulty
Berman	Gonzalez	Meehan
Bevill	Goodling	Meek
Bilbray	Gordon	Menendez
Bishop	Green	Mfume
Blackwell	Gutierrez	Michel
Billey	Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)
Bonior	Hall (TX)	Mineta
Borski	Hamburg	Mink
Boucher	Hamilton	Moakley
Brewster	Harman	Mollohan
Brooks	Hastings	Montgomery
Browder	Hayes	Moran
Brown (CA)	Hefner	Morella
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Murphy
Brown (OH)	Hinchee	Murtha
Bryant	Hoagland	Myers
Byrne	Hobson	Nadler
Cantwell	Hochbrueckner	Natcher
Cardin	Holden	Neal (MA)
Carr	Horn	Neal (NC)
Chapman	Houghton	Oberstar
Clay	Hoyer	Obey
Clayton	Hughes	Oliver
Clement	Hutto	Ortiz
Clinger	Hyde	Orton
Clyburn	Inslee	Owens
Coleman	Jefferson	Pallone
Collins (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Parker
Collins (MI)	Johnson (GA)	Pastor
Cooper	Johnson (SD)	Payne (NJ)
Coppersmith	Johnson, E. B.	Payne (VA)
Coyne	Johnston	Pelosi
Cramer	Kanjorski	Peterson (FL)
Danner	Kaptur	Pickle
Darden	Kennedy	Pomeroy
de la Garza	Kennelly	Price (NC)
Deal	Kildee	Rahall
DeFazio	Klecza	Rangel
DeLauro	Klein	Reed
Dellums	Klink	Regula
Derrick	Kolbe	Reynolds
Deutsch	Kopetski	Richardson
Dicks	Kreidler	Roemer
Dingell	LaFalce	Rogers
Dixon	Lambert	Rose
Dooley	Lancaster	Rostenkowski
Durbin	Lantos	Rowland
Edwards (CA)	LaRocco	Royal-Allard
Edwards (TX)	Laughlin	Rush
Engel	Lehman	Sabo
English (AZ)	Levin	Sanders
English (OK)	Lewis (GA)	Sangmeister
Eshoo	Lightfoot	Sarpalius
Evans	Lipinski	Sawyer
Farr	Livingston	Schick
Fazio	Lloyd	Schiff
Flelds (LA)	Long	Schumer

Scott	Swift	Visclosky
Serrano	Synar	Volkmer
Sharp	Talent	Vucanovich
Shepherd	Tanner	Washington
Sisisky	Tauzin	Waters
Skaggs	Taylor (MS)	Watt
Skeen	Tejeda	Waxman
Skelton	Thompson	Wheat
Slattery	Thornton	Whitten
Slaughter	Thurman	Williams
Smith (IA)	Torres	Wilson
Spratt	Torricelli	Wise
Stark	Towns	Wolf
Stenholm	Trafcant	Woolsey
Stokes	Tucker	Wyden
Strickland	Unsoeld	Wynn
Studds	Valentine	Yates
Stupak	Velazquez	Young (FL)
Swett	Vento	

NAYS—156

Allard	Gillmor	Nussle
Archer	Gilman	Oxley
Armey	Gingrich	Packard
Bachus (AL)	Goodlatte	Paxon
Baker (CA)	Goss	Penny
Baker (LA)	Grams	Peterson (MN)
Balleger	Grandy	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Greenwood	Pickett
Bartlett	Gunderson	Pombo
Barton	Hancock	Porter
Bereuter	Hansen	Portman
Bilirakis	Hastert	Poshard
Blute	Hefley	Pryce (OH)
Boehlert	Herger	Quillen
Boehner	Hoekstra	Quinn
Bonilla	Hoke	Ramstad
Bunning	Huffington	Ravenel
Burton	Hunter	Ridge
Buyer	Hutchinson	Roberts
Callahan	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Inhofe	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Istook	Roth
Canady	Jacobs	Roukema
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Coble	Kasich	Santorum
Collins (GA)	Kim	Saxton
Combust	King	Schaefer
Condit	Kingston	Schroeder
Costello	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Cox	Knollenberg	Shaw
Crane	Kyl	Shays
Crapo	Lazio	Shuster
Cunningham	Leach	Smith (NJ)
DeLay	Levy	Smith (OR)
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Dickey	Lewis (FL)	Snowe
Doollittle	Linder	Solomon
Dornan	Machtley	Spence
Dreier	Manzullo	Stearns
Duncan	McCandless	Stump
Dunn	McCollum	Sundquist
Emerson	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Everett	McHugh	Thomas (CA)
Ewing	McInnis	Thomas (WY)
Fawell	McKeon	Torkildsen
Fields (TX)	McMillan	Upton
Fowler	Meyers	Walker
Franks (CT)	Mica	Walsh
Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Weldon
Gallegly	Minge	Young (AK)
Gekas	Molinari	Zelliff
Gilchrist	Moorhead	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—3

Conyers	McDade	Smith (MI)
---------	--------	------------

□ 1127

Ms. LAMBERT changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2520, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2520) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. REGULA

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

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REGULA moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2520, be instructed to insist on disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask whether the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois, is opposed to the motion to instruct conferees?

Mr. YATES. I am not opposed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the motion to instruct, and pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXVIII, I request that one-third of the debate time be allotted to me on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

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

□ 1130

First, I want to commend the gentleman on his motion and his efforts on the issue of grazing fees. This is sensitive and complicated issue, and the gentleman and the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] are to be commended.

The House passed on July 15, by a vote of 240 to 184, an \$8.7 million cut in the National Endowment of Arts. The House made a small but significant step toward controlling spending by this vote.

This vote was about fiscally responsibility. At a time when government's

spending is out of control this was a welcome victory in the House.

It is my hope that the House conferees would insist on the House position in this matter. In past conferences, the House position has not been protected.

I realize that because of the rules of the House I am prevented from amending this motion to instruct conferees, but I seek the gentleman's assurances that the conferees will be empathic to the declared position of the House.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, as he knows, I voted with him on the amendment to reduce the spending, and I want to assure him that I, on this side, will do all I can to preserve the will of the House in this matter, particularly in view of the large vote in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] for his remarks.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the conflict over the fate and future of grazing on the public lands continues to rage on. Some in the other body have likened the battle to the Civil War that tore our Nation apart in 1861. I would note, that far more significant war lasted only 4 years. This conflict has endured for almost two decades.

As a veteran of the grazing battles, I have come to three conclusions. For the opponents, there is no right time to increase grazing fees. There is no right method by which to increase grazing fees. And, there is no level of fee increase which is fair and reasonable.

I followed with great interest the recent debate in the other body on this issue and was pleased, if not somewhat surprised, to hear my Senate colleagues say they "want finality to the controversy." They said they "don't want to be dealing with this again next year." They even claimed to support reform. I couldn't agree more, unfortunately, their actions belie their words.

The 1-year moratorium adopted by the other body is merely a further delaying tactic. It will take the issue of grazing fees and range management off the table for 1 more year. For those of us who support the concept of charging fair market value for the use of public lands and who want to see a range program that is fair for the ranchers, the taxpayers and the environment, there is no time like the present.

I have read with interest, and some chagrin, the misinformation that has been spread about my motion to instruct. It has been said that my motion would "have the effect of raising grazing fees on public lands 130 percent." That is patently false—the motion to instruct takes no position on the level of fee increase or the reforms embodied in the Secretary's proposal. The conferees could consider a range of options

and do not necessarily have to endorse the Secretary's proposal. I personally endorse every part of it.

This issue has been debated on and off since 1976. This body has on four separate occasions in the past 3 years voted overwhelmingly for grazing fee increases in excess of the Secretary's proposal. This is the easiest of the votes because it is not a vote on a specific fee increase, not a vote on specific reform proposals, but simply a vote for change. A vote against the status quo.

If you take those who argued during the recent debate at their word, that is, "it is up to Congress to find the balance among these proposed changes," (Gorton) and that they are "not seeking to stonewall change but simply to be part of that process," (Bryan) then you should support my motion. My motion gives opponents of the administration's proposal a seat at the table. It effectively reopens the negotiations. The moratorium forecloses any near term resolution of this longstanding conflict.

Four times since 1990 the House has voted overwhelmingly to increase grazing fees and four times the response from the other body has been the same. Not the right vehicle, not the right time, not the right fee increase. The result of inaction: The fee, under the current flawed formula, continues to decline. In fact, the fee today is 24 percent lower than it was in 1980.

By virtually any measure the Federal fee is the lowest around. For example, fees collected by State land boards in 1991 ranged from \$1.92 to \$7.92 or an average of \$3.90. Private lease rates in these same western States range from \$17.96 to \$8, or an average of \$12.25. Simply put, the Federal Government is charging and receiving bargain basement rates.

Moreover, when you look at the cost of administering this program from a purely fiscal point of view, the Government would be better off eliminating the grazing program completely. Total costs in 1990 of administering the grazing program for both BLM and the Forest Service were \$73.8 million. In fairness I would point out that some of this cost results from multiple use needs including wildlife enhancement. Total receipts were \$27 million of which \$5.5 million was returned to the western States and counties for a net loss to the Federal Treasury of \$52 million. To remedy this deficit is why this motion is endorsed by the taxpayers union. The failure of the other body to address the numerous reform initiatives approved by this body is why the administration chose to act through a perfectly legal, perfectly deliberative and open rulemaking procedure which will not result in a fee increase before the end of fiscal year 1994 at the very earliest. For those who object to the Secretary's initiative I challenge them to offer a proposal. They have not.

They have offered more of the same old bromides which when translated means do nothing.

Opponents of reform argue that there has not been adequate public input on this proposal. It is simply being put in place by executive fiat. I would point out, however, that there is precedent for addressing this issue administratively. President Reagan, in 1986, with no benefit of public hearings and no public comment period, literally with one stroke of the pen, extended indefinitely the current formula.

The process Secretary Babbitt has laid out is a much more open and public rulemaking procedure which has, and will continue to, involve extensive input from all interested parties. Five public hearings were held in the West before announcing a grazing reform package. An estimated 2,000 people attended those hearings and over 10,000 comments have already been received and are still coming in. Additional public hearings are also planned.

The only proposal on the table that would exclude the public and derail the opportunity for public input is the moratorium. The language in the Senate amendment specifically prohibits the use of any funds to continue any action involving the proposed rulemaking.

My colleagues also argue that the uncertainty surrounding this issue is in and of itself damaging to the lifestyle of western ranchers. I can understand that argument and stand ready to help end that uncertainty. Throughout the debate in the other body the proponents of the moratorium recognized that fees would ultimately go up.

Supporting the position embodied in the Senate amendment only further exacerbates the problem in the western communities caused by uncertainty. We can act today to end the uncertainty. A vote for my motion is a vote to end gridlock; a vote to provide stability and certainty to the western ranchers; a vote to end the conflict over the rangelands.

One other misconception that has surrounded this debate is the notion that this is a partisan issue. I find that argument particularly troublesome.

This is not a partisan issue. If it can be categorized it is a regional issue, but even that ignores the fact that these lands are publicly owned. They do not belong, as many in the West would have you believe, to the western ranchers. We have a duty to the owners, the American taxpayers, to see that these lands are managed properly and that the taxpayer receives a fair return for the use of these lands. That has not happened to date. Reform is critical if we are to right that injustice.

Sound fiscal policy as well as good stewardship demand that we begin phasing in a fairer, more market-based grazing fee, both for its economic benefits and its environmental ones.

Finally, this issue is not just about grazing fees. It is about whether or not we are going to address the broader issue of public lands reform, including reform of the antiquated 1872 mining law and reform of our timber policies.

Grazing fees is the easier of these public lands issues. If we put this issue effectively off the table for 1 more year, it will sound the death knell for this Congress, for any public lands reforms, whether it be grazing, mining, or timber harvesting.

Reform must start somewhere. It is time to put the taxpayers' interests ahead of the narrow special interests of the 2 percent of America's livestock producers who use the public rangelands for grazing.

There is ample room for compromise. The fee proposed by the administration can go down. It can be phased in over a longer period of time. The reform proposals can be revised or even eliminated. But none of these things are possible if the moratorium prevails.

Congress is by its nature a deliberative body, but we have many years to deliberate on this issue. The time for change is now. The time for action is now. It is high time to end the nearly two decades of gridlock on grazing fees.

□ 1140

Mr. Speaker, supporting this motion simply says that the conference committee on the Interior appropriations bill shall look at the grazing fee issue. The conferees can take any position they choose. They can deal with it however they might in the cost of grazing or any reforms. It does not lock the conference committee into anything. But if this fails, nothing can happen.

So I think it is vitally important that we address this issue as a matter of equity to the taxpayers of America that own this land, and, as a matter of equity to the ranchers who graze on these lands, so we can get a degree of certainty in what the future is in the grazing program of America.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse the views of my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], and associate myself with his remarks. On this issue, the gentleman is right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has properly framed the issue. The issue is, once again do we continue subsidizing the privileged class of people in this country who seek not only to have grazing fees at levels that they desire, but who now seek to postpone and prevent any review of those fees by this administration. They did not seek to postpone a review of those fees by a previous administration when they locked them into the current low rate.

This country has just gone through an agonizing process of budget reconciliation during which these fees were taken off the table by the Senate. We are about to enter into another budget reconciliation again next month, and the Senate's proposal is to take these fees off the table again.

What the Secretary of the Interior has done is set out a proposal over a 3-year period to raise these fees to \$4.28 per cow—over a 3-year period, to gradually get to that price.

Mind you, the State of Montana is already at \$4.24; Nebraska is at \$7.53; North Dakota is at \$8.50; Wyoming just voted to double their fees to \$5; Colorado is \$4.70 today. And where is the Federal Government? \$1.86. \$1.86 is what the Senate is trying to preserve.

Here is what is going on in private lands all across the country: \$12 in South Dakota; \$14 in Nebraska; \$10 in Kansas; \$9.49 in Idaho.

Everybody else is dealing with this in a businesslike fashion, except the Congress of the United States, especially the Senate, which time and again has rejected any effort to negotiate this, to consider legislation.

□ 1150

This body has voted overwhelmingly to raise these fees almost double the amount that the Secretary of the Interior is now proposing on an immediate basis, and the Secretary will string that out over 3 years.

The question is, Should we allow that process to go forward? The proposals have been made. They are out for public comment, something that was never provided when they locked in the fees. There was no public comment, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] pointed out.

We must vote for this motion to instruct by the gentleman from Ohio so that the conference committee can deal with this issue and we can get it over and done with.

If Members listen to the Senate, a handful of Senators want to suggest to Members that it is never the right time, it is never the right amount, it is never the right issue.

We now have the ability to do this in the public light, in the public interest, in the interest of the taxpayers.

My colleagues, I urge support for the motion to instruct the conferees and to join the National Taxpayers Union, the League of Conservation Voters and almost every environmental group in this country. The minimum we can do for our constituents, who are paying the way, paying the subsidies for this program, is to allow this administration to bring it to some kind of common decency in terms of return for the taxpayers and the protection of the land.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Regula motion to instruct

conferees. Members who are concerned about jobs, fairness and protecting the environment and U.S. taxpayers ought to reject this motion, too.

This motion will kill jobs. Lots of them. Raising grazing fees 130 percent, as this motion would do, will destroy jobs that support tens of thousands of rural ranching families. Board up the windows; close down the schools; put up the "for sale" signs because the "out of touch" Washington beltway bandits who know not the slightest thing about public land grazing have issued their edict: No ranchers allowed on public lands. That is the message this motion sends and that is the attitude that has caused so much hostility toward government.

What business could withstand an increase over two times its current operating costs? Certainly not the families that make a modest living—an average of \$28,000 annually—by providing low-cost beef to a hungry America and a growing export market.

Not only will this motion devastate the families who depend on ranching for their livelihood, but entire rural communities, consumers of beef and the environment will all be worse-off without the contributions of public ranchers.

In Arizona, there is a \$302 million annual positive impact from ranching. This includes \$30 million in taxes and \$18.5 million in range improvements and results in the production of enough beef to feed 4.6 million Americans annually.

Those who are against family ranchers make two arguments, both of which contain holes large enough to drive 100 head of cattle through.

The first argument is that grazing fees on Federal lands amount to a subsidy. Nothing could be further from the truth. These proponents of misinformation compare private lease rates with public leases as if they are one and the same. Any serious evaluation of the two reveals significant differences.

Federal rangeland is not lush meadows, but mostly sparse desert or mountainous terrain. Federal permittees bear additional costs of transportation, herding, and predator and death losses. These permittees must pay for and maintain water systems on public lands that benefit grazing livestock as well as wildlife. The Federal permittee has the right to the grass only, yet must pay for all maintenance and improvements. Ranchers invest an average of \$11,000 annually in money and labor to improve Federal rangeland. When these costs are included, the differences between Federal and private lease rates—not surprisingly—disappear. In many cases, final costs to Federal permittees actually surpass private lease rates.

When one considers the inferior quality of range forage, fewer services, shared access with other users, it is no

surprise that 20 percent of grazing allotments go unused on Forest Service lands. If this is such a great deal for ranchers, why isn't the percentage of leased allotments much higher?

The current grazing fee is not a subsidy—it actually saves money for U.S. taxpayers. The costs of managing Federal rangelands would have to be incurred no matter what the level of grazing. Moreover, the public and wildlife would not enjoy the benefits—like building and maintaining fences and roads—that are now provided by ranchers. Former BLM Director, Cy Jamison, predicts that removing ranchers from Federal lands would result in an increase of up to 50 percent in the cost of managing public lands.

The value of rancher improvements is not small change. According to the BLM, in just one grazing district in Wyoming, BLM would be required to build 13,222 miles of fencing at a cost of almost \$98 million if ranchers were removed from those lands! Estimates of the total cost to the Federal Government of fencing alone go into the several billion dollar range.

Mr. Speaker, very bluntly: Public lands ranchers do not receive a subsidy.

But what of the second argument of the opponents of family ranching: that the environment will be better off without—or with less—Federal grazing? Like the subsidy argument, closer scrutiny shows this argument to be unfounded. In fact, without public ranching, the environment would suffer.

Properly managed livestock grazing is good for rangelands. It reduces the risk of forest fires; it improves the condition of the land; and it promotes the growth of young trees. The thousands of watering facilities built by ranchers this century have improved the lands and wildlife populations. Since 1960, for instance, elk populations on Federal lands have increased 782 percent and moose populations have ballooned 476 percent. The result, according to BLM, is that Federal rangelands are in better forage condition than at any time this century.

One does not need to be a range expert to understand why the lands are doing so well. All one needs is a basic understanding of market economics. Ranchers are good stewards of public land because it is their best financial interest to do so—and because they know environmental protection reaps economic benefits. They carve out a living based on the condition of the rangeland. Unlike the Members in this chamber, theirs is more than an academic pursuit; their livelihoods depend on good healthy rangeland.

Proponents of this motion claim that voting for it is a vote to end gridlock. Don't be fooled. A vote for this motion is a vote to abdicate our congressional responsibility to set national policy on the administration of Federal lands. A

vote against this motion is also a vote for a fair, thorough, and open public process—something that has not occurred to date.

After all the bogus arguments are stripped away, the simple truth is revealed: the fight to increase grazing fees is about removing ranchers from Federal rangeland for purely political reasons.

Stop this charade. The current grazing fee formula is fair. It works, and it's in the public interest. Vote for jobs, vote for the environment, vote for hard-working American ranchers—vote against the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it is time that the 24,000 cattlemen who feed their livestock on 270 million acres of public land pay a fairer rate for grazing. Not a year from now, not sometime in the future, now.

These ranchers represent only 2 percent of the cattlemen in the United States and produce less than 2 percent of the country's beef. Yet, they pay only \$1.86 per animal per month to graze on public lands, while the rest of the ranching industry pays an average of \$10 per animal per month to graze on comparable private lands.

The loss to the taxpayers is in the millions. Mr. Speaker, these ranchers do not need a government subsidy. In fact at least four of them have made it to the Forbes magazine list of 96 billionaires in the United States.

In a time of fiscal problems, subsidies to special groups, subsidies to those who do not have a real need simply cannot be afforded.

We should be embarrassed that we cannot have the courage to cut out these indefensible subsidies. Republicans believe, Mr. Speaker, in market mechanisms. We believe in market pricing. It is interesting that we are for the market unless it goes our way, and then somehow our philosophy goes out the window.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot cut this one reasonably and over a period of time, where can we cut?

It is argued that this is apples and oranges, but the Domenici amendment prevents us even looking at those apples and oranges for yet another year. Enough is enough.

Support the Regula motion to instruct. It is right for taxpayers. It is right for America.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Natural Resources, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Regula motion to instruct. Hopefully, the House will not be cowed, like the Senate was, in terms

of voting for the special interests on this policy.

Mr. Speaker, the existing policy with regard to the grazing on our public lands and those permitted to graze cattle makes a mockery of sound policy. That is why this proposal that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] is offering and the effort to work in good faith with the Secretary of the Interior on this has received support of the Taxpayers Union, has received the support of Citizens Against Government Waste and has received, of course, the very strong support of virtually every conservation and environmental group in this country.

Those who are opposed to it are those that benefit from it. Who are they? They are big companies. They are special interests. It is not just the little individual—the small rancher. In fact, Secretary Babbitt, by going out West and trying to develop a process in terms of input and hearing has, in fact, done yeoman's work in terms of trying to place this issue in an open public forum.

This policy was yielded upon and removed from the reconciliation bill and the administration stated they "were going to deal with it in the normal course—the regular administrative process or through changes in law."

Now we have the Senate attempting to slam dunk through the appropriations process a failed policy and continue the denial that they have made with regard to what the solution should be, what the policy should be with regards to the cost of grazing and using public lands.

It is not just that this freezes the process for 1 year. The fact is, the effect of this is there will be no change in grazing policy in 1993, no change in 1994, and probably no change in even 1995.

Even under the best of circumstances, going through the environmental impact statements and the other procedures, the earliest that this policy, if this were permitted to proceed in an administrative vein would be in July 1994.

□ 1200

That is when the policy could be put into effect. If you freeze this through a moratorium and say that the Secretary of the Interior and the administration cannot even study the problem until next October, and this particular proposal, what is going to happen? We are not going to have then another 10 months, another year. It is going to be 1995, if ever, to see a policy change.

Of course, I think something could shake up the other body over there, the Senate, and something miraculous could descend on them and they all of a sudden could come out for good public policy in terms of managing the range. But we have problems on the range today, and that has not happened

in the past decade regarding public grazing issues.

In fact, the House has repeatedly sent bills over there trying to engage the Senate in dealing with this issue in a legislative manner. They have rejected that. They have been in a state of denial. The last administration sympathized with the special interests, in terms of management of public land and specifically regarding grazing permit charges. They gave in to political concerns and the taxpayer and the range ecosystem have paid the price.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will vote for the Regula motion and vote for sound public policy on the range today and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, our conferees on the Interior appropriation bill definitely should reject the ill-conceived Senate attempt to kill public land range reform.

The Senate amendment is simply yet another attempt to block effective steps toward reform of grazing and rangeland management, just as the Senate has blocked such steps for the past decade.

Home on the western range, reform is long overdue. The taxpayers are being short-changed because the current system keeps grazing fees far below fair market value—not only below the price of private forage, but below what most Western States themselves charge for grazing on their State lands, lands which are intermingled with the national rangelands and are similar to the national lands in character and value. These State lands are often the mirror image of national range lands that are being leased on the cheap.

The House has repeatedly voted to scrap this obsolete system and to establish grazing fees that would more closely reflect market value. The new administration's proposals would finally move in that same direction, but the Senate amendment would actually block the administration from even developing those proposals.

Range reform involves more than grazing fees. In fact, while grazing fee increases are certainly justified and needed, they are less significant than other proposed changes in range management.

These changes—including greater public involvement, greater protection for the rangeland riparian areas that are so valuable for wildlife and the environment, less pressure on arid public rangeland, and using grazing-fee receipts for better land management—have also been supported by the House, and are addressed in the administration's preliminary reform proposals.

The Senate amendment would block all administrative steps toward these much needed reforms. It would prohibit the administration from "taking any action involved" in connection with developing its grazing reform initiative. While the dollars are important, the rational land management of these hundreds of millions of acres of public land is imperative.

The Senate proposal not only means that present policies could not be changed, it means that no proposals for change could be developed—and, in fact, that nobody in the administration could even review and consider the comments of the livestock industry or any

other public comments related to development of a final proposal for rangeland reform. This type of narrow special interest control of America's public lands is repugnant and a slap in the face to the Secretary of the Interior's good faith effort to provide deliberate consideration of revisions to the grazing policies.

The House should surely reject this amendment. We should expect and encourage Secretaries Babbitt and Espy to consider public comments that are submitted over the next month, to develop a draft environmental impact statement—one that itself will be subject to further public comments—and to complete development of a complete reform proposal. Let us not hogtie the new Secretary of the Interior, who is trying to end gridlock and change public land policies through an open, fair process.

Congress can participate in this process and also can address grazing reform through legislation if there is a sincere desire to do so.

Several House grazing reform bills are pending, including one I introduced along with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN] on which hearings already have been held. Also pending is a bill for a 4-year reauthorization of the Bureau of Land Management. It also would be an appropriate measure for addressing grazing fees and rangeland reform.

Comparable bills are pending in the Senate, including the 2-year BLM reauthorization bill just passed by the House.

So, despite what some have said, the Senate amendment is not needed to preserve Congress' options. The Senate, in fact, has repeatedly rejected positive initiatives to engage in constructive grazing policy reform. Rather it has been satisfied to permit special interest to bully past administrations into maintaining faulty grazing fees.

In my opinion, it would be better for Congress to enact rangeland reform, rather than for needed changes to be made solely by the administration. And the House has been—and, I think, still is—ready to act on grazing reform.

The problem has been in the Senate. The problem clearly still is in the Senate as demonstrated by the amendment that is the subject of this motion to instruct House conferees.

Some supporters of the Senate amendment claimed that the amendment was not intended to stall rangeland reform. They said that they intended to seek the passage of legislation. I hope that is true. I hope that this time, finally, they will succeed in having the Senate pass a range reform bill. I am sure the House is ready to act. But if we fail to instruct conferees and serve notice about our opposition to this Senate attempt to kill range reform, both the House and the positive new administration policies of reform could be slam dunked through the appropriation process and avoid for a full year any administrative reform. In fact, it takes 10 months to fully, properly implement the change in grazing fees. If all goes well, the Senate freeze would mean that the administration could not take action for 2 years: No action in 1993, no action in 1994, and no action until maybe 1995. A big "maybe".

Mr. Speaker, the administration should be allowed to go forward with development of its own reform proposals. We should not prevent that—in fact, we should be encouraging Sec-

retary Babbitt and the rest of the administration to continue with their efforts.

The Senate amendment would bring to an absolute stop this administration initiative. It is certainly unwise and premature. The House should instruct our conferees to soundly reject it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Under the rule, Members should not characterize the Senate on this matter.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Regula-Synar motion to instruct. The increase in grazing fees that the Clinton administration would like to enact without congressional approval will destroy the entire Western livestock industry and the rural communities it supports.

The livestock industry is the key to rural development throughout much of the West. Every dollar a rancher spends yields another \$5 in economic activity. The vast majority of ranch families are small businesses which earn less than \$28,000 a year. The huge increase in the Federal grazing fee will force thousands of family ranchers out of business. The last thing Congress needs to do is support a policy which will damage small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this motion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will support the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] to instruct the House's conferees on H.R. 2520, Interior appropriations for fiscal year 1994, to have them reject the Senate's amendment blocking Secretary Babbitt's efforts to reform grazing and rangeland management practices.

There are sound environmental and fiscal reasons to support these reforms. Large expanses of public lands in the West are used for grazing, and large parts of those lands are actively eroding because they have lost much of their plant cover. The Bureau of Land Management states that two-thirds of the public lands it manages are in less than satisfactory condition.

Over the past decade, Colorado has been a model state for improvement of range conditions. In fact, Colorado is one of the few states in which BLM claims that its management efforts have resulted in improved range conditions in specific, identified areas. But even in this best case, the improvement has been minimal—involving a small fraction of BLM's rangelands in Colorado.

Overall, Colorado's rangelands are in trouble. According to the available, site-specific published data, 82 percent

of BLM's rangelands in Colorado are in unsatisfactory condition. More than one-third—36 percent—are rated in the lowest category, or in poor condition. Poor condition means that these lands are "producing only a fraction of the vegetative cover compared to similar lands because they have lost so much plant cover and soil." That also means that these lands are actively eroding, and their condition is deteriorating.

Long-term range conditions are important to the ranching community. But, as Secretary Babbitt's proposal recognizes, rangelands also support extensive areas of critical habitat for wildlife, influence the water quality of virtually every river and stream, and provide recreational opportunities for millions of visitors. The deterioration of these lands—which the BLM attributed substantially to over-grazing—damages all of these important uses.

Given this situation, it is clear that we need to do more to restore the environmental condition of public rangelands. But, with a growing Federal deficit, where are the funds going to come from? The obvious and the equitable answer is that they should come from an increase in grazing fees. By statute, over 60 percent of the Federal grazing fee—62.5 percent to be exact—must be returned to the area involved for investments in improving rangeland conditions.

An increase in fees not only is needed but is justifiable. Today, the grazing fees charged by the BLM and Forest Service cover less than half of the cost of the agencies' rangeland management programs—programs which have not been able to halt deterioration on these lands at current funding levels.

For years, BLM has resisted making the connection between range conditions and grazing fees. I think that it is time for the BLM to acknowledge that grazing is a for-profit commercial activity, and its fees should recover at least grazing's fair share of the cost of maintaining the underlying service—in this case maintaining the environment which supports grazing.

With people demanding deficit reduction, with the public pressing for more action to protect the environment, the proposals which Secretary Babbitt has made make sense. Increasing grazing fees, opening the range management process to other users of the public lands, and increasing investments in rangeland improvements are all needed steps—and are all responsive to the public.

While ranching families have raised legitimate concerns about some aspects of the Secretary's proposals, his direction is the right direction—and we should not let the Senate block him from proceeding. The process the Department intends to follow will provide the public, including the ranching community, with several more opportunities to critique future versions of the

proposal. Further, under the Administrative Procedures Act, the Department will be required to respond, on the record, to all substantive concerns and criticism which are expressed. Moreover, Secretary Babbitt certainly recognizes that grazing is and should be a continued use of the public lands.

The bottom line is that range reform makes fiscal and environmental sense. The Senate amendment would just perpetuate gridlock and ignore the continuing deterioration of western rangelands. The Senate amendment should be rejected. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the motion to instruct.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the Regula motion to instruct conferees to reject the Senate amendment to the Interior Department appropriations bill, which would impose a 1-year moratorium on raising the grazing fees on Federal land.

The administration's reforms related to grazing fees and public lands management are overdue. Why should the Federal Government continue to subsidize grazing on public lands?

For 3 years, I and a large number of my colleagues in the House have voted to increase Federal grazing fees. Yet, each year this House vote is disregarded in conference.

Secretary Babbitt plans to issue proposed rules to increase grazing fees. These regulations will go through a comment period and only after that will final rules be written. The Secretary has proposed a 3 year phase-in of fees. Let us give the Secretary time to issue these proposals.

Mr. Speaker, the league of conservation voters, the National Wildlife Federation and every environmental organization supports the Regula motion. I ask my colleagues to support a reform of Federal grazing fees and vote yes on the Regula motion to instruct.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as this country developed, most of the States took all of their public land, every square inch of it. In the West we really did not do that. It turned into the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, and State lands.

We have been managing that land in a process we call multiple use: campers use it, hunters use it, birdwatchers, backpackers, fishermen, and also grazing uses it. How do we care for that? We have various tools. A lot of people do not understand this, but hunting is a tool. We keep down herds with hunting. Controlled burning is a tool. Cutting trees is a tool, and grazing is a tool.

One of the foremost experts that we have in America on public land is Dr.

Jim Bounds. Dr. Jim Bounds has made the statement that if we take cattle and sheep off the range, watch it burn, just count on it. We will burn the range from one area to the other.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting, an article that came from Canada. Our folks in Canada went through the same exercise as the Regula thing: Take the sheep and cattle off the range. Now what are they doing? "Rent a sheep, save a forest." Now someone came up with the brilliant idea of putting sheep on the range and paying \$5 a month for sheep and cattle to go on the public range.

Ten years from now we will be standing here and someone will have a great idea, saying, How are we going to keep the burning in the West down? Put sheep or cattle on it, and let us take it out of the public funds to take care of that particular area.

What this is, it is an attack on the multiple use of the ground. I would urge Members to keep three things in mind. If we pass this Regula instruction, we will ruin the environment, we will hurt the industry, and it will cost the United States money. I would urge a no vote. Let us use some common sense on use of the public ground.

Maybe the people in the West should have been as smart as they were in Ohio and Oklahoma and other States, and should have taken over all of the public ground, which should be under the administration of the States anyway.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise against the amendment and for the moratorium. I am not interested in stonewalling, I am not interested in delaying. I believe Congress, preferably this year, should deal with this matter of changing policy and some increase in grazing fees. The grazers in America are also supportive of some increase in grazing fees.

I say the Congress should do it, not a bureaucrat by executive fiat downtown, but the Congress, because there is a great deal more in Secretary Babbitt's proposal than a simple increase in grazing fees. He has subleasing, which is a change in that policy; a change in grazing advisory boards; a change in the very important matter of tenure; that is, how long a grazer can have the right to lease.

Then there is the critically important matter which Secretary Babbitt would change with regard to water rights. Mr. Speaker, these are policy issues. These are matters which the Congress of the United States, if it is going to change, should codify the changes.

I urge my colleagues to support the right of the Congress to make policy changes, and not have it done downtown by executive fiat.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA]. Once again, my colleague from a State with no public rangelands, and few beef cattle, is attempting to make policy that affects my constituents greatly, and his own not at all—except perhaps for a few Midwestern feedlot operators who stand to gain from diminished competition from Western ranchers.

Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that the other body recently placed a moratorium on the expenditure of funds by the Interior Department to implement rangeland reforms by administrative fiat. They did this so that Congress might have proper opportunity to address legislative reform.

My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, seeks to instruct our conferees not to accept such language. Yet, Mr. REGULA, himself, is the author of a moratorium, in this same bill, on mineral patent processing by the Department. He did this in order to freeze the status quo while Congress considers reform of the mining laws governing the public lands. Now, it seems to me the Congress ought to be consistent in the use of spending moratoria as a tool to effect public policy.

So which is it to be? My constituents are impacted by both Mr. REGULA's mining patent moratorium and the Senate-passed rangeland reform moratorium. The House could take a stand, on principle, against this legislative tactic, in any and all forms—mining, grazing, offshore oil-drilling, you name it.

On the other hand we can acknowledge the utility of moratoria to effect the will of Congress. If so, let us dry our hypocritical tears shed over the actions of the other body and defeat this motion. But, my colleagues, you cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on this motion.

□ 1210

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HAMBURG].

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the very fine amendment by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], and also with the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], and the support of Chairman YATES.

I believe that the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Babbitt, has demonstrated important leadership on this issue to create a direct relationship between grazing permits, the grazing market, and the impact on public lands.

Senator DOMENICI's amendment I believe is an attempt to freeze reform. We need to move forward with this issue, and I want my freshman colleagues to know and to understand

that the House of Representatives has been trying to deal with this issue since 1976. We need that push from the administration and the leadership that has been shown by Secretary Babbitt.

Secretary Babbitt has put into place a very strong public process. He has held hearings all over the West. He has published a rule. He has taken public comment. He is committed to a fair and open process which balances the interests that are concerned here.

Please join me in voting to instruct our representatives at the conference to oppose the Domenici amendment, to create open space so that our Secretary of the Interior can lead the way to reform in this very important area.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure Members are confused about why the Senate voted so heavily for a moratorium. The obvious answer is this: This issue has been before the authorizing committees in this Congress for the last 11 years that I have been here, and the people who know most about it, the members of those committees, have never brought a bill to the floor.

We have tried to compromise this issue and cannot do it. The people who know most about it did not bring a bill to the floor. So that is why we end run this program through the Rules Committee, we end run it with this kind of an idea of an instruction to conferees.

The facts are that the people who know understand that there is no subsidy for grazing fees. There is none, because the fee now covers the cost of management of grazing on public lands. And the facts are that it costs more to run cattle on public lands than it does to run on private lands. Think of it with this fee between \$1.86 and \$10. It costs more to run on Federal lands, proven by economists throughout the country.

Now why do States demand higher prices? They have better land. Why does private enterprise, private land, command higher fees? Better land. It is that simple. The worst land in the country to graze on is Federal land.

If you think there is deprivation because of livestock, you are wrong. Look at this chart. The range after 6 years of drought, 36 percent is in fair condition, 31 percent in good condition, 5 percent excellent, unclassified 13, and poor 15 percent. Now that is the classification of the land by the Bureau of Land Management.

If there is such a deprivation to public lands, why have wild game, big game, competitors some say with livestock, increased dramatically? Look at the antelope, bighorn sheep, deer, elk, moose, all up, huge, in huge numbers in the West for all the benefit from, grazing alongside with cattle.

I ask Members not to impose this tax on people. We have just choked down the Clinton tax increase. This is the next one. Vote "no."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not support the Secretary of the Interior's grazing-fee increases. I believe they would be a serious problem for many small ranchers throughout the West, especially the smallest ranchers.

However, I will be supporting the Regula motion, because I believe this issue has been debated to death for years, and it is time to bite the bullet.

I am concerned about an administration proposal perhaps a year from now that may be more damaging. I am concerned that if we put this issue off one more year, where are we going to be in that year? My concern is those small ranchers with 50 to 300 head of cattle that would be severely impacted by the administration's proposal.

I believe that if we can negotiate the difference now that we will be better off. I have been promised a seat at the table with Secretary Babbitt, with Mr. SYNAR, with Mr. MILLER, with my colleagues who I have long supported on this issue.

I think the current grazing formula is reasonably fair. But if we put it off, we are not getting anywhere. The time has come to negotiate the best possible deal. The time has come to deal with this issue now. The time has come to put this issue behind us so that we can deal with other land issues that are important on the national agenda.

Mr. Speaker, once again, to my colleagues who have been very sincere and positive on this issue, I do not support the Secretary's proposal. I believe we are going to have to compromise it. I believe we are going to, unfortunately, draw lines between big and small ranchers, because the smaller ranchers are going to be more severely impacted. That is political reality.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the Regula motion.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my concerns with the way in which the administration's grazing reform seems to be headed. I do not support the administration's proposal as it is currently structured. I believe that significant changes are needed to make this reform acceptable.

I recently requested a study from Texas A&M University to evaluate the impacts of the proposed 230-percent increase in the public land grazing fee. From this study, I have concluded that the small ranchers—ranchers grazing less than 300 head of cattle—will be significantly hurt by the proposed increase in grazing fees. I am especially concerned with the impacts that the proposed reform could have on the small ranchers in New Mexico. We need to ensure that the limits and timing of fee increases are reasonable and allow for a viable grazing industry that is dependent of public lands.

Despite my reservations about the grazing plan, I believe strongly that this issue needs to be settled now. We cannot afford to have debate on these grazing issues prolonged by a 1-year moratorium. What will 1 year buy us? It will merely prolong the debate, harden positions on both sides, and result with a reform package that is even worse than what we have to work with today.

I have talked with both proponents and opponents to the proposed grazing reform. I believe we can reach agreement on what is needed to reform grazing. I have talked with Representative SYNAR and other colleagues in the House, and I have personal assurances from Secretary Babbitt that I will be at the table with the administration in negotiating changes to make this a workable reform package.

Now is the time for Congress to negotiate with the administration on the grazing reform package. I will work directly with the administration and Secretary Babbitt to modify and improve the provisions in the grazing reform proposal. I encourage you to work with me and take advantage of this opportunity. We need to cooperatively arrive at grazing regulations that we can all live with. Let's not delay this any further. Let's get on with resolving the grazing issues now.

I urge my colleagues to support the Regula motion and move forward now negotiating with the administration. We need a grazing reform package that will work, not prolonged debate for another year.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express opposition to the motion to instruct conferees on the Interior appropriations bill. This motion would instruct conferees to disagree with the Senate language in the Interior appropriations bill, that places a 1 year moratorium on the issue of grazing fees on public lands.

Whether you agree or disagree with raising the grazing fees, the bottom line is that this motion would cut lawmakers out of this debate. Clearly, this is an issue which demands congressional action, and we should not be precluded from input.

I believe that Secretary Babbitt should not be able to unilaterally raise grazing fees of public lands without congressional approval. The people elected Members of Congress to serve them as Government debates issues of great importance—such as the use of our public lands. If my colleagues support the motion to instruct, they sanction removing themselves from this debate.

The Senate language will ensure that we have a voice in the process, and we do not turn the entire decisionmaking process over to Secretary Babbitt and the Interior Department. I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to instruct the Interior conferees.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN].

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] to instruct the conferees. And I want to commend him for taking this very, very bold action.

For the past 7 years, I have joined several of our colleagues in introducing legislation to increase Federal grazing fees to fair market value and to reform public rangeland management. This body has approved rangeland management reform measures at least four times in the last 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, reform of the current rangelands management system is badly needed. The BLM and the U.S. Forest Service rangeland programs, which manage over 260 million acres of public land, operate at a combined deficit of approximately \$50 million per year. In addition to this operating loss, the American taxpayer is losing millions of dollars in grazing fee revenues every year as the result of the current Federal grazing fee that is 20 percent of the market value in some locations and one-third of the average market value in the Western United States.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when the Federal deficit is a critical concern to the American people and this body, responsible management of public resources alone is reason enough to support this motion to instruct the conferees. But there are other reasons to support public rangeland management reforms.

The current program is fundamentally unfair to the vast majority of our Nation's livestock ranchers. Nationally, only 3 percent of all ranchers have access to this federally subsidized grazing land. In the Western States, only 10 percent of the ranchers have access to this below-cost service. The majority of ranchers, large and small, who do not have access to Federal grazing land are placed at a competitive disadvantage by the current policy. The Federal Government should not penalize the vast majority of this Nation's ranchers by subsidizing their competition.

Mr. Speaker, the rangeland reforms contemplated by Secretary Babbitt would also help restore thousands of acres of rangeland damaged by overgrazing and poor management by offering better permit terms to those ranchers who manage their allotments in a sound environmental manner. Allotments for conservation-related use would also be made available under the new proposal. In a number of reports issued over the past several years, the GAO has described the environmental risks created by declining allotment conditions, insufficient monitoring, and generally inadequate management of large sections of BLM and Forest Service rangeland. The management changes proposed by the administration are not only environmentally responsible, but also protect the value and utility of an important public resource.

Mr. Speaker, many of those receiving the grazing fee subsidy are large ranching businesses, not the small ranchers that some would have us believe. In fact, last year's combined report issued by BLM and the Forest Service showed that almost one-half—47 percent—of the total available grazing forage managed by the BLM was controlled by only 10 percent of the total permittees. One permittee controls over 5 million acres of grazing land, an area larger than six of our Nation's States.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Secretary Babbitt for addressing this issue and I urge the members of this body to cast a vote for fair and responsible management of taxpayers' property by supporting Mr. REGULA's motion.

□ 1220

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, Colorado is the home of 13,000 of the Nation's approximately 27,000 permittees; almost half of all the people we are talking about are in Colorado. These increases could devastate the ranching industry in Colorado. It could cripple Colorado's agricultural industry, which historically has been one of the most stable segments of our sometimes boom-and-bust economy out there.

The projected increases could rise more than 130 percent over the next 5 years, and we think that is a great way to bring in money for the Federal Government, it is a little like the boat buyers act tax we put in a few years ago. We are not going to bring in more money, we are going to force permittees, many of them, into leaving ranching altogether.

It is not fair to see grazing fees as a windfall for ranchers. We need to realize that the rangeland we are talking about is a rangeland that, when we were homesteading this country, no one wanted; the worst land, the highest land, the least productive land. This is a land no one wanted. That is why the Federal Government still has it. And the rancher must bear both the grazing fee and the cost of improvements, such as water and fencing.

Total costs using Federal lands often, already, cost ranchers in excess of \$9. By comparison, private leases cost around \$8.50 per animal unit month, and the landlord provides the improvements.

I encourage you to vote against this motion to instruct.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS].

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of points I wish to make. First of all, the issue here is not the pluses or the minuses of grazing, the issue is whether or not we should issue a moratorium.

Why do we need a moratorium? Because we have not gotten a fair hearing.

I missed my only votes out of the Natural Resources Subcommittee because I went to one of those hearings. They were nothing but a courtesy. You can nod your head or shake it in disgust, but let me read you an internal memo that came out of the Interior Department and then you tell me if this is a fair hearing. This is to the Secretary of Interior, Mr. Babbitt, from his director of communications:

DEAR SECRETARY: We realize you want to use price increases as a strawman to draw attention from management issues. But there are other ways this might be done.

We've not yet done enough to sell the public and media on what will be coming out in the regs. Let us manage, manage the first public comments, manage them so the regs are perceived to be fair and in the long-term interest of the region.

For those with concern of the environment, the riparian zone, our own statistics can be used to show the range is in better shape than at any point in this century. With that in mind, we must make deliberate and public attempts to prove how bad the conditions are in many riparian zones.

Those public hearings were nothing but a joke.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

Mr. CRAPO. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I too rise in opposition to this motion. It has been argued here that we should support this motion because we need to better manage the rangeland. But let us recognize that arguing about proper price for the use of our rangelands should not be used as a tool to manipulate agendas on the range issues.

It has been argued here that the price being paid for the use of our rangeland is not high enough. Some said it is only 20 percent of the market value. They do not point out that the impact of this could be devastating on the agricultural industry in Idaho, or rangeland utilized throughout this country, because users pay those additional costs for management and handling of the Federal lands that they are able to use. But the most important point to make here is that we should oppose this motion to make sure that Congress remains a part of making this decision.

The amendment that was just talked about indicates there is a very carefully managed and carefully calculated effort on the way to impose these new increases by Executive fiat, taking Congress out of the system. That is why the Senate acted, and that is why we must take the same course and allow Congress to work this issue rather than to continue to let it be managed by Executive fiat.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, 1 minute is hardly enough time to cover it, but I am opposed to the bill. I have a book I just got on Western wisdom the book is called "Don't Squat With Your Spurs On." That is good advice. But it also says in there in other little bits, and one of them is, "Don't ask your barber if you need a haircut." I sort of think about that when everyone who has spoken here in support of this comes from somewhere else other than the States dedicated to public lands. We have 50 percent in our State, some go as high as 80 percent. These are not parks; these are not wilderness; these are lands that were left after the homesteads took place.

These are not high-productive areas. We are talking about multiple use here, the opportunity to use multiply these lands that are in public ownership. The rest of your States, the lands went to private ownership or went to the State.

I have a suggestion: Why do you not deed it to the States? Why do you not do that in a fairness mood? We will take care of it, and you will not have the cost of dealing with it.

We have talked about the condition of the range. The condition of the range is good. The wildlife is up; that is good for hunters. We have talked about multiple use. We have talked about the price, comparing apples and oranges. We need to have a chance to do something with this besides moving forward with the Secretary's plan that will put people off the ground.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Regula motion. Most agree that public land use policy should be examined and updated. However, the administration rangeland plan goes too far and totally ignores the role of Congress in managing our Federal lands.

Congress has a role, as it should be, since we represent districts which in many cases are 50 percent, 70 percent, or 90 percent owned by the Federal Government. The people who are impacted by the proposed 130 percent fee increase must have a voice in the process.

The administration has just begun public hearings gathering facts and data on grazing. Recent studies conclude that there is no Federal subsidy—that grazing on public lands is actually more costly than grazing private land. However, when the Federal Government owns 70 percent to 90 percent of the land, as in most Western States, there is little choice: Either you graze livestock on public land or you go out of business.

I urge my colleagues not to short circuit the process—allow the morato-

rium to extend time to gather the facts and make a reasoned decision. Oppose the Regula motion.

□ 1230

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I think the reasons for opposing the Regula motion to instruct have all been given. I rise to oppose the motion before us.

I am glad that we have the moratorium language from the Senate on grazing fees.

I view this effort to remove the moratorium as part of a series of attacks on the resource-based industries, whether to limit the public lands for grazing, whether to limit the use of water for agriculture, the use of lands for mining or for timber harvesting. I think enough is enough.

If we want to get back to having people employed and to becoming competitive again and having a higher quality of life, we have got to be able to allow these lands to be used by ranchers who live in the area.

As many know, there is not much other use that these public lands can be put to. The fees are reasonable. We are not giving a subsidy here, considering that the users have to build their own fences, provide their own water, plus buy their grazing permits.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this motion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR].

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes we have remaining in this debate, I hope that we can move away from the hyperbole by some of the speakers and return to the calm recitation of the facts.

Fact No. 1. The taxpayers of this country lost \$1 billion coming to the Treasury during the decade of the eighties, subsidizing 2 percent of the cattle industry of this country.

Fact No. 2. Of that 2 percent of the cattle industry that has enjoyed this subsidy for literally decades, 2 percent of it control almost half the grazing lands in our country. They do not represent the Ma and Pa operations that have been portrayed here today. Some of the major benefactors of the grazing permits are companies like Getty Oil, Union Oil, Texaco, Zenchiku Land & Livestock Co. out of Japan, Metropolitan and John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Cos., some the largest companies in our country.

Fact No. 3. Sixty percent of the grazing land in this country well into the next century will be in poor or unsatisfactory condition.

Fact No. 4, and probably the most important: In 10 years of debate on this floor and in the committees of this Congress, there has not been one pres-

entation of one shred of verifiable evidence to support any accusations and objections that have been presented today. It will not kill jobs; it will not raise cattle prices, hurt the environment, destroy western communities, kill small business, or run ranchers off the land.

To the contrary, the evidence after 10 years is overwhelming and indisputable that this is the proper thing to do for the management of our range lands.

Mr. Speaker and my fellow colleagues and fellow Americans, it is time to run our public range lands more like a business. It is time to give our western ranchers a good dose of free enterprise.

This administration, under the leadership of Bruce Babbitt, has given us a wise and workable solution to a long-standing dispute that very frankly we in Congress simply cannot resolve.

The Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture went out to five public meetings and heard from literally thousands of citizens who participated in these hearings and will participate in the process as we move forward.

It is very simply time for Congress to get out of the way and let the process move forward.

The bottom line for those who support the Senate position is that there is never going to be a right time to increase the grazing fees and there is never going to be an increase that is acceptable.

For those of us who support the concept of fair market value for the use of our public lands and for a range program that works for both the taxpayers and the environment, the only solution is to support the Regula motion to instruct.

Finally, let us be honest with ourselves. Let us be honest with our constituents. If we cannot do this small thing for the taxpayers, we will never convince the public that we are serious about reducing the Federal deficit or public land reform.

Mr. Speaker, support the Regula motion to instruct.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Regula amendment. I believe strongly that we must promote proper stewardship of our Federal lands, make all reasonable efforts to balance the budget, and always strive to strengthen our economy. As far as I can tell, though, the administration's proposal will accomplish none of these objectives. Some reform of Federal grazing policy is, indeed, necessary, but it must recognize distinct differences between public and private lands.

Ranchers already have a built-in incentive to properly manage Federal lands on which their cattle graze—they need to continue grazing on

that land for years into the future. If there are problems, conditions can be built into permits to encourage better stewardship. As well, permits can be extended beyond 10 years for especially good land stewards.

Doubling grazing fees and drastically increasing Federal burdens will only serve to drive ranchers from public lands. Without ranchers sustainably utilizing Federal lands, less money will go to the Treasury and the budget will be worse off, not better.

There can be no question that cattle ranching families play a significant role in regional economies, both directly through the product they bring to market and indirectly through other businesses such as automobile and equipment dealers, feedstores and grocery stores, doctors and dentists, that rely on the broader ranching economy. Already hard hit by our lingering recession, many rural areas will be dealt a knockout blow. This will especially be the case in many parts of California, which is having a particularly difficult time during this recession.

But the recession has been forgotten by those who would propose the current version of reform of Federal grazing policies. I believe some reform is necessary but believe it should recognize differences between public and private lands. Public land reserved for multiple use was not placed in wilderness for a reason. These lands are of lower grade and cost more to use and maintain.

Protect proper stewardship of Federal lands, the budget, and the economy. Oppose the Regula amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Regula motion to instruct.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Regula tax increase.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Regula motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2520, the Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose an increase in the Federal grazing fee. However, I do object to the continuing efforts to circumvent the legislative process in an effort to achieve a large increase in the fee. Most ranchers who lease Federal land understand the need for an adjustment in the fee, but understandably oppose huge increases, like the 130-percent increase proposed by the administration, because it would be devastating to their business.

I think that the administration's proposal deserves some study. I believe that Secretary Babbitt has made his best effort to propose a solution. However, I object to having his solu-

tion implemented without congressional input and oversight. The House and Senate committees with jurisdiction over Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service land have the responsibility to ensure that any changes made to the Federal grazing program be fair, sensible, and just. Clearly, the administration needs to play a role in this process, but shutting out Congress is not acceptable.

We have debated the issue of grazing fees many times in this Chamber, and I won't take a lot of time reiterating these arguments, but I would like to point out one important issue. It is clear to anyone who has taken the time to study grazing in the Western States that grazing on Federal land is vastly different from grazing on private land. Each time we debate this issue, proponents of an increased fee compare the private fee with the Federal fee. Unfortunately, this is comparing apples and oranges. Ranchers who use Federal grazing permits are required to make many range improvements that private permit holders are not. A report prepared by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture found that the 23,600 ranchers who hold Federal permits have receipts that are 17 percent below the industry average. It is clear that a Federal grazing permit does not give a rancher a competitive advantage. Any change in the grazing formula must take into account the investment that a rancher must make on public lands.

Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot continue to shirk its responsibility to make decisions on how our public lands and other natural resources are to be managed. While I know firsthand that we won't always agree on these issues, I strongly believe that we owe it to our constituents to fulfill this important responsibility.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield our remaining time to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize to the gun control lobby for plagiarism, but it illustrates the Shoot Out at the O.K. Corral that we have done time and time again.

With the utmost respect for the proponents of this measure, for whom I do have a great deal of love and respect, at least for a few of them, we have met again and I will dispute facts one, two, three, four and five, and you can shake that packet of GAO studies that have been done. They even contradict themselves. It is totally refutable.

How many of you in here have ever had a grazing permit? Hold your hands up. One, two, three, four.

How many of you wish that you did not have them? One, two, three, four. I do not. I bought mine off because I knew one day that we were going to face this kind of a problem with people who have no attachment to the real problem of land management under a grazing permit system, who are going to object to the system as it is, when it was imposed on the ranching communities in Western States, not like other States that own all their land. This was put upon us as a method of having

somebody steward the land from the 1800's on up to the 1900's.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a subsidy to ranchers under any circumstances.

How in the world do you think that you can compare private leasing systems with a public land system is fallacious, has no bearing whatever, none, and will never have because they are totally two different things.

Market value, how do you establish market value when there is no market? You cannot sell a permit. You cannot buy a permit. You have to conform to the method of leasing this land by owning adjacent land, putting in the capital improvements, control the water base and all the rest.

Environmentally, let me say this, the greatest managers in the environment that you have are those grazing permittees you have today because they manage that land day in and day out.

The BLM, you never see them and never will.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

□ 1240

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I think we should take one more step. In holding up our hands, asking everybody in this room who owns these lands to hold up their hands; well, of course, it is everyone in this room because these lands belong to all the people of these United States. What we are seeking to do is have fairness in the administration of these lands in terms of the fees that are charged.

Now this is supported by the National Taxpayers Union. It is supported by practically every environmental group in this country. The reason that it is equitable, Mr. Speaker, is it makes sense, and of course we have heard how ranchers will go out of business.

Well, what I do not understand is how the 98 percent of the ranchers that do not graze on public lands stay in business. They seem to manage somehow, as opposed to the 2 percent that get the subsidies in the form of lower grazing fees, lower by 20 percent now than in 1980. I would like to know what else we can buy that is 20 percent cheaper today than it was in 1980. That speaks eloquently to the fact that there is something inequitable about the present standard.

I would point out, too, that we have had a lot of concern about budget deficits. We are subsidizing these fees to the tune of \$52 million.

Now let me in fairness say that that also helps the multiple use of these lands, and I am all for the multiple use, and I have no quarrel with leasing of these lands. I think it makes good sense to have the ranchers use them. It is simply a matter of getting what is fair.

And let me point out what my motion does not do. It does not, and I emphasize it does not, endorse Secretary

Babbitt's plan. It does not increase grazing fees.

What does it do? It allows the House and Senate conferees, the elected representatives of the people, the elected representatives of the owners of the land, to establish a fair and equitable grazing fee, fair to the ranchers, fair to the taxpayers, fair to the Treasury, a program that will be fair to all that will recognize the realities of today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this motion so that the conferees from the House and the Senate, and, as my colleagues heard, the gentleman from New Mexico, others, will have an opportunity to participate. Let us get rid of this problem that has been around. However the conferees decide, along with input from the Members of this body, let us achieve a fair and equitable program for the taxpayers, for the ranchers and all concerned. I urge this body to support this motion.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Synar-Regula motion to instruct conferees. The Senate rightly denied funds for implementation of the Clinton administration's Rangeland Reform 1994 Program. Given the impact it will undoubtedly have—it will devastate many already struggling Western communities—Congress ought to have an opportunity to fully review and assess its impact, and vote on it, before it is implemented. The Senate amendment will allow that time to act.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's 130-percent increase in Federal grazing fees is a job-killer. It is unreasonable. It appears to be an effort to eliminate livestock grazing as an acceptable use of public lands, and it ought to be rejected.

If the concern is about environmental damage resulting from overgrazing, there are ways to address that. Those who are abusing public lands and causing significant damage can be identified and either brought into compliance or be denied a grazing permit. However, the vast majority of ranchers are good stewards of the land. They need to be. Their livelihoods depend on it.

If the concern is about wildlife, managed grazing can be an asset. Livestock producers have built—with their own funds—tens of thousands of watering sites on Federal lands.

If the concern is about the comparability of fees with those charged on State or private lands, let's compare apples to apples. A rancher on Federal land, unlike his counterpart on private land, must build his own erosion control measures, stockpounds and watering holes, and fencing. That ought to be taken into account when setting fees.

If the concern is about fair return to the Treasury, a more modest increase could be considered. Most ranching families earn less than \$28,000 per year, and an increase of the magnitude proposed here today will simply put them over the edge. Once bankrupt and unemployed, they won't be paying grazing fees, or income taxes. Revenues to the Treasury will fall.

Mr. Chairman, legitimate concerns can be addressed. The Clinton program is not about resolving concerns. It is about eliminating

grazing from public lands. I urge the defeat of the Synar-Regula motion to instruct, and support for the Senate amendment to block implementation of the Clinton policy.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the motion to instruct conferees on the fiscal year 1994 Interior Appropriations bill to raise grazing fees could devastate rural communities in the West and set a very bad precedent. We should not raise grazing fees 130 percent: It is not justified because of environmental reasons. The Bureau of Land Management found that public rangelands are in better condition than any time this century. It is not for budget reasons a recent Heritage Foundation study found what westerners have known for some time—that public lands grazing is not priced below market value and that higher grazing fees could actually result in less Federal revenue, with millions of additional dollars having to be spent on fencing and other improvements to the land. If bids were taken the grazing fees would probably be less. Indeed, the former Director of the BLM predicts that if ranchers were eliminated from Federal lands, costs to the Federal Government for rangeland management would increase by as much as 50 percent. I urge this body to let the Senate language prevail and that in the next year we examine the possibility of bidding or otherwise assuring a fair market value.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, this is not gridlock, this is a total roadblock.

Despite overwhelming public support for raising Federal fees charged for grazing livestock on public lands, the other body has voted to preclude the Clinton administration from implementing this necessary reform. I believe that we should approve the Regula motion to instruct conferees, and reject the Senate amendment extending the freeze on grazing fees. We must allow the President to act.

For decades, a small group of ranchers representing only 2 percent of all livestock producers, has enjoyed the benefits of an outdated and unfair grazing fee policy that is both financially and environmentally unsound. By effectively limiting Federal grazing fees to only one-fifth of the those charged by private landowners, this program inflicts a double whammy on the taxpayer: costing the Government in lost revenue and preventing the collection of sufficient fees to administering the program or to cover the cost of restoring habitats damaged by grazing.

By supporting the Regula motion, the Members of this House can take an important first step in bringing about the long overdue end to Federal subsidies of livestock grazing on public lands. I intend to take this unique opportunity to protect the American taxpayer and our environment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in my support of this motion.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has approved legislation in each of the past several years to increase the fees for grazing on land administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. In every instance, the House-passed language has been removed from the final measure by Senate conferees.

Recently, the Secretary of the Interior took the initiative by proposing increased grazing fees over the next 3 years within the context of overall rangeland reform. This action is in

the proposed rulemaking stage, and public comment is being received. An amendment to H.R. 2520, however, could derail this process by prohibiting spending any funds to continue any action involving the proposed rulemaking. This language, offered by Senator DOMENICI of New Mexico places a 1-year moratorium on the reform process. Even though I do not endorse the broad scope of the Secretary's proposal, I cannot support the intent of the Domenici amendment to delay these reforms. We have avoided real reform in the area of grazing fees for far too long.

I recognize that fair value grazing is not a realistic alternative for many Western ranchers. Some reform, however, is necessary in order to bring this subsidy into line with the costs to the Federal Government. I favor a fair resolution to ensure that the fee increases are reasonable. But if the Domenici amendment is retained, then there will be no compromise on grazing fees for at least another year.

In 1992, I voted with 244 of my colleagues to reform this program, which effectively subsidizes ranchers at a cost to the Federal Government of more than \$50 million a year. Today, we are considering a motion to permit the process of reform to proceed. I believe that it is important that we move toward a resolution of this issue. Therefore, I intend to vote for the motion to instruct the House conferees to reject the Domenici amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the administration's efforts to comprehensively reform grazing practices on our public lands. I want to stress the word "reform."

I have consistently opposed attempts in this body to levy punitive grazing fee increases on ranchers in the West. I said that any fee increase should be part of a comprehensive proposal to grazing practices. The administration's proposal passes that test.

I don't necessarily support every detail of Secretary Babbitt's proposal. But I flat-out oppose the Senate's effort to stifle debate on long overdue rangeland management reforms. The Senate's position would prevent the administration from even reviewing comments from the public on its proposal, including constructive suggestions from the ranching community. It would prevent any meaningful reforms for the next year. This debate has nothing to do with protecting congressional prerogatives; it has everything to do with protecting a system that no longer serves the public interest.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Regula motion and do so as a supporter of rangeland reform.

Let me state at the outset that the current grazing fee formula needs to be reformed and a grazing fee increase is warranted. Unfortunately, there is the appearance that the administration has already set a new grazing fee target and is now in the process of justifying the proposed increase. It appears as though a decision has been made on the new grazing fee level before the rulemaking process has been completed. Before embracing a proposed fee increase, there must be an open and fair process that entertains the concerns and interests of all parties, including industry.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the practical effect of the moratorium will be minimal. Under the current rulemaking process, a final rule on

rangeland reform will not likely be implemented until the fall of next year, about the time the proposed moratorium would expire. The process can continue to move forward unimpeded during this time.

I support rangeland reform, but I want a constructive, open and fair process to achieve it. Therefore, I will oppose the Regula amendment. Simply let the administration know that I want an inclusive process, free from predetermined outcomes.

Ms. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio to instruct the House conferees to reject the Senate amendment to the bill imposing a 1-year moratorium on administration actions to establish market-rate grazing fees and enact other rangeland reforms.

We have an opportunity to begin reinventing Government today by telling the House conferees that we will wait no longer to end the senseless waste of taxpayer dollars and sensitive rangelands caused by Federal grazing subsidies.

The Vice President's reinventing Government task force recently issued its report which called on the Federal Government to charge market-rate prices for the use of Federal property. Undercharging for grazing rights encourages environmentally harmful overgrazing and provides ranchers on Federal lands an unfair advantage over their competitors who must pay market rates for grazing privileges.

Year after year, Members of this body have struggled to reform Federal rangeland policies only to lose to the special interests. I have supported those efforts and this year I introduced legislation of my own to direct the Department of Interior to charge market rates for grazing privileges on Federal lands. This measure would save an estimated \$80 million over the next 5 years.

The Department of Interior, headed by Secretary Babbitt, has signaled its intention to move forward with grazing policy reforms that include charging market rates for grazing privileges. The proponents of the Senate moratorium want to block the Interior Department's efforts to end this wasteful subsidy. They want to prolong the gridlock and preserve a sweetheart deal that the Federal Government has been giving to some cattle rangers all these years.

It is time to take a stand for the national interest. It is time to tell the privileged few, who have been enjoying special treatment at the expense of the American taxpayer, to pay their way like everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of better ways to spend the estimated \$80 million that Federal grazing subsidies will cost the American people over the next 5 years—by reducing the Federal deficit, by enhancing our commitment to education, by investing in our neglected infrastructure.

These are the choices that the American people sent us here to make. I urge my colleagues who have expressed support for reinventing Government to vote for reinventing Government today. Support the Regula motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, today the House spoke on an issue of great importance to our Nation's ranching and livestock industry. By a majority vote, the House instructed its con-

ferrees for the fiscal year 1994 Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill to insist disagreement to Senate amendment No. 123, which would place a moratorium on the Clinton administration's efforts to reform the Federal Government's policy for livestock grazing on public lands.

As a supporter of this motion to instruct conferees, I would like to state that I am firmly committed to a healthy and productive livestock industry in the United States. I do believe however, that the time has come for definitive action on the question of grazing fees and rangeland management reform. It is in this spirit that I cast my vote in favor of the motion to instruct the House conferees.

I would like to state, Mr. Speaker, that my vote for the motion does not necessarily constitute support for any specific recommendation or provision contained in Secretary Bruce Babbitt's proposed reforms. Rather, my vote indicates my strong desire to continue the reform dialog. To date, the administration has held five public meetings in the West and has heard from thousands of people. In December, when a draft environmental impact statement and draft regulations on the proposed reforms will be released, there will be additional opportunities for input from the public. My vote today was for the continuation of this process.

For years now, Congress has attempted to bring stability to the manner in which the Federal Government manages its rangelands. And for years, Congress has been unable to agree on a solution. What is needed today is not a continuation of this gridlock, but an end to the grazing fees debate that has produced so much uncertainty for ranchers and others throughout the country.

With this said, Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight the important fact that by its action today, the House is not relinquishing its ability to legislatively change any administration plan for reform or to develop its own reform measures. As a Member of Congress and an Arizonan committed to a productive livestock industry, I will be closely watching the continued development of the administration's proposed reforms for the management of Federal rangelands and the grazing fees system.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Regula motion. Most agree that public land use policy should be examined and updated. However, the administration rangeland plan goes too far and totally ignores the role of Congress in managing our federal lands.

Congress has a role, which is as it should be, since we represent districts which in many cases are 50 percent, 70 percent or 90 percent owned by the Federal Government. The people who are impacted by the proposed 130 percent fee increase must have a voice in the process.

Such a massive increase in the grazing fee would have a devastating impact on many livestock producers in my district and across the west. The Federal Government owns almost 70 percent of the land in Utah. In most of the rural counties in my district, the Federal Government owns over 90 percent of the land; in several, it owns 98 percent. This high level of federal ownership presents economic and other challenges which my colleagues from the East cannot even imagine. In my district,

as in most western states, there is little choice. Either you graze public land or you go out of business.

My colleagues should make no mistake about it. The increase in the grazing fee which the administration is proposing would put many livestock producers in my district and across the West out-of-business. A wide range of unanticipated costs would result. The most serious are the social and human costs in small rural communities. But since the proponents of an increase in grazing fees insist on trying to frame the debate in purely dollar terms, let me briefly mention a couple of the direct dollar costs to the Federal Government.

A direct, but hidden cost would be the increased expenditures for entitlement programs as we destroy the ability of many of our citizens in the rural West to earn a living. Before we allow any increase in grazing fees in the guise of providing a fair return to the treasury, it would seem wise to me to determine whether such a change would result in net gain or loss to the treasury. This has not been done.

Another hidden impact would be upon banks. Banks in rural communities which have in the past accepted a grazing permit as loan collateral would be increasingly stressed by the bankruptcies which would result by this action by the administration. The value of grazing permits has plummeted in the face of these proposed increases significantly reducing the collateral value of the permit securing these loans. Some banks could fail. Others could be so badly hurt that they would not be able to provide the money needed by the private sector to enhance the economies and quality of life in these rural areas. This unfortunate chain of events, in turn, could slow the growth of the national economy with consequences for the nation as a whole.

Let me cite just one other impact. As the base of rural counties erodes, so does their ability to provide the basic services to the millions of visitors to the federal lands. Most of my colleagues are not aware that the counties provide landfills for garbage, pay for search and rescue activities, provide police protection and law enforcement on most public lands and a wide range of other services with no or very little compensation by the Federal Government. The cost to the Federal Government to provide these services in my district would far exceed the relatively small amount of money the increased grazing fees would return to the treasury.

If the evidence were clear that grazing fees were indeed below the fair market value, I could understand the desire of some in this body and in the administration to raise fees quickly. But the data from a number of studies suggest that even at the current rate, it actually costs more to graze on public land than to graze on comparable private land. There certainly is no subsidy to livestock producers and grazing fees in the west are certainly not below fair market value.

It is particularly disturbing to me that the decision by the administration to increase grazing fees ignores this evidence. Equity demands that the burden of proving the insufficiency of the current grazing fees should rest with those who would seek to raise them. There has yet to be a thorough and in depth

public discussion of these studies and analyses by the administration. Indeed, as the famous leaked Sweeney/Wyman memo so frequently referred to here today and in recent debate in the other body makes abundantly clear, the Interior Department apparently had its mind made up to raise grazing fees long ago, regardless of the facts of the situation. I hope that the leak of that memo proves sufficiently embarrassing that the Department will now seriously and honestly look at all the facts and engage in good faith in a public debate on this issue.

That is all the moratorium language in the conference report seeks to accomplish. By postponing the implementation of any increased grazing fees for a year, all of us, Congress, the public, livestock producers and others will have the time to fully debate this issue. I am confident that this review will show that what the administration proposes is not only unwise but unjustified.

The economic impact upon thousands of good, hard working people across the West could be devastating if this proposed action by the administration is undertaken precipitously. There is no harm or damage which would result from waiting. The only prudent course is to support the moratorium and provide both the time and the incentive for all parties to gather and debate the facts and make a reasoned decision.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Regula motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 314, nays 109, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—314

Abercrombie	Borski	Coppersmith
Ackerman	Boucher	Costello
Andrews (ME)	Brooks	Coyne
Andrews (NJ)	Browder	Cramer
Andrews (TX)	Brown (CA)	Danner
Applegate	Brown (FL)	Darden
Archer	Brown (OH)	de la Garza
Bacchus (FL)	Bryant	Deal
Bachus (AL)	Byrne	DeFazio
Baesler	Cantwell	DeLauro
Barca	Cardin	Dellums
Barlow	Carr	Derrick
Barrett (WI)	Castle	Deutsch
Barlett	Chapman	Diaz-Balart
Becerra	Clay	Dickey
Bellenson	Clayton	Dicks
Bereuter	Clement	Dixon
Berman	Clinger	Duncan
Bevill	Clyburn	Durbin
Bilirakis	Coble	Edwards (CA)
Bishop	Coleman	Engel
Blackwell	Collins (GA)	English (OK)
Blute	Collins (IL)	Eshoo
Boehrlert	Collins (MI)	Evans
Bonior	Cooper	Everett

Farr	Levin	Roemer
Fawell	Levy	Rohrabacher
Fields (LA)	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Filner	Linder	Rose
Fingerhut	Lipinski	Rostenkowski
Fish	Long	Roukema
Flake	Lowey	Rowland
Foglietta	Machtley	Royal-Allard
Ford (MI)	Maloney	Royce
Ford (TN)	Mann	Rush
Fowler	Manton	Sabo
Frank (MA)	Margolles	Sanders
Franks (CT)	Mezvinsky	Sangmeister
Franks (NJ)	Markey	Santorum
Furse	Martinez	Sawyer
Gallo	Matsul	Saxton
Gejdenson	Mazzoli	Schenck
Gephardt	McCloskey	Schroeder
Gibbons	McCurdy	Schumer
Gilchrest	McDermott	Scott
Gillmor	McHale	Sensenbrenner
Gilman	McHugh	Sharp
Glickman	McKinney	Shaw
Gonzalez	McMillan	Shays
Goodlatte	McNulty	Shepherd
Goodling	Meehan	Shuster
Gordon	Meek	Sisk
Goss	Menendez	Skaggs
Green	Meyers	Skelton
Greenwood	Mfume	Slattery
Gunderson	Mica	Slaughter
Gutierrez	Miller (CA)	Smith (IA)
Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Hamburg	Mineta	Snowe
Hamilton	Minge	Solomon
Harman	Mink	Spence
Hastings	Moakley	Stark
Hefner	Molinari	Stearns
Hilliard	Mollohan	Stokes
Hinchee	Moran	Strickland
Hoagland	Morella	Studds
Hobson	Murphy	Stupak
Hochbrueckner	Murtha	Swett
Hoekstra	Nadler	Swift
Hoke	Natcher	Synar
Holden	Neal (MA)	Tanner
Horn	Neal (NC)	Taylor (MS)
Hoyer	Oberstar	Tejeda
Hughes	Obey	Thompson
Hutto	Oliver	Thornton
Hyde	Ortiz	Thurman
Inglis	Owens	Torkildsen
Inslie	Oxley	Torres
Istook	Pallone	Torricelli
Jacobs	Parker	Towns
Jefferson	Pastor	Trafficant
Johnson (CT)	Paxon	Tucker
Johnson (GA)	Payne (NJ)	Unsoeld
Johnson, E. B.	Payne (VA)	Upton
Johnston	Pelosi	Valentine
Kanjorski	Penny	Velazquez
Kaptur	Peterson (FL)	Vento
Kasich	Petri	Visclosky
Kennedy	Pickett	Volkmer
Kennelly	Pickle	Washington
Kildee	Porter	Waters
Kim	Portman	Watt
King	Poshard	Waxman
Kleczka	Price (NC)	Weldon
Klein	Pryce (OH)	Wheat
Klug	Quinn	Whitten
Knollenberg	Rahall	Wilson
Kreidler	Ramstad	Wise
LaFalce	Rangel	Woolsey
Lambert	Ravenel	Wyden
Lancaster	Reed	Wynn
Lantos	Regula	Yates
Laughlin	Reynolds	Young (FL)
Lazio	Richardson	Zeliff
Leach	Ridge	Zimmer

NAYS—109

Allard	Bonilla	Crapo
Armey	Brewster	Cunningham
Baker (CA)	Bunning	DeLay
Baker (LA)	Burton	Dooley
Bailenger	Buyer	Doolittle
Barcia	Callahan	Dornan
Barrett (NE)	Calvert	Dreier
Barton	Camp	Dunn
Bateman	Canady	Edwards (TX)
Bentley	Combest	Emerson
Blibray	Condit	English (AZ)
Bliley	Cox	Ewing
Boehner	Crane	Fazio

Fields (TX)	Kyl	Rogers
Frost	LaRocco	Roth
Gallegly	Lehman	Sarpallus
Gekas	Lewis (CA)	Schaefer
Gerren	Lewis (FL)	Schiff
Gingrich	Lightfoot	Skeen
Grams	Livingston	Smith (OR)
Hall (TX)	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Hancock	McCandless	Stenholm
Hansen	McCollum	Stump
Hastert	McCrery	Sundquist
Hayes	McInnis	Talent
Hefley	McKeon	Tauzin
Herger	Montgomery	Taylor (NC)
Houghton	Moorhead	Thomas (CA)
Huffington	Myers	Thomas (WY)
Hunter	Nussle	Vucanovich
Hutchinson	Orton	Walker
Inhofe	Packard	Walsh
Johnson (SD)	Peterson (MN)	Williams
Johnson, Sam	Pombo	Wolf
Kingston	Pomeroy	Young (AK)
Kolbe	Quillen	
Kopetski	Roberts	

NOT VOTING—10

Conyers	Lloyd	Smith (MI)
Dingell	McDade	Spratt
Grandy	Michel	
Klink	Serrano	

□ 1305

Mr. LIVINGSTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. LEVY, COBLE, BACHUS of Alabama, and EVERETT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENNY). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 2520, Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994: Messrs. YATES, MURTHA, DICKS, BEVILL, SKAGGS, COLEMAN, NATCHER, REGULA, MCDADE, KOLBE, and PACKARD.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1734

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 1734.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2519, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2519, be instructed to agree to the first proviso of the Senate amendment numbered 147, with an amendment that reads as follows:

In lieu of the first proviso in Senate amendment numbered 147, insert the following:

"Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for arrearage payments to the United Nations until the Secretary of State certifies to the Congress that the United Nations has established an independent office with responsibilities and powers substantially similar to offices of Inspectors General authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended"

Mr. ROGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, my motion would instruct the House conferees to agree to a Senate provision, authored by Senator DOMENICI, requiring the United Nations to create an inspector general's office before receiving any more U.S. arrearage payments in fiscal 1994.

The United Nations must be reformed. That has been Congress' cry so often in the last 10 years that we are beginning to sound like a broken record. The American people, who pay

25 percent of the United Nations general budget and 31.7 percent, Mr. Speaker, of the international peacekeeping budget of the United Nations, people will be charged almost \$1.5 billion in assessed contributions to the United Nations in 1994.

This does not include the hundreds of millions of dollars our constituents will give in voluntary contributions to the United Nations not contained in this bill. That is a huge investment, and we are entitled to know how our money is being spent. And we do not.

Almost 80 percent of the general budget of the United Nations is being used to pay for 14,000 employees of the U.N. Secretariat alone, workers who enjoy some of the most generous employment benefits around, including salaries which are guaranteed at rates 15 to 20 percent higher than the highest comparable private sector, salaries which, I might add, are tax free, Mr. Speaker.

They have additional payments of \$1,270 per year per dependent child. They are guaranteed 100 percent cost-of-living increases. These 14,000 employees at the Secretariat alone enjoy vacations of up to 2 months per year.

□ 1310

They have payments to cover three-fourths of all education costs including college, for each of their children, and they have one of the world's best retirement systems.

No wonder U.N. programs are forced to scrounge for other sources of funding—including coming back to Uncle Sam for voluntary contributions.

And, would you believe, the Secretary-General has called for higher pay for U.N. staff members.

With personnel policies like these, no wonder Richard Thornburgh, during his tenure as head of management at the United Nations found:

Too many deadwood staff members doing too little work and too few good staff members doing too much.

Featherbedding to preserve unnecessary U.N. jobs at all costs.

In one instance, management sabotaged attempts to eliminate 500 unneeded jobs, a move costing the United Nations \$20 million per year.

Lucrative consulting contracts given to retired and even dismissed employees.

In addition we are treated to all too frequent press accounts of questionable U.N. spending, including:

\$110,000 to refurbish the home of the head of the U.N. peacekeeping mission in Cambodia;

Millions spent to generate thousands of U.N. publications on such worthwhile topics as "Imperialism: The Last Stage of Capitalism."

And the list goes on, and on, and on. Obviously, no one at the United Nations is minding the store.

At a time when the United Nations is reported to face tremendous financial crisis, how can this be?

According to the Richard Thornburgh's review of the United Nations—the United Nations is almost totally lacking in any effective mechanism to deal with waste, fraud, and abuse.

To bring about much needed reform, Thornburgh recommended to the United Nations that it immediately establish an inspector general's office.

He is not alone in his cry:

President Clinton called for an IG in his speech at the United Nations earlier this week.

Vice President GORE recommended the immediate creation of a U.N. IG in his national performance review.

Unbelievable, their calls for an inspector general face stiff opposition at the United Nations—even from some of our traditional allies.

It is beyond me as to how anyone could oppose an inspector general whose function would be to:

Evaluate and recommend policies to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness;

Prevent and detect fraud and abuse;

Keep the U.N. Secretary General and the member States fully informed about problems in the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, an inspector general is our chance to get true reforms at the United Nations.

It is time this Congress put some muscle behind the President's call for reform. The vote on my motion is a vote for U.N. reform. It is a vote for accountability.

The American public, which, let me once again remind my colleagues, will provide over \$1 billion to the United Nations this year, demands no less of its government, and we must demand no less of the United Nations.

As the Vice President said in his national performance review, we must "prove to the American people that their tax dollars will be treated with respect for the hard work that earned them."

My colleagues, I do not believe the United Nations has treated the American taxpayer with respect.

Prove to your constituents that you want the U.N. waste to stop.

Support my motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for my motion to instruct, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, former Attorney General Thornburgh was appointed in the last administration as the Under Secretary General for Management at the United Nations, and he made the recommendation that they have an inspector general. Our present Ambassador to the United Nations, Albright, has recommended they have an inspector general, and they are moving in that direction. The President has called for them to have an inspector general.

The Senate bill has about two pages of wording in it referring to this subject matter. Then the gentleman from

Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has an improved version, I think, but the gist of what we are talking about is, they need an inspector general, and they need to move that way as fast as possible. I do not think there is any disagreement about the objectives.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the gentleman's motion. There is a difference in the wording, obviously, between what the gentleman has in his motion and what they have in the Senate bill, but I think whatever it is, we can work the wording out. The gist of it is that we want them to have an inspector general.

Mr. Speaker, I was a sponsor of the first inspector general in the Government here in the United States. It was for the Department of Agriculture. The idea is that they should have someone working at all times, looking for things that ought to be corrected and reporting back to the people who can do something about it, and exposing it.

That is the whole idea here. I do not disagree with the idea, and I am going to vote for the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there further requests for time?

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not expect we will consume anywhere near the time that has been allotted. I plan to close very briefly here if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] wishes to do the same. We should have a vote very soon, so those who are watching the debate can be thus advised.

Let me take just a few minutes. I will be brief, Mr. Speaker. This is a proposal that, although fresh on the floor today, has been pushed for so many years in a variety of forms. The U.S. Congress and other institutions have been requesting of the United Nations some accountability for years with no avail. It is a part of the bureaucracy of the United Nations to resist this kind of request. I understand that. There are at least two schools of thought within the United Nations about whether or not this is a good idea.

Most of the industrialized nations have been requesting this for a long time, and agree upon it. Many of the Third World countries do not want it. That is understandable. That is part of the history of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, we will not see the needed reforms until we take this action of withholding arrearage payment funds until our Secretary of State certifies the United Nations has complied with this request. It is not unreasonable. In fact, it is very sensible, and will make a better United Nations, and of course, better accountability of the funds that our taxpayers and all others around the world give to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the founders in 1945 did not mean for the United Nations to end

up as it is now, in this bureaucratic maze. I am quoting from a story in the press recently: "The whole U.N. civil service got hijacked by the Cold War and decolonization," said Donald McHenry, the former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations

"As many experts point out, the U.N. grew as it did because its members wanted it to. For the Third World countries, the United Nations offered jobs for politicians' brothers-in-law and gave them a world platform for their problems. The major powers went along.

"Hiring for U.N. offices was rather like patronage hiring in the old Chicago Streets and Sanitation Department—except that Streets and Sanitation actually picked up garbage, while the United Nations only complained about it," Charles Lipson, a University of Chicago Professor of International Politics, recently told a U.S. panel studying the United Nations

So it has developed over the years, into the bureaucracy that needs to be reformed. The only way to do it is as we have done in the past. The Kassebaum-Solomon amendment, which began these arrearages 4 years ago, the money was withheld for the purposes of extracting some reforms in the United Nations.

□ 1320

Now we need to take the next step.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope we can have a very positive vote on this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENNY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie	Doolittle	Johnson (GA)
Ackerman	Dornan	Johnson (SD)
Allard	Dreier	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews (ME)	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Andrews (NJ)	Dunn	Johnston
Andrews (TX)	Durbin	Kanjorski
Applegate	Edwards (CA)	Kaptur
Archer	Edwards (TX)	Kasich
Armye	Emerson	Kennedy
Bacchus (FL)	Engel	Kennelly
Bachus (AL)	English (AZ)	Klidae
Baessler	English (OK)	Kim
Baker (CA)	Eshoo	King
Baker (LA)	Evans	Kingston
Ballenger	Everett	Kleczyka
Barca	Ewing	Klein
Barcia	Farr	Klink
Barlow	Fawell	Klug
Barrett (NE)	Fazio	Knollenberg
Barrett (WI)	Fields (LA)	Kolbe
Bartlett	Fields (TX)	Kopetski
Barton	Filner	Kreidler
Bateman	Fingerhut	Kyl
Bellenson	Fish	LaFalce
Bentley	Flake	Lambert
Bereuter	Foglietta	Lancaster
Berman	Ford (MI)	Lantos
Bevill	Ford (TN)	LaRocco
Bilbray	Fowler	Laughlin
Bilirakis	Frank (MA)	Lazio
Bishop	Franks (CT)	Leach
Blackwell	Franks (NJ)	Lehman
Billey	Frost	Levin
Blute	Furse	Levy
Boehlert	Galleghy	Lewis (CA)
Boehner	Gallo	Lewis (FL)
Bonilla	Gejdenson	Lewis (GA)
Bonior	Gekas	Lightfoot
Borski	Geren	Linder
Boucher	Gibbons	Lipinski
Brooks	Gilchrest	Livingston
Browder	Gillmor	Lloyd
Brown (CA)	Gilman	Long
Brown (FL)	Gingrich	Lowe
Brown (OH)	Glickman	Machtley
Bryant	Gonzalez	Maloney
Bunning	Goodlatte	Mann
Burton	Goodling	Manton
Buyer	Gordon	Manzullo
Byrne	Goss	Margolies-
Callahan	Grams	Mezvinsky
Calvert	Grandy	Markey
Camp	Green	Martinez
Canady	Greenwood	Matsui
Cantwell	Gunderson	Mazzoli
Cardin	Gutierrez	McCandless
Carr	Hall (OH)	McCloskey
Castle	Hall (TX)	McCollum
Chapman	Hamburg	McCrary
Clay	Hamilton	McDermott
Clayton	Hancock	McHale
Clinger	Hansen	McHugh
Clyburn	Harman	McInnis
Coble	Hastert	McKeon
Coleman	Hastings	McKinney
Collins (GA)	Hayes	McMillan
Collins (MI)	Hefley	McNulty
Combest	Hefner	Meehan
Condit	Hergert	Meek
Cooper	Hilliard	Menendez
Coppersmith	Hinchee	Meyers
Costello	Hoagland	Mfume
Cox	Hobson	Mica
Coyne	Hochbrueckner	Michel
Cramer	Hoekstra	Miller (FL)
Crane	Hoke	Mineta
Crapo	Holden	Minge
Cunningham	Horn	Mink
Danner	Houghton	Moakley
Darden	Hoyer	Molinari
de la Garza	Huffington	Mollohan
Deal	Hughes	Montgomery
DeFazio	Hunter	Moorhead
DeLauro	Hutchinson	Moran
DeLay	Hutto	Morella
Dellums	Hyde	Murphy
Derrick	Inglis	Murtha
Deutsch	Inhofe	Myers
Diaz-Balart	Inslee	Nadler
Dickey	Istook	Natcher
Dicks	Jacobs	Neal (MA)
Dixon	Jefferson	Neal (NC)
Dooley	Johnson (CT)	Nussle

Oberstar	Roybal-Allard	Synar
Obey	Royce	Talent
Oliver	Rush	Tanner
Ortiz	Sabo	Tauzin
Orton	Sanders	Taylor (MS)
Owens	Sangmeister	Taylor (NC)
Oxley	Santorum	Tejeda
Packard	Sarpallius	Thomas (CA)
Pallone	Sawyer	Thomas (WY)
Parker	Saxton	Thompson
Pastor	Schaefer	Thornton
Paxon	Schenk	Thurman
Payne (NJ)	Schiff	Torkildsen
Payne (VA)	Schroeder	Torres
Pelosi	Schumer	Torricelli
Penny	Scott	Towns
Peterson (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Trafficant
Peterson (MN)	Serrano	Tucker
Petri	Sharp	Unsoeld
Pickle	Shaw	Upton
Pombo	Shays	Valentine
Pomeroy	Shepherd	Velazquez
Porter	Shuster	Vento
Portman	Sisisky	Viscolosky
Poshard	Skaggs	Volkmmer
Price (NC)	Skeen	Vucanovich
Pryce (OH)	Skelton	Walker
Quillen	Slattery	Walsh
Quinn	Slaughter	Washington
Rahall	Smith (IA)	Waters
Ramstad	Smith (NJ)	Watt
Rangel	Smith (OR)	Waxman
Ravenel	Smith (TX)	Weldon
Reed	Snowe	Wheat
Regula	Solomon	Whitten
Reynolds	Spence	Williams
Richardson	Spratt	Wise
Ridge	Stark	Wolf
Roberts	Stearns	Woolsey
Roemer	Stenholm	Wyden
Rogers	Stokes	Wynn
Rohrabacher	Strickland	Yates
Ros-Lehtinen	Studds	Young (AK)
Rose	Stump	Young (FL)
Rostenkowski	Stupak	Zeliff
Roth	Sundquist	Zimmer
Roukema	Swett	
Rowland	Swift	

## NAYS—0

## NOT VOTING—13

Becerra	Dingell	Pickett
Brewster	Gephardt	Smith (MI)
Clement	McCurdy	Wilson
Collins (IL)	McDade	
Conyers	Miller (CA)	

## □ 1342

Mr. LAZIO changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 466 on H.R. 2519 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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 the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2519 which was just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. PENNY]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SMITH of Iowa, CARR of Michigan, MOLLOHAN, MORAN, SKAGGS, PRICE of North Carolina, NATCHER, ROGERS, KOLBE, TAYLOR of North Carolina, and MCDADE.

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2295, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994, AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NEW INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION ACT, 1993

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 259 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 259

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2295) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and making supplemental appropriations for such programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], 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 259 waives all points of order against the conference report on H.R. 2295, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1994 and against its consideration. The rule further provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act provides \$13 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1994. This amount is \$1.6 billion below the President's request and is within the 602(b) allocation.

The agreement displays a new policy emphasis on emerging democracies and provides a total of \$2.5 billion in technical and humanitarian assistance for the new Independent States of the former Soviet Union and \$390 million for Eastern Europe and the Baltics.

The conference agreement provides \$5 billion for Israel and Egypt as well as increased funding for the economic support fund to accommodate assist-

ance for the West Bank and Gaza. In addition, the agreement provides \$800 million for refugee and disaster assistance to meet the current situation in Somalia, the former Yugoslavia, as well as other areas around the world.

The conference agreement provides \$784 million in development assistance for Africa as well as \$1 billion to assist United States business to export United States goods abroad.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 259 will expedite consideration of this important conference agreement. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the agreement, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this side half the time.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from South Carolina has just indicated, we have before us a rule that provides for the timely consideration of the conference report on the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

This rule is typical of those that are usually provided for conference reports in that all points of order are waived.

There is a twofold reason for the waivers.

First, the conference report contains \$1.6 billion in fiscal year 1993 assistance for Russia.

In order for these funds to be made available, the President must sign this legislation into law before midnight tomorrow night.

Thus, the 3-day layover has been waived.

The second reason for waivers is simply the fact that Congress has not enacted a foreign aid authorization bill into law since 1985. That was 8 years ago.

Hence, virtually everything in this conference report is unauthorized.

I must say that Members should appreciate the work of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee in stepping into the breach each year and, in effect, writing the annual foreign aid bill. They do a good job, even though I have some problems in supporting foreign aid in general.

Turning now to the substance of the conference report itself, Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to oppose this legislation on final passage. I will do so because of my continuing reservations about aid for Russia, aid that might take the form of direct assistance to the Government or to the central bank of Russia.

I have opposed this kind of assistance in the past, and I will continue to oppose it in the future until a fully democratic government is in place in Moscow and Soviet troops are completely and once and for all out of the Baltic nations.

In Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, those Soviet troops are still there.

My further concern is simply the question of where this assistance is going.

The situation in Russia is so chaotic, and we all are watching it on TV by the hour, I remain unconvinced that we can tell with any certainty exactly who is getting this assistance and how effectively they are using it.

Given the track record of so many foreign aid programs in so many countries in which, by hook or by crook, the government itself or government-controlled entities get their hands on it, I am not convinced the situation in Russia will turn out to be any different. It rarely does.

I must also say that the amount of money involved strikes me as being too much for a token, but not enough to really make a difference—even if it were to be used with maximum effectiveness which it will not be. Too many former Communists still are in the government and they still have their fingers in this foreign aid pie.

□ 1350

When one considers just how much it is costing today to stabilize and rebuild the former East Germany, a country only one-tenth the size of Russia, we can get an idea of just how much it will cost eventually to repair Russia after 74 years of communism. All of the money in the world would not be enough to do it, Mr. Speaker. The Russians themselves will have to pull it all together by a sincere, all-out effort to completely democratize their country, including a free market system. They are vacillating back and forth, not really doing it. The only way they can establish a free market system is by attracting private capital and private investment from outside the country itself. They cannot do that without enacting property rights laws, without enacting commercial laws to protect investments from American businesses and industry that might want to do business there. They must absolutely establish a judiciary system that is free of political interference, like we have in this country, to guarantee protection under the law. Otherwise their laws are not worth 2 cents, and nobody in their right mind is going to put money into Russia from our private sector.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be giving the Russian Government, or their central bank, American tax dollars. It ought to be going from the private sector here to the private sector there in the form of loans or investments so that we can get a return on that investment in this country.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old philosophy that says, "Do not give them fish, do not give them money to buy fish. Teach them how to fish, and they will feed themselves." This philosophy is not represented in this foreign aid appropriations legislation. This is the

philosophy we ought to be living by because of the failure of foreign aid in the past. I will vote no when this conference report comes up for a vote later on, after this rule has been passed.

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

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, 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. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 259, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2295) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and making supplemental appropriations for such programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRYANT). Pursuant to House Resolution 259, the conference report is considered as read. (For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 28, 1993, at page H7159.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, before I begin to describe what is in this conference report, I would like to pay special tribute to a group of people who are often maligned in the popular press and in the court of public opinion, namely the congressional staffers who helped put together this bill: Terry Peel, Bill Schuerch, Mark Murray, Mike Marek, Laurie Maes, Karen Brown, Dean Sackett, Jim Kulikowski, and the two people who gave us tremendous technical assistance from the agencies themselves, Bob Lester and Carol Schwab and a number of others. I simply want to say that, if we take into account the hundreds of witnesses our committee has before it each year, if we take into account the hundreds of staff who accompany each and every one of those witnesses, if we take into account the hundreds of public groups and the hundreds of interest groups who are constantly inquiring of the committee about one or another of the matters in this package, and if we realize that all of the staff work to respond to all of those problems is done by roughly seven people, I think it is an

amazing accomplishment, and I am very grateful to all of them on both sides of the aisle, as I am to the associate staff members who have also assisted the subcommittee membership.

I also want to say that this is, very largely, a new subcommittee this year. We have on the Democratic side myself, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] who have served on the subcommittee in the past, but then we have the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] who have served on the subcommittee but a short time. On the Republican side we have the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the ranking Republican, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] who have performed yeoman's service on the bill and who have at all times conducted themselves in an absolutely bipartisan fashion.

I would dare to say, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot recall a single partisan comment made by any Member on either side of the aisle during the hearings, markups or conference, and I really believe that the way members of this subcommittee, and the way the staff on this subcommittee, conduct themselves is really a case study in the way Congress ought to perform. I very much appreciate the help that we have gotten from each and every one of them.

Let me simply say that this bill is \$1.1 billion below last year's spending level. It is \$1.4 billion below the President's request. It is \$373,000 below the bill as it left the House. It is \$461 million below our subcommittee allocation under the 602(b) section of the budget. We have seen a lot of writing in the popular press, and elsewhere, lately about the need to reform foreign assistance and the need to reduce military aid now that the cold war has ended. I want to simply point out that in the years since I have become chairman of this committee this bill has dropped from \$16.5 billion total to \$12.5 billion today, and that would not have happened without the bipartisan cooperation of each and every member of the subcommittee.

I would also point out that the military aid, as a share of this bill, has dropped from 40 percent as a share of the bill in 1985 to 24.6 percent today, which is a very large reduction, and I think it reflects the new realities in the world.

I also want to make the point that this bill, in spite of those overall budget reductions, provides \$2½ billion to

meet our highest new priority, assistance to the former republics in the Soviet Union. There is also room in the bill for the beginning of the \$500 million aid proposition that the administration has been discussing with respect to the Middle East to assist the Palestinians as we move toward peace in that region. This committee has always made refugees our No. 1 priority, and we did again this year despite the fact that we had very deep cuts in a significant number of programs. We have an increase in this budget for refugees. We also make enhancing the ability of this country to export our commercial products a high priority because we provide \$1 billion to the Export-Import Bank to facilitate our exports to the rest of the world, and we institute, or we begin the process of instituting, virtually each and every reform mentioned by the Gore Commission including requiring that AID begin to downsize the number of missions that it has around the world by eliminating 12 of those missions this year.

□ 1400

So I think this subcommittee can truthfully say that if you take a look at what we have done and what we have required the administration to do

before they can get the second half of the money in this bill, we have virtually put into place all of the reform actions suggested by the Gore Commission.

With respect to the earmarks in the bill, when the bill left the House we had no earmarks. The Senate had 27. We come back from conference with only four. I think that is a very good record.

We have a number of legislative limitations in the bill as well, limitations on assistance, such as, for example, the limitation on Soviet aid if they provide any significant assistance to Cuba. There was a waiver authority that we provided for the President in that instance. In my view, he will not need to use that waiver authority, because I do not define in any way what the Soviet Union has been doing as supplying assistance. I think the relationship that they have with Cuba with respect to purchasing sugar is very similar to a large number of other commercial relationships that countries often have with each other around the world, and does not in any way constitute assistance.

I would also say that it is necessary for this House to pass this bill today,

because, as was indicated in discussion on the rule, we have in this bill a significant amount of assistance which is funded through 1993 supplemental appropriations for the Soviet Union. If we do not enact this bill before the end of the fiscal year, that portion of the bill will be inoperative.

So I simply want to say I think this bill meets the desires of the taxpayers to be fiscally frugal. I think it certainly responds to the new realities around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay special tribute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the ranking Republican. This is his first year as ranking Republican. I think the gentleman has done a very good job in acquainting himself with all of the many programs that this bill has. He has conducted himself in an absolutely bipartisan fashion. You will never doubt for a moment when you deal with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] that you are dealing with a conservative Republican, and there is nothing wrong with that. But I very much appreciate the professional way he has gone about our business.

*[The remainder of the page contains extremely faint and illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the document.]*

## FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS, FY 1994 (H.R. 2295)

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
International Military Education and Training.....	42,500,000	42,500,000	21,250,000	21,250,000	21,250,000	-21,250,000
Foreign Military Financing Program:						
Grants.....	3,300,000,000	3,231,657,000	3,175,000,000	3,123,558,000	3,149,279,000	-150,721,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(26,000,000)	(25,558,000)	(23,558,000)	(23,558,000)	(23,558,000)	(-2,442,000)
Direct concessional loans:						
Subsidy appropriations.....	149,000,000	120,263,000	46,530,000	46,530,000	46,530,000	-102,470,000
Administrative expenses.....	200,000	194,000				-200,000
(Estimated loan program).....	(855,000,000)	(855,000,000)	(769,500,000)	(769,500,000)	(769,500,000)	(-85,500,000)
FMF program level.....	(4,155,000,000)	(4,086,657,000)	(3,944,500,000)	(3,893,058,000)	(3,918,779,000)	(-236,221,000)
Subtotal, Foreign military financing program.....	3,449,200,000	3,352,114,000	3,221,530,000	3,170,088,000	3,195,809,000	-253,391,000
Reappropriation (deobligation/reobligation) authority (sec. 515):						
Foreign military financing.....		500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	+500,000
Total, Foreign military assistance.....	3,449,200,000	3,352,614,000	3,222,030,000	3,170,588,000	3,196,309,000	-252,891,000
Special Defense Acquisition Fund:						
(Limitation on obligations).....	(225,000,000)					(-225,000,000)
Fund elimination.....		-266,000,000	-266,000,000	-266,000,000	-266,000,000	-266,000,000
Peacekeeping operations.....	27,186,000	77,186,000	75,823,000	82,500,000	75,823,000	+48,457,000
Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund.....		50,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000
Total, title III, Military assistance programs.....	3,518,866,000	3,256,280,000	3,062,903,000	2,996,338,000	3,037,182,000	-481,684,000
(Limitation on obligations).....	(251,000,000)	(25,558,000)	(23,558,000)	(23,558,000)	(23,558,000)	(-227,442,000)
(Estimated loan program).....	(855,000,000)	(855,000,000)	(769,500,000)	(769,500,000)	(769,500,000)	(-85,500,000)
<b>TITLE IV - EXPORT ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES</b>						
Limitation of Program Activity:						
Subsidy appropriations.....	757,000,000	757,000,000	700,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	+243,000,000
(Estimated loan program).....	(15,500,000,000)	(16,500,000,000)				(-15,500,000,000)
Administrative expenses.....	45,683,000	46,295,000	45,369,000	45,369,000	45,369,000	-314,000
Negative subsidy.....	-16,533,000	-51,783,000	-51,783,000	-51,783,000	-51,783,000	-35,250,000
Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States.....	786,150,000	751,512,000	693,586,000	993,586,000	993,586,000	+207,438,000
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
<b>Trade and Development Assistance</b>						
Trade and development.....	40,000,000	60,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	
Total, title IV, Export assistance.....	826,150,000	811,512,000	733,586,000	1,033,586,000	1,033,586,000	+207,438,000
(Estimated loan program).....	(15,500,000,000)	(16,500,000,000)				(-15,500,000,000)
Grand total, all titles:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	26,257,377,903	14,425,993,066	12,983,038,866	12,526,854,047	12,982,665,866	-13,274,712,037
Appropriations.....	(26,257,377,903)	(14,425,993,066)	(13,168,038,866)	(12,781,954,047)	(13,190,765,866)	(-13,066,612,037)
Rescissions.....			(-185,000,000)	(-255,100,000)	(-208,100,000)	(-208,100,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(251,000,000)	(25,558,000)	(23,558,000)	(23,558,000)	(23,558,000)	(-227,442,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(650,000,000)	(375,027,000)		(346,885,000)		(-650,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....		(20,712,000)		(19,161,000)		
(Limitation on callable capital).....	(4,631,070,700)	(4,665,876,024)	(4,090,800,894)	(3,188,161,394)	(4,090,600,894)	(-540,469,806)
(Estimated level of direct/guaranteed loans).....	(231,319,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(135,000,000)	(-96,319,000)
(Estimated loan program).....	(16,355,000,000)	(17,355,000,000)	(769,500,000)	(769,500,000)	(769,500,000)	(-15,585,500,000)
<b>RECAP</b>						
<b>TITLE I - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE</b>						
Contributions to International Financial Institutions.....	1,583,418,903	1,957,852,066	1,505,070,866	1,358,764,107	1,507,770,866	-75,648,037
International organizations and programs.....	310,000,000	390,000,000	339,500,000	360,628,000	360,628,000	+50,628,000
Total, contribution for Multilateral Economic Assistance.....	1,893,418,903	2,347,852,066	1,844,570,866	1,719,392,107	1,868,398,866	-25,020,037
<b>TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE</b>						
Bilateral Development Assistance.....	4,158,382,000	4,075,578,000	3,838,997,000	3,761,217,940	3,868,517,000	-289,865,000
Economic Support Fund/Special Assistance Initiatives.....	3,546,704,000	3,934,771,000	3,502,982,000	3,014,320,000	3,174,982,000	-371,722,000
Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance.....	7,705,086,000	8,010,349,000	7,341,979,000	6,775,537,940	7,043,499,000	-661,587,000

## FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS, FY 1994 (H.R. 2295), continued

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>Housing and other credit guaranty programs:</b>						
Subsidy appropriations.....	16,407,000	16,407,000	16,078,000	16,078,000	16,078,000	-329,000
Operating expenses.....	8,407,000	8,407,000	8,239,000	8,239,000	8,239,000	-168,000
(Estimated level of guaranteed loans).....	(150,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(-40,000,000)
<b>Subtotal, development assistance.....</b>	<b>2,387,183,000</b>	<b>2,295,259,000</b>	<b>2,158,202,000</b>	<b>2,058,082,000</b>	<b>2,154,102,000</b>	<b>-243,061,000</b>
<b>Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund ...</b>						
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development.....	42,677,000	44,151,000	44,151,000	44,151,000	44,151,000	+1,474,000
Development.....	512,000,000	512,000,000	501,780,000	494,080,000	501,780,000	-10,240,000
(By transfer).....	(4,300,000)					(-4,300,000)
Reform and downsizing.....					3,000,000	+3,000,000
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General.....	39,316,000	39,916,000	39,118,000	38,518,940	39,118,000	-198,000
Debt restructuring.....	50,000,000	45,427,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	-43,000,000
<b>Subtotal, Agency for International Development.....</b>	<b>3,041,156,000</b>	<b>2,936,753,000</b>	<b>2,750,231,000</b>	<b>2,641,831,940</b>	<b>2,749,131,000</b>	<b>-292,025,000</b>
<b>Economic Initiatives</b>						
Economic support fund.....	2,670,000,000	2,582,000,000	2,364,562,000	2,280,500,000	2,364,562,000	-305,438,000
Rescission (sec. 545 (a)).....			-185,000,000	-250,000,000	-203,000,000	-203,000,000
International fund for Ireland.....	19,704,000	20,000,000	19,800,000		19,600,000	-104,000
<b>Assistance for the Philippines:</b>						
Multilateral assistance initiative for the Philippines.....	40,000,000	40,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	-40,000,000
Assistance for Eastern Europe.....	400,000,000	408,951,000	400,000,000	380,000,000	390,000,000	-10,000,000
Assistance for former republics of the Soviet Union.....	417,000,000	903,820,000	903,820,000	603,820,000	603,820,000	+188,820,000
(1993 Supplemental - Foreign Operations).....		(630,000,000)	(630,000,000)	(630,000,000)	(630,000,000)	(+630,000,000)
(1993 Supplemental - Defense).....		(979,000,000)	(979,000,000)	(979,000,000)	(979,000,000)	(+979,000,000)
Demobilization and transition fund (by transfer).....	(29,000,000)					(-29,000,000)
<b>Subtotal, Economic Initiatives.....</b>	<b>3,546,704,000</b>	<b>3,934,771,000</b>	<b>3,502,982,000</b>	<b>3,014,320,000</b>	<b>3,174,982,000</b>	<b>-371,722,000</b>
<b>Total, Agency for International Development.....</b>	<b>6,587,860,000</b>	<b>6,871,524,000</b>	<b>6,253,213,000</b>	<b>5,656,151,940</b>	<b>5,924,113,000</b>	<b>-663,747,000</b>
<b>Independent Agencies</b>						
<b>African Development Foundation</b>						
Appropriations.....	16,905,000	16,905,000	16,905,000	16,905,000	16,905,000	
<b>Inter-American Foundation</b>						
Appropriations.....	30,960,000	30,960,000	30,340,000	30,960,000	30,960,000	
<b>Overseas Private Investment Corporation</b>						
<b>Loan subsidies:</b>						
Direct.....		2,937,000	2,717,000	2,717,000	2,717,000	+2,717,000
Guaranteed.....	9,800,000	6,863,000	6,348,000	6,348,000	6,348,000	-3,452,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>9,800,000</b>	<b>9,800,000</b>	<b>9,065,000</b>	<b>9,065,000</b>	<b>9,065,000</b>	<b>-735,000</b>
Operating expenses.....	8,128,000	8,128,000	7,518,000	7,518,000	7,518,000	-610,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....		(20,712,000)		(19,161,000)		
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(650,000,000)	(375,027,000)		(346,885,000)		(-650,000,000)
<b>Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation.....</b>	<b>17,928,000</b>	<b>17,928,000</b>	<b>16,583,000</b>	<b>16,583,000</b>	<b>16,583,000</b>	<b>-1,345,000</b>
<b>Total, Funds Appropriated to the President.....</b>	<b>6,653,653,000</b>	<b>6,937,317,000</b>	<b>6,317,041,000</b>	<b>5,720,599,940</b>	<b>5,988,561,000</b>	<b>-665,092,000</b>
<b>Peace Corps</b>						
Appropriations.....	218,146,000	219,745,000	219,745,000	219,745,000	219,745,000	+1,599,000
<b>Department of State</b>						
International narcotics control.....	147,783,000	147,783,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	-47,783,000
Montreal Protocol Facilitation Fund (by transfer).....	(15,000,000)					(-15,000,000)
Migration and refugee assistance.....	620,688,000	640,688,000	670,688,000	670,688,000	670,688,000	+50,000,000
<b>United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund.....</b>						
Assistance Fund.....	49,261,000	49,261,000	19,261,000	49,261,000	49,261,000	
Anti-terrorism assistance.....	15,555,000	15,555,000	15,244,000	15,244,000	15,244,000	-311,000
<b>Total, Department of State.....</b>	<b>833,287,000</b>	<b>853,287,000</b>	<b>805,193,000</b>	<b>835,193,000</b>	<b>835,193,000</b>	<b>+1,906,000</b>
<b>Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance.....</b>	<b>7,705,086,000</b>	<b>8,010,349,000</b>	<b>7,341,979,000</b>	<b>6,775,537,940</b>	<b>7,043,499,000</b>	<b>-661,587,000</b>
Appropriations.....	(7,705,086,000)	(8,010,349,000)	(7,526,979,000)	(7,030,637,940)	(7,251,599,000)	(-453,487,000)
Rescissions.....			(-185,000,000)	(-255,100,000)	(-208,100,000)	(-208,100,000)
(By transfer).....	(48,300,000)					(-48,300,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....		(20,712,000)		(19,161,000)		
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(650,000,000)	(375,027,000)		(346,885,000)		(-650,000,000)
(Estimated level of direct/guaranteed loans).....	(231,319,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(135,000,000)	(-96,319,000)

## FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS, FY 1994 (H.R. 2295), continued

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>Foreign Military Financing Program:</b>						
Grants.....	3,300,000,000	3,231,657,000	3,175,000,000	3,123,558,000	3,149,279,000	-150,721,000
Direct concessional loans, subsidy costs.....	149,200,000	120,457,000	46,530,000	46,530,000	46,530,000	-102,670,000
(Limitation on concessional loans).....	(855,000,000)	(855,000,000)	(769,500,000)	(769,500,000)	(769,500,000)	(-85,500,000)
<b>Subtotal, Foreign Military Financing Program:</b>						
Budget authority.....	3,449,200,000	3,352,114,000	3,221,530,000	3,170,088,000	3,195,809,000	-253,391,000
(Program level).....	(4,155,000,000)	(4,086,657,000)	(3,944,500,000)	(3,893,058,000)	(3,918,779,000)	(-236,221,000)
Other, Military.....	69,666,000	-95,834,000	-158,627,000	-171,750,000	-158,627,000	-228,293,000
<b>Total, Military Assistance Programs.....</b>	<b>3,518,866,000</b>	<b>3,256,280,000</b>	<b>3,062,903,000</b>	<b>2,998,338,000</b>	<b>3,037,182,000</b>	<b>-481,684,000</b>
<b>TITLE IV - EXPORT ASSISTANCE</b>						
Export Assistance.....	826,150,000	811,512,000	733,586,000	1,033,586,000	1,033,586,000	+ 207,436,000
<b>Total, all titles, excluding IMF.....</b>	<b>13,943,520,903</b>	<b>14,425,993,066</b>	<b>12,983,038,866</b>	<b>12,526,854,047</b>	<b>12,982,665,866</b>	<b>-960,855,037</b>
International Monetary Fund (IMF).....	12,313,857,000					-12,313,857,000
<b>Grand total, all titles.....</b>	<b>26,257,377,903</b>	<b>14,425,993,066</b>	<b>12,983,038,866</b>	<b>12,526,854,047</b>	<b>12,982,665,866</b>	<b>-13,274,712,037</b>

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the foreign operations conference report. As my friend and chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, this is my first year as ranking Republican of the subcommittee. I have to tell you that because of the leadership of Chairman OBEY, with whom I have a great working relationship, the great cooperation from his staff, and the hard work and cooperation of the members of the subcommittee, the job of passing this bill, while not easy, has certainly been pleasant.

We have done, I think, an extraordinary job with limited resources. We are meeting the immediate needs of the Nation with respect to foreign assistance. Again, I want to congratulate the chairman for being so kind and generous with his time.

I also want to thank all the members of the subcommittee and their staff for their assistance to me while we went through this whole procedure.

Mr. Speaker, under normal circumstances, I might have been tempted to treat the House to a lengthy explanation of my support for H.R. 2295, which I am sure would have captivated everyone's attention. However, Monday night's conference, which lasted well into Tuesday morning, has given me a new appreciation for the need of great brevity. So I am going to keep my remarks confined, if I may.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, H.R. 2295 is indeed a bipartisan piece of legislation. It overwhelmingly passed the House last June, by 309 to 111 votes, with a majority of both parties sup-

porting the bill. I expect and hope, that it will pass today. But I must stress my belief that it is very important that it does pass. In fact, if H.R. 2295 is not signed by the President by midnight tomorrow, Thursday, the last day of September, U.S. foreign assistance programs will be thrown into an uproar, as the continuing resolution passed earlier today contained no provisions to temporarily fund any of the accounts provided for in H.R. 2295.

Furthermore, the Russian aid package, which is so vital to our national interests, will be irreparably gutted if this conference report is not passed today. Approximately \$1.6 billion of the \$2.5 billion contained in H.R. 2295 for Russia and other new Independent States of the former Soviet Union is in the form of fiscal year 1993 supplemental money, which will be lost forever if this conference report fails to become law before the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I could elaborate on the many reasons I support 2295, and I could list provisions in H.R. 2295 that most, if not all of us, would agree are important to U.S. interests. But I will resist that temptation and discuss just a couple more reasons why I support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is this is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill. It is not a perfect bill and there are provisions which I personally would change. Coming at it from my perspective, I will say that the chairman and some of the members of the committee and I disagreed on perhaps the approach of some of the provisions, but it was an amicable disagreement. In fact, when it came down to it, not only the members of our subcommittee, but the

Members of the other body, finally reached a compromise.

Mr. Speaker, this is a compromise bill. This is a compromise which we all can and should support.

The conference report is fiscally responsible. It continues a recent downward trend in foreign aid spending by cutting \$1.1 billion from last year's foreign aid levels and over \$1.6 billion from President Clinton's 1994 budget request.

The bill also contains funding for the West Bank and for Gaza, to facilitate the Middle East peace process which began a couple of weeks ago in earnest. One could support the bill for this reason alone.

Another vitally important aspect of H.R. 2295 is the \$2.5 billion in aid for Russia and the Independent States. The recent events in Georgia and Russia, as well as other parts of the former Soviet Union, underscore the volatility of the region, but they also underscore our need for assistance, which will only bolster the democratic forces and lessen the economic tension contributing to the unrest.

We have had news, for example, that there are more missiles in Russia than we initially knew were there. It is very much in our interest to see to it that those missiles do not threaten the United States again, and are, in fact, dismantled and cease to exist altogether. Certainly it is in our interest to see to it that they become neutralized and are not part of a massive force bent on the destruction of the United States and the rest of the world.

So by fostering democracy and free enterprise in Russia, and by helping them dismantle their nuclear arsenal

and resettle their troops, we are ultimately helping ourselves. A democratic, free market, Russia will be a boom to the United States business interests and exports. If we are successful, and I caution "if," there are no guarantees in this bill, but if we are successful in bringing Russia into the fold of Western industrialized peaceful nations, the savings in United States defense expenditures alone will more than pay for the small amount of Russian aid in H.R. 2295.

Most importantly, the peace and tranquillity of the world, the future of our children and grandchildren, can be greatly improved by the passage of this bill. So I would urge the adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT].

□ 1410

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill and the fine work that has been done by my colleagues, those who brought this Foreign Operations Conference Committee report to the floor. Let me just add my voice in strong support of this legislation. I commend all my colleagues, especially subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for the fine work that they have done.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to add my voice in strong support for the fiscal year 1994 foreign operations conference report. I commend the members of the committee and all of my colleagues who played a role in bringing this bill to the floor today.

This measure takes important steps toward recognizing the changing realities and priorities that our Nation and the world face in the post-cold-war era. The bill, for example, seeks to help stabilize the situation in the former Soviet Union, and it provides refugee and disaster relief for the tragedy that continues to unfold in Bosnia and Somalia.

At the same time, this measure also maintains our strong national commitment to Israel and peace in the Middle East. In its region of vital strategic importance and violent instability, today's bill recognizes that it is in America's best interests to continue to play a prominent role in the Middle East. By providing full funding to Israel and Egypt. The fiscal year 1994 foreign operations bill will help ensure that we maintain that important commitment at this critical period.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the world watched in hope and wonder as a historic step towards Israel-Palestinian peace was taken. President Clinton called it a brave gamble for peace.

Now more than ever, it is important for our Nation to provide resources and assistance to help ensure that the Israeli people feel confident and secure in taking bold steps towards peace. This legislation will help send a signal to all that the United States-Israel alliance is unshakable and the commitment to Israel's security is enduring.

This is a time of great challenge and great opportunity in the Middle East and elsewhere around the world. In this regard, the administration and Congress are working together to develop a new approach to U.S. foreign policy and our international aid program.

Each of the challenges singled out by President Clinton during his recent address at the United Nations—weapons proliferation, sustainable development, conflict resolution, population growth, economic growth, democracy building, and humanitarian assistance—are of immediate concern and priority to Israel and the entire Middle East region.

I am confident that as we work together to reform our Nation's foreign assistance program, Congress and the administration will stand united in support of efforts to meet these and other challenges in the Middle East while building upon our strong commitment to the people and the security of Israel.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the direction that we take on foreign assistance this year and in the coming years is a strong signal about our attitudes toward America's role in the post-cold-war era. We are at a crossroads. Will we turn inwards or will we look outwards?

Perhaps it is an American trait that we are wont to forget history. We forgot history after World War I, stuck our heads in the sand and ended up unprepared for another world war only two decades later.

After World War II, we never really stopped fighting, as the hot war led directly into the cold war. Now that cold war is over, and the debate is raging in our country, not always explicitly but often as an undercurrent, about our Nation's proper role in the world.

I believe this is a watershed time in the history of our Nation and that the direction we choose will affect the lives of our children and grandchildren, just as the American victory in World War II led to tremendous economic growth in our Nation and an increase in American stature after World War II.

This will provides \$2.5 billion in assistance for Russia and the newly independent States to help them transition to freedom, democracy, and a market system. Can we guarantee that by providing these funds the former Soviet Union will transition peacefully? No. No, we cannot. In fact, almost assuredly, no matter what we do the transition will be rocky. But you can be sure that if we do nothing and the tenuous political situation erupts into violence and the forces of democracy are defeated, we will regret not having done what we could.

Foreign assistance is a small but important part of our Nation's foreign policy. With it we can project our Nation's values—human rights, rule of law, democratic institutions, a market-oriented economic system—to the people in nations that desperately desire

positive change. Without foreign assistance, which accounts for less than 1 percent of our budget, we could only project our interests through pure diplomacy or the force of arms. Foreign assistance is an essential alternative.

For all the positive elements in this bill, I believe it contains a flaw. We have given up earmarks, Mr. Speaker.

The proponents of this non-earmarking policy support giving the President broad latitude in allocating foreign assistance. That is a positive trait. But in this, it is curious that this is the very year when the Clinton administration, everyone in Congress, including the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, concedes that the Agency for International Development, receiving nearly \$1 billion under this bill, is broken and must be fixed.

We await a Wharton report that we have not yet seen, and it seems very curious and an illogical time for Congress to step away from the earmarks, one of our best ways to ensure that AID focuses on our Nation's priorities.

I do not think this is a fatal flaw, and I continue to support the bill. But I believe that appropriate committees and subcommittees must carefully monitor AID in the coming year. Mr. Speaker, I call on the President and Brian Atwood, our AID Administrator, to produce their recommendations so that we can reform AID and not need earmarks nearly so much as we have in the past.

I thank my chairman and ranking member, I thank our fine staff for bringing this conference report to the floor, and I urge the Members to look outward and to vote yes.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2295, the conference report on the foreign operations, export financing, and related programs appropriations bill of 1994.

First, I want to commend our chairman for the distinguished work he has done in moving this bill, with its crucial aid for the states of the former Soviet Union and our Middle East allies. This bill should be on its way to the President's desk tomorrow and that is a tribute to you, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. LIVINGSTON, and to your wonderful staffs.

As a new member of the subcommittee, I have appreciated the seriousness with which you approach all the work of the subcommittee. You stand out as a public servant with both heart and intellect. People in this country, and throughout the world—people who don't necessarily know your name—benefit every day from the work you do. And I have benefited from working with you.

In my limited time, I wish to address one area in this bill: The United States relationship with Israel.

Just 3 weeks ago we all watched in amazement as Israelis and Palestinians signed their historic agreement on the White House lawn. That agreement did not instantly create peace in the Middle East. But it did establish a foundation on which secure and permanent peace will be built.

That agreement would never have been reached without the strong backing the United States has provided Israel in recent years. That support has provided Israel with the confidence it needs to pursue a peace initiative that entails serious risk, along with great opportunity.

That backing is manifested in the bill we are voting on today. The conference report includes \$3 billion in military and economic assistance—assistance that is essential if Israel is to maintain its qualitative military edge. It also contains \$80 million to help Israel absorb the tens of thousands of Jewish refugees who continue to pour into the Jewish homeland. The bill has a strong new provision opposing the Arab boycott of Israel, that economic assault on Israel which must be eliminated so that Israel can achieve its full potential as a center for commerce, trade, and research.

The bill also includes an important provision that would halt any U.S. dealings with the PLO if that organization backs away from its pledge to live in peace with Israel.

In short, this bill will help provide Israel with the confidence it needs to build a secure peace with all its neighbors. A vote for this bill is nothing less than a vote to endorse an end to the long and tragic Arab-Israeli conflict.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], a member of the subcommittee.

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

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for an excellent job in guiding this bill through the House and negotiating a conference report with the Senate. They heard from a number of committee members and there is, obviously, a diverse amount of opinion amongst those of us on the committee. And I think bringing that all together into something we all can support deserves a great deal of credit.

On Monday, President Clinton addressed the United Nations General Assembly. In that speech to the world body, the President stated that putting our economic house in order cannot mean that we shut our windows to the world. I agree with the President, but I think it is tough to do when we have so many priorities here at home.

Frankly, I have rather mixed feelings toward this bill. I do accept our inter-

national responsibilities, but I cannot help but think we can do it better. As a new member of this subcommittee, I was disappointed by the enormous waste of money, largely because of some dubious congressional earmarks.

For example, earlier this year I listened to the Defense Department explain to us how they were going to spend the equivalent cost of five new, American-made aircraft to refit 20-year-old aircraft and donate them to Botswana as part of a program to give African countries excess military equipment. This program was forced upon the Defense Department by an earmark in the other body.

I do want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for removing all of the earmarks but those most important out of the bill this year.

I am also disappointed by an administration that has still failed to produce a foreign aid reform plan. The fall of the Soviet Empire does mean that we must reorder our aid priorities. But the issue has been studied to death, and it is time for the administration to pick one and present it to the Congress.

This is the last foreign aid bill I will support without a comprehensive plan from this administration. They are talking a good game about empowering AID workers, but now I think it is time to let them do it.

Finally, I want to briefly discuss the Russian aid package. The stakes are high in Russia and throughout that entire region. Not only is democracy at stake but, with thousands of nuclear weapons, our safety as well as other countries of the world. Helping people to make the peaceful transition by understanding the market economy through contracts and through marketing, I think, is one of the things that we should be working on.

□ 1420

Beyond that, however, I am not sure if the situation is beyond our ability to help. I do support the bill, but I believe we can do better. I believe we must watch carefully in Russia to make sure our enthusiasm for helping them make the democratic transition does not overrule common sense.

In closing, I again commend both the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for a job well done, not just in getting the bill through this House, but for what it represents in a changing world.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, except for a few closing remarks of my own.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

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

commend him, as others have, for his work on the subcommittee as the first year's ranking member, and from our side, we certainly appreciate his efforts in keeping us informed.

Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report as a whole, but I do want to register an objection to one part of the report. That is the \$2.5 billion in aid to Russia. We all want to help Russia. I have supported particularly the dismantlement of nuclear facilities funds, so-called Nunn-Lugar funds, and have spent some time in Russia in an effort to try to assist in development of that program, because in the end it will assist the United States.

It is also the case that we have helped Russia. As a matter of fact, right now there is so much money in the pipeline that we cannot spend it all. That is one of the reasons why \$1.6 billion would be transferred in this bill from the fiscal 1993 year to the fiscal 1994 year. There is a total of about \$138 billion that has been pledged or given to Russia or the other Republics by the United States and other Western nations and Japan. Approximately \$16.5 billion of the U.S. contribution remains in the pipeline right now, and the President's promises consist of an additional \$4.1 billion.

As I said, this money is in the pipeline, and we do not need to put any more money in the pipeline, in my view, but leave that argument aside for a moment. There is also a necessity to help other republics. I do not think sufficient attention has been given to this part of the problem, and it is not specifically addressed in this conference report.

A third point that I think needs to be addressed is the fact that the Russian Government itself obviously is in a state of crisis at this time, and has done some things which are not contributing to a successful conversion of the economy to a system that well receives the kind of aid that we provide, Mr. Speaker. One has to have a system that can use the money we provide in the way we give it. Right now, that is not happening.

Last Thursday, I believe it was the Wall Street Journal that ran a long article on the new central bank chief. I have with me here the Journal of Commerce article reporting the same story. The headline is: "U.S. Investors Troubled by Reports Yeltsin Will Keep Central Bank Chief."

To just quote a couple of paragraphs:

U.S. optimism over Russian economic prospects dimmed following reports that President Boris N. Yeltsin has decided to retain Viktor Gerashchenko as head of the nation's Central Bank.

Jeffrey D. Sachs, a Harvard University economist and Yeltsin advisor, said in a phone interview from Bolivia that he was informed by a Yeltsin cabinet member Wednesday of Mr. Gerashchenko's reappointment, adding that the move "throws cold water" on hopes for economic reform.

He further "blamed Mr. Gerashchenko for runaway inflation in the Russian ruble and charged him with responsibility for 'destruction of confidence in the currency.'"

This is not a way to inspire confidence that the kind of assistance that we are providing is going to have any significant effect.

In addition to that, any assistance that the United States or anyone else offers probably ought to await the election of a new parliament. Again, Jeffrey Sachs, speaking on this point, said:

The West can do little at this point, except to spell out the stakes clearly to Yeltsin and hold back on financial aid to the Russian Government until the reformers are more strongly in place. . . . What's needed for decisive progress is a breakthrough to new elections that can retire most of the old guard.

Mr. Speaker, it is the old guard that has been contributing to most of these problems. It is certainly not Yeltsin or his advisors.

Mr. Speaker, the last point I would make this: Andrey Kozyrev, the foreign minister, yesterday spoke at the United Nations saying that Russia should have the right to use force to intervene in the former Soviet Republics, several of which are engaged in or engulfed in ethnic conflicts. One of them is Georgia. Mr. Speaker, where Mr. Shevardnadze has blamed the Russians for interference in the offensive there, which is aimed at throwing him out of the Georgian Government.

It seems to me that under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, for the United States to be providing this assistance to Russia when the Foreign Minister is asking for the right from the United Nations to intervene militarily in former Republics, where people like Mr. Shevardnadze are blaming the Russians for their action in the State of Georgia, it is not the time, in effect, to give a blank check of \$2.5 billion to the Russians. We ought to be sitting down with them and insisting on some conditions, both economic and foreign policy, before we do this.

This is the portion of the conference report which I oppose, although in balance, I would support the report in its entirety, and I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, with the understanding that we are about to close, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would tell my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL], that this bill has no blank check for Russia and the former Soviet Republics. There is at least \$300 million which is designated at the discretion of the State Department and the administration to go to the Independent States, other than Russia. The administration has the flexibility to distribute aid to the new Independent States other than Russia as is needed.

The fact is, the money for Russia is not unchecked. It is going for goods and services in Russia, it is not going in cash from government to government. Moreover, no money can go to Russia unless the Government, the existing Government under Yeltsin or anybody else, is making progress in implementing comprehensive economic reforms based on market principles, is moving toward private ownership, is negotiating repayment of commercial debt, has respect for commercial contracts, and provides equitable treatment for foreign private investment.

I would stress, our aid is conditional. Moreover, there is another condition, that if the Russians, for example, somehow seize assets of American nationals or disrupt the free enterprise system by additional expropriation, our assistance can be cut off right away by this administration. This is a day-to-day process. I would suggest to the gentleman that if he were to talk to Mr. Chubias in Russia, who is, as young as he may be, the godfather of the free enterprise system in Russia, he would find that a vast majority of Russian industries, large and small, are in the process of being privatized. As a matter of fact, almost all of the small businesses have been privatized, and in a very short space of time most of the medium-sized and large businesses will be privatized.

We really do not have a schedule. The train is leaving the station. This is the last bill for another year. If we decide to wait around before we give aid to Russia and to the new Independent States of the former Soviet Union until the next bill comes through here, we do not know what kind of governments will exist there.

This is an expression of the goodwill of the American people in hopes that they will develop democracy, because God help us, God help this Nation, God help this world, if they revert to another form of communism, fascism, totalitarianism, or some other form of dictatorship.

This is an expression of hope, not a guarantee, but hope that Russia and the other new Independent States will become free. If we do not make this installment of hope today, we may be too late by the next time we have an opportunity.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], who has been of immense help on this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 1994 foreign appropriations conference report. As a member of the subcommittee, I would like to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for their leader-

ship and cooperation on this bill. I think it was a fine example of bipartisanship and cooperation that enabled us to come to the floor with this.

Although I did not agree with everything, some of my differences were on the Democratic side, so I did want to make that point.

I also commend the subcommittee staff, particularly Terri Peel, Bill Schuerch, and Mark Murray, for their many hours of hard work in bringing this conference report to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, foreign aid is not necessarily a popular expenditure, but it certainly is a necessary one, and I think a good investment. This conference report addresses pressing global funding needs while reducing overall spending. It appropriates just under \$13 billion, over \$1.4 billion less than the President's request.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report provides the administration with maximum flexibility in carrying out this Nation's foreign aid programs.

□ 1430

It also respects the integrity of the authorization process. For the first time in recent history, the House passed a foreign operations bill containing no earmarks. The Senate, on the other hand, had earmarked over 60 percent of the funds in their version of this bill. As our colleagues can imagine, the conference was lively.

I am pleased that the conference agreement before us today contains an equitable resolution of the earmark discrepancy. This conference report earmarks only earmarks which I support, resolution of the funds critical to the Middle East peace process, foreign assistance for Israel and Egypt, and needed refugee assistance in Israel, and a small pool of funds designed to promote the reunification of Cyprus.

The conference report also contains funding critical to our global future. The aid to the former Soviet Republics is a sound investment in global security. If the former Republics do not successfully make a peaceful transition to market economies and democratic states, and we see daily how difficult this transition is, we face the real possibility of an explosion of regional conflicts which will dwarf the tragic situation in the former Yugoslavia. Assistance provided now can save us increased defense and military expenses in the future.

Among the many programs of note to be funded through this conference report are family planning, including the U.N. Population Fund [UNFPA], receiving U.S. assistance for the first time in 9 years. UNFPA's 1993 State of the World Population report contains some alarming statistics with serious implications for the global environment. At the current rate of growth, the world population will more than double by the year 2050, further straining global resources which are already

unable to sustain the world's population. The conference report contains language to address my concerns and the concerns of a number of my colleagues about UNFPA's participation in China, which has some Draconian family planning practices. United States funds will not be available for use in China; and if the UNFPA spends more than \$10 million on its program in China, the excess will be deducted from the United States contribution to UNFPA. I will be following this issue closely, as I know my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will also.

Recent reports have noted the administration's interest in reinventing our foreign aid programs. This process will entail significant consultation with Congress on goals, priorities, and funding levels. The conference report before us today is an important step. It provides maximum flexibility and congressional guidance and will allow the administration and Congress to work together on promoting a foreign aid agenda which promotes democracy, sustainable development, and new priorities.

I only wish we could resolve the situation without degrading language regarding Cuba. However, I would urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to close debate by making a few points about assistance to the former Soviet Union. I have said many times that if you total up the total amount of money spent by the United States since Harry Truman first decided it was necessary to contain Russia until it changed, if you total up all of the money spent on defense since that time and divide it by the number of American families paying income taxes today, you come up with a per-family cost to win the cold war of over \$80,000 per family. That is a lot of money. It could buy an awful lot of people in this country a pretty nice retirement home.

Since 1985 when the Communist system started to crumble in Russia, we have spent \$565 billion less than President Reagan thought would be necessary to spend in defense between then and now, because no one realized the Soviet Union was about to collapse. That is saving an awful lot of taxpayers' money.

And I would suggest that the \$2.5 billion in this bill aimed at trying to stabilize the situation in the former Soviet Union now, today, was correctly described by none other than Ross Perot as being "a good buy and pennies on the dollar." That is exactly what it is.

When I talk to people, they think foreign aid means we write out checks to Russia, send them over, and put them in a pot somewhere. That is not the way it works. The way it works is we

set up standards for receiving that aid, and we do not send cash. We send technical assistance, we send food, we send pharmaceuticals.

I was in parts of Russia—along with the gentleman from Louisiana—in April, where they were denying insulin to children and all of those who had retired because they did not have enough to go around. So they were giving it only to the working-age population.

I think American values dictate that we do something to try to help people in that situation, and I think it is in our own national interest.

As the gentleman from Louisiana has correctly pointed out, we are not sending cash to the central bank. We are providing technical assistance to build the private sector. We are providing humanitarian aid. We are helping them to create a commercial code. We are helping them to develop private-property law. We are helping to develop a private sector and develop small businesses so that they can convert from a Marxist system to a market system.

I do not know if we are going to see success in Russia or not. I think history probably dictates that we probably will not. But I would ask what is the alternative? Should we just sit by on the sidelines, such our thumbs and worry? I don't think so. I think we need to do a little more than that. I think we need to be engaged. It is the biggest crisis facing the world at this time.

After World War I we were not engaged. When post-World War I Germany collapsed, and when the forces of turmoil were chewing up that country, just as they are in Russia today, the West did not engage. The West abandoned the Weimar Republic to its own fate. A fellow by the name of Hitler rose out of those ashes. The result was 40 million people dead and almost half a million Americans dead. American families were shattered because of the loss of loved ones.

I think that America and the West can do better this time. We do not know if Mr. Yeltsin's reform forces are going to survive or not, but I ask you this: How many American politicians have run the kind of risk, either political or personal, that Mr. Yeltsin and his allies are running every day? If you have talked to Mr. Kozyrev, the Foreign Minister of Russia, and I talked to him directly a week after the coup, after the right-wing Communist coup failed, he told us what it was like to be bottled up in the Russian White House with Russian troops all around, and with the right-wingers trying to gather them up and destroy the reformist movement. And he said he was very frightened when he stepped from the safety of the White House behind that small band of military leaders supporting the reformers, stepped through the military lines and went to his home to try to get what he needed in order to

try to leave Russia so that he could talk to President Bush and talk to the West and let them know that the coup was not succeeding, and that the reformist forces were still alive and well. He said he expected at any moment to be arrested.

Do you know how he got out of Moscow with the KGB looking for him? It was because the KGB was stupid enough to only be watching the VIP exits, and so he took the regular tourist exit, and by a lucky accident of history got out, and kept trumpeting the fact that the reformers were still alive and well.

It just seems to me that we owe that incipient democratic movement in that country our support, our emotional support, our financial support, something more than our rhetorical support.

Jeffrey Sachs has been referred to today, and I would simply point out that despite all of his misgivings, which we share, he supports the aid in this bill. He does not want to see cash assistance go to the central bank in Russia, because the central bank has been essentially irresponsible. And that is why the IMF and the World Bank are withholding funding, because they think so too.

So I would suggest that the right thing to do is to support this bill for this and many other reasons. Again, I appreciate the broad degree of support we have had for it on both sides of the House.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on Foreign Operations and I would like to direct my colleagues' attention to one provision in particular within this conference report.

Under the title providing assistance to the new Independent States of the former Soviet Union, language was inserted that states that the conferees strongly encourage the participation of qualified U.S. business in the United States with expertise in nuclear engineering and nuclear safety to participate in assisting any of the newly Independent States in the establishment of designs to increase the safety of nuclear powerplants.

The language further encourages the awarding of grants to small businesses for these purposes—especially those companies which are located in areas affected by the decline in defense-related industries.

This is an excellent use of foreign aid dollars. We are promoting U.S. business and jobs in districts such as my own in Connecticut which have felt the pinch of defense cutbacks, while providing an urgent need to our friends overseas. I only wish the provision had extended the use of these grants to our friends in Poland and other countries within Eastern Europe who also desperately need these services.

Let's avoid another Chernobyl. Let's support this conference report.

#### NEW TIED AID POLICY

The administration has developed a new tied aid policy of \$150 million for the war

chest—in subsidy. That translates into \$1.5 billion in project finance.

They propose to get the money by using the \$50 million already set aside at Eximbank for this purpose—no change for Eximbank's budget, in other words. The balance of \$100 million is to come from other export promotion accounts, meaning F.C.S., T.D.A., O.P.I.C., and so forth.

We should ask Chairman Brody to explain the new tied aid policy. The following questions should also be asked:

It would appear that the Bank is not contributing new money for this purpose but, rather, receiving a net increase through budget reallocations of \$100 million; is that correct?

How will you cut the other agencies' and departments' budgets?

Will the bulk of the \$100 million come from the USDA, which holds the lion's share of export promotion dollars—\$3.2 billion?

Are you concerned that this policy may have negative effects on our export promotion programs? For example, T.D.A. will have less money for feasibility studies and F.C.S. may have to cut their overseas representation.

Could you comment on these concerns?

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to support reluctantly the foreign operations conference report. The bill conditions economic aid to Nicaragua on a number of criteria. Let me start by saying I stand second to no one in my support for Violetta Chamorro and the democratic Government of Nicaragua.

Over the last several months, we have heard from the critics waiting in the weeds to tear down the only builders of democracy Nicaragua ever has had. On the one hand, I am torn by my friendship and support for the Chamorro government. On the other, I realize that if this were not agreed to, the alternative would be even worse for the people of Nicaragua. So, the political powers that be have crafted a plan. This is the best we are going to get. I accept it, but not happily.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRYANT). The question is on the conference report.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 321, nays 108, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

YEAS—321

Abercromble	Applegate	Ballenger
Ackerman	Bacchus (FL)	Barca
Andrews (ME)	Bacchus (AL)	Barca
Andrews (NJ)	Baesler	Barlow
Andrews (TX)	Baker (LA)	Barrett (WI)

Bartlett	Grandy	Mink	Vento	Wheat	Wynn
Bateman	Green	Moakley	Visclosky	Whitten	Yates
Becerra	Greenwood	Mollinari	Walsh	Wilson	Young (AK)
Bellenson	Gunderson	Montgomery	Washington	Wise	Zeliff
Bentley	Gutierrez	Moran	Waters	Wolf	Zimmer
Bereuter	Hall (OH)	Morella	Watt	Woolsey	
Berman	Hamburg	Murtha	Waxman	Wyden	
Bevill	Hamilton	Nadler			
Bilbray	Harman	Natcher			
Billrakis	Hastert	Neal (MA)	Allard	Goodling	Pombo
Bishop	Hastings	Oberstar	Archer	Goss	Poshard
Blackwell	Hilliard	Obey	Army	Hall (TX)	Quillen
Bliley	Hinchey	Oliver	Baker (CA)	Hancock	Rahall
Blute	Hoagland	Ortiz	Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Roberts
Boehert	Hobson	Owens	Barton	Hayes	Roemer
Boehner	Hochbrueckner	Oxley	Bonilla	Hefley	Rogers
Bonior	Hoekstra	Pallone	Brooks	Hefner	Rohrabacher
Borski	Hoke	Parker	Bunning	Herger	Roth
Boucher	Holden	Pastor	Buyer	Hughes	Sanders
Brewster	Horn	Paxon	Callahan	Hutchinson	Sangmeister
Browder	Houghton	Payne (NJ)	Canady	Hutto	Sarpalius
Brown (CA)	Hoyer	Payne (VA)	Collins (GA)	Inglis	Schaefer
Brown (FL)	Huffington	Pelosi	Combest	Jacobs	Schroeder
Brown (OH)	Hunter	Penny	Condit	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Bryant	Hyde	Peterson (FL)	Conyers	Kim	Shuster
Burton	Inhofe	Peterson (MN)	Costello	Klink	Smith (NJ)
Byrne	Insee	Pickett	Cox	Laughlin	Smith (OR)
Calvert	Istook	Pickle	Crane	Lehman	Solomon
Camp	Jefferson	Pomeroy	Crapo	Lewis (FL)	Spence
Cantwell	Johnson (CT)	Porter	Cunningham	Lloyd	Stark
Cardin	Johnson (GA)	Portman	DeFazio	McCandless	Stearns
Carr	Johnson (SD)	Price (NC)	DeLay	McHugh	Stump
Castle	Johnson, E. B.	Pryce (OH)	Dooley	McKeon	Tanner
Chapman	Johnston	Quinn	Doolittle	Mica	Tauzin
Clayton	Kanjorski	Ramstad	Dreier	Miller (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Clement	Kaptur	Rangel	Duncan	Minge	Thomas (WY)
Clinger	Kasich	Ravenel	English (OK)	Mollohan	Thurman
Clyburn	Kennedy	Reed	Everett	Moorhead	Traficant
Coble	Kennelly	Regula	Fields (LA)	Murphy	Velazquez
Coleman	Kildee	Reynolds	Fields (TX)	Myers	Volkmer
Collins (IL)	King	Richardson	Flake	Neal (NC)	Vucanovich
Collins (MI)	Kingston	Ridge	Gallely	Nussle	Walker
Cooper	Kleczka	Ros-Lehtinen	Gekas	Orton	Weldon
Coppersmith	Klein	Rose	Geren	Packard	Williams
Coyne	Knollenberg	Klug	Gonzalez	Petri	Young (FL)
Cramer	Kolbe	Roukema			
Danner	Kopetski	Rowland			
Darden	Kreidler	Royce	Clay	McDade	
de la Garza	Kyl	Rush	Ford (MI)	Smith (MI)	
Deal	LaFalce	Sabo			
DeLauro	Lambert	Santorum			
Dellums	Lancaster	Sawyer			
Derrick	Lantos	Saxton			
Deutsch	LaRocco	Schenk			
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Schiff			
Dickey	Leach	Schumer			
Dicks	Levin	Scott			
Dingell	Levy	Serrano			
Dixon	Lewis (CA)	Sharp			
Dornan	Lewis (GA)	Shaw			
Dunn	Lightfoot	Shays			
Durbin	Linder	Shepherd			
Edwards (CA)	Lipinski	Sisisky			
Edwards (TX)	Livingston	Skaggs			
Emerson	Long	Skeen			
Engel	Lowey	Skelton			
English (AZ)	Machtley	Slattery			
Eshoo	Maloney	Slaughter			
Evans	Mann	Smith (IA)			
Ewing	Manton	Smith (TX)			
Farr	Manzullo	Snowe			
Fawell	Margolies-	Spratt			
Fazio	Mezvinsky	Stenholm			
Filner	Markey	Stokes			
Fingerhut	Martinez	Strickland			
Fish	Matsui	Studds			
Foglietta	Mazzoli	Stupak			
Ford (TN)	McCloskey	Sundquist			
Fowler	McCollum	Sweet			
Frank (MA)	McCrery	Swift			
Franks (CT)	McCurdy	Synar			
Franks (NJ)	McDermott	Talent			
Frost	McHale	Taylor (NC)			
Furse	McInnis	Tejeda			
Gallo	McKinney	Thomas (CA)			
Gejdenson	McMillan	Thompson			
Gephardt	McNulty	Thornton			
Gibbons	Meehan	Torkildsen			
Gilchrest	Meek	Torres			
Gillmor	Menendez	Torricelli			
Gilman	Meyers	Towns			
Gingrich	Mfume	Tucker			
Glickman	Michel	Unsoeld			
Goodlatte	Miller (CA)	Upton			
Gordon	Mineta	Valentine			
Grams					

#### NAYS—108

Archer	Goodling	Pombo
Army	Goss	Poshard
Baker (CA)	Hall (TX)	Quillen
Barrett (NE)	Hancock	Rahall
Barton	Hansen	Roberts
Bonilla	Hayes	Roemer
Brooks	Hefley	Rogers
Bunning	Hefner	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Herger	Roth
Callahan	Hughes	Sanders
Canady	Hutchinson	Sangmeister
Collins (GA)	Hutto	Sarpalius
Combest	Inglis	Schaefer
Condit	Jacobs	Schroeder
Conyers	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Costello	Kim	Shuster
Cox	Klink	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Laughlin	Smith (OR)
Crapo	Lehman	Solomon
Cunningham	Lewis (FL)	Spence
DeFazio	Lloyd	Stark
DeLay	McCandless	Stearns
Dooley	McHugh	Stump
Doolittle	McKeon	Tanner
Dreier	Mica	Tauzin
Duncan	Miller (FL)	Taylor (MS)
English (OK)	Minge	Thomas (WY)
Everett	Mollohan	Thurman
Fields (LA)	Moorhead	Traficant
Fields (TX)	Murphy	Velazquez
Flake	Myers	Volkmer
Gallely	Neal (NC)	Vucanovich
Gekas	Nussle	Walker
Geren	Orton	Weldon
Gonzalez	Packard	Williams
	Petri	Young (FL)

#### NOT VOTING—4

Clay	McDade
Ford (MI)	Smith (MI)

□ 1503

Mrs. VUCANOVICH and Mr. MOLLOHAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FAWELL and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2243, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1993

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2243) to amend

the Federal Trade Commission Act to extend the authorization of appropriations in such act, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DINGELL, SWIFT, MANTON, MOORHEAD, and OXLEY.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 254 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. 2401.

□ 1504

#### 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. 2401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, with Mr. DURBIN, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, September 28, 1993, amendment No. 3, printed in part 3 of House Report 103-252, had been disposed of.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part 4 of House Report 103-252.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KOPETSKI

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KOPETSKI: At the end of subtitle C of title XXXI, insert the following new section:

#### SEC. 3139. MORATORIUM ON NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTING.

(a) MORATORIUM.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no underground test of a nuclear weapon may be conducted by the United States before September 30, 1994.

(b) EXCEPTION.—An underground test of a nuclear weapon may be conducted by the United States before September 30, 1994 if a foreign state conducts a test of a nuclear weapon before such date. An underground test of a nuclear weapon may be conducted by the United States under this subsection only in accordance with the procedures established in section 507(c) of Public law 102-377.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI].

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to thank the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order first.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] and the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY] want to reserve the right to be opposed to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Arizona rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI]?

Mr. KYL. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do; and I appreciate my colleagues making the point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] will be recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI] in support of the amendment.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to thank the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], as well as to acknowledge to the Nation a fact that the folks in his district know that he has a strong commitment as a leader of peace in this world to try to bring sanity to America's defense program and peace to the entire world.

Mr. Chairman, I prepared this amendment in the event that President Clinton's announced nuclear weapons testing policy might be challenged in either body. This has not happened, and momentarily I will ask that this amendment be withdrawn from consideration. I will also include a statement from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], a decent man and one of the leaders for nuclear weapons disarmament, to be printed in the RECORD:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1992.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the Kopetski amendment, and also to commend my colleague from Oregon for the strong leadership he has provided to the Congress on this issue of nuclear weapons testing. I understand the amendment will be withdrawn, but I am glad I have this chance to express my support for limits on nuclear testing.

Over the last dozen years, those of us who support the idea of arms control have often taken the floor to criticize Administration policies. I am glad that this time I am able to applaud a President for making the right decision on nuclear testing.

Earlier this summer, President Clinton decided to extend the U.S. moratorium on nuclear testing at least until September 1994. After consultations with the relevant agencies, the President determined that we would be able to maintain the safety and reliability

of our nuclear deterrent without active explosives testing. He further determined that continuing the moratorium would assist U.S. efforts to control the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

As a result of that decision, the French, British, and Russians also have agreed to a temporary, but open-ended, nuclear testing moratorium. The Chinese also came along, although somewhat reluctantly. There have been no nuclear tests, anywhere in the world, for almost a year. The Administration has devised a plan for negotiating a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and has begun consultations with the other nuclear powers about the specifics of time and location for those talks. We have also begun to plan for renewal of the Nonproliferation Treaty in 1995.

The core of this policy is the continuing nuclear testing moratorium. I strongly support it, and I believe the majority of the Congress supports it, as well.

This is why I am disturbed and concerned about continuing reports in the press that China is preparing to conduct a nuclear test, probably within the month. I have joined several of my colleagues in writing the Chinese Ambassador to the United States to urge that this test not be conducted. I understand the U.S. government, as well as many other governments around the world, have expressed their concern to Chinese government officials.

A Chinese test would undermine our efforts to achieve a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Perhaps more importantly for China, which must be concerned about the acquisition of nuclear weapons by North Korea and other Asian states, I believe renewed testing would make extension and strengthening of the Nonproliferation Treaty a much more difficult proposition.

As bad as a Chinese test would be to these efforts, a renewal of testing by the other nuclear powers would greatly compound the problem. Certainly it would not benefit the interests of the United States to respond to a single Chinese test with a U.S. test. As I understand Administration policy, we have determined that a ban on nuclear testing and controlling the spread of nuclear weapons are fundamentally in the interests of U.S. national security. These are the goals toward which we are working. A Chinese test would undermine the achievement of those goals, but a U.S. test—which would almost certainly be followed by Russian, English, and French tests—could destroy any chance of achieving them.

There are elements within the Executive Branch which probably would promote a tit-for-tat response—our test for their test. I also suspect that these will be the same people who argued earlier this year for the United States to discontinue the testing moratorium. This argument, so redolent of the "old thinking" that predominated during the Cold War, must be rejected. There is no fundamental U.S. security interest that would be served by resumed testing.

There are other, much more effective options available to the President—options which support, not undermine, movement toward a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. The Chinese test should be condemned as dangerous and ill-advised. We should reaffirm our determination that the U.S. arsenal continues to be safe and reliable without additional testing. The other nuclear powers should be encouraged to maintain the moratorium. And we should solidify plans to begin testing negotiations.

In short, Mr. Chairman, the President made the correct decision in continuing the

nuclear test moratorium and moving toward negotiations for a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. We should maintain that policy.

Representative MARTIN OLAV SABO.

Before withdrawing my amendment, Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few moments to assess the current nuclear weapons testing situation. With great respect I salute President Clinton's decision to extend the moratorium on U.S. nuclear weapons testing. The President reaffirmed this policy this week in his speech before the U.N. General Assembly. The New Testament of the Bible has a passage that reads, "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God." Bill Clinton has established himself as a peacemaker.

Mr. Chairman, on July 3, 1993, President Clinton stated:

I have therefore decided to extend the current moratorium on United States nuclear testing at least through September of next year, as long as no other nation tests, and I call on the other nuclear powers to do the same. If these nations will join us in observing this moratorium, we will be in the strongest possible position to negotiate a comprehensive test ban and discourage other nations from developing their own nuclear arsenals.

For the RECORD I include a copy of President Clinton's radio address from July 3, 1993:

THE PRESIDENT'S RADIO ADDRESS, JULY 3, 1993

Good morning. Two hundred and seventeen years ago, our Founding Fathers declared our independence to secure the liberty and prosperity we celebrate every July Fourth. Although our times and challenges are very different from those our founders faced, these issues are still the enduring concerns of the American people today.

In a few days, I will represent the United States in Japan at the annual meeting of the major industrialized nations of the world to work for new global policies that create more American jobs, open markets for our products, and strengthen our security as we embrace the challenges of this new world. America commands respect on the world stage because we have taken aggressive steps to put our own economic house in order at a time when all the advanced nations are having real troubles with the economy.

Here in Washington the House and Senate have both passed versions of my economic plan to promote growth and to reduce the deficit by \$500 billion. The plan also has incentives for people to invest more in our economy, to create jobs, and provides money for education and training in new technologies and helps the defense workers who have been laid-off by defense cuts.

We've made a good beginning now. As this plan has progressed through the Congress, interest rates have continued to come down, mortgage rates are now below 7.5 percent, and nearly 1 million new jobs have been added to the economy since January, about the same number as came in the previous 3 years.

Change is hard, though. Many people are still skeptical. Many of the opponents of my plan chant "tax-and-spend." But the truth is, it's not an old tax-and-spend plan. And the people who are attacking it are those

who taxed the middle class, cut taxes on the wealthy, borrowed and spent our economy into a \$4 trillion debt in the last 12 years. Our plan is fair. It has \$250 billion in spending cuts and asks the upper 6 percent of Americans to pay 75 percent of the new taxes. It moves the working poor out of poverty. It enables me to attend this meeting of the other advanced nations with a record of real results that will encourage our competitors to take steps to revive their economies as well. And that's important for every American, because we can't grow the United States economy as we ought to until we have cooperation from other nations, and they're growing. Why? Because since 1987, two-thirds of our new jobs have come from exports. We live in a global economy. We have to compete all over the world, and we have to sell our products and services everywhere.

When we stepped up to the plate here at home to get our own house in order, it enabled us to make the global economy work for the people of the United States if others will do their part. And that's what we're working on now. As I said, all the nations I'll be meeting with are facing difficult times. Their economies are even slower than ours. But we know that together we can grow, we can have a stronger economy, and we can have more security.

I'd like to talk to you about that for a few minutes. Because of the vigilance, the democratic values, the military strength of the United States and our allies, we won the cold war. Our inheritance, our victory is a new chance to rebuild our economies and solve our problems in each of our countries while we reduce military spending. But our profound responsibility remains to redefine what it means to preserve security in this post-cold-war era. We must be strong, we must be resolute, and we must be safe. This great task has certainly changed with the passage of the cold war. The technologies of mass destruction in the hands of Russia and the United States are being reduced. But technologies of mass destruction that just a few years ago were possessed only by a handful of nations, and still are possessed only by a few, are becoming more widely available. It is now theoretically possible for many countries to build missiles, to have nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. This is a new and different challenge that requires new approaches and new thinking.

During my campaign for President, I promised a wholehearted commitment to achieving a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. A test ban can strengthen our efforts worldwide to halt the spread of nuclear technology in weapons. Last year, the Congress directed that a test ban be negotiated by 1996, and it established an interim moratorium on nuclear testing while we reviewed our requirements for further tests. That moratorium on testing expires soon. Congress said that after the moratorium expires, but before a test ban was achieved, the United States could carry out up to 15 nuclear tests to ensure the safety and reliability of our weapons. After a thorough review, my administration has determined that the nuclear weapons in the United States arsenal are safe and reliable. Additional nuclear tests could help us prepare for a test ban and provide for some additional improvements in safety and reliability. However, the price we would pay in conducting those tests now, by undercutting our own nonproliferation goals and ensuring that other nations would resume testing, outweighs these benefits.

I have therefore decided to extend the current moratorium on United States nuclear

testing at least through September of next year, as long as no other nation tests. And I call on the other nuclear powers to do the same. If these nations will join us in observing this moratorium, we will be in the strongest possible position to negotiate a comprehensive test ban and to discourage other nations from developing their own nuclear arsenals.

If, however, this moratorium is broken by another nation, I will direct the Department of Energy to prepare to conduct additional tests while seeking approval to do so from Congress. I therefore expect the Department to maintain a capability to resume testing.

To assure that our nuclear deterrent remains unquestioned under a test ban, we will explore other means of maintaining our confidence in the safety, the reliability, and the performance of our own weapons. We will also refocus much of the talent and resources of our Nation's nuclear labs on new technologies to curb the spread of nuclear weapons and verify arms control treaties.

Beyond these significant actions, I am also taking steps to revitalize the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency so that it can play an active role in meeting the arms control and nonproliferation challenges of this new era. I am committed to protecting our people, deterring aggression, and combating terrorism. The work of combating proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is difficult and unending, but it is an essential part of this task. It must be done.

Americans have earned the right on this Fourth of July weekend to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit to happiness in the new era America did so much to create. This moment of opportunity is the reward for our vigilance and sacrifice during the long years of the cold war.

We now have the freedom to concern ourselves not merely with survival but with prosperity for ourselves and our children. We have the strength and the stature to lead the world into a future of greater security and global growth.

Because of the changes we have made, America can now fulfill the dreams and aspirations of the patriots who made our freedom possible more than 200 years ago. We can do them no greater honor than to make the most of what these times have to offer. Working together, we will.

Have a happy and safe holiday, and thanks for listening.

NOTE: This address was recorded at 6:34 p.m. on July 2, in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 3.

Just over 1 year ago, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona and I directed a spirited debate during House consideration of a 1-year moratorium on U.S. nuclear weapons testing. Advocates of the moratorium challenged the U.S. Government to assume the mantle of nonproliferation leadership. Advocates of the moratorium challenged the cold war mindset of nuclear bomb testing just for the sake of the status quo. Advocates of the moratorium refuted every reason given for continued nuclear weapons testing. On October 2, 1992, then-President George Bush signed legislation instituting a 9-month moratorium on U.S. nuclear weapons testing.

□ 1510

Today, the Nevada test site remains silent and will hopefully do so for time

eternal. The Russians have not tested since 1990 and the French nuclear testing program in the South Pacific is silent also. Even the Chinese have acted with restraint since September 25, 1992. I commend all of these nations for the leadership as the world community pursues nonproliferation goals of a comprehensive test ban [CTB] treaty and extension of the Non Proliferation Treaty [NPT] in 1995.

At the same time, the Congress and the Clinton administration must call for continued leadership from all of the nuclear powers to refrain from a resumption of nuclear weapons testing. A resumption of testing or new nuclear weapons testing by any nation must be viewed for what it is: a rogue nation stampeding away from the herd of nations who have found common purpose in ending the nuclear arms race.

In recent days, the press has reported that China may be on the verge of a nuclear weapons test. I and numerous other Members have urged the Chinese to demonstrate continued leadership, and to join the other nuclear powers in support of the moratorium and nonproliferation objectives. It has also been made clear to the Chinese, by the Clinton administration and Members of Congress, that China will be held accountable in the United States and abroad for her actions. At the same time, let me stress what I believe to be the view of a significant number of Members of this body; one Chinese nuclear weapons test is not justification for resumed nuclear weapons testing by the United States or any nation. Should the proponents of resumed nuclear testing, or the Clinton administration seek to resume testing based on one Chinese test, I am confident this will meet strident opposition in the Congress. The United States should not allow itself to join a stampede led by one irresponsible rogue.

In the coming months, I look forward to working with interested Members on both sides of the aisle as the administration moves forward on a CTB and extension of the NPT. Already President Clinton has dispatched representatives to Beijing, London, Paris, Moscow, and New York City to meet with the nuclear powers and international community. There are many outstanding questions ranging from the necessary safeguards to maintain the U.S. deterrent to the proper forum for international negotiations. Diligent oversight by the Congress and the committees of jurisdiction is appropriate and necessary.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI]. We recognize that the Chinese probably are on the verge of resuming nuclear testing, and I do not

think that world pressure has been shown in the past to have any effect on the Chinese as exemplified by we continue to extend most-favored-nation treaty status to the Chinese. I do think it is going to help put pressure on them. They just do not respond to world pressure. I think we have to have things in place to resume testing, if necessary, to show the world that we mean business in this particular regard.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the Kopetski amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Kopetski amendment codifies President Clinton's policy of extending the moratorium on nuclear testing until September 1994, unless another country tests a weapon. Yet, as we have heard, China is preparing a test, and now the President has announced that we will not resume tests in any event, but we will hold China accountable.

Mr. Chairman, how? Obviously, China will test, regardless of what the United States does. That is the first point that I would make.

Mr. Chairman, contrary to the assumption underlying the Clinton administration's policy and this amendment, a comprehensive test ban treaty will not strengthen efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. There is no evidence that a testing moratorium or a CTBT will promote nonproliferation. The most recent affirmation of this point is the planned nuclear test by China and the discussion in China about developing its own nuclear weapons program. The U.S. policy not to test obviously has had no impact on these nations' decisions.

Other nations will make their decisions about the utility of a nuclear option on the basis of their perception of their own security interests, not on the actions of the United States on nuclear testing.

Mr. Chairman, my second point is contrary to another Clinton assumption, nuclear testing is needed to assure the safety and reliability of U.S. nuclear weapons. The administration's apparent view that U.S. nuclear weapons are "safe enough for now," demonstrates a cavalier attitude toward the complexity of nuclear weapons and fails to take into account past safety and reliability problems with the stockpile. No Department of Defense or Department of Energy has ever taken the position that our weapons are reliable enough to forgo testing. We have always ensured continued reliability and safety through testing.

Mr. Chairman, I might add that we test the most mundane of weapons in our inventory, from pistols, rifles, and handgrenades, on up to the most sophisticated jet fighters. It is truly an anomaly that the most sophisticated and dangerous weapons, our nuclear

weapons, would not be subjected to continued testing for their reliability and safety.

Mr. Chairman, finally, contrary to an assumption by the Clinton administration, there are no other means sufficient to maintain confidence in the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile. Sophisticated computer modeling and simulation, conventional testing, and other non-nuclear testing regimes can provide useful data, but none of these methods provide a high confidence alternative to ensure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of U.S. nuclear weapons.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, the bottom line is this: the Kopetski amendment does nothing but codify current policy, which is both wrong and unneeded, and for that reason I applaud the gentleman for withdrawing his amendment and would have urged opposition to it.

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

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. DURBIN]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 254, I offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendment 11, as modified, and amendment 16, as modified, printed in part 4 of House Report 103-252.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc as modified.

The text of the amendments en bloc as modified, is as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Mr. DELLUMS:

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

The amendment as modified is as follows:

Page 367, after line 9, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 1304. DISSEMINATION OF LIST OF CONVERSION, REINVESTMENT, AND TRANSITION PROGRAMS.**

Section 4004(c) of the Defense Economic Adjustment, Diversification, Conversion, and Stabilization Act of 1990 (division D of Public Law 101-510; 104 Stat. 1849) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) ensure that adequate means are available to disseminate to interested communities, businesses, and defense workers and members of the Armed Forces a list of the Federal economic adjustment programs described in the reports required under paragraph (3)."

At the end of title IX (page 325, after line 25), insert the following new section:

**SEC. 950. PROHIBITION OF TRANSFER OF NAVAL ACADEMY PREPARATORY SCHOOL.**

During fiscal year 1994, the Secretary of the Navy may not transfer the Naval Academy Preparatory School from Newport, Rhode Island, to Annapolis, Maryland, or expend any funds for any work (including preparation of an architectural engineering study, design work, or construction or modification of any structure) in preparation for such a transfer.

**MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN**

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II (page 70, after line 19), insert the following new section:

**SEC. . TACTICAL AND THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Systems to provide effective defense against theater and tactical ballistic missiles that may be developed and deployed by the United States have the potential to make equal or greater contributions to the national security interests of nations that are allies of the United States as they do to the national security interests of the United States.

(2) The cost of developing and deploying a broad spectrum of such systems will be several tens of billions of dollars.

(3) A truly cooperative approach to the development and deployment of such systems could substantially reduce the financial burden of such an undertaking to any one country and would tap additional sources of technological expertise.

(4) While recent statements of nations that are allies of the United States have expressed a desire for greater involvement in United States tactical missile defense efforts, those nations are unlikely to support programs for theater missile defense development and deployment unless, at a minimum, they can play a meaningful role in the planning and execution of such programs, including active participation in research and development and production of the systems involved.

(5) Given the high cost of developing theater ballistic missile defense systems, allied participation in tactical missile defense efforts would result in substantial savings to the United States.

(b) PLAN AND REPORTS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall develop a plan to coordinate development and implementation of Theater Missile Defense programs of the United States with that of its allies, in order to avoid duplication of effort, to increase interoperability, and to reduce costs. The plan shall set forth in detail any financial, in-kind, or other form of participation in cooperative efforts to plan, develop, produce, and deploy theater ballistic missile defenses for the mutual benefit of the countries involved.

(2) The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the plan developed under paragraph (1). The report shall be submitted in both classified and unclassified version, as appropriate, and may be submitted as a component of the next annual Ballistic Missile Defense organization report to Congress.

(3) The Secretary shall include in each annual Ballistic Missile Defense Organization report to Congress a report on steps taken to implement the plan developed under paragraph (1). Each such report shall set forth the status of discussions with United States allies for the purposes stated in that paragraph and the status of contributions by those allies to the Theater Missile Defense

Cooperation Account, shown separately for each allied country covered by the plan.

(c) RESTRICTION OF FUNDS.—Of the total amount appropriated pursuant to authorizations in this Act for theater ballistic missile defenses programs, not more than 80 percent may be obligated until—

(1) the report under subsection (b)(2) is submitted to Congress; and

(2) the President certifies in writing to Congress that each of the NATO allies, Japan, Israel, South Korea, and any other country that the President considers appropriate have been formally contacted concerning the matters described in the report.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, whenever the United States deploys theater ballistic missile defenses to protect another country, or the military forces of another country, that has not provided financial or in-kind support for development of theater ballistic missile defenses, the United States should consider whether it is appropriate to seek reimbursement from that country to cover at least the incremental cost of such deployment.

(e) REQUIREMENT TO ESTABLISH ANNUAL TMD LEVEL.—The Congress shall establish by law for each fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 1995) the level of new obligational authority (stated as a single dollar amount) for research, development, test, and evaluation and for procurement for theater missile defense programs of the Department of Defense for that fiscal year.

(f) ALLIED PARTICIPATION IN TMD.—Congress encourages greater participation by United States allies, and particularly by those nations that would benefit most from Theater Missile Defense systems, in cooperative Theater Missile Defense efforts with the United States.

(g) FUND FOR ALLIED CONTRIBUTIONS.—(1) Chapter 155 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**"§ 2609. Theater Missile Defense: acceptance of contributions from allies; Theater Missile Defense Cooperation Account**

"(a) ACCEPTANCE AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may accept from any allied foreign government or any international organization any contribution of money made by such foreign government or international organization for use by the Department of Defense for Theater Missile Defense programs.

"(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE COOPERATION ACCOUNT.—(1) There is established in the Treasury a special account to be known as the 'Theater Missile Defense Cooperation Account'.

"(2) Contributions accepted by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a) shall be credited to the Account.

"(c) USE OF THE ACCOUNT.—(1) Funds in the Account are hereby made available for obligation for research, development, test, and evaluation, and for procurement, for Theater Missile Defense programs of the Department of Defense.

"(d) INVESTMENT OF MONEY.—(1) Upon request by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury may invest money in the Account in securities of the United States or in securities guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

"(2) Any interest or other income that accrues from investment in securities referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deposited to the credit of the Account.

"(e) NOTIFICATION OF CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress of any condition imposed by the donor on the

use of any contribution accepted by the Secretary under the authority of this section.

"(f) ANNUAL AUDIT BY GAO.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an annual audit of money accepted by the Secretary of Defense under this section and shall submit a copy of the results of each such audit to Congress.

"(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section."

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"2609. Theater Missile Defense: acceptance of contributions from allies; Theater Missile Defense Cooperation Account."

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments en bloc, as modified, be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the amendments en bloc are not subject to a demand for division of the question.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the en bloc amendment's language on theater missile defense burdensharing. The rationale for this amendment is clear—our allies are the principal beneficiaries of these defensive systems, and we want to ensure that they have the opportunity to contribute to the cost of research and development of the program.

Theater defenses do not offer protection against missiles capable of intercontinental flight. Even at the height of the cold war, they would not have protected the United States against attacks from the Soviet Union, because they're designed to intercept objects fired at low-altitude trajectories.

The Clinton administration's bottom-up review proposes spending \$12 billion on theater missile defense systems from 1995 to 1999. Despite the end of the cold war and our crushing budget problems, the United States continues to fund virtually all of the theater missile defense programs. Clearly, we cannot continue to shoulder the entire burden of paying for this program.

This amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to develop a detailed plan to coordinate development and implementation of TMD programs with our allies to avoid duplication and reduce costs.

In an effort to encourage greater participation by our allies in cooperative

theater missile defense efforts, the amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress classified and unclassified reports that detail financial, in-kind, and any other contributions made by our allies toward the theater missile defense program.

I want to emphasize that point again, because it goes to the heart of the issue. This amendment specifies, for the first time, that the Secretary of Defense must take concrete steps to implement the plan. The Secretary must keep Congress informed on the status of discussions with our allies and the amount of allied contributions, broken down by country, to the theater missile defense cooperation account.

Theater missile defense continues to have utility in the post-cold-war world. Make no mistake—this amendment is not about eliminating the TMD program. Rather, this amendment puts the Department of Defense and our allies on notice that it is in their interests to share the costs of building TMD systems that are designed primarily to benefit them.

Let us share the burden.

□ 1520

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

Mr. Chairman, now that the House is about to consider final passage of H.R. 2401, I want to take a brief moment to explain how I view this vote.

When you consider this bill separate from broader, longer term considerations, it is not that bad a bill. Other than cuts to ballistic missile defense and intelligence programs that I, along with the Clinton administration, believe are too deep, the Armed Services Committees and the full House have taken a generally cautious, moderate approach to this bill.

There is one particularly positive element of H.R. 2401 that I would like to bring to the House's attention. I am, of course, referring to the leadership of my chairman, the gentleman from California. While the chairman and I may often disagree over issues of substance and politics, my colleague has allowed all members to be heard, he has provided the forum for ample, sometimes exhaustive, debate, and he has treated the minority as fairly as any chairman I have served with during my 23 years as a Member of this House.

While there are valid substantive reasons for voting against this bill, Chairman DELLUMS' stewardship of the Armed Services Committee and this year's defense debate in the House is not one of them. I look forward to working with my chairman on this bill and on the many important issues our committee will be confronted with in the future.

Unfortunately, this bill brings to the House floor the stark reality of the Clinton administration's long-term vi-

sion for the further dismantling of the U.S. military. President Clinton was not elected to address defense issues. Despite the violent realities of national, ethnic, and religious conflicts that have filled the political vacuum created by the end of the cold war, when it comes to issues of the U.S. military it would appear that the White House is far too preoccupied with how much further they can cut defense spending. This focus on cutting defense spending is increasingly inconsistent with the administration's desire to expand the commitments of U.S. military personnel in assorted peacekeeping, peacemaking, and humanitarian missions around the world.

Secretary Aspin's bottom-up review recently recommended a military force structure that I believe is inconsistent with the administration's future strategy of maintaining forces sufficient to prevail in two nearly simultaneous regional conflicts. I do not believe that the Aspin-recommended forces can be paid for within the Clinton 5-year defense numbers. Following on the heels of 8 consecutive years of real decline in defense spending, I believe that the Clinton administration 6-year defense plan threatens the viability of our U.S. military forces.

As I stated when general debate on this bill commenced back in early August, I am more concerned today for the security of this Nation than I was during the height of the cold war. The end of the cold war has unleashed numerous regional and local conflicts, some of which challenge our political, economic, and security interests in various parts of the world. In light of these many challenges, I fear that those who advocate large cuts in the U.S. defense budget pose perhaps the biggest threat to the future of the U.S. military.

For months now, the President and Secretary Aspin have asserted the importance of U.S. economic security as justification for the deep defense cuts they have proposed. Administration officials have assured us that job creation plans, worker retraining, and defense conversion programs will alleviate any dislocation caused by the almost 2 million military and defense-related private sector jobs that the Clinton Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates will be lost under the Clinton defense plan.

Likewise, despite the fact that defense companies, of all sizes, will disappear by the thousands as a result of these cutbacks in the years ahead, the administration assures us that it is committed to preserving a strong industrial base. I do not know how the administration will reconcile these seemingly irreconcilable forces, but I contend that defense spending cuts of the magnitude proposed will do more harm than good to the very economic security the President wants to pro-

tect, as several million skilled workers are laid off and the once strong defense industrial base is dramatically reduced.

These are the longer term interests and the broader context of which I spoke a moment ago. H.R. 2401 reflects an initial downpayment on a 6-year defense plan that I simply cannot support. Despite the characterization of fiscal year 1994 as a trading water defense budget, it nonetheless represents the first year of a longer term Clinton vision for U.S. national security that I believe puts at risk the finest military force in history.

As a taxpayer, an individual Member of Congress, and the new ranking Republican on the Armed Services Committee, I have wrestled long and hard with these issues. The last time I voted for House passage of a Defense authorization bill was in 1985, the same year the on-going defense build-down began. Up until this year's debate, this defense build-down has been carried out on the watch of two Republican Presidents—a build-down I opposed then as I do now. Accordingly, my vote today has everything to do with my concerns for national security and nothing to do with partisanship. I am voting my conscience as every Member in this House ought to. As such I cannot support final passage of H.R. 2401 and plan to vote "no."

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity, nearing the moment of final passage of this bill, under the leadership of the new chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], I take this opportunity to compliment him and congratulate him, not only for his even-handedness and his fairness but for his leadership, for his looking after the troops, for his doing his best to see that there is an opportunity for them to be the best-trained in the world and to keep us on the cutting edge militarily, to keep us the best nation on defense in this world.

This is his first bill as chairman. I compliment him on the excellent job that he has done, wish him well in the days ahead.

On a personal note, as subcommittee chairman, he has been a very great help to me in putting the parts of my particular portion of the bill together.

I want to let this body know of the outstanding job that this gentleman has done, his first year as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the matter before us is an en bloc amendment. I am assuming that that will pass on a voice vote. At the end of that, the committee will have done its job and we will report back to the House. So I would like to take this opportunity not to speak to the en bloc amendment but to speak more generically.

First, let me thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SPENCE] for his very kind and very generous remarks. He is a very easy gentleman to work with, an easy gentleman with which to communicate, and it is a delight and a pleasure to work with my colleague.

Clearly, we have substantive differences on a wide range of matters, but we have learned how to deal with each other with comity and with cordiality and with respect. I thank the gentleman for that.

I would like to also thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] for his very kind and generous remarks.

Finally, in this regard, to thank all of the members of the staff. As I have said on more than one occasion, we are only as good as our staffs, because a great portion of the business of government is done by staff people, often unsung and not visible human beings but people who do an extraordinary job.

I think that any time and every time we have an opportunity to thank them and to compliment them for their extraordinary work, we should do so.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this is the first opportunity that I have had to come to the floor in this new capacity as chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services. I am now in my 23d year. I was elected in 1970.

I came to Congress to advocate peace, nuclear disarmament, to radically alter the priorities of this country, to address the human misery of people across the wide panorama of experiences that afflict human beings in this country at the level of race and class and sex and geography, whatever.

In the context of 1971, against the backdrop of the Vietnam war, this gentleman's comments were deemed as radical, far out. But I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the issues we raised 23 years ago, perceived as radical in the context of the early 1970's, are issues that are now on the front burner of America and this country.

What are the issues? Peace, nuclear disarmament, downsizing the military budget, economic conversion, reordering the priorities, reinvesting in America, reinvesting in American people, reinvesting in our children, rebuilding our economy, health care, education, all of these issues.

Mr. Chairman, we have become the first generation of American people who are afraid of our own children. That has enormous implications.

I would suggest to Members that a society that is afraid of its own chil-

dren is a society on its way to dying. We are frightened of our children, because we are now reaping the whirlwind of decades of neglect and lack of attention. But now the Berlin Wall is down. The Soviet Union has dissipated. The Warsaw Pact no longer exists.

It brings us great challenges, but it gives us great hope, because there are great possibilities at this moment.

As I have said before, this moment is pregnant with great potential to do extraordinary good. The world cries out for peace. People cry out for human rights and civil rights, and our people cry out for social and economic justice in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I have ascended to the position of the chair of the House Committee on Armed Services as an advocate of peace, as one who has advocated the military budget in order to address the priorities of our people. We now are there, Mr. Chairman.

As my distinguished colleague from South Carolina indicated how he will vote, it is interesting. I voted on 22 separate occasions against military budgets. Now I am placed in this new role, this new position.

□ 1530

I will vote for this bill, Mr. Chairman, but not because I am communicating to anyone in this body or to the American people that this military budget cannot be cut further. I believe that a prima facie case can be made to cut this budget even further than President Clinton chooses to do it.

The challenge before us is to take a prima facie case and make it a reality. We have to move our colleagues down a different road. Old labels no longer apply. Old paradigms no longer apply. Old ideas no longer apply. This is a new moment with great possibilities and great opportunities.

This new administration is trying to get off the ground. They were not off the ground fast enough to be able to allow a bottom-up review to shape this budget for fiscal year 1994, but we as a committee did our best. We did some good things in this bill. We have lifted the issue of economic conversion to a level that was never seen before. We placed \$13 billion at the disposal of the American people to clean up toxic waste and restore our environment. We have moved away from nuclear armament. We have done many good things in this bill, but we have miles to go, Mr. Chairman.

The Members have placed me in this role of leadership to try to help guide my colleagues to a new vision, a new set of ideas, to a new paradigm. I accept that challenge, but let the challenge be that we cannot continue to spend at this level. The world does not require it. Our people need us to move in a different direction.

I think we have turned a magnificent corner, but we have a ways to go. Next

year, the year after, and the year after that will be the great challenges of this committee. Let this administration place their 5-year plan on the table.

To my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], let us have an honest debate. I will guarantee that the framework will be open, will be frank, will be vigorous. My objective will be to try to move this body to a new place, to go even below the cuts, to start restoring this country, because as long as our children are dying in the streets and we are spending money preparing to wage war, there is something wrong in our society. We have to go in a different way, in a different direction.

Mr. Chairman, for those of my colleagues who have voted against the military budget over the years, because of their concerns of the priority of this Nation, feel free to do that. I think every human being in this body ought to vote their conscience, ought to vote what they honestly believe is correct.

I think we have turned a major corner. It is my hope and my dream and my aspiration, for whatever time remains in this body, and I am allowed to serve with honor in this position, to take us far below where we are, because I think that is the priority, that is the mandate, that is the necessity.

For those who feel that we have cut too much, I do not think that case can be made. When we were spending \$300 billion a year on the military budget, 70 percent of it was directed at fighting a war with the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, \$210 billion annually directed at two enemies that no longer exist. One does not have to be a brilliant rocket scientist to understand that if those major threats to which we directed 70 percent of our resources are no longer on the radar screen, that we can certainly make significant reductions in our military budget.

If the threats to the United States out there are regional threats, we certainly do not need to continue to spend as if the threat is the Soviet Union. The bipolar world has evaporated, disappeared. Let us now develop a new notion, a new definition of what national security is, Mr. Chairman. Let us develop a new set of ideas about what the threat is, based on the reality of the world, not some misconstrued, cartoon-like notion about what the real world is.

Let us develop a military budget that makes sense, and let us take the savings from that, whether we call it a peace dividend or whatever, and begin to rebuild our society. Our children demand it, their parents need it, and their grandparents hope for it.

Mr. Chairman, with those remarks we conclude a very significant and important debate. I am honored that my colleagues have chosen me to chair the Committee on Armed Services at this extraordinary moment in American history.

My hope is that, on sober reflection of this moment, that history will record that we did a decent job, as good as we could for this moment, but not nearly as good as we can.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The amendments en bloc were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will put the question on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Chair, do I have time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] can still move to strike the last word, under the terms of the rule.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I am privileged to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by applauding the chairman, the gentleman from California, for the extraordinary work he has done as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and for the many years of enormous effort that he has put into fighting for a world of peace and social justice.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one word, or more than one word, on my views on this budget. That is to say that while I think it is probably the best Defense budget we have seen for many years, as the chairman himself has indicated, it probably has not gone far enough. I intend to vote against it. Let me say very briefly why I intend to.

To put it simply, Mr. Chairman, despite the end of the cold war, we simply have not gone far enough in recognizing that the Soviet Union does not exist, that the Warsaw Pact does not exist, and that in fact our major security problem now is not foreign policy, it is domestic needs. When we talk about spending \$263 billion on the military at the same time as our children continue to go hungry, 5 million kids in America are hungry at the same time as 2 million people continue to sleep out on the streets, at the same time as millions of young people are unable to afford to go to college, then I think we are wrong about our definition of the American security problems. Our security problems are home now, and not abroad.

I want to congratulate the chairman and other people for their efforts to make sensible cuts in the budget. Sadly enough, amendment after amendment that was brought forth was

voted down. I find it ironic that some of those people who fought against these amendments are exactly the same people who are telling us how serious our deficit problem is. When we ask them to vote to save taxpayers money, they do not do it.

Let me give a few examples. The so-called Dellums-DeFazio amendment regarding star wars would have cut this wasteful and inefficient system in half. We do not need star wars. We had a good amendment to significantly cut star wars. Unfortunately, despite all the rhetoric about our \$4 trillion debt and our needs at home, that amendment was defeated.

The D-5 missile program. The Dellums-Penny amendment would have terminated procurement, saving \$1.2 billion. Unfortunately, once again, that amendment was defeated.

Burden-sharing. We are spending over \$100 billion a year defending Europe, Western Europe, and Asia against a nonexistent enemy. We are defending countries that in many ways are wealthier than we are.

There was a good amendment brought forth, the so-called Bryant amendment, which would have required Europe, Korea, and Japan to pay the cost of defending themselves by September 1996, a very sensible amendment. Unfortunately, a majority of the Members voted no; again, the same people who tell us every day about how terrible our deficit problem is.

The intelligence budget, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] and I offered an amendment which could have cut intelligence spending by 10 percent. We are now funding the intelligence budget at the same level as at the height of the cold war; once again, voted down.

Altogether, these amendments, if passed, would have saved the American taxpayers over \$100 billion over the next several years, \$100 billion. Some could go to deficit reduction, some to rebuild America and give hope and faith to the people that the chairman was just talking about, the young people who are never going to have a job in their lives, the children who are hungry. That is where the money could have gone, but we did not do it.

Let me simply conclude, Mr. Chairman, by congratulating once again the chairman for putting together what is probably the best Defense budget we have seen here in many, many years. However, I believe that now is the time to demand radical changes in national priorities. Let us look home at our enormous needs.

□ 1540

And let us tell the military-industrial establishment that their day has come and gone, and we are going to pay attention to the working people, to the children, to the veterans, to the elderly people who have been ignored for so many years.

And it is in that spirit, while congratulating my good friend on the excellent work that he has done, that I urge a "no" vote on the Defense budget.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire, under the rule, do the Chair and the ranking member continue to have the opportunity to strike the last word?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. DURBIN]. At this point the ranking minority member has the right under the rule to strike the last word and to be recognized for 5 minutes and to yield as he desires. Of course, the gentleman from California can ask for unanimous consent from the committee to extend his pro forma debate time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, might I further inquire, so that I understand it, the Chair is saying that this gentleman has exhausted the opportunity to strike the last word?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The fact is the gentleman has just debated a pro forma amendment and he may not do so over and over again, unless the committee were at some other stage in the bill. The gentleman can make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take any further time, but in view of what has transpired lately I feel I must.

Mr. Chairman, we will always have in this country and we have always had in this country people who have said that we do not need a defense, or that we need to cut out most of our defenses.

I would like to remind those people that we would not be here today as a free country if we had listened to those kinds of people over the history of this country. We will have more wars, Mr. Chairman. As long as we have human beings on this Earth, acting like human beings act, we will have more wars. The Bible admonishes us in that respect. There will be wars and rumors of wars. The only question is when, not if we will have other wars. We have to be prepared.

At the same time we will always have people in this country who will fight for our freedom, and that is what makes us what we are today. I thank God for them, and have thanked God for them in the past. That is our only hope.

Please do not listen to those who say we do not need a strong defense. The best way to prevent a war is to be so strong that no one is going to take you on.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding. I have always supported this authorization bill, because I remember

the early days of World War II when this country was not prepared. I am concerned about this bill. Are we heading in that same direction once again where we are not prepared, and I hope and pray we are never tested to find out whether we are doing an adequate job in defending or preparing for the inevitable some time in the future.

I am also concerned about what this committee did not do this time, and that is to take care of our retired military. I think we have an obligation to those retirees who did serve faithfully and to their families.

We have a responsibility, not necessarily for providing commissaries or exchange privileges, but for medical facilities. I will use my own State of Indiana as an example. When the work of the Base Closing Commission is completed, we will have no active base in the State of Indiana to provide medical care and pharmacies for our retirees and their families, and the retirees will have to travel several hundred miles just to fill a prescription.

I did not testify before the committee. I did write and talk to several Members and asked that they investigate this and to find some way where retirees are taken care of. But I do not find where we have it in this legislation.

So I think we are failing the retirees who have served our Nation in an obligation that we have made to those people and their families. So I am disappointed that this committee did not take care of these retirees adequately.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding because I did want to clarify that there are going to be a number of no votes on this floor that are not going to reflect the opinions expressed earlier by the gentleman from Vermont. The gentleman from Vermont is voting no because he does not believe this bill goes far enough toward creating a hollow army for our country. There are many of us who believe that this bill goes too far toward creating a hollow army, and we are going to be voting no as well.

We are going to be voting no because we believe when you have a President who continues to want to commit or commits troops all over the world, that it becomes passing strange that we then suggest on this House floor that we can continue to decimate the military, and yet complete those commitments.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First I want to commend the committee and its distinguished chairman for what they have done. I shall vote for this legislation.

I am concerned though that the job of the Armed Services Committee is going to become more difficult as we go along. I rejoice as much as anyone does at the ability to cut back. There are some items in here that I feel should have been cut back even further.

But I think we need to remind ourselves that there are Hitlers born every day, there are Mussolinis born every day, there are Tojos born every day, there are Saddam Husseins that are born every day, and the history of my lifetime has been that there has got to be somebody with the determination and the ability to say no, you cannot go that far; you have got to stop.

That is, unfortunately, the role that we Americans have to play. It is an extra burden that we have to carry.

I think this is a good bill. But I want to wish good luck to the chairman and to the ranking minority member on this committee, thank them for their fine work, and wish them good luck in piloting us to a sound future.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has expired.

(On request of Mr. WALKER and by unanimous consent, Mr. SPENCE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, as I was pointing out, the problem that we have is that we see a lot of these commitments arising around the world. The President evidently wants to commit us at some point to Bosnia.

The Somalia resolution that was adopted on the floor yesterday essentially tells the President that he has to come back to us with a plan, but has no hope whatsoever in it that we are actually going to withdraw troops from Somalia. There evidently are a contingent of troops being planned to go to Haiti, and we have a series of actions where we are going to commit American troops.

Yet, this committee has come up with a bill that strips us of the resources to be able to do all of these missions that this administration is committing us to.

I would suggest that if in fact we have a desire to concentrate on domestic affairs and withdraw the resources from the military, then maybe, maybe it is time that you also have the nerve to suggest to your own administration that they ought not to commit us to any more military missions, and actually vote for real actions to pull troops out of where they are now serving.

The fact is that we could have had a real vote on this House floor to withdraw the troops from Somalia now, and we refused to allow in the Rules Committee that kind of an amendment to

come to the floor, so that we are going to continue to expend money in Somalia at the same time that we are withdrawing the resources from those troops.

I would suggest that that is not an appropriate way to proceed, that we then have a hollow army that is always at risk. And it is not the appropriate kind of measure for us to be approving on this floor.

□ 1550

So my vote will be "no," not because I do not believe that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] have not worked hard on this bill—I think they have—but I think in the end the bill does undermine our ability to maintain the sort of military force that this administration seems anxious to commit all over the world.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MCNULTY] having assumed the chair, Mr. DURBIN, Chairman pro tempore 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. 2401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 254, 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, as amended, adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand separate votes on the following amendments:

The Schroeder amendment that requires the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Commission to include foreign bases along with domestic facilities in its closure recommendations;

The Lloyd amendment which requires the overseas operations and maintenance funding to be reduced by \$725 million in fiscal year 1994 to reflect anticipated overseas force reductions of 50 percent;

The Andrews of Maine amendment that bans the use of defense conversion funds for financing foreign arms sales;

The Skelton amendment that codifies a modified version of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military; and

The Gephardt-Gilman amendment which requires the President to report to Congress by October 15 the goals, objectives, and anticipated duration of United States forces deployed in Somalia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute. This concerns what we talked about this morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would not normally entertain that request at this particular point in the order of events.

The votes will be taken in the order in which the amendments were considered in the Committee of the Whole, since the bill was considered as read and the order of amendments was prescribed by three serial orders.

If a separate vote is not 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: At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII of the bill, add the following new section:

**SEC. 2819. EXPANSION OF BASE CLOSURE LAW TO INCLUDE CONSIDERATION OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES FOR CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT.**

(a) EXPANSION OF SCOPE OF BASE CLOSURE LAW.—The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 2910 and 2911 as sections 2911 and 2912, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 2909 the following new section:

**"SEC. 2910. CONSIDERATION OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**

"(a) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TERMINATION AND REDUCTIONS OF MILITARY OPERATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—With respect to recommendations made in 1995 for the closure and realignment of military installations under this part, the Secretary and the Commission shall include recommendations for the termination and reduction of military operations carried out by the United States at military installations outside the United States.

"(b) SELECTION CRITERIA.—(1) Not later than December 31, 1993, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register and transmit to the congressional defense committees the criteria proposed to be used by the Department of Defense in making recommendations for terminating and reducing military operations carried out by the United States at military installations outside the United States. The Secretary shall provide an opportunity for public comment on the proposed criteria for a period of at least 30 days and shall include notice of that opportunity in the publication required under the preceding sentence.

"(2) Not later than February 15, 1994, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Reg-

ister and transmit to the congressional defense committees the final criteria to be used in making recommendations for terminating and reducing military operations carried out by the United States at military installations outside the United States.

"(3) The criteria developed under this subsection, along with the force-structure plan referred to in section 2903(a), shall be the final criteria to be used in making recommendations for terminating and reducing military operations carried out by the United States at military installations outside the United States, unless the criteria are—

"(A) disapproved by a joint resolution of Congress enacted on or before March 15, 1994; or

"(B) amended by the Secretary in the manner described in section 2903(b)(2)(B).

"(c) RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall transmit recommendations to the Commission for the termination and reduction of military operations of the United States at specified military installations outside the United States. The recommendations shall be included in the recommendations transmitted to the Commission with respect to the closure and realignment of military installations inside the United States under section 2903(c).

"(d) REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY COMMISSION.—The Commission shall review the recommendations transmitted by the Secretary under subsection (c). The Commission may make changes in the recommendations made by the Secretary only in the manner provided in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of section 2903(d)(2). The Commission shall include, in its recommendations to the President under section 2903(d), its recommendations for the termination and reduction of military operations of the United States at specified military installations outside the United States.

"(e) REVIEW AND TRANSMITTAL BY THE PRESIDENT.—The recommendations transmitted by the President under section 2903(e) shall contain the recommendations of the Commission for the termination and reduction of military operations of the United States at specified military installations outside the United States."

(b) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO INCLUDE SUFFICIENT OVERSEAS INSTALLATIONS.—Section 2903 of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) FAILURE TO INCLUDE SUFFICIENT OVERSEAS INSTALLATIONS.—(1) In the case of the recommendations of the Commission required to be transmitted to the Congress in 1995 pursuant to subsection (e), if the closure or realignment of military installations outside the United States does not account for at least 25 percent of the closure and realignment recommendations of the Commission, as certified by the Commission under paragraph (2), then the process by which military installations may be selected for closure or realignment under this part with respect to that year shall be terminated.

"(2) In determining whether the percentage specified in paragraph (1) is satisfied, the Commission shall calculate such percentage both in terms of—

"(A) the number of military installations outside the United States recommended for closure or realignment as a percentage of the total number of military installations recommended for closure or realignment that year; and

"(B) the number of military personnel and civilian employees of the Department of Defense stationed or employed outside the United States directly affected by the rec-

ommendations as a percentage of the total number of military personnel and civilian employees of the Department of Defense directly affected by the recommendations."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (b) of section 2901 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Purpose.—The purpose of this part is to provide a fair process that will result in the timely closure and realignment of military installations inside and outside the United States."

(2) Section 2911 of such Act, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), is amended—

(A) in paragraph (4), by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "With respect to military operations carried out by the United States outside the United States, such term includes the sites and facilities at which such operations are carried out without regard to whether the sites and facilities are owned by the United States."; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(8) The terms 'closure' and 'realignment' include, with respect to military operations carried out by the United States outside the United States, the termination or reduction of such operations."

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to rule XV, the four votes, if ordered, will be 5-minute votes and Members will be requested to remain in the Chamber in order to avoid missing votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 292, nays 138, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 468]  
YEAS—292

Abercromble	Brown (OH)	de la Garza
Ackerman	Bryant	Deal
Allard	Burton	DeFazio
Andrews (ME)	Byrne	DeLauro
Andrews (NJ)	Callahan	Dellums
Andrews (TX)	Calvert	Derrick
Applegate	Camp	Deutsch
Baesler	Canady	Dicks
Barca	Cantwell	Dingell
Barla	Cardin	Dixon
Barlow	Carr	Dooley
Barrett (WI)	Chapman	Dreier
Becerra	Clay	Duncan
Bellenson	Clayton	Durbin
Bentley	Clement	Edwards (CA)
Bevill	Clinger	Engel
Bilbray	Clyburn	English (AZ)
Bilirakis	Coleman	English (OK)
Bishop	Collins (IL)	Eshoo
Blackwell	Collins (MI)	Evans
Boehlert	Condit	Farr
Bonior	Conyers	Fazio
Borski	Cooper	Fields (LA)
Boucher	Costello	Finer
Brewster	Coyne	Fingerhut
Brooks	Cramer	Flake
Browder	Crane	Foglietta
Brown (CA)	Danner	Ford (MI)
Brown (FL)	Darden	Ford (TN)

Frank (MA)	Lowey	Rostenkowski
Franks (NJ)	Maloney	Roth
Frost	Manton	Roukema
Furse	Margolles-	Rowland
Gejdenson	Mezvinsky	Roybal-Allard
Gephardt	Markey	Royce
Gillmor	Martinez	Rush
Glickman	Matsui	Sabo
Gonzalez	Mazoll	Sanders
Gordon	McCloskey	Sangmeister
Grandy	McDermott	Sarpalius
Green	McHugh	Sawyer
Greenwood	McInnis	Schaefer
Gunderson	McKinney	Schenk
Gutierrez	McNulty	Schroeder
Hall (OH)	Meehan	Schumer
Hall (TX)	Meek	Scott
Hamburg	Meyers	Sensenbrenner
Hansen	Mfume	Serrano
Harman	Miller (CA)	Sharp
Hastert	Miller (FL)	Shepherd
Hastings	Mineta	Skaggs
Hayes	Minge	Skelton
Hefley	Mink	Slattery
Hefner	Moakley	Slaughter
Hilliard	Montgomery	Snowe
Hinchee	Moran	Spratt
Hoagland	Morella	Stark
Hobson	Murphy	Stenholm
Hochbrueckner	Myers	Stokes
Hoke	Nadler	Strickland
Holden	Natcher	Studds
Horn	Neal (MA)	Stupak
Hoyer	Neal (NC)	Sundquist
Hughes	Oberstar	Swett
Insole	Obey	Swift
Istook	Olver	Synar
Jacobs	Ortiz	Tanner
Jefferson	Orton	Tauzin
Johnson (CT)	Owens	Taylor (MS)
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Taylor (NC)
Johnson (SD)	Parker	Tejeda
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor	Thompson
Johnston	Payne (NJ)	Thornton
Kanjorski	Payne (VA)	Thurman
Kaptur	Pelosi	Torres
Kasich	Penny	Towns
Kennedy	Peterson (FL)	Traficant
Kennelly	Peterson (MN)	Tucker
Kildee	Petri	Unsoeld
Kleczka	Pickle	Upton
Klein	Pomeroy	Valentine
Klink	Portman	Velazquez
Klug	Poshard	Vento
Kopetski	Price (NC)	Volkmer
Kreidler	Quillen	Walsh
LaFalce	Quinn	Washington
Lambert	Rahall	Waters
Lantos	Rangel	Watt
LaRocco	Ravenel	Waxman
Lazio	Reed	Wheat
Leach	Regula	Williams
Lehman	Reynolds	Wise
Levin	Richardson	Wolf
Lewis (CA)	Ridge	Woolsey
Lewis (GA)	Roberts	Wyden
Lightfoot	Roemer	Yates
Lipinski	Rogers	Zimmer
Long	Rose	

## NAYS—138

Archer	Cox	Gilman
Armey	Crapo	Gingrich
Bacchus (FL)	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Bacchus (AL)	DeLay	Goodling
Baker (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Goss
Baker (LA)	Dickey	Grams
Ballenger	Doolittle	Hamilton
Barrett (NE)	Dornan	Hancock
Bartlett	Dunn	Herger
Barton	Edwards (TX)	Hoekstra
Bateman	Emerson	Houghton
Bereuter	Everett	Huffington
Berman	Ewing	Hunter
Billey	Fawell	Hutchinson
Blute	Flelds (TX)	Hutto
Boehner	Fish	Hyde
Bonilla	Fowler	Inglis
Bunning	Franks (CT)	Inhofe
Buyer	Gallely	Johnson, Sam
Castle	Gallo	Kim
Coble	Gekas	King
Collins (GA)	Geren	Kingston
Combest	Gibbons	Knollenberg
Coppersmith	Gilchrest	Kolbe

Kyl	Mollohan	Smith (IA)
Lancaster	Moorhead	Smith (NJ)
Laughlin	Murtha	Smith (OR)
Levy	Nussie	Smith (TX)
Lewis (FL)	Oxley	Solomon
Linder	Packard	Spence
Livingston	Paxon	Stearns
Lloyd	Pickett	Stump
Machtley	Pombo	Talent
Mann	Porter	Thomas (CA)
Manzullo	Pryce (OH)	Thomas (WY)
McCandless	Ramstad	Torkildsen
McCollum	Rohrabacher	Torricelli
McCrery	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
McCurdy	Santorum	Vucanovich
McHale	Saxton	Walker
McKeon	Schiff	Weldon
McMillan	Shaw	Wilson
Menendez	Shays	Wynn
Mica	Shuster	Young (AK)
Michel	Sisisky	Young (FL)
Mollinari	Skeen	Zeliff

## NOT VOTING—3

McDade	Smith (MI)	Whitten
--------	------------	---------

□ 1616

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Before the Chair announces the results of this vote, he would like to make an announcement:

Due to a momentary power outage the computers were down for approximately 1 minute during the course of this vote. One or more Members may think they have voted when they actually have not. So, the Chair is going to wait for another minute to allow Members to look at the board and verify whether or not they have actually been recorded.

Mr. PAXON and Mr. WILSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HASTERT, HANSEN, and BURTON of Indiana changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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 next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: At the end of title X (page 346, after line 23), insert the following new sections:

## SEC. 1043. SHARING DEFENSE BURDENS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since fiscal year 1985, the budget of the Department of Defense has declined by 34 percent in real terms.

(2) During the past few years, the United States military presence overseas has declined significantly in the following ways:

(A) Since fiscal year 1986, the number of United States military personnel permanently stationed overseas has declined by almost 200,000 personnel.

(B) From fiscal year 1989 to fiscal year 1994, spending by the United States to support the stationing of United States military forces overseas will have declined by 36 percent.

(C) Since January 1990, the Department of Defense has announced the closure, reduction, or transfer to standby status of 840 United States military facilities overseas, which is approximately a 50 percent reduction in the number of such facilities.

(3) The United States military presence overseas will continue to decline as a result of actions by the executive branch and the following initiatives of the Congress:

(A) Section 1302 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, which required a 40 percent reduction by September 30, 1996, in the number of United States military personnel permanently stationed ashore in overseas locations.

(B) Section 1303 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, which specified that no more than 100,000 United States military personnel may be permanently stationed ashore in NATO member countries after September 30, 1996.

(C) Section 1301 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, which reduced the spending proposed by the Department of Defense for overseas basing activities during fiscal year 1993 by \$500,000,000.

(D) Sections 913 and 915 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, which directed the President to develop a plan to gradually reduce the United States military force structure in East Asia.

(4) The East Asia Strategy Initiative, which was developed in response to sections 913 and 915 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, has resulted in the withdrawal of 12,000 United States military personnel from Japan and the Republic of Korea since fiscal year 1990.

(5) In response to actions by the executive branch and the Congress, allied countries in which United States military personnel are stationed and alliances in which the United States participates have agreed in the following ways to reduce the costs incurred by the United States in basing military forces overseas:

(A) Under the 1991 Special Measures Agreement between Japan and the United States, Japan will pay by 1995 almost all yen-denominated costs of stationing United States military personnel in Japan.

(B) The Republic of Korea has agreed to pay by 1995, one-third of the won-based costs incurred by the United States in stationing United States military personnel in the Republic of Korea.

(C) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has agreed that the NATO Infrastructure Program will adapt to support post-Cold War strategy and could pay the annual operation and maintenance costs of facilities in Europe and the United States that would support the reinforcement of Europe by United States military forces and the participation of United States military forces in peacekeeping and conflict prevention operations.

(D) Such allied countries and alliances have agreed to more fully share the responsibilities and burdens of providing for mutual security and stability through steps such as the following:

(i) The Republic of Korea has assumed the leadership role regarding ground combat forces for the defense of the Republic of Korea.

(ii) NATO had adopted the new mission of conducting peacekeeping operations and is, for example, providing land, sea, and air forces for United Nations efforts in the former Yugoslavia.

(iii) The countries of western Europe are contributing substantially to the development of democracy, stability, and open market societies in eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the forward presence of United States military personnel stationed overseas continues to be important to United States security interests;

(2) that forward presence facilitates efforts to pursue United States security interests on a collective basis rather than pursuing them on a far more costly unilateral basis or receding into isolationism;

(3) the bilateral and multilateral arrangements and alliances in which that forward presence plays a part must be further adapted to the security environment of the post-Cold War period;

(4) the cost-sharing percentages for the NATO Infrastructure Program should be reviewed with the aim of reflecting current economic, political, and military realities and thus reducing the United States cost-sharing percentage; and

(5) the amounts obligated to conduct United States overseas basing activities should decline significantly in fiscal year 1994 and in future fiscal years as—

(A) the number of United States military personnel stationed overseas continues to decline; and

(B) the countries in which United States military personnel are stationed and the alliances in which the United States participates assume an increased share of United States overseas basing costs.

(c) **REDUCING UNITED STATES OVERSEAS BASING COSTS.**—(1) In order to achieve additional savings in overseas basing costs, the President should—

(A) continue with the reductions in United States military presence overseas as required by sections 1302 and 1303 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993; and

(B) intensify his efforts to negotiate a more favorable host-nation agreement with each foreign country to which this paragraph applies under paragraph (3)(A).

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), a more favorable host-nation agreement is an agreement under which such foreign country—

(A) assumes an increased share of the costs of United States military installations in that country, including the costs of—

(i) labor, utilities, and services;

(ii) military construction projects and real property maintenance;

(iii) leasing requirements associated with the United States military presence; and

(iv) actions necessary to meet local environmental standards;

(B) relieves the Armed Forces of the United States of all tax liability that, with respect to forces located in such country, is incurred by the Armed Forces under the laws of that country and the laws of the community where those forces are located; and

(C) ensures that goods and services furnished in that country to the Armed Forces of the United States are provided at minimum cost and without imposition of user fees.

(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), paragraph (1)(B) applies with respect to—

(i) each country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (other than the United States); and

(ii) each other foreign country with which the United States has a bilateral or multilateral defense agreement that provides for the assignment of combat units of the Armed Forces of the United States to permanent duty in that country or the placement of combat equipment of the United States in that country.

(B) Paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to—

(1) a foreign country that receives assistance under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2673) (relating to the foreign military financing program) or under the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.); or

(i) a foreign country that has agreed to assume, not later than September 30, 1996, at least 75 percent of the nonpersonnel costs of United States military installations in the country.

(d) **OBLIGATIONAL LIMITATION.**—(1) The total amount appropriated to the Department of Defense for Military Personnel, for Operation and Maintenance, and for military construction (including NATO Infrastructure) that is obligated to conduct overseas basing activities during fiscal year 1994 may not exceed \$16,915,400,000 (such amount being the amount appropriated for such purposes for fiscal year 1993 reduced by \$3,300,000,000).

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term "overseas basing activities" means the activities of the Department of Defense for which funds are provided through appropriations for Military Personnel, for Operation and Maintenance (including appropriations for family housing operations), and for military construction (including family housing construction and NATO Infrastructure) for the payment of costs for Department of Defense overseas military units and the costs for all dependents who accompany Department of Defense personnel outside the United States.

(e) **ALLOCATIONS OF SAVINGS.**—Any amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1994 for the purposes covered by subsection (d)(1) that are not available to be used for those purposes by reason of the limitation in that subsection shall be allocated by the Secretary of Defense for operation and maintenance and for military construction activities of the Department of Defense at military installations and facilities located inside the United States.

**SEC. 1044. BURDENSARING CONTRIBUTIONS FROM DESIGNATED COUNTRIES AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1045 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102-190; 105 Stat. 1465) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking out "During fiscal years 1992 and 1993, the Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary"; and

(B) by striking out "Japan, Kuwait, and the Republic of Korea" and inserting in lieu thereof "any country or regional organization designated for purposes of this section by the Secretary of Defense"; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking out "each quarter of fiscal years 1992 and 1993" and inserting in lieu thereof "each fiscal-year quarter";

(B) by striking out "congressional defense committees" and inserting in lieu thereof "Congress"; and

(C) by striking out "Japan, Kuwait, and the Republic of Korea" and inserting in lieu thereof "each country and regional organization from which contributions have been accepted by the Secretary under subsection (a)".

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

**"SEC. 1045. BURDENSARING CONTRIBUTIONS FROM DESIGNATED COUNTRIES AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS."**

**SEC. 1045. MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN REPORT REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) **BIENNIAL NATO REPORT.**—Section 1002(d) of the Department of Defense Author-

ization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-525; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), is amended—

(1) by striking "(1) Not later than April 1, 1990, and biennially each year thereafter" and inserting in lieu thereof "Not later than April 1 of each even-numbered year";

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2); and

(3) by striking out paragraph (2) (following the paragraph (2) designated by paragraph (2) of this subsection).

(b) **REPORT ON ALLIED CONTRIBUTIONS.**—Section 1046(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102-190; 105 Stat. 1467; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) specifying the incremental costs to the United States associated with the permanent stationing ashore of United States forces in foreign nations."

(c) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—(1) The Congress finds that the Secretary of Defense did not submit to Congress in a timely manner the report on allied contributions to the common defense required under section 1003 of the National Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-525; 98 Stat. 2577), to be submitted not later than April 1, 1993.

(2) It is the sense of Congress that the timely submission of such report to Congress each year is essential to the deliberation by Congress concerning the annual defense program.

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. **DELAY**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 427, nays 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 469]  
YEAS—427

Abercrombie	Blackwell	Clinger
Ackerman	Bliley	Clyburn
Allard	Blute	Coble
Andrews (ME)	Boehlert	Coleman
Andrews (NJ)	Boehner	Collins (GA)
Andrews (TX)	Bonilla	Collins (IL)
Applegate	Bonior	Collins (MI)
Archer	Borski	Combest
Army	Boucher	Condit
Bacchus (FL)	Brewster	Conyers
Bachus (AL)	Brooks	Cooper
Baessler	Browder	Coppersmith
Baker (CA)	Brown (CA)	Costello
Baker (LA)	Brown (FL)	Cox
Ballenger	Brown (OH)	Coyne
Barca	Bryant	Cramer
Barca	Bunning	Crane
Barlow	Burton	Crapo
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Cunningham
Barrett (WI)	Byrne	Danner
Bartlett	Callahan	Darden
Barton	Calvert	de la Garza
Bateman	Camp	Deal
Becerra	Canady	DeFazio
Bellenson	Cardwell	DeLauro
Bentley	Cantini	DeLay
Bereuter	Carr	Dellums
Berman	Castle	Derrick
Bevill	Chapman	Deutsch
Bilbray	Clay	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Clayton	Dickey
Bishop	Clement	Dicks

Dingell Johnson (GA)  
 Dixon Johnson (SD)  
 Dooley Johnson, E. B.  
 Doolittle Johnson, Sam  
 Dornan Johnson  
 Dreier Kanjorski  
 Duncan Kaptur  
 Dunn Kasich  
 Durbin Kennedy  
 Edwards (CA) Kennelly  
 Edwards (TX) Kildee  
 Emerson Kim  
 Engel King  
 English (AZ) Kingston  
 English (OK) Kleczka  
 Eshoo Klein  
 Evans Klink  
 Everett Klug  
 Ewing Knollenberg  
 Farr Kolbe  
 Fawell Kopetski  
 Fazio Kreidler  
 Fields (LA) Kyl  
 Fields (TX) LaFalce  
 Filner Lambert  
 Fingerhut Lancaster  
 Fish Lantos  
 Flake LaRocco  
 Foglietta Laughlin  
 Ford (TN) Lazlo  
 Fowler Leach  
 Frank (MA) Lehman  
 Franks (CT) Levin  
 Franks (NJ) Levy  
 Frost Lewis (CA)  
 Furse Lewis (FL)  
 Gallegly Lewis (GA)  
 Gallo Lightfoot  
 Gejdenson Linder  
 Gekas Lipinski  
 Gephardt Livingston  
 Geren Lloyd  
 Gibbons Long  
 Gilchrest Lowey  
 Gillmor Machtley  
 Gilman Maloney  
 Gingrich Mann  
 Glickman Manton  
 Gonzalez Manzullo  
 Goodlatte Margolles-  
 Goodling Mezvinsky  
 Gordon Markey  
 Goss Martinez  
 Grams Matsui  
 Grandy Mazzoli  
 Green McCandless  
 Greenwood McCloskey  
 Gunderson McCollum  
 Gutierrez McCrery  
 Hall (OH) McCurdy  
 Hall (TX) McDermott  
 Hamburg McHale  
 Hamilton McHugh  
 Hancock McInnis  
 Hansen McKeon  
 Harman McKinney  
 Hastert McMillan  
 Hastings McNulty  
 Hayes Meehan  
 Hefley Meek  
 Hefner Menendez  
 Herger Meyers  
 Hilliard Mfume  
 Hinchey Mica  
 Hoagland Michel  
 Hobson Miller (CA)  
 Hochbrueckner Miller (FL)  
 Hoekstra Mineta  
 Hoke Minge  
 Holden Mink  
 Horn Moakley  
 Houghton Molinari  
 Hoyer Mollohan  
 Huffington Montgomery  
 Hughes Moorhead  
 Hunter Moran  
 Hutchinson Morella  
 Hutto Murphy  
 Hyde Murtha  
 Inglis Myers  
 Inhofe Nadler  
 Inslee Natcher  
 Istook Neal (MA)  
 Jacobs Neal (NC)  
 Jefferson Nussle  
 Johnson (CT) Oberstar

Talent  
 Tanner  
 Tauzin  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Tejada  
 Thomas (CA)  
 Thomas (WY)  
 Thompson  
 Thornton  
 Thurman  
 Torkildsen  
 Torres  
 Torricelli  
 Towns

Trafficant  
 Tucker  
 Upton  
 Valentine  
 Velázquez  
 Vento  
 Visclosky  
 Volkmer  
 Vucanovich  
 Walker  
 Walsh  
 Washington  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Waxman

Weldon  
 Wheat  
 Whitten  
 Wilson  
 Wise  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wyden  
 Wynn  
 Yates  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)  
 Zelliff  
 Zimmer

[Roll No. 470]

AYES—266

NAYS—1  
 Stump  
 NOT VOTING—5  
 Ford (MI) Smith (MI) Williams  
 McDade Unsoeld

□ 1626

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 was demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: At the end of title XIII (page 447, after line 6), insert the following section:

**SEC. 1360. RESTRICTION ON USE OF DEFENSE CONVERSION FUNDS FOR THE SALE OR TRANSFER OF DEFENSE ARTICLES OR DEFENSE SERVICES.**

(a) RESTRICTION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in this Act and made available for defense conversion programs may be used to finance (whether directly or through the use of loan guarantees) the sale or transfer to foreign countries of foreign entities of any defense article or defense service, including defense articles and defense services subject to section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778).

(b) CIVILIAN END-USE.—The Secretary of Defense may grant exemptions from the restriction of subsection (a) with respect to sales or transfers of defense articles or defense services for civilian end-use.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "defense article" has the meaning given that term in paragraph (3) of section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

(2) The term "defense service" has the meaning given that term in paragraph (4) of such section.

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote, which will be followed by additional votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 266, noes 162, not voting 5, as follows:

Abercrombie  
 Ackerman  
 Allard  
 Andrews (ME)  
 Andrews (NJ)  
 Applegate  
 Baesler  
 Ballenger  
 Barca  
 Barcia  
 Barlow  
 Barrett (NE)  
 Barrett (WI)  
 Becerra  
 Bellenson  
 Bentley  
 Bereuter  
 Berman  
 Bevil  
 Billirakis  
 Bishop  
 Blackwell  
 Boehlert  
 Bonior  
 Borski  
 Brewster  
 Brooks  
 Brown (CA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Brown (OH)  
 Bryant  
 Byrne  
 Cantwell  
 Cardin  
 Carr  
 Chapman  
 Clay  
 Clayton  
 Clement  
 Clyburn  
 Coleman  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (IL)  
 Collins (MI)  
 Condit  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Coppersmith  
 Costello  
 Coyne  
 Crane  
 Danner  
 Deal  
 DeFazio  
 DeLauro  
 Dellums  
 Derrick  
 Deutsch  
 Dixon  
 Dooley  
 Duncan  
 Dunn  
 Durbin  
 Edwards (CA)  
 Engel  
 English (AZ)  
 English (OK)  
 Eshoo  
 Evans  
 Farr  
 Fawell  
 Fazio  
 Fields (LA)  
 Filner  
 Fingerhut  
 Fish  
 Flake  
 Foglietta  
 Ford (TN)  
 Frank (MA)  
 Franks (NJ)  
 Furse  
 Gallo  
 Gejdenson  
 Gephardt  
 Gibbons  
 Gilchrest  
 Gilman  
 Glickman  
 Gonzalez  
 Gordon  
 Grams  
 Grandy  
 Green  
 Greenwood  
 Gunderson  
 Gutierrez  
 Hall (OH)  
 Hall (TX)  
 Hamburg  
 Hamilton  
 Hancock  
 Hansen  
 Harman  
 Hastert  
 Hastings  
 Hayes  
 Hefley  
 Hefner  
 Herger  
 Hilliard  
 Hinchey  
 Hoagland  
 Hobson  
 Hochbrueckner  
 Hoekstra  
 Hoke  
 Holden  
 Horn  
 Houghton  
 Hoyer  
 Huffington  
 Hughes  
 Hunter  
 Hutchinson  
 Hutto  
 Hyde  
 Inglis  
 Inhofe  
 Inslee  
 Istook  
 Jacobs  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (CT)  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (SD)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Johnson  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kasich  
 Kennedy  
 Kennelly  
 Kildee  
 Kim  
 King  
 Kingston  
 Kleczka  
 Klein  
 Klink  
 Klug  
 Knollenberg  
 Kolbe  
 Kopetski  
 Kreidler  
 Kyl  
 LaFalce  
 Lambert  
 Lancaster  
 Lantos  
 LaRocco  
 Laughlin  
 Lazlo  
 Leach  
 Lehman  
 Levin  
 Levy  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (FL)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lightfoot  
 Linder  
 Lipinski  
 Livingston  
 Lloyd  
 Long  
 Lowey  
 Machtley  
 Maloney  
 Mann  
 Manton  
 Manzullo  
 Margolles-  
 Mezvinsky  
 Markey  
 Martinez  
 Matsui  
 Mazzoli  
 McCandless  
 McCloskey  
 McCollum  
 McCrery  
 McCurdy  
 McDermott  
 McHale  
 McHugh  
 McInnis  
 McKeon  
 McKinney  
 McMillan  
 McNulty  
 Meehan  
 Meek  
 Menendez  
 Meyers  
 Mfume  
 Mica  
 Michel  
 Miller (CA)  
 Miller (FL)  
 Mineta  
 Minge  
 Mink  
 Moakley  
 Molinari  
 Mollohan  
 Montgomery  
 Moorhead  
 Moran  
 Morella  
 Murphy  
 Murtha  
 Myers  
 Nadler  
 Natcher  
 Neal (MA)  
 Neal (NC)  
 Nussle  
 Oberstar  
 Nussle  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olver  
 Ortiz  
 Orton  
 Owens  
 Oxley  
 Packard  
 Pallone  
 Parker  
 Pastor  
 Paxon  
 Payne (NJ)  
 Payne (VA)  
 Pelosi  
 Penny  
 Peterson (FL)  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Petri  
 Pickett  
 Pickle  
 Pombo  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Portman  
 Poshard  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Quillen  
 Quinn  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Ravenel  
 Reed  
 Regula  
 Reynolds  
 Richardson  
 Ridge  
 Roberts  
 Roemer  
 Rogers  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Rose  
 Rostenkowski  
 Roth  
 Roukema  
 Rowland  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Rush  
 Sabo  
 Sanders  
 Sangmeister  
 Santorum  
 Sarpalus  
 Sawyer  
 Saxton  
 Schaefer  
 Schenk  
 Schiff  
 Schroeder  
 Schumer  
 Scott  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sharp  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Shepherd  
 Shuster  
 Sisk  
 Sisk  
 Skaggs  
 Sken  
 Skelton  
 Slattery  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (IA)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (OR)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Snowe  
 Solomon  
 Spence  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Stenholm  
 Stokes  
 Strickland  
 Studds  
 Stupak  
 Sundquist  
 Swett  
 Swift  
 Synar  
 Nussle  
 Oberstar  
 Nussle  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olver  
 Orton  
 Owens  
 Pallone  
 Parker  
 Pastor  
 Paxon  
 Payne (NJ)  
 Payne (VA)  
 Pelosi  
 Penny  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Petri  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Portman  
 Poshard  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Quinn  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Ravenel  
 Reed  
 Regula  
 Reynolds  
 Richardson  
 Roemer  
 Rose  
 Rostenkowski  
 Roth  
 Roukema  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Rush  
 Sabo  
 Sanders  
 Sangmeister  
 Sawyer  
 Saxton  
 Schenk  
 Schiff  
 Schroeder  
 Schumer  
 Scott  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sharp  
 Shepherd  
 Skaggs  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stokes  
 Strickland  
 Studds  
 Swett  
 Swift  
 Synar  
 Tanner  
 Thompson  
 Thornton  
 Thurman  
 Torres  
 Towns  
 Trafficant  
 Tucker  
 Upton  
 Valentine  
 Velázquez  
 Vento  
 Visclosky  
 Volkmer  
 Washington  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Wheat  
 Whitten  
 Wise  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wyden  
 Wynn  
 Yates  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)  
 Zelliff  
 Zimmer

NOES—162

Andrews (TX)	Gingrich	Ortiz
Archer	Goodlatte	Oxley
Army	Goodling	Packard
Bacchus (FL)	Goss	Payne (VA)
Bacchus (AL)	Hall (TX)	Peterson (FL)
Baker (CA)	Hancock	Pickett
Baker (LA)	Hansen	Pickle
Bartlett	Hastert	Pombo
Barton	Hayes	Quillen
Bateman	Hefley	Ridge
Bilbray	Herger	Roberts
Bliley	Hobson	Rogers
Blute	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Boehner	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonilla	Hutchinson	Rowland
Boucher	Hutto	Santorum
Browder	Hyde	Sarpalius
Bunning	Inglis	Schaefer
Burton	Inhofe	Shaw
Buyer	Johnson (CT)	Shays
Callahan	Johnson (GA)	Shuster
Calvert	Johnson, E.B.	Sisisky
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Skeen
Canady	King	Skelton
Castle	Kingston	Slattery
Clinger	Kolbe	Smith (IA)
Coble	Kyl	Smith (OR)
Combest	Lancaster	Smith (TX)
Cox	Laughlin	Snowe
Cramer	Levy	Solomon
Crapo	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Cunningham	Lewis (FL)	Stearns
Darden	Lightfoot	Stenholm
de la Garza	Linder	Stump
DeLay	Livingston	Stupak
Diaz-Balart	Machtley	Sundquist
Dickey	Mann	Talent
Dicks	Manzullo	Tauzin
Dingell	McCandless	Taylor (MS)
Doolittle	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Dornan	McCreery	Tejeda
Dreier	McHugh	Thomas (CA)
Edwards (TX)	McInnis	Thomas (WY)
Emerson	McKeon	Torkildsen
Everett	McNulty	Torricelli
Ewing	Meek	Vucanovich
Fields (TX)	Meyers	Walker
Fowler	Mica	Walsh
Franks (CT)	Michel	Weldon
Frost	Molinar	Wilson
Gallely	Moorhead	Yates
Gekas	Murtha	Young (AK)
Geren	Myers	Young (FL)
Gillmor	Natcher	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—5

Ford (MI)	Smith (MI)	Williams
McDade	Unsoeld	

□ 1636

Mr. MURTHA changed his vote from "aye" to "no."  
 Mr. ISTOOK changed his vote from "no" to "aye."  
 So the amendment was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1640

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:  
 Amendment: Strike out section 575 (page 198, line 7, through page 206, line 11) and insert in lieu thereof the following:  
**SEC. 575. POLICY CONCERNING HOMOSEXUALITY IN THE ARMED FORCES.**

(a) CODIFICATION.—(1) Chapter 37 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**"§ 654. Policy concerning homosexuality in the armed forces**

"(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

"(1) Section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States commits exclu-

sively to the Congress the powers to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a Navy, and make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

"(2) There is no constitutional right to serve in the armed forces.

"(3) Pursuant to the powers conferred by section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, it lies within the discretion of the Congress to establish qualifications for and conditions of service in the armed forces.

"(4) The primary purpose of the armed forces is to prepare for and to prevail in combat should the need arise.

"(5) The conduct of military operations requires members of the armed forces to make extraordinary sacrifices, including the ultimate sacrifice, in order to provide for the common defense.

"(6) Success in combat requires military units that are characterized by high morale, good order and discipline, and unit cohesion.

"(7) One of the most critical elements in combat capability is unit cohesion, that is, the bonds of trust among individual service members that make the combat effectiveness of a military unit greater than the sum of the combat effectiveness of the individual unit members.

"(8) Military life is fundamentally different from civilian life in that—

"(A) the extraordinary responsibilities of the armed forces, the unique conditions of military service, and the critical role of unit cohesion, require that the military community, while subject to civilian control, exist as a specialized society; and

"(B) the military society is characterized by its own laws, rules, customs, and traditions, including numerous restrictions on personal behavior, that would not be acceptable in civilian society.

"(9) The standards of conduct for members of the armed forces regulate a member's life for 24 hours each day beginning at the moment the member enters military status and not ending until that person is discharged or otherwise separated from the armed forces.

"(10) Those standards of conduct, including the Uniform Code of Military Justice, apply to a member of the armed forces at all times that the member has a military status, whether the member is on base or off base, and whether the member is on duty or off duty.

"(11) The pervasive application of the standards of conduct is necessary because members of the armed forces must be ready at all times for worldwide deployment to a combat environment.

"(12) The worldwide deployment of United States military forces, the international responsibilities of the United States, and the potential for involvement of the armed forces in actual combat routinely make it necessary for members of the armed forces involuntarily to accept living conditions and working conditions that are often spartan, primitive, and characterized by forced intimacy with little or no privacy.

"(13) The prohibition against homosexual conduct is a longstanding element of military law that continues to be necessary in the unique circumstances of military service.

"(14) The armed forces must maintain personnel policies that exclude persons whose presence in the armed forces would create an unacceptable risk to the armed forces' high standards of morale, good order and discipline, and unit cohesion that are the essence of military capability.

"(15) The presence in the armed forces of persons who demonstrate a propensity or in-

tent to engage in homosexual acts would create an unacceptable risk to the high standards of morale, good order and discipline, and unit cohesion that are the essence of military capability.

"(b) POLICY.—A member of the armed forces shall be separated from the armed forces under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense if one or more of the following findings is made and approved in accordance with procedures set forth in such regulations:

"(1) That the member has engaged in, attempted to engage in, or solicited another to engage in a homosexual act or acts unless there are further findings, made and approved in accordance with procedures set forth in such regulations, that the member has demonstrated that—

"(A) such conduct is a departure from the member's usual and customary behavior;

"(B) such conduct, under all the circumstances, is unlikely to recur;

"(C) such conduct was not accomplished by use of force, coercion, or intimidation;

"(D) under the particular circumstances of the case, the member's continued presence in the armed forces is consistent with the interests of the armed forces in proper discipline, good order, and morale; and

"(E) the member does not have a propensity or intent to engage in homosexual acts.

"(2) That the member has stated that he or she is a homosexual or bisexual, or words to that effect, unless there is a further finding, made and approved in accordance with procedures set forth in the regulations, that the member has demonstrated that he or she is not a person who engages in, attempts to engage in, has a propensity to engage in, or intends to engage in homosexual acts.

"(3) That the member has married or attempted to marry a person known to be of the same biological sex.

"(c) ENTRY STANDARDS AND DOCUMENTS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the standards for enlistment and appointment of members of the armed forces reflect the policies set forth in subsection (b).

"(2) The documents used to effectuate the enlistment or appointment of a person as a member of the armed forces shall set forth the provisions of subsection (b).

"(d) REQUIRED BRIEFINGS.—The briefings that members of the armed forces receive upon entry into the armed forces and periodically thereafter under section 937 of this title (article 137 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) shall include a detailed explanation of the applicable laws and regulations governing sexual conduct by members of the armed forces, including the policies prescribed under subsection (b).

"(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (b) shall be construed to require that a member of the armed forces be processed for separation from the armed forces when a determination is made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense that—

"(1) the member engaged in conduct or made statements for the purpose of avoiding or terminating military service; and

"(2) separation of the member would not be in the best interest of the armed forces.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) The term 'homosexual' means a person, regardless of sex, who engages in, attempts to engage in, has a propensity to engage in, or intends to engage in homosexual acts, and includes the terms 'gay' and 'lesbian'.

"(2) The term 'bisexual' means a person who engages in, attempts to engage in, has a

propensity to engage in, or intends to engage in homosexual and heterosexual acts.

“(3) The term ‘homosexual act’ means—  
“(A) any bodily contact, actively undertaken or passively permitted, between members of the same sex for the purpose of satisfying sexual desires; and

“(B) any bodily contact which a reasonable person would understand to demonstrate a propensity or intent to engage in an act described in subparagraph (A).”

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“654. Policy concerning homosexuality in the armed forces.”.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall revise Department of Defense regulations, and issue such new regulations as may be necessary, to implement section 654 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section or section 654 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) may be construed to invalidate any inquiry, investigation, administrative action or proceeding, court-martial, or judicial proceeding conducted before the effective date of regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense to implement such section 654.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the suspension of questioning concerning homosexuality as part of the processing of individuals for accession into the Armed Forces under the interim policy of January 29, 1993, should be continued, but the Secretary of Defense may reinstate that questioning with such questions or such revised questions as he considers appropriate if the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so in order to effectuate the policy set forth in section 654 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a); and

(2) the Secretary of Defense should consider issuing guidance governing the circumstances under which members of the Armed Forces questioned about homosexuality for administrative purposes should be afforded warnings similar to the warnings under section 831(b) of title 10, United States Code (article 31(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

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. This is a 5-minute vote, to be followed by additional votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 295, noes 133, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]

AYES—295

Allard	Baker (LA)	Bereuter
Andrews (NJ)	Ballenger	Bevill
Andrews (TX)	Barca	Bilbray
Applegate	Barcia	Bilbrak
Archer	Barrett (NE)	Bishop
Armey	Bartlett	Bliley
Bachus (AL)	Barton	Blute
Baesler	Bateman	Boehner
Baker (CA)	Bentley	Bonilla

Bonior	Hoagland	Paxon
Borski	Hobson	Payne (VA)
Boucher	Hochbrueckner	Penny
Brooks	Hoekstra	Peterson (FL)
Browder	Hoke	Peterson (MN)
Brown (FL)	Holden	Petri
Bunning	Houghton	Pickett
Burton	Hoyer	Pomboy
Buyer	Hughes	Pomeroy
Callahan	Hunter	Porter
Calvert	Hutchinson	Portman
Camp	Hutto	Poshard
Canady	Hyde	Price (NC)
Carr	Inglis	Pryce (OH)
Castle	Inhofe	Quillen
Chapman	Inslee	Quinn
Clement	Istook	Rahall
Clinger	Jacobs	Ramstad
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Ravenel
Coble	Johnson (SD)	Regula
Coleman	Johnson, Sam	Richardson
Collins (GA)	Kanjorski	Ridge
Combust	Kaptur	Roberts
Condit	Kasich	Roemer
Cooper	Kildee	Rogers
Costello	Kim	Rohrabacher
Cox	King	Ros-Lehtinen
Cramer	Kingston	Rose
Crane	Klecza	Roth
Crapo	Klein	Roukema
Cunningham	Klink	Royce
Danner	Klug	Sangmeister
Darden	Knollenberg	Santorum
De la Garza	Kopetski	Sarpalius
Deal	Kyl	Sawyer
DeLay	LaFalce	Saxton
Derrick	Lambert	Schaefer
Diaz-Balart	Lancaster	Schiff
Dickey	LaRocco	Sensenbrenner
Dicks	Laughlin	Sharp
Dingell	Lazio	Shaw
Dooley	Lehman	Shuster
Doolittle	Levin	Sisisky
Dorman	Levy	Skeean
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Skelton
Duncan	Lewis (FL)	Slattery
Dunn	Lightfoot	Smith (NJ)
Durbin	Linder	Smith (TX)
Edwards (TX)	Lipinski	Snowe
Emerson	Livingston	Solomon
English (OK)	Lloyd	Spence
Everett	Long	Spratt
Ewing	Lowey	Stearns
Fawell	Machtley	Stenholm
Fields (TX)	Mann	Strickland
Fingerhut	Manton	Stump
Fish	Manzullo	Stupak
Ford (MI)	Martinez	Sundquist
Fowler	Mazzoli	Swett
Franks (CT)	McCandless	Talent
Franks (NJ)	McCollum	Tanner
Frost	McCrary	Tauzin
Galleghy	McCurdy	Taylor (MS)
Gallo	McHale	Taylor (NC)
Gekas	McHugh	Tejeda
Gephardt	McInnis	Thomas (CA)
Geren	McKeon	Thomas (WY)
Gibbons	McMillan	Thornton
Gilchrest	McNulty	Thurman
Gillmor	Menendez	Torricelli
Gingrich	Meyers	Trafficant
Glickman	Mica	Upton
Goodlatte	Michel	Valentine
Goodling	Miller (FL)	Volkmer
Gordon	Minge	Vucanovich
Goss	Mollinari	Walker
Grams	Mollohan	Walsh
Grandy	Montgomery	Weldon
Green	Moorhead	Whitten
Greenwood	Murphy	Wilson
Hall (OH)	Murtha	Wise
Hall (TX)	Myers	Wolf
Hamilton	Natcher	Wynn
Hancock	Neal (NC)	Young (AK)
Hansen	Nussle	Young (FL)
Hastert	Obey	Zeliff
Hayes	Ortiz	Zimmer
Hefley	Oxley	
Hefner	Packard	
Herger	Parker	

NOES—133

Abercrombie	Bacchus (FL)	Becerra
Ackerman	Barlow	Bellenson
Andrews (ME)	Barrett (WI)	Berman

Blackwell	Hilliard	Rangel
Boehler	Hinchee	Reed
Brown (CA)	Horn	Reynolds
Brown (OH)	Huffington	Rostenkowski
Bryant	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Byrne	Johnson (CT)	Rush
Cantwell	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
Cardin	Johnston	Sanders
Clay	Kennedy	Schenk
Clayton	Kennelly	Schroeder
Collins (IL)	Kolbe	Schumer
Collins (MI)	Kreidler	Scott
Conyers	Lantos	Serrano
Coppersmith	Leach	Shays
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Shepherd
DeFazio	Maloney	Skaggs
DeLauro	Margolies-	Slaughter
Dellums	Mezvisinsky	Smith (IA)
Deutsch	Markey	Smith (OR)
Dixon	Matsui	Stark
Edwards (CA)	McCloskey	Stokes
Engel	McDermott	Studds
English (AZ)	McKinney	Swift
Eshoo	Meehan	Synar
Evans	Meek	Thompson
Farr	Mfume	Torkildsen
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Torres
Fields (LA)	Mineta	Towns
Filner	Mink	Tucker
Flake	Moakley	Unsoeld
Foglietta	Moran	Velazquez
Ford (TN)	Morella	Vento
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Visclosky
Furse	Neal (MA)	Waters
Gejdenson	Oberstar	Watt
Gilman	Oliver	Waxman
Gonzalez	Owens	Wheat
Gunderson	Pallone	Williams
Gutierrez	Pastor	Woolsey
Hamburg	Payne (NJ)	Wyden
Harman	Pelosi	Yates
Hastings	Pickle	

NOT VOTING—5

Brewster	Orton	Washington
McDade	Smith (MI)	

□ 1645

Messrs. HASTINGS, JEFFERSON, and MARKEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 471, the Skelton amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted “no.”

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: At the end of title X (page 346, after line 23), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1043. INVOLVEMENT OF ARMED FORCES IN SOMALIA.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARDS SOMALIA.—

(1) Since United States Armed Forces made significant contributions under Operation Restore Hope towards the establishment of a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations and restoration of peace in the region to end the humanitarian disaster that had claimed more than 300,000 lives.

(2) Since the mission of United States forces in support of the United Nations appears to be evolving from the establishment of “a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations,” as set out in United Nations Security Council Resolution 794 of December 3, 1992, to one of internal security and nation building.

(b) STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY—

(1) CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESS.—The President should consult closely with the Congress regarding United States policy with respect to Somalia, including in particular the deployment of United States Armed Forces in that country, whether under United Nations or United States command.

(2) PLANNING.—The United States shall facilitate the assumption of the functions of United States forces by the United Nations.

(3) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

(A) The President shall ensure that the goals and objectives supporting deployment of United States forces to Somalia and a description of the mission, command arrangements, size, functions, location, and anticipated duration in Somalia of those forces are clearly articulated and provided in a detailed report to the Congress by October 15, 1993.

(B) Such report shall include the status of planning to transfer the function contained in paragraph (2).

(4) CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL.—Upon reporting under the requirements of paragraph (3) Congress believes the President should by November 15, 1993, seek and receive congressional authorization in order for the deployment of United States forces to Somalia to continue.

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote, and will be followed by additional votes on this bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 405, noes 23, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

AYES—405

Abercrombie	Boucher	Crapo
Ackerman	Brewster	Cunningham
Allard	Brooks	Danner
Andrews (ME)	Browder	Darden
Andrews (NJ)	Brown (CA)	de la Garza
Andrews (TX)	Brown (FL)	Deal
Applegate	Brown (OH)	DeFazio
Archer	Bryant	DeLauro
Army	Bunning	DeLay
Bacchus (FL)	Burton	Dellums
Baessler	Buyer	Derrick
Baker (CA)	Byrne	Deutsch
Baker (LA)	Callahan	Diaz-Balart
Ballenger	Calvert	Dickey
Barca	Camp	Dicks
Barcla	Canady	Dingell
Barlow	Cantwell	Dixon
Barrett (NE)	Cardin	Dooley
Barrett (WI)	Carr	Doolittle
Bartlett	Castle	Dreier
Bateman	Chapman	Duncan
Becerra	Clay	Dunn
Bellenson	Clayton	Durbin
Bentley	Clement	Edwards (CA)
Bereuter	Clinger	Edwards (TX)
Berman	Clyburn	Emerson
Bevill	Coleman	Engel
Blibray	Collins (IL)	English (AZ)
Blirakis	Collins (MI)	English (OK)
Bishop	Condit	Eshoo
Blackwell	Conyers	Evans
Bliley	Cooper	Everett
Blute	Coppersmith	Ewing
Boehkert	Costello	Farr
Boehner	Cox	Fawell
Bonilla	Coyne	Fazio
Bonior	Cramer	Fields (LA)
Borski	Crane	Filner

Fingerhut	Leach	Reynolds
Fish	Lehman	Richardson
Flake	Levin	Roemer
Foglietta	Levy	Rogers
Ford (MI)	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher
Ford (TN)	Lewis (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Fowler	Lewis (GA)	Rose
Frank (MA)	Lightfoot	Rostenkowski
Franks (CT)	Linder	Roth
Franks (NJ)	Lipinski	Roukema
Frost	Livingston	Rowland
Gallegly	Lloyd	Roybal-Allard
Gallo	Long	Royce
Gejdenson	Lowey	Rush
Gekas	Machtley	Sabo
Gephardt	Maloney	Sanders
Gibbons	Mann	Sangmeister
Gilchrest	Manton	Santorum
Gillmor	Manzullo	Sarpallus
Gilman	Margolies-	Sawyer
Gingrich	Mezvinsky	Saxton
Glickman	Markey	Schaefer
Gonzalez	Martinez	Schenk
Goodlatte	Matsui	Schiff
Goodling	Mazzoli	Schroeder
Gordon	McCandless	Schumer
Goss	McCloskey	Scott
Grams	McCollum	Serrano
Grandy	McCrery	Sharp
Green	McCurdy	Shaw
Greenwood	McDermott	Shays
Gunderson	McHale	Shepherd
Gutierrez	McHugh	Shuster
Hall (OH)	McInnis	Siskis
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Skaggs
Hamburg	McMillan	Skeen
Hamilton	McNulty	Skelton
Hansen	Meehan	Slattery
Harman	Meek	Slaughter
Hastert	Menendez	Smith (IA)
Hastings	Meyers	Smith (NJ)
Hayes	Mfume	Smith (OR)
Hefley	Mica	Smith (TX)
Hefner	Michel	Snowe
Herger	Miller (CA)	Solomon
Hilliard	Miller (FL)	Spence
Hinche	Mineta	Sperr
Hoagland	Minge	Stark
Hobson	Mink	Stearns
Hochbrueckner	Moakley	Stenholm
Hoekstra	Mollinari	Stokes
Hoke	Mollohan	Strickland
Holden	Montgomery	Studds
Horn	Moorhead	Stupak
Houghton	Moran	Sundquist
Hoyer	Morella	Swett
Huffington	Murphy	Swift
Hughes	Murtha	Synar
Hutchinson	Myers	Talent
Hutto	Nadler	Tanner
Hyde	Natcher	Tauzin
Inglis	Neal (MA)	Tejeda
Inslie	Neal (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Istook	Nussle	Thomas (WY)
Jacobs	Oberstar	Thompson
Jefferson	Olver	Thornton
Johnson (CT)	Ortiz	Thurman
Johnson (GA)	Orton	Torkildsen
Johnson (SD)	Owens	Torres
Johnson, E.B.	Oxley	Towns
Johnson, Sam	Packard	Trafficant
Kanjorski	Pallone	Tucker
Kaptur	Pastor	Unseid
Kasich	Payne (VA)	Upton
Kennedy	Pelosi	Valentine
Kennelly	Penny	Velazquez
Kildee	Peterson (FL)	Vento
Kim	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
King	Petri	Volkmer
Kingston	Pickett	Vucanovich
Kieccka	Pickle	Walsh
Klein	Pombo	Washington
Klink	Pomeroy	Waters
Klug	Porter	Watt
Knollenberg	Portman	Waxman
Kolbe	Poshard	Wheat
Kopetski	Price (NC)	Whitten
Kreidler	Pryce (OH)	Williams
Kyl	Quillen	Wilson
LaFalce	Quinn	Wise
Lambert	Rahall	Wolf
Lancaster	Ramstad	Woolsey
Lantos	Rangel	Wyden
LaRocco	Ravenel	
Laughlin	Reed	
Lazio	Regula	

Wynn	Young (AK)	Zelliff
Yates	Young (FL)	Zimmer
NOES—23		
Bachus (AL)	Hunter	Ridge
Barton	Inhofe	Roberts
Coble	Johnston	Sensenbrenner
Combust	McKinney	Stump
Dornan	Obey	Taylor (MS)
Fields (TX)	Parker	Walker
Geren	Paxon	Weldon
Hancock	Payne (NJ)	
NOT VOTING—5		
Collins (GA)	McDade	Torricelli
Furse	Smith (MI)	

□ 1657

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on September 28, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] offered an amendment which I strongly supported. I ask unanimous consent that the following remarks be placed in the RECORD immediately following rollcall vote No. 472 on the Gephardt amendment:

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, and have a frustrating disagreement regarding the electronic recording of my vote. Therefore to make my position perfectly clear, I would have voted, and, indeed, believe I did vote, in favor of the Gephardt amendment.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SPENCE  
Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SPENCE. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPENCE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2401 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike out section 1041 (page 344, line 9, through page 346, line 13) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

**SEC. 1041. LIMITATION ON PLACING UNITED STATES FORCES UNDER OPERATIONAL CONTROL OF A FOREIGN NATIONAL ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED NATIONS.**

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense may not be obligated or expended for activities of any element of the Armed Forces that after the date of the enactment of this Act is placed under the operational control of a foreign national acting on behalf of the United Nations.

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of any proposed placement of United States Armed Forces under such operational control if the President, not less than 30 days before the date on which such operational control is to become effective, certifies to Congress that such operational control is necessary to protect vital national security interests of the United States.

(c) **REPORT TO ACCOMPANY CERTIFICATION.**—In the case of any certification under subsection (b), the President shall submit with the certification a report setting forth the following:

(1) A description of the vital national security interest that requires the placement of United States forces under the operational control of a foreign national acting on behalf of the United Nations.

(2) The mission of the United States forces involved.

(3) The expected size and composition of the United States forces involved.

(4) The incremental cost to the United States associated with the proposed operation.

(5) The precise command and control relationship between the United States forces involved and the international organization.

(6) The precise command and control relationship between the United States forces involved and the commander of the United States unified command for the region in which the operation is proposed.

(7) The extent to which the United States forces involved will rely on non-United States forces for security and self-defense and an assessment on the ability of those non-United States forces to provide adequate security to the United States forces involved.

(8) The conditions under which the United States forces involved can and would be withdrawn.

(9) The timetable for complete withdrawal of the United States forces involved.

(d) **CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT.**—A report under subsection (c) shall be submitted in unclassified form and, if necessary, in classified form.

(e) **EXCEPTION FOR SMALL FORCES.**—This section does not apply in the case of elements of the Armed Forces involving fewer than 100 members of the Armed Forces in any one country.

(f) **EXCEPTION FOR ONGOING OPERATIONS.**—(1) This section does not apply in the case of activities of the Armed Forces in Somalia pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 814, adopted March 26, 1993 (or any Security Council resolution that is adopted as a successor to that resolution), as part of the United Nations operation designated as the United Nations Peacekeeping Operation in Somalia II (UNOSOM II).

(2) This section does not apply in the case of activities of the Armed Forces in Macedonia pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolutions 795, adopted December 11, 1992, and 842, adopted June 18, 1993, as

part of the United Nations force designated as the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR).

(g) **INTERPRETATION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed as authority for the President to use United States Armed Forces in any operation.

Mr. SPENCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer this motion to address a serious policy issue that has surfaced over the past few months. This is not a partisan motion. It is not a motion in gest. It is a serious motion which deserves the attention of this body.

I am referring to the proposal by this administration to change long-standing U.S. military and foreign policy by allowing American military forces to be placed under the command of foreign officers on a regular basis.

The first step in this direction was taken in Somalia earlier this year when we placed several thousand U.S. troops under the command of a Turkish general acting on behalf of the United Nations.

The next step was taken in Macedonia, where another 300 Americans were placed under the command of a Danish general acting on behalf of the United Nations.

At the same time, the administration has been working on a Presidential Policy Directive or PDD intended to formalize this policy of subordinating U.S. forces to the control of foreign officials.

Mr. Speaker, the substance of this motion is straightforward.

It simply requires that before the President can place American people under the command of a foreign officer acting on behalf of the U.N., he must first certify to the Congress that taking such a step is necessary to protect vital U.S. national security interests.

It is not a prohibition—it is not an infringement on the President's ability to carry out his Commander-in-Chief responsibilities—and it does not affect our current operations in Somalia or Macedonia.

What it does is set a standard on any future deployment of U.S. forces requiring that our young men and women will not have their fate entrusted to foreign control of some foreign officer unless the President determines that it is in our national interest to do so.

□ 1700

It is just that simple, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my good friend, the ranking Republican member

of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], in urging adoption of the motion to recommit H.R. 2401 with instructions.

I want to stress to my colleagues that this motion will make a very simple and long-overdue change in the law. It will require that the President not place our U.S. forces under foreign command in U.N. operations unless he can certify that doing so is necessary to protect vital national security interests of the United States.

This motion is not intended to tie the hands of the President. Rather it is intended to ensure that any decision to place our U.S. forces under foreign command in U.N. operations be well-thought-out.

It will ensure that no American mother will ever be told that her son or daughter died in a foreign-commanded U.N. operation that was not vital to our national interests.

There is nothing unprecedented about this kind of requirement. The law already requires, for instance, that the President not initiate covert actions without first finding that they are important to the national security of the United States, and he is required to report all such findings to Congress in a timely fashion.

I say to my colleagues, if you think our U.S. forces should routinely be placed under foreign command in U.N. operations, you should oppose this motion.

But, if you agree with me that foreign command of our U.S. forces should be the exception rather than the rule, you should support this motion.

Accordingly, I urge a "yes" vote on this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the motion.

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. operation in Somalia is evidence that expanding U.N. command of U.S. forces, which the President is considering, would be a serious mistake.

The United States is the world's sole superpower, and it must act and lead as a superpower, without surrendering to the United Nations its sovereignty or the responsibilities of its own people.

President Clinton is our Nation's Commander in Chief. When U.S. troops are committed, the responsibility is his. It is a constitutional burden that all who sit in the Oval Office must bear. It cannot be transferred to the United Nations or any other foreign entity.

Multinational U.N. operations may sometimes be feasible and desirable. But the command of our forces should never, as a matter of standard policy, be relinquished to the United Nations and accountability for the conduct

of military operations must always rest with the President.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, any and all attempts by this administration to give the United Nations a "blank check" for the use of U.S. combat troops overseas must be stopped.

Are we sending U.S. troops into combat for U.S. national security interests and U.S. military objectives, or are we sending them into combat for U.N. interests and objectives?

Who will be accountable to the American people—the mothers and fathers, wives and husbands, sons and daughters—for sending and keeping these troops in a combat situation? Will it be Bill Clinton or will it be Boutros-Ghali?

How are we going to pay for expanded U.S. military operations under the United Nations while we continue to gut the defense budget? Can we really afford to be the policeman of the world?

If we have learned anything about the use of military force in the last quarter century, it is that once we decide to use force, we must act quickly and decisively with clear objectives. Putting U.S. forces under U.N. command would leave U.S. forces in open ended commitments without decisive action and without clear objectives. The cost would be much more than dollars, it could be American lives.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of my letter to Clinton and a very thoughtful editorial by Senator BYRD.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 19, 1993]

#### THE PERILS OF PEACEKEEPING

(By Robert C. Byrd)

WASHINGTON—The news that the Clinton Administration is considering an expanded role in United Nations peacekeeping operations is cause for concern. The plan would allow American soldiers to serve under foreign commanders on a regular basis. Before adopting any directive embracing this policy, the Administration should allow Congress to debate it thoroughly.

If the plan is carried out, we would face more than the dubious prospect of sending U.S. troops into battle under foreign command. We might also become militarily involved in operations that the American people don't properly understand or support.

Unless there is a national consensus in favor of U.S. involvement, any such military endeavors could be disastrous.

U.N. intervention in Somalia is a case in point. The operation was initially commendable. It's goal was to see that humanitarian aid was delivered to needy Somalis, and U.S. troops performed admirably. But now, with the humanitarian mission successfully completed, the U.N. is trying to rebuild the nation's political structure. This risky experiment could include thousands of U.S. troops.

The deaths of four American soldiers in Mogadishu this month and the overt hostility of Somalis toward U.N. troops show that the operation is quickly crumbling. It is not worth American lives lost and injuries sustained.

Congress has never approved, or even considered, U.S. participation in forcing a polit-

ical reconciliation in Somalia. And there is certainly not a consensus among Americans that such an effort is worth any price in our soldiers' blood. Without a consensus, the likely result of such an operation could be a cut-and-run failure similar to the Beirut disaster of 1982 to 1984.

Lacking Congressional and popular support, U.S. combat forces in Somalia should be removed as soon as possible.

Dedication to U.N. Security Council resolutions and peacekeeping missions should not be used by any Administration to escape the hard job of consensus-building in Washington. Despite a Security Council resolution authorizing member nations to do battle against the marauding Iraqi Army in Kuwait in 1990, the Bush Administration sensibly sought Congressional approval before committing American forces.

The humanitarian mission in Somalia has now been totally eclipsed by a gang war in which the U.S. is taking sides under the U.N. umbrella. In October, the U.N.'s initial six-month mandate there expires. If the mission is extended, additional money will be required.

The U.S. is expected to pay about 30 percent of the U.N.'s peacekeeping bill. The U.N. intervention in Somalia and Bosnia is far more expensive than more traditional peacekeeping and humanitarian relief operations. Congress is already being asked to provide billions of dollars to support the mushrooming ambitions of the U.N. in peacekeeping operations around the world.

On Capitol Hill there is a growing reluctance to write such large checks. Congress has even been reluctant to pay our currently overdue peacekeeping bill. This shows that the Administration will have a tough sell in gaining support for more money. Where will these funds come from? We certainly should not cut spending on domestic needs to pay for foreign adventures.

Yet the White House has requested almost \$1 billion for U.N. obligations in fiscal 1994. By setting aside this huge sum, the Administration could avoid having to come to Congress to get approval for every peacekeeping endeavor it wants to get involved in.

Congress's ability to support or deny financing is critical to insuring its voice in policy making. Until a clear consensus is reached regarding the U.S. role in all peacekeeping matters, Congress should not hand off its constitutional responsibility.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say those whirring sounds you hear are American military dead turning over in their graves at the prospect of command of their forces being turned over to the United Nations, in whose Security Council now sits the Cape Verde Islands, for example. It seems to me the President has an obligation to certify that the particular operation in which our troops are to be under the command of the United Nations is in our national interest. That is not asking a lot; it does not deprive him of his power as commander-in-chief, but it safeguards the command and control of our troops.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me say to all of you this may very well be the most important foreign policy/national security issue that you will debate in this decade, the question of command and control with respect to the use of troops.

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, that with all due respect to my colleagues, this motion to recommit is no way to embrace major policy. I take great pride in what I do as a Member who serves on the Committee on Armed Services, and I am sure that members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs feel the same sense of pride. We should discuss these matters in the normal course of events. We should have a significant discussion, we should have witnesses, we should have a debate, we should come to some determination about these matters, not in a motion to recommit.

We should not be propelled into action without careful considerations. I would say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle, if there is anyone in this body who has not been a puppet of any President irrespective of party, it is this person.

So I am prepared, with the help of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, in the House Armed Services Committee, and I am sure that I speak to a moral certainty as to my colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that we should hold hearings and address this issue seriously and substantively within the framework of the process.

I would first urge my colleagues to withdraw this condition on the motion to recommit. This policy is too important for us to do it in this process. That is now not talking to the merits, simply speaking, to how we ought to do our business with dignity and, as I said, on the most important foreign policy/national security issue we will deal with in this decade.

I hope my colleagues will withdraw it. But in the event they do not, and notwithstanding that discussion, let me make a final few points:

First, with respect to the administration, I will say to my colleagues, the President and the Secretary of Defense oppose this motion to recommit. For those of you who wish to, there is a letter signed by the Secretary of Defense dated today for your perusal that lays out the administration's opposition to this motion to recommit and their reasons.

Let me give you a few of mine: First, this committee dealt with this issue, but without prejudicing the debate or the outcome with respect to whether or not to deploy forces under U.S. command in the U.N. action. The committee bill expands upon the Congress' precious right to authorize the use of troops. We do require at least 30 days' notice before the President undertakes such action.

Second, the administration has committed itself to maintaining national

command and control. You heard those statements from the President of the United States in his most recent statement to the United Nations.

Third, in the post-cold-war world, Mr. Speaker, we must move forward and understand the need to work in these coalition efforts. If we proclaim as national policy that we would not do so, it seems to me we send an extraordinarily negative message to the world at a time when we ought to be moving in coalition efforts to bring sanity and peace to the world.

Finally, during both World War I and World War II, the U.S. combat units did indeed serve under foreign commands. Since the founding of the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, our forces have served under foreign command in U.N. operations in Korea, in the Sinai, in West New Guinea, in Somalia and former Yugoslavia, and others. We have the capacity to make these judgments, and we should do so.

I urge my colleagues, in the event my colleagues on the other side of the aisle persist in offering this amendment, I ask you to reject it. Let us do our job. I guarantee you that the House Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Foreign Affairs will address these matters in due course. It is too important for us to do it frivolously at this moment on a motion to recommit, and I ask my colleagues to do so but I also ask my colleagues to withdraw this amendment. It does harm at a very important point.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce that a recorded vote on final passage, if ordered, will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 238, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 473]

#### AYES—192

Allard	Billrakis	Coble
Andrews (NJ)	Bliley	Collins (GA)
Applegate	Blue	Combest
Archer	Boehlert	Condit
Armey	Boehner	Cox
Bachus (AL)	Bonilla	Crane
Baker (CA)	Bunning	Crapo
Baker (LA)	Burton	Cunningham
Ballenger	Buyer	DeLay
Barcia	Callahan	Diaz-Balart
Barrett (NE)	Calvert	Dickey
Bartlett	Camp	Doolittle
Barton	Canady	Dornan
Bentley	Castle	Dreier
Bereuter	Clinger	Duncan

Dunn	Kim	Ravenel
Emerson	King	Regula
Everett	Kingston	Ridge
Ewing	Klug	Roberts
Fawell	Knollenberg	Rogers
Fields (TX)	Kolbe	Rohrabacher
Fingerhut	Kyl	Ros-Lehtinen
Fish	Lazio	Roth
Fowler	Levy	Roukema
Franks (CT)	Lewis (CA)	Royce
Franks (NJ)	Lewis (FL)	Santorum
Galleghy	Lightfoot	Saxton
Gallo	Linder	Schaefer
Gekas	Lipinski	Schiff
Gilchrist	Livingston	Sensenbrenner
Gillmor	Machtley	Shaw
Gilman	Manzullo	Shays
Gingrich	Mazzoli	Shuster
Goodlatte	McCandless	Skeen
Goodling	McCollum	Slattery
Goss	McCrery	Smith (MI)
Grams	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Grandy	McInnis	Smith (OR)
Greenwood	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Gunderson	McMillan	Snowe
Hall (TX)	McNulty	Solomon
Hancock	Meyers	Spence
Hansen	Mica	Stearns
Hastert	Michel	Stump
Hefley	Miller (FL)	Sundquist
Herger	Molinar	Talent
Hobson	Moorhead	Tanner
Hoekstra	Morella	Tauzin
Hoke	Myers	Taylor (MS)
Horn	Neal (NC)	Taylor (NC)
Houghton	Nussle	Thomas (CA)
Huffington	Oxley	Thomas (WY)
Hunter	Packard	Torkildsen
Hutchinson	Parker	Traffant
Hyde	Paxon	Upton
Inglis	Petri	Vucanovich
Inhofe	Pombo	Walker
Istook	Porter	Walsh
Jacobs	Portman	Weldon
Johnson (CT)	Poshard	Wolf
Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)	Young (AK)
Kaptur	Quillen	Young (FL)
Kasich	Quinn	Zeliff
Kildee	Ramstad	Zimmer

#### NOES—238

Abercromble	Danner	Harman
Ackerman	Darden	Hastings
Andrews (ME)	de la Garza	Hayes
Andrews (TX)	Deal	Hefner
Bacchus (FL)	DeFazio	Hilliard
Baesler	DeLauro	Hinchey
Barca	Dellums	Hoagland
Barlow	Derrick	Hochbrueckner
Barrett (WI)	Deutsch	Holden
Becerra	Dicks	Hoyer
Bellenson	Dingell	Hughes
Berman	Dixon	Hutto
Bevill	Dooley	Inslee
Bilbray	Durbin	Jefferson
Bishop	Edwards (CA)	Johnson (GA)
Blackwell	Edwards (TX)	Johnson (SD)
Bonior	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Borski	English (AZ)	Johnston
Boucher	English (OK)	Kanjorski
Brewster	Eshoo	Kennedy
Brooks	Evans	Kennelly
Browder	Farr	Klecza
Brown (CA)	Fazio	Klein
Brown (FL)	Fields (LA)	Klink
Brown (OH)	Fliner	Kopetski
Bryant	Flake	Kreidler
Byrne	Foglietta	LaFalce
Cantwell	Ford (MI)	Lambert
Cardin	Ford (TN)	Lancaster
Carr	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Chapman	Frost	LaRocco
Clay	Furse	Laughlin
Clayton	Gejdenson	Leach
Clement	Gephardt	Lehman
Clyburn	Geren	Levin
Coleman	Gibbons	Lewis (GA)
Collins (IL)	Glickman	Lloyd
Collins (MI)	Gonzalez	Long
Conyers	Gordon	Lowey
Cooper	Gordon	Maloney
Coppersmith	Gutierrez	Mann
Costello	Hall (OH)	Manton
Coyne	Hamburg	Margolles-
Cramer	Hamilton	Mezvinisky

Markey	Penny	Stark
Martinez	Peterson (FL)	Stenholm
Matsul	Peterson (MN)	Stokes
McCloskey	Pickett	Strickland
McCurdy	Pickle	Studds
McDermott	Pomeroy	Stupak
McHale	Price (NC)	Swett
McKinney	Rahall	Swift
Meehan	Rangel	Synar
Meek	Reed	Tejeda
Menendez	Reynolds	Thompson
Mfume	Richardson	Thornton
Miller (CA)	Roemer	Thurman
Mineta	Rose	Torres
Minge	Rostenkowski	Towns
Mink	Rowland	Tucker
Moakley	Roybal-Allard	Unsoeld
Mollohan	Rush	Valentine
Montgomery	Sabo	Velazquez
Moran	Sanders	Vento
Murphy	Sangmeister	Visclosky
Murtha	Sarpaluis	Volker
Nadler	Sawyer	Washington
Natcher	Schenk	Waters
Neal (MA)	Schroeder	Watt
Oberstar	Schumer	Waxman
Obey	Scott	Wheat
Olver	Serrano	Whitten
Ortiz	Sharp	Williams
Orton	Shepherd	Wilson
Owens	Siskiy	Wise
Pallone	Skaggs	Woolsey
Pastor	Skelton	Wyden
Payne (NJ)	Slaughter	Wynn
Payne (VA)	Smith (IA)	Yates
Pelosi	Spratt	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Bateman	McDade	Torricelli
---------	--------	------------

□ 1725

So the motion to recommit was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, even though the chairman of the Armed Services Committee did a fine job of shepherding through the legislative process this massive Defense authorization bill, I find myself ambivalent about it. On the one hand it contains many good programs for converting some of our defense economy into useful nondefense purposes; on the other, it still contains money which is sorely needed to ease the critical needs of our society which is struggling under the weight of homelessness, poverty, a less than vigorous national economy, a poorly educated citizenry, and many other ills being funded for star wars, ballistic missile systems, and stealth bombers.

The question then is: Are our priorities properly placed? I think not. Sure we Americans must have a strong national defense, but we must also have safe neighborhoods, and a well educated populous who enjoy a quality of life at the very least commensurate with those of their parents.

Now this is not some idyllic dream I am spinning. It is a brief recitation of what has up to now been historically the case with each new generation of Americans.

While I feel certain those who voted against amendments to delete star wars, et cetera from this bill surely believe they were furthering our Nation's quest for peace and/or self-defense, it is my opinion that we as a Nation are missing the mark in our insistence on seeing threats where they do not exist and failing to address the threats that stare us in the face. We do have an ongoing crisis within our shores. As I watch the war that goes on every night in some parts of my district of Chicago and in urban, suburban, and rural communities

across America I wonder if we in this Congress are paying attention. The young men in some of our communities and neighborhoods have a greater chance of being killed in gunfire than soldiers engaged in formal warfare. Yes, today we face threats of ignorance, violence, and poor education systems within the borders of our country that pose just as much of a danger as any foreign power and we must address them.

To reiterate, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has done a significant job on this bill but even though its dollar amounts have been reduced, its total cost is too high. Until we pay attention to the tragic conditions that beset our domestic tranquility, quality of life and overall well-being, I will continue to find it difficult to support more funding for the Department of Defense.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, the Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1994, H.R. 2401, reminds me of the fairy tale of the emperor with no clothes on. I only wish this legislation was a fairy tale.

The massive cuts to our military, reflected both in this bill and in the Clinton administration's "Bottom-up Review," will leave our proud fighting forces naked, without adequate resources or manpower. I oppose this legislation because of the size and timing of the cuts to the military—cuts leading to hollow forces reminiscent of the Carter administration. And while proponents of these draconian cuts applaud and cheer as this Defense budget is paraded through the House, this Member wishes to point out that, indeed, it has no clothes on.

President Clinton intends to cut a minimum of \$127 billion out of the Defense budget over 5 years. While proponents of these cuts argue that the tearing down of the Berlin Wall, the demise of the Warsaw Pact, and the dissolution of the former Soviet Union permits us to make dramatic cuts in the United States Defense budget, the irony is, the world is less safe today than at the height of the cold war. The former Soviet Union still has a huge arsenal and the risk of an accidental or unauthorized launch has increased. Certainly, the recent turmoil in Russia should remind us of this threat. Long range missile technology is proliferating, and within 10 years, the United States will face a number of countries armed with long range nuclear missiles. For example, China is buying ICBM's from Russia and selling arms to Iran, and nuclear proliferation is also rearing its head in North Korea.

The Clinton administration's foreign policy decisions can not be reconciled with their proposed cuts to our military. For the first time, significant numbers of U.S. military men and women are under the command of the United Nations in peacekeeping operations—with the U.S. taxpayer footing much of the bill. Troops are also serving in Somalia and Macedonia and many more may go to missions in Bosnia, Haiti and the Golan Heights. The limitless task of global peacemaking and peacekeeping consumes more and more of a declining U.S. Defense budget.

This Defense bill includes \$16 billion in authorization for environmental expenditures and economic conversion—draining further funds from Defense needs into nonmilitary programs. So in reality, this bill cuts even deeper and puts a greater strain on military resources than is apparent from the raw numbers.

Despite the substantial military build-down since 1986, U.S. military forces have performed spectacularly while serving around the world in a growing variety of missions. In recent years, our troops have been deployed to Libya, Bolivia, the Philippines, Panama, and most notably to the Persian Gulf to participate in Operation Desert Shield/Storm. Our troops have also participated in counternarcotics operations, peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, and humanitarian efforts. But if the cuts proposed in this legislation are enacted, Congress will be asking our men and women in uniform to perform these tasks in socks and a helmet.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 2401 so that the House Armed Services Committee can bring before the House a new bill that places national security issues above arbitrary budget cuts. Jeane Kirkpatrick, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, said, "Clinton's budget cuts too deeply, too quickly to be prudent, and it has been given too little thought." Let's be sure to properly clothe our military.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 2401, the Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1994. This bill does not make enough cuts in wasteful defense programs, and it codifies a shameful, discriminatory policy toward gays in the military. For these reasons, I am voting against the Defense bill.

The cold war is over. The recent signing of the Middle East peace accord shows us that peace is breaking out. But while Members of Congress keep saying that the cold war is over, they are failing to translate the message into sound peacetime spending policies.

In terms of current dollars, America has spent \$231 billion on defense in 1975. This year's bill calls for \$263 billion in defense spending. In 1993—a year when America has no superpower enemy—Congress is considering a bill which spends \$32 billion more than the defense budget that was passed at the height of the cold war. Thanks to the hard work of Armed Services Committee Chairman RON DELLUMS, this bill does make cuts in some of the wasteful Reagan/Bush programs, but we are still far above the spending levels of the cold war. As the threat has gone down, spending has gone up.

During the August district work period, Members of Congress went home and heard their constituents tell them to make more spending cuts. However, when we came back in September to debate this bill, the House of Representatives failed to take the opportunity to cut spending in the most wasteful programs of all—weapons systems which are relics of the cold war and should no longer be a priority for the future of this Nation.

My colleagues had an opportunity to cut funding for star wars by 50 percent and they declined. They had an opportunity to require our allies to bear a greater share of the burden for our operation in Europe, and they declined. Finally, Members of this body had a chance to save the American taxpayers \$10 billion over the next 5 years by voting for an amendment I offered with a few of my colleagues to terminate funding for the Trident D-5 nuclear missile, a relic from the cold war era. Again, they declined. This shows me that

while Members of this body are constantly saying cut spending, they refuse to cut the most wasteful, and expensive, spending programs.

The people I speak with in Marin and Sonoma Counties are not interested in wasting another \$10 billion on more nuclear missiles. They are interested in health care reform, education reform, and reducing the deficit; 37 million people are going without health care, programs like Head Start have not been fully funded, and our deficit continues to rise because we choose to spend money on unnecessary weapons instead of our children. I would hate to go back and tell the people of Marin and Sonoma that we failed to deal with these problems because we are spending \$262 billion on defense. It is time to reorder our Nation's spending priorities.

Mr. Chairman, our Defense budget is not better than it was in 1975, and our policy on gays in the military is no better than the Dark Ages. On the policy of "don't ask/don't tell," I say, don't ask me to support it, don't tell me that it's fair. The proposal contained in this bill would not only gag gay and lesbian soldiers from admitting their sexual orientation to anyone, including family members; it would also prohibit conduct on and off the base. Moreover, it will continue to subject soldiers to unjust investigation and persecution. I find it outrageous that the Department of Defense has wasted hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars to conduct witch hunts, which amount to nothing less than an internal war against the citizens of this country.

In November 1992, the American people elected 110 new Members of Congress because they wanted change. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not see enough change in this bill. I am voting in opposition to the Defense authorization bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MCNULTY]. 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. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Notwithstanding the Chair's prior announcement, this will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 268, noes 162, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

AYES—268

Abercrombie	Bevill	Bryant
Ackerman	Bilbray	Buyer
Andrews (ME)	Bishop	Byrne
Andrews (NJ)	Blackwell	Camp
Andrews (TX)	Blute	Cantwell
Bacchus (FL)	Bonilla	Cardin
Baessler	Bonior	Carr
Ballenger	Borski	Castle
Barca	Boucher	Chapman
Barclay	Brewster	Clay
Barlow	Brooks	Clayton
Bateman	Browder	Clement
Becerra	Brown (CA)	Clinger
Bellenson	Brown (FL)	Clyburn
Berman	Brown (OH)	Coleman

Collins (MI)	Kaptur	Portman
Condit	Kasich	Poshard
Cooper	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Coppersmith	Kennelly	Pryce (OH)
Costello	Kildee	Quinn
Coyne	Kingston	Ravenel
Cramer	Kleczka	Reed
Danner	Klein	Reynolds
Darden	Klink	Richardson
de la Garza	Kopetski	Roemer
Deal	Kreidler	Rose
DeLauro	LaFalce	Rostenkowski
Dellums	Lambert	Rowland
Derrtick	Lancaster	Roybal-Allard
Deutsch	Lantos	Sabo
Dicks	LaRocco	Sangmeister
Dingell	Laughlin	Sarpalius
Dixon	Lazio	Sawyer
Dooley	Leach	Saxton
Durbin	Lehman	Schenk
Edwards (TX)	Levin	Schroeder
Engel	Lewis (CA)	Schumer
English (AZ)	Lewis (GA)	Scott
English (OK)	Lipinski	Serrano
Eshoo	Lloyd	Sharp
Evans	Long	Shepherd
Farr	Lowe	Sisisky
Fazio	Machtley	Skelton
Fields (LA)	Mann	Slattery
Filner	Manton	Slaughter
Fingerhut	Manzullo	Smith (IA)
Flake	Markey	Smith (NJ)
Foglietta	Martinez	Snowe
Ford (MI)	Matsui	Spratt
Ford (TN)	Mazzoli	Stark
Fowler	McCloskey	Stenholm
Frank (MA)	McCurdy	Stokes
Frost	McDermott	Strickland
Gejdenson	McHale	Stupak
Gephardt	McKinney	Sundquist
Geren	McMillan	Swett
Gibbons	McNulty	Swift
Gilchrest	Meehan	Synar
Glickman	Meek	Talent
Gonzalez	Menendez	Tanner
Gordon	Mfume	Tauzin
Grandy	Mneta	Taylor (MS)
Green	Mink	Tejeda
Greenwood	Moakley	Thompson
Gutierrez	Mollohan	Thornton
Hall (OH)	Montgomery	Thurman
Hall (TX)	Moran	Torkildsen
Hamilton	Morella	Torres
Harman	Murtha	Towns
Hastings	Natcher	Trafcant
Hayes	Neal (MA)	Tucker
Hefner	Neal (NC)	Unsoeld
Hilliard	Oberstar	Valentine
Hinche	Obey	Velazquez
Hoagland	Olver	Vislosky
Hochbrueckner	Ortiz	Volkmr
Holden	Orton	Vucanovich
Horn	Oxley	Washington
Hoyer	Pallone	Waters
Hughes	Parker	Watt
Hutto	Pastor	Waxman
Insole	Payne (NJ)	Weldon
Istook	Payne (VA)	Wheat
Jacobs	Pelosi	Whitten
Jefferson	Penny	Williams
Johnson (CT)	Peterson (FL)	Wilson
Johnson (GA)	Pickett	Wise
Johnson (SD)	Pickle	Wynn
Johnson, E.B.	Pomeroy	
Kanjorski	Porter	

## NOES—162

Allard	Burton	Dornan
Applegate	Callahan	Dreier
Archer	Calvert	Duncan
Armey	Canady	Dunn
Bachus (AL)	Coble	Edwards (CA)
Baker (CA)	Collins (GA)	Emerson
Baker (LA)	Collins (IL)	Everett
Barrett (NE)	Combest	Ewing
Barrett (WI)	Conyers	Fawell
Bartlett	Cox	Fields (TX)
Barton	Crane	Fish
Bentley	Crapo	Franks (CT)
Bereuter	Cunningham	Franks (NJ)
Billrakis	DeFazio	Furse
Bliley	DeLay	Galleghy
Boehert	Diaz-Balart	Gallo
Boehner	Dickey	Gekas
Bunning	Doolittle	Gillmor

Gilman	Margolies-	Roukema
Gingrich	Mezvinsky	Royce
Goodlatte	McCandless	Rush
Goodling	McCollum	Sanders
Goss	McCrery	Santorum
Grams	McHugh	Schaefer
Gunderson	McInnis	Schiff
Hamburg	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Hancock	Mica	Shaw
Hansen	Meyers	Shays
Hastert	Michel	Shuster
Hefley	Miller (CA)	Skeen
Herger	Miller (FL)	Smith (MI)
Hobson	Minge	Smith (OR)
Hoekstra	Molinar	Smith (TX)
Hoke	Moorhead	Solomon
Houghton	Murphy	Spence
Huffington	Myers	Stearns
Hunter	Nadler	Studds
Hutchinson	Nussle	Stump
Hyde	Owens	Taylor (NC)
Inglis	Packard	Thomas (CA)
Inhofe	Paxon	Thomas (WY)
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)	Upton
Johnston	Petri	Vento
Kim	Pombo	Walker
King	Quillen	Walsh
Klug	Rahall	Wolf
Knoellenberg	Ramstad	Woolsey
Kolbe	Rangel	Wyden
Kyl	Regula	Yates
Levy	Ridge	Young (AK)
Lewis (FL)	Roberts	Young (FL)
Lightfoot	Rogers	Zeliff
Linder	Rohrabacher	Zimmer
Livingston	Ros-Lehtinen	
Maloney	Roth	

## NOT VOTING—3

McDade	Skaggs	Torricelli
--------	--------	------------

## □ 1742

Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. GILMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on that portion of the bill, H.R. 2401, considered today and the remainder of the bill as passed.

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

There was no objection.

### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2401, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2401, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, H.R. 2401.

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

There was no objection.

### WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3116, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 263 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 263

*Resolved*, That points of order against consideration of the bill (H.R. 3116) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill, all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with "Provided" on page 20, line 17, through "operations" on page 21, line 21; beginning on page 27, line 23, through line 25; beginning on page 108, line 20, through page 109, line 5; and beginning on page 114, line 3, through page 115, line 10, where points of order are waived against only part of a paragraph, a point of order against matter in the balance of the paragraph may be applied only within the balance of the paragraph and not against the entire paragraph. Points of order under clause 2 of rule XXI against the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 263 expedites the consideration of H.R. 3116, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1994, by waiving certain points of order against its consideration and against provisions in the bill.

The rule waives clause 7 of rule XXI against the consideration of the bill.

Clause 7 of rule XXI requires that printed hearings and the bill's report be available for 3 days prior to the consideration of a general appropriation bill. The Committee on Rules has provided this waiver only because the transcripts of the hearings conducted by the Defense Subcommittee in preparation for the fiscal year 1994 bill have not been printed. The bill and report, however, have been, and are, currently available.

Mr. Speaker, with the exception of four provisions of the bill which are specified in the rule, House Resolution 263 also waives clause 2 and clause 6 of rule XXI against the provisions in H.R. 3116. Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits the inclusion of unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill, and clause 6 of that rule prohibits reappropriations in a general appropriations bill.

As Members are aware, the House has just finished its consideration of the fiscal year 1994 Defense authorization, and consequently H.R. 3116 contains unauthorized provisions. The appropriations bill, however, largely tracks the authorization, and in those instances where there are major policy conflicts, the Committee on Rules has deferred to the authorizing committee.

Specifically, the Armed Services Committee objected to the inclusion of \$1 billion in funds for a Carrier Replacement Program which was not included in the authorization. Consequently, the Committee on Rules did not provide a waiver of clause 2 of rule XXI against the specific provision in the bill which provides these funds. In addition, because the carrier provision is found at the beginning of a long paragraph entitled "Shipbuilding and Navy," and because this provision is the only one in that paragraph which was objected to by the authorizing committee, the rule provides a specific protection for the remainder of the paragraph.

The Committee on Rules has also declined to protect the provisos in the paragraph entitled "Global Cooperative Initiatives, Defense-Wide," which prohibit the use of funds for humanitarian or peacekeeping operations unless certain conditions have been met; section 8099, which prohibits the purchase by the Department of Defense of certain cement products; and section 8113, which waives certain requirements of the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act. The inclusion of these provisions in H.R. 3116 was objected to by the authorizing committees with jurisdiction over these matters, and the Rules Committee, therefore, did not provide waivers of clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 263 waives clause 2 of rule XXI points of order against an amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules which accompanies this reso-

lution. This amendment, to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] extends a deadline for DOD, the National Institutes of Health, and the Food and Drug Administration to certify that a large-scale clinical trial of a specific AIDS vaccine should not be performed.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3116 is the last of the 13 appropriations bills to be considered by the House for fiscal year 1994. It is a bill which has been carefully crafted by the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and which reflects the policy decisions that have been recommended to the House by the Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 263 provides for the orderly consideration of this appropriations bill and I urge its adoption in order that the House may complete its consideration of the funding for the Department of Defense prior to the end of the fiscal year. Mr. Speaker, if this bill is to be sent to the President prior to the expiration of the continuing resolution we passed earlier today, Congress must move quickly to finish its work on this most important legislation.

□ 1750

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in the strongest possible opposition to this rule, and I urge every Member who is concerned about the defense of our country to join me in voting against it.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has just told the House, this rule for the Defense appropriations bill is typical of those granted for appropriation bills in that most points of order are waived except for several specified sections. It is those sections that the rule does not protect which are of greatest concern to me, and to those who worry about what might be happening in the next several weeks in a place called Bosnia.

Frankly, I cannot support this bill on final passage if the two sections dealing with peacekeeping and the construction of a new aircraft carrier are knocked out by points of order. Those issues ought to be debated on the floor of this House, and they are not going to be.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed the Defense authorization bill on final passage because I believe that legislation does not provide for an adequate defense of our country. Is that going to ring home in the not-too-distant future.

I am convinced that the authorization bill does not meet the minimum security requirements for this country that were outlined by Secretary Aspin's bottom-up review of our national defense structure. Indeed, Secretary Aspin himself has said publicly that the projected defense spending over the

4-year span of the Clinton administration does not meet the minimum requirements identified by that bottom-up review. I would urge every Member of this House to go back and read it. It is important.

When listening to testimony last week in the Committee on Rules, I became convinced that the appropriators share these same concerns. Accordingly, they put two provisions into this defense appropriations bill which in my view are a significant start in correcting the deficiencies in the authorization bill.

First, the appropriators established some very realistic, very realistic and necessary requirements and conditions with respect to U.S. participation in international peacekeeping operations. People on the other side of the aisle ought to be listening to these conditions, because it is almost as if debate has been turned around here. The world is upside down, and I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELUMS] that he gave a great speech. It sounded like a speech that I ought to be giving on my side of the aisle.

The appropriators put in provisions that require 15-days notice to Congress whenever the administration is going to commit U.S. troops to a peacekeeping operation. The language in this bill before us requires congressional authorization for such participation by our troops, and even more importantly, the appropriators also established a ceiling. They established a ceiling on Defense Department funds that can be transferred into peacekeeping operations.

The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], gave very compelling testimony before the Committee on Rules concerning these provisions. He expressed his serious concern that continued and indefinite and indiscriminate U.S. support for peacekeeping operations, which is about to happen, funded by pirating the readiness accounts in the defense budget, run the grave risk of hollowing out our active duty forces.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] warned in the strongest possible terms against a return to the hollow forces of the late 1970's. My God, every one of us sitting here remembers that. When our troops were stationed in Germany and Korea, their families back home were on food stamps because we were improperly funding the defense needs of our country. We are on our way right back to that very situation.

During the present fiscal year alone, the United States has spent more than \$1.3 billion in support of peacekeeping operations, at the expense of maintaining the readiness of our own regular forces. I am holding right here in my hand an itemized list. Do the Members

want to hear the names? Somalia, Iraq, Angola, Cambodia, El Salvador, the Western Sahara, the former Yugoslavia—that means Macedonia and Bosnia. We have already spent \$1.3 billion in these peacekeeping efforts in civil wars around the world.

Come and take a look at this list. It is going to be 10 times bigger than that in the next 3 months. Believe me, \$1.3 billion hardly represents a downpayment compared to the bill that will come due if and when the administration commits 25,000 United States troops into Bosnia. Do the Members know how much that will cost per day? Millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, our ongoing participation in Somalia has become, in my opinion, a monstrous folly. Getting involved in the swamp known as the Balkans is not only monstrous folly, it is insanity. Adolph Hitler put 42 divisions, 200,000 men, into the Balkans and they were picked off 1 and 2 and 10 at a time by snipers. What do we think is going to happen to American troops over there? The same thing is going to happen.

The social, ethnic, and religious conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, however tragic that situation may be, have defied resolution for centuries. We are not going to solve it with 25,000 troops or 50,000 troops or 200,000 troops. No outside force has ever gone in there and figured out a solution, not even with hundreds of thousands of troops at their disposal.

Mr. Speaker, I greatly fear that the administration is getting us for a debacle in Bosnia that will make the Somali operation look like a success story by comparison. That is why the provisions, the restraints that the appropriators inserted in this bill, are so terribly necessary. I can say only one thing to my friends on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, so many of whom I served with for so many years. If the Members knock out the peacekeeping provisions in this bill on a point of order, and they are coming to this floor tomorrow to do it, at the request of President Clinton, the Committee on Foreign Affairs had better be prepared to bring their own alternative to the floor in the very near future. The Members know that is not going to happen. That is why it is important that we maintain it in this bill today.

The debate we had yesterday concerning Somalia was thanks to the initiative of the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], sitting next to me, who insisted that the sense-of-Congress language be put in the Defense authorization bill. Fortunately, the House had sense enough to do that.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs as a whole, in my estimation, however, has been derelict in its duty by letting this whole issue go this far without having done anything.

□ 1800

I sincerely hope that the committee will come up with a legislative vehicle that will provide this House with an opportunity to have a comprehensive debate on the subject of peacekeeping. It is the most important issue facing this Nation today, because we are talking about lives. This debate absolutely must take place before a single United States soldier sets foot in Bosnia.

Now the second item, Mr. Speaker, that I am concerned about in this bill is the provision that provides for a \$1 billion appropriation toward the construction of a new aircraft carrier. Why should we be concerned about that?

This provision is also subject to a point of order, according to the rule. It is my understanding, based on the testimony presented in the Rules Committee, that the appropriators included this provision as a way to anticipating the Clinton administration's expected request for such a carrier in the fiscal year 1995, next year out, defense budget.

I would note further that the bottom-up review, which I do not think 50 Members of this body have read, called for the construction of an additional carrier to replace one presently in service which is more than 40 years old. Ladies and gentlemen, we owe it to the men and women in service to give them the best.

By starting construction this year, and this is where all fiscal conservatives ought to pay attention, by starting construction this year the eventual cost of finishing the carrier would be reduced by \$300 million. Members know we are drowning in a sea of red ink. We have a chance here tonight to save \$300 million, and yes we are going to flush it down the drain. We are going to add \$300 million to the cost of that carrier by putting off the funding until next year.

Again, the Rules Committee leaves this provision unprotected, a provision which has bipartisan support, wide support on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, the provision on peacekeeping will save American lives by the thousands, if we are able to debate that on this floor. The provision for the new carrier will save taxpayers millions of dollars.

This rule does the irresponsible thing. The Rules Committee, by leaving these two provisions unprotected, will not give us important debate on the floor tomorrow because two Members of Congress will stand up and knock these provisions out on points of order.

That is why we ought to vote down this rule and come back here with a good rule and a real debate. We are not talking about pork-barrel projects. We are not talking about domestic projects. We are talking about the defense of this country and the lives of American men and women, the All-Vol-

unteer Force that serves our country. Why can we not debate this on the floor? We owe it to our troops and we owe it to our constituents back home to vote down this rule. I urge defeat of it.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the chairman of the authorizing committee.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of my distinguished colleague from New York, because I did listen to every word that my colleague uttered this evening. There are a number of remarks that the gentleman made that I would like to respond to, but time does not permit. Let me go to the salient issue.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me raise this rhetorical question: How many times, I would ask my colleagues, have we been asked to vote against rules that waive points of order? How many times? More times than I can count, Mr. Speaker.

It sets history on its head. It takes me aback. It is shocking to me to hear tonight on the floor of this body that the gentleman is asking us to oppose a rule that does not waive all points of order. We cannot walk both sides of the street simultaneously, unless your legs are pretty wide open, and when they are, Mr. Speaker, you stand pretty vulnerable.

The gentleman from New York is my good friend and I respect him. He says one person can rise to raise a point of order. I do not stand here in the capacity of one person. This is not an ego trip. This is no personal issue. I stand here as the chairperson of the authorizing committee charged with a responsibility. It sets history on its head, Mr. Speaker, when you argue to sanction violations of a process that the gentleman from New York and I have already marched into the well on numerous occasions to defend, that the integrity of the process must be maintained.

Let us come specifically to the carrier. Let me say something to my colleague. We asked for a point of order to be allowed against a \$1 billion appropriation, against a \$4.8 billion weapons system. Now that is not an accommodation. That is real money.

Mr. Speaker, the bill says appropriation based on authorization. First, to simply say that is a prima facie case that that is a weapons system that is not authorized.

Second, I would say to the gentleman from New York, this weapons system was not even requested in fiscal year 1994.

Now to the integrity of the process. "If authorized." The House authorization bill did not authorize it, it does not appear anywhere in the companion

report of the fiscal year 1994 authorization bill just passed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, further, in the other body, the companion bill of the DOD authorization for fiscal year 1994 also did not authorize this weapons system. Their report does not speak to it.

To the gentleman from New York I would ask this question that he might answer in his time: If the bill says appropriate upon authorization, and the House authorization bill did not authorize it, the Senate authorization bill did not authorize it, the only way that it can be authorized in fiscal year 1994 is both bodies to report back in a conference report \$1 billion out of scope, where is the precedent for coming back to a body \$1 billion out of scope? I would suggest that logic stands on this gentleman's side. If you can authorize the bill in fiscal year 1994, and you say you cannot appropriate until you authorize, and you cannot authorize until fiscal year 1995, then query: Why then encumber \$1 billion in budget authority to appropriate in fiscal year 1994 saying that it is sitting there waiting so some businessman says well, if I can take this money from 1994, sit it there until we authorize, on October 1 we can rush to start signing contracts.

Mr. Speaker, we on the House Armed Services Committee take our jobs very seriously. I will say to the gentleman from New York if we have rules here, how can we argue to votedown a rule because it waives points of order? We ought to maintain the integrity of the authorizing process. But then when it comes to defense we say but, let us set that aside. Do you want a kangaroo court here, do you want rules that govern different subject matters in different ways? Then this would be a bizarre experience. There has to be some continuity. This would be a bizarre experience. So there has to be some way.

You can say yes in the authorizing process. You can say no in the appropriation process. But you cannot turn that around. You cannot say no authorization and yes in the appropriation. That is the rules that were set up before I came here, Mr. Speaker, so I am not here on some personal trip. That is insulting. I am not here on some ego trip, some turf war. That is insulting.

Either this body operates on discipline, it operates on principle, it operates on integrity, or it does not.

So this is not a personal fight here. This is not some one-man show.

Finally, I would say in order to get beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I met with the Democratic caucus of our committee and I said I serve at your pleasure, what do you wish to do. I am prepared as the chair of the committee to tell you what I think, but you act. If you want to blink, blink. If you do not want us to blink, then do not blink. They said do not blink. That is why I am here.

I ask Members to support this rule. Give us the opportunity to maintain the integrity of the process.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume, briefly, to respond to one of the people whom I respect most in this House. I have always respected him over all of these years, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. RON DELLUMS. He has grown in further respect by the membership of this entire House in the way he has conducted himself, believe me, and I have said that a number of times. I mean it sincerely, so in no way would I ever want to insult the gentleman, because he is extremely capable and sincere in everything that he does.

Mr. DELLUMS. I stand corrected and thank the gentleman.

Mr. SOLOMON. Having said that, let me just point out that the authorizers, when they came before the Rules Committee, asked for restrictive rules. The rules did limit what we could do in the way of amendments on the authorization bill.

□ 1810

Let me finish and I will yield to the gentleman.

Furthermore, we went on for some 7 weeks now, putting out four rules. That ties a record for the number of rules dealing with a single piece of legislation.

Let me say to the gentleman that I am not as concerned about the aircraft carrier as I am about the other issue. I am concerned about the aircraft carrier because it saves \$300 million, and any time we can do that we ought to be doing it.

What I am really concerned about, I will say to the gentleman, is the other provision that is being left subject to a point of order, namely peacekeeping.

You know, if we put ourselves in a position—and I served in the U.S. Marine Corps and know what it is to be the military—if our troops are put in Bosnia, it is going to be very hard for this gentleman here to cut off funding for them and bring them home. I am going to owe it to them to support them.

Therefore, before that happens, I want the opportunity to be able to say to the President on behalf of the American people that we do not want those troops placed into a civil war situation in the Balkan countries.

Having said that, let me just read to you what we are arguing about. This is the language at issue in the bill. It prohibits the use of funds for humanitarian or peacekeeping operations unless—the President notifies Congress at least 15 days before approving the operation. That gives us the opportunity for debate before the fact, and not after the fact.

We owe that to these young men and women.

No. 2, the President specifies the estimated costs, method of payment, duration, and scope of the operation, and States the United States interest and goals that will be served by the operation. That is reasonable to request.

No. 3, the funds for such operations are derived only from operations provided under the heading of global cooperative initiatives for humanitarian assistance.

That limits the amount the administration can spend on peacekeeping efforts to about \$380 million, almost half a billion dollars, without coming back to this Congress and asking permission to continue.

This to me is reasonable language to include. And we could do it because it is for the defense of this country. It is not arguing over whether we are going to spend money on this domestic program or that one; it is for the defense of the country. We ought to have that debate.

Then, if Mr. LEE HAMILTON, the gentleman from Indiana, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, wants to come to this floor and offer an amendment to strike this language, we have the debate and an opportunity to vote "yes" or "no." But let's have the debate; don't short circuit the whole thing by a simple point of order.

I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] the appropriators are right.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, a point of clarification: My point of order does not go to the gentleman's latter point, as he well knows.

Mr. SOLOMON. I know it does not.

Mr. DELLUMS. This gentleman's point goes only to the appropriation of the carrier that has not been requested, nor authorized.

Secondly, I know the gentleman was sitting there the day I walked into the Committee on Rules for the first time as chair of the Committee on Armed Services. I said to the gentlemen that you can fashion whatever rule you choose, and I did not walk in the door offering any restrictions. I said that I am prepared to live with whatever the Rules Committee fashioned in order for the deliberation of the debate.

So the gentleman is not speaking to this person.

I was prepared to live with the open rule or whatever rule.

So the rule that got laid down the Rules Committee laid down; this gentleman did not walk in and ask you for some limited rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is absolutely right, and I am not criticizing the gentleman. I am criticizing the rule. I am asking every Member to vote

"no" on the rule. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished ranking Republican member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

I share Mr. SOLOMON's concerns about the arbitrary manner in which the Rules Committee majority has exercised its power on this and other bills to prevent important issues from coming to the floor.

One significant item in this bill that this rule will keep from the floor is a provision concerning the so-called global cooperative initiative which is the new Defense Department program established by the administration to significantly step up our Nation's participation in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

I have previously raised serious concerns about this global cooperative initiative. The provision that this rule will keep from the floor would impose some very sensible restrictions on Defense Department support for and involvement in U.N. peacekeeping operations pursuant to the global cooperative initiative.

It is unfortunate that the Members of this House will once again be denied an opportunity to debate and vote on this very significant matter.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on this issue probably looking at it a bit differently than others do. But first let me address myself to the gentleman from New York. I have deep concerns regarding the proposed peacekeeping thoughts and suggestions. I have communicated with the White House an entire set of conditions that they should consider before any peacekeeping is to be instituted in Bosnia. So I understand whence you come on that issue.

Our committee—and as the gentleman knows, I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services, the authorizing committee—our committee did not have anything to do with that issue on peacekeeping. But I understand whence you come, and I want the gentleman to know that I have made my position quite clear at the White House on the conditions that ought to be taken into consideration.

And I think they would be parallel to some of the gentleman's conditions.

I do speak, however, on the issue dealing with the aircraft carrier. I look at it, I am sure, in a different light than my chairman. This was not asked for by the administration. It was not authorized by our committee.

I will probably help lead the charge for an aircraft carrier when it is recommended and requested. I feel very strongly about the seapower of our Nation.

But what happens in this instance where we have gone through a machination of trying to crunch numbers and fit them all together to make them come out, doing our best to have enough training, operation, maintenance, and a respectable number of young men and young women in uniform, plus the other systems that go into it. I am fearful that if we at the last minute, without all the previous time which we should have had, had they asked for the aircraft carrier we could have done it and found where you would take the money from. At this date, what happens? The only easy place to take money is from the end strength; that is, you cut people out of uniform. You get 100 cents on the dollar when you do that.

For that billion dollars, let me say this, the average salary cost on a man-year basis for a serviceman or woman is \$35,000 per year. On that basis we could use that billion dollars toward an aircraft carrier to pay the salaries of 28,600 troops. That is 28,600 service members that we could keep on active duty if that billion dollars were not spent on the aircraft carrier.

Now, if that is to become a part of the budget, the quick way to find the billion dollars is right out of the end strength of those and we end up at least cutting 28,600 additional troops. We do not want that.

Let me go on and tell you my concerns because I think you on the other side of the aisle will understand and agree with me. We have additional duties coming up, like it or not, in the peacekeeping area. I am convinced that when the bottom-up review refers to 10 Army divisions, for instance—a division slice is 48,000—that is 480,000 troops plus the training and the doctrine command, which would be 42,000, that is 522,000 soldiers, bottom.

□ 1820

I think it is too low, but in addition to that, if we have peacekeeping efforts, those people in peacekeeping should be over and above those troops, because it is those troops that give us the capability of fighting a successful conflict on two fronts. Frankly, it is not enough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] has expired.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that should we enter into peacekeeping duties, we will need around 60,000 people for that. Do you take them out of hide or do you take them in addition thereto?

So what we are looking at is additional soldiers and sailors, people in uniform, rather than cutting.

An aircraft carrier that has not been taken into consideration by an authorization committee causes a cut in troop strength. I am truthfully concerned about that. I want the Members of this body to understand, I feel very strongly about keeping a high level of troops, keeping a high level of training for them.

I will be for the aircraft carrier, but we have to make sure that the troops are not cut in the process. That is a deadly serious situation. We have to consider that. If we do it properly, and hopefully we will, I assure the gentleman on the other side that I will lead the charge for that aircraft carrier, but I do not want our troops to get cut. Frankly, we are going to need more if we have any type of peacekeeping obligations in the future.

I hope those on the other side will help me find those additional troops when that time comes, because there will be a major battle on this floor comes the time for the budget consideration, and I hope to do my best to make sure we have sufficient troops, sailors, marines, soldiers, and airmen, to meet our commitments throughout this world.

I hate to see anything even as important and vital as an aircraft carrier to invade that number and to hurt the possibility of keeping our end strength at a proper level.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman who just spoke that he is one of the most respected Members of this House; particularly in the chairmanship of the subcommittee that he chairs, he certainly does look out for those troops.

Mr. Speaker, I yield time to another respected Member, one from the State of Florida. He is also a member of the Intelligence Committee, and he is the ranking Republican on the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

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

I had no intention of getting into this debate on the rule, but I was astonished at some of the debate I heard between the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking member of the Rules Committee, about the issue of an aircraft carrier.

The question was whether or not the Appropriations Committee was funding

an aircraft carrier that had not been authorized. I would remind the very distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee that last year his committee authorized nearly \$1 billion for advanced procurement on this specific aircraft carrier. Our committee appropriated the funds to go along with that authorization.

Now we are talking about dropping out a year. The Navy has told us if we drop out a year, that aircraft carrier is going to cost at least \$200 million more than it would if we proceed with the funding included in the bill we will consider tomorrow morning.

Now, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], the very distinguished gentleman, raised the issue of end strength. There is no doubt in this Member's mind that we have reduced the end strength to a level that I think is dangerous, but listen to this, the end strength that we provide in the appropriations bill is exactly the end strength authorized by the gentleman's committee, and in the area of end strength for Reserves we have actually gone beyond the authorization and appropriated for an additional 7,000 personnel end strength for Reserves.

So the arguments that the carrier is not authorized are hollow, because the carrier advanced procurement was authorized last year by the gentleman's committee.

On the end strength argument, we have actually appropriated for more end strength than the Armed Services Committee authorized.

I think the arguments made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in opposition to this rule are valid arguments. I think the arguments of the distinguished gentleman who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee, while they might be articulate, which he always is, do not really address the issue as it exists today.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his cogent remarks.

I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the gentleman yielding this time to me.

Certainly within the 3 minutes there is a lot more that needs to be said than I can possibly say; but one aspect of this discussion needs to be addressed and is not being addressed, and that is to the extent we are in this position where legitimately the chairman of the Armed Services Committee can call this proposal for the aircraft carrier unauthorized and where we risk costing the taxpayers of America over \$200 million if we delay funding the aircraft carrier in this session, and when you bear in mind that we now operate

under rules as to authorization and the other workings of authorization and the Appropriations Committee designed long before we had the accounting rules that now go to how you score outlays and budget authority and how you match one with the other and how the timing in which the authorizers act relative to when the appropriators are required to act, we have some incredible mixed mishmash of how we make the gears of our wheels mesh in order to cogently and rationally legislate.

I would call upon all the Members of this body, especially those on the Rules Committee, to address this problem and how the Rules of the House need to be changed so that we do not have to make unintelligent, even silly, stupid public policy decisions, because of the complexities of our rules and their inability to match the reality in which we need to make public policy decisions.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it does strike this Member as odd that we say something we appropriated and authorized \$832 million for last year is an unauthorized activity or project. That strikes me as strange. It strikes me as strange that if the appropriators have said in funding something that none of this money can be obligated until it has been finally formally and officially authorized that this is a substantial accommodation.

I do not understand this in the context that we may be depriving our taxpayers of America of \$200 million unnecessarily for a defense platform that I think every knowledgeable person on the authorizing and Appropriations Committee feels is one of our most vitally important platforms and which is justified under the bottom-up review.

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

Mr. BATEMAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, where does the gentleman seek to find the \$1 billion? The gentleman served with me on the committee as we assiduously went about the business of putting together a \$263 billion military budget that all fit. Where would the gentleman find this additional \$1 billion?

Mr. BATEMAN. I would say to my chairman that that is indeed a problem and one which needs to be addressed and should be addressed.

I do not know. No one has been able to tell me what the Appropriations Committee has done or not done in order to make it possible to at least appropriate conditionally the \$1 billion.

□ 1830

But we have a long ways to go before we will ever enact either an authorization bill that gets signed into law and passes this Congress in an appropriations bill, and what we ought to be doing is seeing that we go forward together in order to do it the logical way

in order that we do not hamstring the end strength of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] and the personnel account, but at the same time we get the platform, and we get it in a way in a timetable that avoids wasting \$200 million. That is my plea.

Mr. Speaker, the concluding point I want to make is: I am not quarreling with my chairman, or anyone else on the authorizing committee. The only committees I serve on are authorizing committees. I, too, am jealous of their prerogatives, but certainly there is enough wisdom, enough judgment, and enough responsibility in this body that we can come together in a way that we do the practical, common sense thing that serves the public interest and our national security.

We have a rule which, if passed, makes the carrier subject to a point of order. It may be subject to a point of order, but it does not require a point of order, and logic would dictate that no point of order should be raised, even if it can.

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

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] really backs up what I have been saying: "You cannot pinpoint where the billion dollars comes from."

We went through a very arduous procedure of piecing together a \$263 billion defense authorization bill. I am for the carrier, but where in the world are we going to find—

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

Mr. SKELTON. I will tell the gentleman where to find it.

Mr. BATEMAN. The one thing that is not being done: It has not been taken out of personnel to this point, and we can make sure that it does not get done this way before we are through and does get done in the most responsible way.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire what time remains for each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MCNULTY]. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, let me just respond.

First of all, this is a debate on the rule. The rule goes to the question of the process that governs how we do business here. We are trying to change this debate into a discussion about the carrier. This debate is about the integrity of the process, or the lack thereof, and Members' willingness or ability to make judgments in that regard.

Having said that, let me just now come to both the process and the substance.

I say to the gentleman. A carrier is probably more important to the Navy than anything else. If they had wanted it, why did they not ask the authorizing committee? As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] pointed out, he was prepared to support it, and, if you had asked me, I would imagine that the majority of my colleagues would support it. But why did they not ask if it was that important?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard this figure: \$200 million. We are going to save the taxpayers \$200 million. Where did that figure come from? Did it drop from the air? Did it come from our committee?

No. Some CEO said, "If you guys appropriate the money and authorize it, I can show you where I can save you \$200 million." Yet these are the guys that have never built a ship with the money they said they would build it on in history.

Mr. Speaker, we are replete with cost overruns, so suddenly there is going to be this great accuracy of this \$200 million? Give me a break.

Now my distinguished colleague said he could not answer the question of where would the money come from. That is precisely the responsibility of the authorizing committee, to determine those judgments within the framework of intelligent and rational policy considerations, policy discussions.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield and I will answer the question?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, just one second, and I will come back to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] because I want answered one other question.

The gentleman from Florida said \$800 million was authorized by this committee last year, long-lead items.

No. 1, this gentleman was not the chair last year; but, No. 2, that \$800 million for long-lead items was for a nuclear propulsion system that routinely is requested 2 years in advance of the request and authorization because it takes a substantial amount of time in order to build that nuclear propulsion system. So, there is nothing off-color or unusual about that. But the request has not been made.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, No. 1, this is not a debate about the carrier. That ought to be dealt with in the normal course of things. This is a debate about the process, the integrity or the lack thereof. I am suggesting to you that it sets this institution on its head when my colleagues, day after day, come here banging against rules that waive points of order, and we simply ask for a rule that gives point of order, and suddenly they are saying, "Defeat the rule."

I say, "You can't walk both sides of the street."

Finally, let the administration ask in the normal course of things, and let us

do our job in the normal course of events.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just say to the gentleman, "You wanted to know where the money is going to come from. Let me give you two very good sources: First of all, bring our troops home from Somalia. We'll save \$500 million in the next few months alone. Do not deploy our troops in Bosnia, and we will save hundreds of millions of dollars over the next 7 to 8 months. That more than pays for any carrier, believe me, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will take that into consideration.

Mr. DELLUMS. I would simply say to my colleague on both of those issues:

On the issue of Somalia, my colleague, that is going to be a debate that is going to go into the future. The gentleman and I know that. We know we are going to ultimately resolve that matter. The question of Bosnia is a debate that lies before us, an the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] knows where this gentleman stands on that, the authority and responsibility of Congress in war making and my concern about war powers.

I come back to the issue: Why are we appropriating in fiscal year 1994 \$1 billion for a \$5 billion weapon system that cannot legally be authorized until fiscal year 1995?

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee, and I know that my colleague has spoken on this already, but we saw an opportunity because long lead had already been approved by the authorization committee to put in \$1 billion because of this complex relationship, and we felt, because of the interrelationship of outlays and budget authority, we had an opportunity to invest \$1 billion in the carrier, which is needed. We are going to build it, we know we are going to build it, and, because of that, by doing that, and this is the point I heard the gentleman make when I first came to the floor.

I called the Secretary of the Navy. I called the Chief of Naval Operations. I said, "Is this \$200 million number real?"

I was told, "Yes, we will save in the acquisition of the carrier \$200 million."

Now I know that sometimes these numbers get stretched, sometimes by contractors, but this came right from the top leadership of the U.S. Navy.

Mr. DELLUMS. If I might reclaim my time for a moment—

Mr. DICKS. And so we just thought it was a good investment. We—

Mr. DELLUMS. I will yield back, but I would like to reclaim my time at this point because I think the record should be complete.

Mr. DICKS. Yes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I have talked with the Deputy Secretary of Defense who said they did not, while they may have wanted it. I said, "Why didn't you ask?"

They said, "We didn't, and we're not trying to go around the authorizing process."

They said that as a matter of fact and as a matter of record, my friend. The administration should not be about going around the authorization process—

Mr. DICKS. They were just—

Mr. DELLUMS. They—

Mr. DICKS. The number of \$200 million, of whether that was a real number, and they said, "Yes, that was a real number." They did not say they were asking us to do it. They wanted the whole carrier.

Mr. DELLUMS. One other thing they agreed with me on is that in the course of the markup they did have ample opportunity to penetrate the process with a request on a timely enough basis that we could have considered it ordinarily within the framework of H.R. 2401. They agreed with me in that regard.

So, my question is: "Why wasn't it done?"

One last comment, Mr. Speaker.

During the authorization process I tried to maintain the integrity of keeping the playing field level.

□ 1840

What this does is it unlevels the playing field. You start down the road on this defense conversion effort here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Chair would advise that each side has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the chief deputy whip.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to comment to those who ask, where is the money coming from? It is going to come from the same place every other dollar comes from, and that is the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the chairman, this bill we consider tomorrow, the appropriations bill that includes this amount, is under the 602(b) allocation budget authority, as well as outlay.

I would like to, if I may, make just one further comment. The reason that we are having this debate today, I would say to the gentleman, on the subject of the carrier, is because tomorrow, once the gentleman makes his

point or order, we are not going to be able to have any debate on the subject of the carrier. So, when the iron is hot, you strike, or whatever the cliché is. That is why we are doing it today, because I think the gentleman is going to preempt us tomorrow.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think this discussion of process here has been fascinating this evening. I have enjoyed it. It is a little interesting, the fact that they do waive points of order on 95 percent of the bill, because the fact is none of this is authorized and will not be authorized by the time this bill becomes law. So to suggest that somehow we can carve out one or two little territories here and that is destructive of the process, the fact is the rule coming down here waives about 95 percent of the bill. But they leave a couple of places where they are going to allow no debate.

One of the places that is particularly of concern to me, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] suggested is of concern to him also, is the introduction of peacekeeping forces possibly into Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why that becomes important is because when the authorization bill was here, it was here under a closed rule, where typically we would have been able to offer language under an open rule to deal with this matter. But we were prevented from offering amendments. We could not even offer amendments on the authorization bill to knock out pork projects that were protected by the Committee on Rules.

In the case of the introduction of military troops on peacekeeping missions, we were not able to address that issue. The Committee on Appropriations found the need to address that issue so compelling that they included it in their bill.

Mr. Speaker, what happens? Well, now the rules process is used to see to it that we will never get to debate it under the appropriations process either.

So what has happened here is the rules process has been used to prevent this House from debating whether or not peacekeeping forces ought to be put into Bosnia without congressional approval. That is wrong. That is the use of the process, that is the use of governance, in the wrong way.

We ought to have a right to debate that issue. It is a fundamentally important issue at this point. Young men and young women are going to be sent to die in Bosnia, and we are not going to even have a chance to debate it beforehand. This administration does not want us to have that debate on this floor, because they feel that debate might embarrass them. It is wrong not to have that debate, and this rule prevents us from having that debate. It should be turned down.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 4 minutes

to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

Mr. Speaker, I operate a little bit at a disadvantage here because I did not hear all of the previous statements with regard to the waiver. As I understand it, the rule does not protect the provision from objection, and it is my intention to object.

Now, it is not my intention to be obstreperous here. It is true that the particular language is authorizing language, which, as I understand it, very clearly falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

That is a parochial argument. It is an argument on the basis of protecting the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is really not, however, the most important thing to be said here.

It just so happens that this whole business of peacekeeping is a threshold issue in this Congress at this time. It is a very important issue, we all recognize that. The provision that has been drafted has been drafted with the best of intentions, but it could be a very mischievous provision.

It is a provision that is strongly opposed by the administration. It is a provision which they believe seriously hampers the power of the Commander in Chief. It is a provision that, as they have stated to me, they object to seriously enough that it would make this bill subject to a veto.

Now, I want to say to my friends who support this provision that I understand their motivation here, and I think it is a motivation that is worthy, because they are deeply concerned about peacekeeping here, and this 15-day prenotification provision calls for good information.

But let me just argue not to proceed too quickly. This is a very tough, difficult issue. The way this particular provision is drafted, it raised very grave concern on the part of the President, the Commander in Chief, as to whether the exercise of the powers of the Commander in Chief would in fact be seriously hampered.

That is the reason I intend to object to this tomorrow. Not to be obstreperous, but because I think we are acting too quickly on a very grave matter.

I do want to say that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and other committees here are working very closely now with the administration on the whole question of a better consultative mechanism than we now have. Some of us saw that in action last week as the administration came up with prior consultation with respect to the introduction of troops, possibly into Bosnia under the peace agreement. I think we are moving in the right direction.

I also want to say that with regard to the remarks of the gentleman who just

spoke, his deep concern about Bosnia; that is a legitimate concern, obviously. It is my very strong view that if American forces are introduced into Bosnia as part of a peacekeeping agreement, that those steps should be authorized by the Congress. The administration agrees with that position. There is no intent, as I understand it, no intent to introduce American forces into Bosnia as part of a peacekeeping agreement without getting the authorization of the United States Congress.

That is my strong view. So far as I can understand it, it is the strong view of the administration. And everybody in this chamber is quite right to be concerned about Presidents acting without the authorization of Congress there.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the opportunity to make these observations.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is one of the most respected Members of this House. I served with him for years on that committee. Much of what the gentleman says is true. I hope the President does come and ask permission to put these troops in.

However, there is no guarantee that that is going to happen. What the argument is today is over this language. It simply says the President notifies Congress at least 15 days before the operation. The gentleman agrees with that, so why not write it into the bill.

The second portion says, and this is so terribly important to the American people, that the President specifies the estimated cost, the method of payment, the duration and scope of the operation, and states the U.S. interests and goals that will be served by that operation.

We do not believe that a civil war warrants any U.S. participation, and we want that explained to us. This simply says the President will explain it to us.

Mr. Speaker, this may be the only vote that Members have on whether we put American troops into a civil war in Bosnia. If Members defeat this rule, it will not only save \$300 million on the aircraft carrier issue, but, more importantly, it will save American lives.

□ 1850

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

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I are not really, I do not think, in too much difference here.

The gentleman supports this particular provision, but there may be times

when the President cannot notify the gentleman 15 days ahead of time. We do not write something that arbitrary into the law.

There has been a lot of complaining done about micromanagement of the executive power. This is a classic illustration of it.

We are micromanaging a President and saying that he must give us 15 days. There may be occasions when he cannot give us 15 days.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time I say to my good friend, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] is one of the most respected Members of this House. He would never do anything to impair the Commander in Chief of the United States of America. This is his language. He believes in it. We believe in it.

Members ought to vote "no" on this rule so that we can keep that language in the bill.

Vote "no."

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The issues here have been adequately aired. We have had eloquent speeches on both sides.

The Committee on Rules has tried to be fair and reasonable in its approach, and I urge the adoption of this rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 176, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

YEAS—254

Abercromble	Brewster	Coppersmith
Ackerman	Brooks	Costello
Andrews (ME)	Browder	Coyne
Andrews (NJ)	Brown (CA)	Cramer
Andrews (TX)	Brown (FL)	Danner
Applegate	Brown (OH)	Darden
Bacchus (FL)	Bryant	de la Garza
Baessler	Byrne	Deal
Barca	Cantwell	DeFazio
Barcia	Cardin	DeLauro
Barlow	Carr	Dellums
Barrett (WI)	Chapman	Derrick
Becerra	Clay	Deutsch
Bellenson	Clayton	Dicks
Berman	Clement	Dingell
Bevill	Clyburn	Dixon
Bilbray	Coleman	Dooley
Bishop	Collins (IL)	Durbin
Blackwell	Collins (MI)	Edwards (CA)
Bonior	Condit	Edwards (TX)
Borski	Conyers	Engel
Boucher	Cooper	English (AZ)

English (OK)	Lewis (GA)
Eshoo	Lipinski
Evans	Lloyd
Farr	Long
Fazio	Lowey
Fields (LA)	Maloney
Filner	Mann
Fingerhut	Manton
Flake	Margolies-
Foglietta	Mezvinsky
Ford (MI)	Markey
Ford (TN)	Martinez
Frank (MA)	Matsui
Frost	Mazzoli
Furse	McCloskey
Gejdenson	McCurdy
Gephardt	McDermott
Geren	McHale
Gibbons	McKinney
Glickman	McNulty
Gonzalez	Meehan
Gordon	Meek
Green	Menendez
Gutierrez	Mfume
Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)
Hall (TX)	Mineta
Hamburg	Minge
Hamilton	Mink
Harman	Moakley
Hastings	Mollohan
Hayes	Montgomery
Hefner	Moran
Hilliard	Murphy
Hinchee	Murtha
Hoagland	Nadler
Hochbrueckner	Natcher
Holden	Neal (MA)
Hoyer	Neal (NC)
Hughes	Oberstar
Hutto	Obey
Inslee	Olver
Jefferson	Ortiz
Johnson (GA)	Orton
Johnson (SD)	Owens
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Johnston	Parker
Kanjorski	Pastor
Kaptur	Payne (NJ)
Kennedy	Payne (VA)
Kennelly	Pelosi
Kildee	Penny
Klecicka	Peterson (FL)
Klein	Peterson (MN)
Klink	Pickett
Kopetski	Pickie
Kreidler	Pomeroy
Lambert	Poshard
Lancaster	Price (NC)
Lantos	Rahall
LaRocco	Rangel
Laughlin	Reed
Lehman	Reynolds
Levin	Richardson

NAYS—176

Allard	Combust
Archer	Cox
Army	Crane
Bachus (AL)	Crapo
Baker (CA)	Cunningham
Baker (LA)	DeLay
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart
Barrett (NE)	Dickey
Bartlett	Doolittle
Barton	Doran
Bateman	Dreier
Bentley	Duncan
Bereuter	Dunn
Billirakis	Emerson
Bliley	Everett
Blute	Ewing
Boehlert	Fawell
Boehner	Fields (TX)
Bonilla	Fish
Bunning	Fowler
Burton	Franks (CT)
Buyer	Franks (NJ)
Callahan	Gallely
Calvert	Gallo
Camp	Gekas
Canady	Gilchrest
Castle	Gillmor
Clinger	Gilman
Coble	Gingrich
Collins (GA)	Goodlatte

Roemer	Klug
Rose	Knollenberg
Rostenkowski	Kolbe
Rowland	Kyl
Roybal-Allard	Lazto
Rush	Leach
Sabo	Levy
Sanders	Lewis (CA)
Sangmeister	Lewis (FL)
Sarpallus	Lightfoot
Sawyer	Linder
Schenk	Livingston
Schroeder	Machtley
Schumer	Manzullo
Scott	McCandless
Serrano	McMillan
Sharp	McCrery
Shepherd	McHugh
Sisisky	McInnis
Skaggs	McKeon
Skelton	McMillan
Slattery	Meyers
Slaughter	Mica
Smith (IA)	Michel
Spratt	Miller (FL)
Stark	Molinari
Stenholm	Moorhead
Stokes	Morella
Strickland	Myers
Studds	
Stupak	
Swett	
Swift	
Synar	
Tanner	
Tauzin	
Taylor (MS)	
Tejeda	
Thompson	
Thornton	
Thurman	
Torres	
Towns	
Trafficant	
Tucker	
Unsoeld	
Valentine	
Velazquez	
Vento	
Visclosky	
Volkmer	
Washington	
Waters	
Watt	
Waxman	
Wheat	
Williams	
Wilson	
Wise	
Woolsey	
Wyden	
Wynn	
Yates	

NOT VOTING—3  
LaFalce McDade Torricelli

□ 1909

Messrs. CANADY, BAKER of California, and KASICH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3167, EXTENDING THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-269) on the resolution (H. Res. 265) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3167) to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, to establish a system of worker profiling, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### JEMEZ NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 38) to establish the Jemez National Recreation Area in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 4, line 19, strike out "religious purposes, and insert: "customary uses,".

Page 4, line 20, strike out "shall," and insert "shall, subject to the provisions of section 2(n)".

Page 4, line 23, strike out "religious purposes," and insert: "customary uses,".

Page 5, line 2, strike out all after "Act")." down to and including line 9 and insert "The Secretary, in accordance with such Act, upon request of an Indian tribe or pueblo, may from time to time temporarily close to general public use one or more specific portions of the recreational area in order to protect traditional and customary uses in such portions by Indian peoples."

Page 6, line 7, strike out all after "law." down to and including line 15.

Page 9, after line 5, insert:

(n) RESOURCE PROTECTION.—The Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, any activity otherwise permitted in the recreation area will not be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish and wildlife management, protection of archaeological or cultural resources, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies such designations by the Secretary shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agencies, appropriate tribal leaders, and other affected parties.

Page 11, after line 13, insert:

**SEC. 5. ACQUISITION OF LAND.**

(a) STATE LAND.—Land and interests in land within the boundaries of the recreation area that are owned by the State of New Mexico, or a political subdivision of New Mexico, may be acquired only by donation or exchange.

(b) OFFERS TO SELL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the boundaries of the recreation area by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange.

(2) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not acquire lands within the recreation area without the consent of the owner thereof unless the Secretary has determined that such lands will be put to a use different from their use as of the date of enactment of this Act and that such new use would be incompatible with the protection of the natural and cultural resources of the recreation area.

Page 11, line 14, strike out "SEC. 5." and insert "SEC. 6."

Mr. VENTO (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, under my reservation I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] for an explanation of the Senate amendments.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 38, introduced by Mr. RICHARDSON, was passed by the House last April and has now passed the Senate with amendments.

The Senate amendments which are acceptable to me clarify the language protecting traditional uses by Indian peoples, require consultation with tribal leaders, and provide more specific direction on how lands within the NRA can be acquired.

H.R. 38 would establish a 57,000-acre Jemez National Recreation Area within the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico. The national recreation area would encompass a portion of the Jemez Mountains that includes steep canyons with brilliantly colored rimrocks and rich biological diversity. The largest elk herd in New Mexico migrates through the area and the mountains are home to many Federal- and State-listed threatened, endangered, and sensitive species.

The Jemez also contains one of the highest densities of archeological and cultural sites in North America, estimated at approximately 15 sites per square mile and totaling approximately 30,000 sites. Large, ancient Pueblo Indian village sites are particularly abundant. Many of these sites have been nominated and placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Easy access and scenic surroundings make the Jemez a popular recreational area. National forest figures show that almost 300,000 people a year visit the Jemez Mountains. Within the area is the east fork of the Jemez River, 11 miles of which have been designated as a national wild and scenic river.

The legislation, in addition to enhancing the public's use and enjoyment of the area, will also protect the resources of the Jemez by withdrawing the area from mineral entry and providing that timber harvesting would have to be compatible with the purposes of the national recreation area.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill which will protect and enhance the Jemez Mountains.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the minority has no problem and we agree with these amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2403, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994**

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 261 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 261**

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany 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. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). 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 Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 261 is the rule providing for consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2403, the bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, and the Executive Office of the President for fiscal year 1994. The bill also includes funding for several independent agencies, including the General Services Administration, the Office of Personnel Management, and the Federal Election Commission.

So that the House may consider this conference report as expeditiously as possible, both the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations requested, and the Rules Committee granted, a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement provides \$22.538 billion for fiscal year 1994, which is \$169.958 million below the level approved by the House in June.

We are also advised by the Budget Committee that the conference report is \$50 million below the discretionary budget authority and \$20 million below outlay spending allocations and the 602(b) spending allocations for this subcommittee.

It is within the target for discretionary budget authority and outlays set by the Appropriations Committee pursuant to the fiscal year 1994 budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we commend the chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee responsible for this legislation, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], for their good work on this bill and I urge my colleagues to approve this rule so that we may act this evening on this conference report.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the gentleman from California, has described, this rule waives all points of order against the consideration of the conference report to accompany 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 fiscal year 1994.

While I do not endorse this frequent practice of granting blanket waivers against conference reports for appropriation bills, we need to complete our action on these funding measures in a timely manner, and I will not oppose this rule.

I hope Members have taken the time to review the provisions of this conference report. Of particular concern to many Members, myself included, is the absence of language to prohibit the use of tax dollars to pay for abortions under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. This language has been around for some 10 years, but it is not included in this bill. Passage of this conference report will open the door to allow taxpayer financing of abortion on demand for Federal employees. I find this unacceptable.

Additionally, the conference report contains a modification to the revenue forgone reform provision to include a 6-year phase-in for postage rate increases for nonprofit mail. The bill also prohibits a cost-of-living increase for Federal employees but adopts the phasing in of the locality-pay increases.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House adopted a continuing funding resolution because we could not move the 13 appropriation bills through the Congress prior to the beginning of the fiscal year. In fact, only one of the appropriation bills has been signed into law. So I will not oppose this rule since it will expedite the consideration of this conference report.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 261, I call up the conference report on 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.

□ 1920

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 24, 1993, at page H6983.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and

the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHT-FOOT] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. Speaker, the conferees have reached agreement on H.R. 2403 the treasury, postal service, and general government appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. It was not an easy conference, because the fiscal restraints required the conferees to make some difficult decisions.

The conference report will fund the agencies in this bill at a level which will enable them to perform their assigned functions in an effective and efficient manner.

H.R. 2403 provides a total of \$22.5 billion in new budget authority for the agencies under this bill for fiscal year 1993. The conference agreement is below the 602(b) allocations for both budget authority and outlays. I ask unanimous consent to insert a table in the RECORD providing details of this conference report.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 2403 funds Federal agencies deeply involved in the war on drugs. The conference report provides funding for a number of law enforcement agencies in the Department of the Treasury such as the U.S. Customs Service, the Secret Service, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, the Internal Revenue Service, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, and others.

#### U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

In the Postal Service, the conferees included revenue forgone reform which represents a compromise between commercial and nonprofit mailers to eliminate the authorization for revenue forgone appropriations. Mr. CLAY, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee did an outstanding job in crafting the original compromise on revenue forgone. This compromise creates a mechanism to continue preferred, lower postage rates for nonprofit mailers without the need for taxpayer subsidy. The compromise also establishes a 6-year phase-in of postage rate increases for nonprofit mail. Commercial use of nonprofit third-class mail has been prohibited. Advertising for nonprofit second-class mail has been limited, as has the use of library rate mail by commercial publishers. Publishers may use library rate mail only for matter which has been ordered by libraries or schools.

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

In the Executive Office of the President, the conferees have fulfilled the President's commitment to reduce employment in the Executive Office by 25 percent below the total level in fiscal year 1993. The conferees have included language in the bill that requests the Office of National Drug Control Policy

to maintain a level of 40 positions, 15 above the President's request. Both the administration and the House were opposed to mandating personnel levels. In fact, the House conferees were successful in eliminating all personnel floors and ceilings except this one. But conferees do involve compromises, and the other body was adamant on this issue. The conferees did require the Executive Office to reduce other Executive Office accounts by 15 positions to guarantee to the House that the total ceiling on the Executive Office of the President reflects the 25-percent reduction below 1993 levels. The conferees have provided appropriations above the President's request in the special forfeiture fund in the Office of the National Drug Control Policy for ADAMHA and community partnership grants for drug prevention and drug treatment in the Department of Health and Human Services.

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT EMPLOYMENT LEVELS

We wish to clarify the intent of the conferees with regard to the employment levels for the Executive Office of the President. The statement of the managers states that the total employment level for the Executive Office of the President shall not exceed 1,044, with the understanding that this level will fluctuate as the President manages the day-to-day operations of the White House.

It is the intent of the conferees that this total should not include the staff requirements for the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, or the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

The President's pledge of a 25-percent reduction in White House staff excludes these offices, and therefore the conferee's agreement of a 1,044 employment level at the White House also excludes these offices.

#### INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

In the General Services Administration the conferees have provided funding for additional construction projects, and have also included language which gives the legislative committees of both the House and Senate an opportunity to review in detail these projects and to approve or disapprove the projects prior to the obligation of funds.

The conferees have also fully funded the Government payment for annuitants, employees' health benefits.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

The conferees have fully protected locality pay and its implementation on January 1, 1994. In order to avoid the necessity of reduction-in-force by agencies whose budgets did not preserve a pay raise in 1994, the conferees have blocked the across-the-board employees cost index pay increase that was to be effective in January.

REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

Mr. Speaker, I also want to discuss what the conferees have done to recreate Government and our response to the Vice President's challenge to make "Government Work Better and Cost Less."

First, the conferees stated their strong support for the goals of making our Government work better and more efficiently.

Second, the conferees initiated changes in the bill to achieve immediate impact toward the Vice President's goals.

We created an "innovation fund" for all agencies within this bill, which will allow agencies to carry over 50 percent of their savings for productivity investments, employee bonuses, and employee training. Adding market incentives for efficiency is, in our opinion, the key to making Government work better for less.

We deleted almost every mandated FTE employee ceiling and floor in this bill, with the only exception being law enforcement and the Office of Drug Control Policy.

We provided agencies flexibility to reallocate funds by providing limited transfer authority.

We directed agencies to work toward reducing Government redtape and paperwork—not only for internal Government paperwork, but for small businesses and people who must deal with the Government as well.

We have urged IRS and Customs to restructure their workforce to meet modern day requirements and service standards.

We have directed GAO and GSA to begin the process to make GSA compete with private companies in providing services to Federal agencies. It is our belief that if GSA can offer the best price, they should win, if not, they should lose agencies business.

We have provided support for the President's Labor-Management Council or the "National Partnership Council" as it is called.

The conferees have approved a provision that would allow multiagency funding of the National Partnership Council. The conferees recognize that the Council may be established under current law with single agency funding. This provision would simply allow the Council also to proceed under multiagency funding, subject to au-

thorization, in case this type of added funding capability is deemed desirable.

We have directed the Administrator of GSA to review every project in this bill and ensure that it meets a Federal need, is of appropriate design, and its costs are fully justified, and report back to us on their findings.

And we have put in place through the House report, the basis for performance management, which we intend to fully pursue in next year's hearings in my subcommittee. We believe that we must be about identifying achievable goals and performance measures to measure progress or failure, if we are to restore the American people's trust in how their Government spends their money.

In summary, the conferees funded all agencies at a level that would enable them to continue their operations in the most effective and efficient way possible.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a good conference report. It represents a reasonable compromise with the Senate. I believe that it is fair, it is well done, and I urge Members to support the conference report.

Table with multiple columns and rows, containing various alphanumeric codes and text, likely a legislative record or index. The text is very faint and difficult to read.

## Treasury Department, U.S. Postal Service, Exec. Office of the President and Ind. Ag. (H.R. 2403)

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY</b>						
<b>Departmental Offices:</b>						
Salaries and Expenses.....	71,202,000	104,597,000	104,597,000	105,700,000	105,150,000	+33,948,000
International Affairs.....	33,408,000					-33,408,000
<b>Total, Departmental Offices.....</b>	<b>104,610,000</b>	<b>104,597,000</b>	<b>104,597,000</b>	<b>105,700,000</b>	<b>105,150,000</b>	<b>+540,000</b>
Office of Inspector General.....	29,147,000	28,897,000	28,897,000	28,897,000	28,897,000	-250,000
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.....	18,342,000	18,280,000	18,280,000	18,280,000	18,280,000	-62,000
Treasury Forfeiture Fund (limitation on availability of deposits).....		14,770,000	14,770,000	50,000,000	32,500,000	+32,500,000
<b>Federal Law Enforcement Training Center:</b>						
Salaries and Expenses.....	47,158,000	47,195,000	47,195,000	47,695,000	47,445,000	+287,000
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses.....	12,301,000	6,712,000	7,712,000	12,712,000	12,712,000	+411,000
<b>Total, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.....</b>	<b>59,459,000</b>	<b>53,907,000</b>	<b>54,907,000</b>	<b>60,407,000</b>	<b>60,157,000</b>	<b>+698,000</b>
Financial Management Service.....	214,069,000	209,877,000	209,877,000	209,877,000	209,877,000	-4,192,000
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.....	370,372,000	364,245,000	364,245,000	368,046,000	366,446,000	-3,928,000
<b>United States Customs Service:</b>						
Salaries and Expenses.....	1,317,535,000	1,311,819,000	1,311,819,000	1,363,668,000	1,350,668,000	+33,133,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air and Marine Interdiction Programs.....	81,624,000	46,063,000	46,063,000	47,883,000	47,883,000	-33,781,000
Operations and Maintenance, Customs P-3 Drug Interdiction Program.....	28,000,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	
Air and Marine Interdiction Programs, Procurement.....	21,174,000	21,093,000	21,093,000	21,093,000	21,093,000	-81,000
Customs Facilities, Construction, Improvements and Related Expenses.....	4,600,000			10,000,000	5,000,000	+400,000
Customs Forfeiture Fund (limitation on availability of deposits)....	15,000,000					-15,000,000
Customs Services at Small Airports (to be derived from fees collected).....	1,500,000	1,406,000	1,406,000	1,406,000	1,406,000	-84,000
<b>Total, United States Customs Service.....</b>	<b>1,469,433,000</b>	<b>1,408,381,000</b>	<b>1,408,381,000</b>	<b>1,472,030,000</b>	<b>1,454,030,000</b>	<b>-15,403,000</b>
United States Mint.....	53,001,000	54,770,000	54,770,000	54,770,000	54,770,000	+1,769,000
Bureau of the Public Debt.....	191,243,000	189,209,000	189,209,000	187,209,000	187,209,000	-4,034,000
Payment of Government Losses in Shipment.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	
<b>Internal Revenue Service:</b>						
Administration and Management.....	157,368,000	167,822,000	167,822,000	167,822,000	167,822,000	+10,454,000
Processing Tax Returns and Assistance.....	1,632,624,000	1,696,853,000	1,696,853,000	1,696,853,000	1,696,853,000	+64,229,000
Tax Law Enforcement.....	3,831,375,000	4,043,281,000	4,007,962,000	4,043,281,000	4,007,962,000	+178,587,000
Information Systems.....	1,478,914,000	1,487,722,000	1,402,628,000	1,487,722,000	1,471,448,000	-7,468,000
(By transfer).....		(39,751,000)				
<b>Total, Internal Revenue Service.....</b>	<b>7,100,281,000</b>	<b>7,395,678,000</b>	<b>7,275,266,000</b>	<b>7,395,678,000</b>	<b>7,344,085,000</b>	<b>+243,804,000</b>
United States Secret Service.....	480,432,000	457,360,000	457,360,000	461,931,000	461,931,000	-18,501,000
<b>Total, Title I, Department of the Treasury.....</b>	<b>10,090,889,000</b>	<b>10,300,471,000</b>	<b>10,181,059,000</b>	<b>10,413,325,000</b>	<b>10,323,832,000</b>	<b>+232,943,000</b>
<b>TITLE II - POSTAL SERVICE</b>						
Payment to the Postal Service Fund.....	121,912,000	91,434,000	91,434,000	91,434,000	91,434,000	-30,478,000
Payment to the Postal Service Fund for Nonfunded Liabilities.....	38,614,000	38,803,000	38,803,000	38,803,000	38,803,000	+189,000
<b>Total, Title II, Postal Service.....</b>	<b>160,526,000</b>	<b>130,237,000</b>	<b>130,237,000</b>	<b>130,237,000</b>	<b>130,237,000</b>	<b>-30,289,000</b>
<b>TITLE III - EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
Compensation of the President.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	
The White House Office.....	42,795,538	38,914,000	38,914,000	38,754,000	38,754,000	-4,041,538
Executive Residence at the White House.....	7,598,000	7,925,000	7,925,000	7,925,000	7,925,000	+327,000
Official Residence of the Vice President.....	324,000	324,000	324,000	324,000	324,000	
Special Assistance to the President.....	3,257,000	3,270,000	3,270,000	3,270,000	3,270,000	+13,000
Council of Economic Advisers.....	3,428,000	3,420,000	3,420,000	3,420,000	3,420,000	-8,000
Office of Policy Development.....	3,772,000	5,122,000	5,122,000	5,122,000	5,122,000	+1,350,000
National Security Council.....	6,118,000	6,648,000	6,648,000	8,209,000	6,648,000	+530,000
National Critical Materials Council.....	185,000					-185,000
Office of Administration.....	24,853,000	24,850,000	24,850,000	24,850,000	24,850,000	-3,000
Office of Management and Budget.....	52,981,000	53,481,000	56,539,000	53,481,000	56,539,000	+3,558,000
Office of Federal Procurement Policy.....	3,058,000	3,058,000		3,058,000		-3,058,000
<b>Office of National Drug Control Policy:</b>						
Salaries and Expenses.....	101,248,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	11,687,000	11,687,000	-89,561,000
<b>Transfer to other agencies:</b>						
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.....	(5,000,000)					(-5,000,000)
Drug Enforcement Administration.....	(2,000,000)					(-2,000,000)
Alcohol, Drug Abuse & Mental Health Administration.....	(33,701,000)					(-33,701,000)
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.....	(2,800,000)					(-2,800,000)
Immigration & Naturalization Service.....	(7,000,000)					(-7,000,000)
United States Marshals Service.....	(2,500,000)					(-2,500,000)
United States Customs Service.....	(5,741,000)					(-5,741,000)

Treasury Department, U.S. Postal Service, Exec. Office of the Pres. and Ind. Ag. (H.R. 2403) - Cont.

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Dept of Justice: Bureau of Justice Assistance.....	(2,000,000)					(-2,000,000)
Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center.....	(15,000,000)					(-15,000,000)
Total, transfer to other agencies.....	(75,742,000)					(-75,742,000)
Total, Office of National Drug Control Policy.....	101,248,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	11,687,000	11,687,000	-89,561,000
Unanticipated Needs.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Federal Drug Control Programs:						
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program.....		88,000,000	88,000,000	88,000,000	88,000,000	+88,000,000
Special Forfeiture Fund.....	75,742,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	75,000,000	52,500,000	-23,242,000
Transfer to other agencies:						
Internal Revenue Service.....			(6,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(+6,000,000)
Drug Enforcement Agency.....			(4,000,000)		(4,000,000)	(+4,000,000)
Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center.....			(5,000,000)			
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.....			(1,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)
United States Customs Service.....			(5,000,000)			
ADAMAHA.....				(25,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)
CTAC (R&D).....				(15,000,000)	(7,500,000)	(+7,500,000)
Community Partnership Grants (CSAP).....				(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(+10,000,000)
ONDCP Director discretion.....			(7,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)
Total, Federal Drug Control Programs.....	75,742,000	114,000,000	114,000,000	161,000,000	138,500,000	+82,758,000
Total, Title III, Executive Office of the President.....	326,609,538	268,062,000	268,062,000	322,350,000	298,289,000	-28,320,538
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
General Services Administration:						
Federal Buildings Fund:						
Appropriation.....	281,601,000			312,814,000	288,486,000	+6,885,000
Unobligated balances.....		150,218,000	295,294,000			
Rescission.....		(-185,344,000)	(-107,781,000)	(-185,344,000)	(-185,344,000)	(-185,344,000)
Limitations on availability of revenue:						
Construction & acquisition of facilities.....	(626,312,000)	(746,965,000)	(820,476,000)	(933,787,000)	(925,027,306)	(+298,715,306)
Repairs and alterations.....	(564,066,000)	(546,682,000)	(539,982,000)	(516,782,000)	(523,782,000)	(-70,284,000)
Energy Investment Proposal.....			(6,700,000)			
Energy Investment Proposal.....		6,700,000				
Installment acquisition payments.....	(143,381,000)	(119,108,000)	(118,108,000)	(119,108,000)	(118,108,000)	(-25,273,000)
Rental of space.....	(1,882,691,000)	(2,125,373,000)	(2,124,373,000)	(2,117,421,000)	(2,117,421,000)	(+234,730,000)
Real property operations.....	(1,130,871,000)	(1,233,085,000)	(1,231,085,000)	(1,226,085,000)	(1,226,085,000)	(+95,214,000)
Program direction.....	(142,000,000)	(157,613,000)	(156,613,000)	(156,613,000)	(156,613,000)	(+14,613,000)
Design and construction services.....	(179,930,000)	(189,274,000)	(188,274,000)	(184,081,000)	(184,081,000)	(+4,151,000)
Total, Federal Buildings Fund.....	281,601,000	156,918,000	295,294,000	312,814,000	288,486,000	+6,885,000
(Limitations).....	(4,699,251,000)	(5,118,100,000)	(5,185,611,000)	(5,253,877,000)	(5,251,117,306)	(+551,866,306)
Federal Supply Service.....	56,144,000	55,804,000	55,804,000	43,420,000	43,420,000	-12,724,000
Use of proceeds of sales and overpayments.....				12,384,000	12,384,000	+12,384,000
Information Resources Management Service.....	46,419,000	46,291,000	45,675,000	44,730,000	45,675,000	-744,000
Federal Property Resources Service.....	13,933,000	15,756,000	15,756,000	15,756,000	15,756,000	+1,823,000
General Management and Administration.....	34,000,000	31,435,000	31,435,000	31,435,000	31,435,000	-2,565,000
Office of Inspector General.....	34,748,000	34,925,000	34,925,000	34,925,000	34,925,000	+177,000
Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents.....	2,386,000	2,833,000	2,833,000	2,833,000	2,833,000	+447,000
Expenses, Presidential Transition.....	5,000,000					-5,000,000
Total, General Services Administration.....	474,231,000	343,982,000	481,722,000	498,297,000	474,914,000	+883,000
Office of Personnel Management:						
Salaries and Expenses.....	119,000,000	118,533,000	118,533,000	118,533,000	118,533,000	-467,000
(limitation on administrative expenses).....	(69,993,000)	(72,754,000)	(72,754,000)	(72,754,000)	(72,754,000)	(+2,761,000)
Office of Inspector General.....	4,227,000	4,253,000	4,253,000	4,253,000	4,253,000	+26,000
(limitation on administrative expenses).....	(6,500,000)	(6,514,000)	(6,514,000)	(6,514,000)	(6,514,000)	(+14,000)
Government Payment for Annuitants, Employees						
Health Benefits.....	4,149,245,000	3,458,480,000	4,146,480,000	3,458,480,000	3,805,480,000	-343,785,000
Government Payment for Annuitants, Employee						
Life Insurance.....	12,433,000	1,607,000	1,607,000	1,607,000	1,607,000	-10,826,000
Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.....	6,900,000,000	7,065,819,000	7,065,819,000	7,065,819,000	7,065,819,000	+185,819,000
Employees Health Benefits Fund (limitation on						
administrative expenses).....	(14,702,000)	(14,774,000)	(14,774,000)	(14,774,000)	(14,774,000)	(+72,000)
Employees Life Insurance Fund (limitation on						
administrative expenses).....	(1,086,000)	(826,000)	(826,000)	(826,000)	(826,000)	(-260,000)
Retired Employees Health Benefits Fund						
(limitation on administrative expenses).....	(251,000)	(165,000)	(165,000)	(165,000)	(165,000)	(-86,000)
Total, Office of Personnel Management.....	11,184,905,000	10,648,692,000	11,336,692,000	10,648,692,000	10,995,692,000	-189,213,000
Administrative Conference of the United States.....	2,314,000	2,314,000		1,800,000	1,800,000	-514,000
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	1,820,000	1,859,000		1,000,000	1,000,000	-820,000
Citizens' Commission on Public Service and Compensation.....	250,000	254,000				-250,000
(Rescission).....				(-250,000)	(-250,000)	-250,000
Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or						
Severely Disabled.....	1,653,000	1,679,000	1,689,000	1,689,000	1,689,000	+36,000

## Treasury Department, U.S. Postal Service, Exec. Office of the Pres. Ind. Ag. (H.R. 2403) - Cont.

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Federal Election Commission .....	21,143,000	21,151,000	23,564,000	23,564,000	23,564,000	+2,421,000
Federal Labor Relations Authority .....	21,647,000	21,341,000	21,341,000	21,341,000	21,341,000	-306,000
Merit Systems Protection Board:						
Salaries and Expenses .....	24,450,000	24,674,000	24,674,000	24,674,000	24,674,000	+224,000
(limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(1,950,000)	(1,989,000)	(1,989,000)	(1,989,000)	(1,989,000)	(+39,000)
National Archives and Records Administration .....	168,042,000	193,182,000	193,182,000	196,482,000	195,482,000	+27,440,000
Reduction of debt .....		-3,397,000	-3,397,000	-3,397,000	-3,397,000	-3,397,000
Office of Government Ethics .....	8,265,000	8,313,000	8,313,000	8,313,000	8,313,000	+48,000
Office of Special Counsel .....	7,952,000	7,992,000	7,992,000	7,992,000	7,992,000	+40,000
United States Tax Court .....	32,435,000	35,350,000	33,850,000	35,350,000	33,650,000	+1,215,000
<b>Total, Title IV, Independent Agencies .....</b>	<b>11,949,107,000</b>	<b>11,307,366,000</b>	<b>12,129,422,000</b>	<b>11,485,547,000</b>	<b>11,788,464,000</b>	<b>-162,643,000</b>
(limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(4,793,733,000)	(5,029,778,000)	(5,174,852,000)	(5,165,555,000)	(5,162,795,306)	(+369,062,306)
<b>General Reduction, 1.478 % of Discretionary accounts .....</b>				<b>-173,772,000</b>		
<b>Grand total:</b>						
New budget (obligational) authority .....	22,527,131,538	22,006,136,000	22,708,780,000	22,157,867,000	22,538,822,000	+11,690,462
(Appropriations) .....	(22,527,131,538)	(22,006,136,000)	(22,708,780,000)	(22,157,937,000)	(22,539,072,000)	(+11,940,462)
(Rescissions) .....				(-250,000)	(-250,000)	(-250,000)
(Limitations) .....	(4,793,733,000)	(5,029,778,000)	(5,174,852,000)	(5,165,555,000)	(5,162,795,306)	(+369,062,306)

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2403, the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. Mr. Speaker, I concur with my chairman and good friend, Mr. HOYER, on a number of points in this bill.

As a Republican and the ranking member of the subcommittee, there are a number of things in this conference report I can strongly support.

For one, as my chairman says, the total numbers of the bill are below the House-passed bill. Our discretionary numbers are slightly higher, but by less than 2 percent. When combined with the mandatory figures, the total bill is actually only \$6 million more than fiscal year 1993. In most accounts, we basically split the difference between the House and Senate bills, and in addition we are below the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation in budget authority.

The funding for the executive office of the President is \$28 million below fiscal year 1993 levels, although most of that can be accounted for by cuts to the office of national drug control policy, or the drug czar's office.

One issue I would like to call to the attention of Members is our bill's incorporation of some of the Vice President's national performance review recommendations. As a Republican, I find myself supportive of many of these recommendations, such as the call for reductions in the numbers of Federal employees, and eliminating legislative mandates to the agencies which micro-manage the Federal Government. For many of the agencies funded in the bill,

we removed the mandated floors in FTE [full-time equivalent positions] levels, in following the Vice President's national performance review recommendations to stop micro-managing Federal agencies. I do believe we could have gone farther than we did in this area, by completely adopting this approach for all agencies, but there were concerns about the impact this might have on law enforcement agencies.

I was also pleased the conference included language I proposed to recommend that Federal agencies make efforts to reduce by 50 percent the paperwork burden, both internally and for individuals and businesses which are required to prepare Government forms for various purposes.

I also want to mention to my colleagues who have concerns about construction of new Federal buildings in the bill, that language is included in the conference report requiring the authorization of the buildings by the public works committees of both bodies prior to the obligations of any funds. The conference report takes the same approach it did last year, by not funding any nongovernment, or special projects, as was done in previous years.

For those who are concerned about postal revenues forgone and non-profit postal rates, our conference report also reaffirms the so-called Clay compromise adopted by the budget reconciliation bill enacted earlier this year. Therefore, this section of the bill should also be noncontroversial.

Another positive point in this conference report carried over the intent of last year's bill with respect to the family-friendly policy of the Federal Government. The conferees directed OPM to take a stronger leadership role in addressing this issue, stressing that the Government's ability to retain and

attract the most qualified professionals depends highly on employee satisfaction, and the perception of such.

The conference report also included language carried over from the House bill requesting that GSA initiate a management review to determine the feasibility of making the Federal supply service a totally reimbursable service. I believe this is an excellent goal, and I think my colleagues on this side of the aisle would agree.

One final matter which I know was important to my Republican colleagues was the elimination, in the House bill, of several small agencies or organizations funded in previous years by this bill. Although we were not successful in defunding all of them, and partially because of objections on both sides of the aisle, I was pleased that the final conference report did refund two of these small entities. As many of you know, once a commission or agency is created, it takes on a life of its own, and is virtually impossible to ever eliminate. I myself have had second thoughts at times.

Unfortunately, if we are ever to get a grip on the Federal budget, we have got to start somewhere. I know many people felt both of these entities had merit, but nonetheless, I was pleased we had the ability to start somewhere, and I commend my colleagues who had the backbone to "just say no."

Now let me take just a few moments to mention a couple of concerns I have about this conference report. First of all, I was extremely disappointed that the conference report eliminates completely, as did the House bill, language contained in this bill in previous years prohibiting the use of Federal funds to finance Federal employees' health benefit plans which fund abortions. I do

not believe the American public is solidly behind public financing of abortion, and I therefore believe most Americans will not want to be compelled to pay for abortions through Federal employees health benefit plans. Adoption of the Hyde amendment by both bodies is clear indication of that. I know many of my colleagues share my concern about this matter, and some may seek to work their will with respect to that portion of the bill—I will not oppose such efforts. It was clear during committee and floor consideration that we did not have the votes to reinstate the abortion prohibition language, but I will let the House work its will on that issue.

I also was quite concerned about the statement of managers' failure to include language discussing the recently completed GAO report on White House payroll practices. We have seen, we believe, unprecedented actions taken by the White House with respect to the backdating of pay raises, retroactive appointments, and double-dipping by White House employees on two federally funded accounts. I believe it is wrong to simply turn a blind eye to that, and I would like to thank the chairman for agreeing to hold a hearing on this matter. GAO made clear that Congress should revisit the issue of title 3 employees and the President's discretion in that regard to prevent potential abuse in the future.

Because the White House and both bodies of Congress are controlled by the same party, we have all the more need to ensure that the proper amount of oversight is being maintained. The minority party has a very important role to play in this oversight process, because we are the only ones providing any scrutiny over the executive branch. This Congress did a very effective job at oversight, I might add, during the past 12 years of Republican administrations, and I urge my Democratic colleagues not to forget that. We are still separate branches of Government, and should not simply take everything said or done by the White House at face value without careful evaluation. If we do, we will be failing to do our jobs for the American people. I will continue to urge my chairman to hold an oversight hearing on White House actions in several areas.

On a final note, I would like to extend my thanks to Bill Smith, Betsy Phillips, Robin Bason, Jenny Mummert, and John Berry on the majority staff, and Michelle Mrdeza on the minority staff, for all their hard work. I especially appreciate the cooperation we have had. In my first year as ranking member of the subcommittee, it has made my job easier. I also thank my friend, Chairman HOYER, for his willingness to hear all sides, and to accommodate the minority when he is able to. I have enjoyed working with him in his first year as chairman of the subcommittee.

□ 1930

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

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill, but before I give the reasons, let me just stipulate publicly my admiration and respect for the job that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and his staff did, also the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] and his staff did.

Nothing that I say here is meant to be criticism in any way of them. You could not have a fairer team.

Let me just say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] that I think it is the A-team, it has always been the A-team. The work of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has always been "A," and I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] has been a great improvement over the one he replaced; so let me just stipulate that for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to oppose the bill for two reasons. There were five Federal employees who lost their jobs because of firing in the Travel Gate. There has been a lot of activity now to try to help them find jobs, and partially because of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] I think they have been successful in finding them, but all five of these employees now have legal fees of over \$20,000. One gentleman is perhaps in the range of \$30,000.

We are asking that the administration work out something to pay for their legal fees.

Now, the Members know and the people listening know that when a Member of Congress or a high-profile employee, a political employee gets in trouble, they go to their campaign funds or to their wealthy friends. These career Federal employees have no place to go. One or two or them may be bankrupt for this activity.

The White House on this issue is out of control, and this issue has to be dealt with. I have been disappointed that but for the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and one or two others, there have been very few people who have really expressed any interest.

I say to the Federal Employee Unions whose job it is to represent and defend your Members and employees, your silence has been basically an indictment, because you had an obligation to come to the defense of the least, and if you come to the defense of the least, many times your employees will be better off.

Second, let me cover an issue that is equally important. It came out in the Wall Street Journal last week that a friend of the President, Mr. Ickes, who is a prominent lawyer up in New York

who is alleged—and I say alleged—to be connected with organized crime had a White House pass.

Now, your constituents when they come to Washington do not have a White House pass. He had a White House pass that enabled him to walk into the White House whenever he wanted to.

In fact, Mr. Ickes was quoted, he said:

Many people get access to the White House. I am one of those and I see nothing improper in it.

Then if you go back and you read in the Wall Street Journal piece it says:

When New York lawyer Harold Ickes visited the Capitol in early June, a Senator's aide asked him quizzically, "Are you here in behalf of the White House or Puerto Rico?"

The confusion was understandable. Mr. Ickes, the son of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's Interior Secretary, is widely known as an influential friend of President Clinton and has often been mentioned for a top White House job, and even has the kind of Secret Service issue pass that is given to Presidential aides allowing him to roam the White House corridors at will. That is wrong. It was wrong in the Reagan administration when Deaver had the pass, and it is wrong in this administration and it ought to stop.

□ 1940

Second, we have Carville, and, if my colleagues read in the latest Time/Newsweek magazine, it is a picture. Adviser James Carville spins the President's message.

Well, Bob Teeter, who was the pollster and political adviser for President Bush, did not have a White House pass. Mary Matalin did not have a White House pass. But Carville has a White House pass; Begala has a White House pass.

Now it is said, "Well, they are friends of the President. What's wrong with that?"

Well, the people who work on the White House staff ought to have White House passes. The President's family ought to have a White House pass.

Now, if the President wants Begala and Carville to come in, just put their name on the list, same way when any Member goes down to the White House.

But it is wrong, and what they are doing is they are trading on their knowledge and ability to enter the White House and be friends of the President. They are trading on that to pick up clients.

Now, if my colleagues read the full article, Ickes is on retainer with the Government of Puerto Rico for \$10,000 a month, and I ask my colleagues, "Why do you think they are hiring him?" They are hiring him because he has the access to the White House.

I would urge Members to vote "no" on this bill. I say to my colleagues, "I think, if you constituents knew that

Begala, and Carville, and then Ickes and others, and we have asked the White House for a list of those, and what I think would be an acceptable compromise, I would feel comfortable, is if they gave the list of those who had the White House passes to the chairman, Mr. HOYER, and to Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and no other Member, if that were the case, whereby they could then make a decision whether or not it was appropriate. But when people are on the White House list, and they are also outside selling their wares, I think it's wrong. I think it's wrong morally, and I think it's wrong ethically.

"Second, by voting this bill down and sending a message to the White House you may do more to help the Clinton administration by stopping this than anything else that you can do.

"Last, I ask that any Member of Congress, if you ever happen to be the subject of an indictment, think about these five Federal employees who now have hanging over their head the situation where they still can potentially be indicted. They are still running up legal fees. One has Akin Gump, who, I can tell you, is not very cheap, and no one is coming to their defense. The White House has a moral obligation to take care of that."

Second, Mr. Speaker, the White House ought to stop these passes, lift the White House passes, and at the minimum, anyone who has a White House pass, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] ought to be able to see them.

I urge a no vote to send a message to the White House that these things are wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. I want to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. HOYER, for his leadership in bringing this conference report to the floor today. I also want to recognize Mr. LIGHTFOOT for his efforts. I was previously the ranking member of this committee, so I'm aware of the demands placed upon Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Both Members have worked hard on this legislation, but because of a number of important changes in this year's bill, I cannot support it.

This bill contains a number of provisions which I support. It expands from three to four the number of Federal telecommuting pilot projects in the Washington metropolitan area. As Members know, these centers will allow Federal employees to work from regional centers—complete with computers, fax machines, and telephones—rather than spending hours commuting to downtown District of Columbia. This is a win-win concept: Federal employees will be able to spend more time with their families rather than being stuck in traffic and they become more productive in their jobs.

I also want to mention one provision which I feel strongly about which was

stricken from this bill before it was originally passed in the House. This provision would have allowed Federal employees to apply their accumulated sick leave for the adoption of a child. Right now, Federal employees may use sick leave for the birth of a child, but families which adopt may not, creating an unfair double standard for adoptive parents. I am pleased that the House recently passed legislation which authorizes this change and I am hopeful that the other body will quickly act on that important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about serious concerns in this bill. From the firings of the Travel Office staff to the backdating of pay and providing White House passes to lobbyists, this Executive Office of the President is skating close to and maybe even over the ethical edge. There are various White House staffing and financial issues that should be examined more closely.

First of all, I am deeply concerned about the fate of the five fired employees of the White House travel office. It is incomprehensible why the Federal employee unions haven't made this issue a top priority. This is a case where Federal employees were wrongfully accused of a crime, fired from their jobs without just cause, publicly criticized for political gain, leaving them unemployed and straddled with thousands of dollars in legal fees. I understand that the Justice Department has ruled that these five employees will be allowed to make their case for Federal reimbursement of legal fees, but that there is no guarantee that the Government will reimburse these people.

Second is the question of White House security passes. Recently I wrote to White House Chief of Staff Mack McLarty regarding the proliferation of White House passes being given out to individuals who are not White House employees but who are basically working in the White House while holding lucrative paid positions outside the White House.

The Chief of Staff declined to provide information on individuals who hold White House passes, but did say that these non-Government persons were holding passes because they provide regular services to the White House. I am seriously concerned that at least some of the non-Government persons known to have White House passes are highly paid lawyers, consultants, and lobbyists who are not subject to any kind of oversight or disclosure requirements that are routine for regular White House employees. Serious ethical and conflict of interest problems abound with this kind of loose operation.

I am concerned that this White House seems to be developing a pattern of having highly paid—from outside sources—volunteers working on a regu-

lar basis in the White House with potentially unknown dubious connections. What outside group or corporation wouldn't mind paying an employee to go volunteer at the White House if that volunteer could promote their cause or have the White House access?

Furthermore, many of these volunteers have the best of both worlds: They don't have to give up their outside salaries or subject themselves to financial disclosure or limits on outside income yet they have the access and the cache of working from the White House. Look at James Carville, for example: He holds a White House pass, works regularly at the White House—see picture featuring him spinning the President's health care message at the Talk Radio fest at the White House last week—and heads out after he is done and gets paid for speeches all over the country and even in foreign countries. He is not subject to any of the restrictions that a regular White House employee must abide by. During the Bush administration outside operatives such as Bob Teeter or Mary Matalin never held such passes or worked at the White House in such a fashion.

If these individuals are providing regular services doesn't the public have a right to know who they are, what their connections are and what potential conflicts of interest they might have?

Earlier this year we saw the consequences of providing Harry Thomasson with the wide roaming access that he had with his White House pass. Now we have individuals such as corporate attorney, Susan Thomases, providing regular services on a volunteer basis and Harold Ickes who recently lobbied successfully to get the White House to switch positions on a Puerto Rican tax break and has been put on retainer by the Puerto Ricans to instruct them on "how best to deal with the Clinton administration" (WSJ 9/21/93). Prior to the vote on the Clinton budget, Mr. Ickes met with freshman lawmakers who in turn made personal pleas to the President on June 10 which were said by Clinton aides to have been critical to his decision to bend on the issue. Yet Mr. Ickes insists he doesn't have to register as a lobbyist because he is serving as a strategist and adviser to the Puerto Ricans in dealing with the Democratic Party. And all this from a President who campaigned on ending the clout of Washington influence peddlers. So much for change in the ethics arena.

Mr. Ickes, who is under investigation for his role in representing a union in New York that is alleged to be dominated by organized crime, bragged to *The Wall Street Journal*: "Many people get access to the White House; I am one of those, I see nothing improper about it." Mr. Ickes was also involved with questionable legal dealings on behalf of New York Mayor David Dinkins

in the past. It was these very reasons that the President decided not to name Mr. Ickes as Deputy Chief of Staff as he had originally planned. If he could not pass White House muster and go through financial disclosure procedures and clearance procedures for a White House job, why is he known as, Mr. Access? In an ironic twist, *Newsday* reports that Mr. Ickes was the transition official who drafted this administration's ethics rules. Talk about the fox guarding the henhouse.

In Mr. McLarty's letter to me, he stated that, "A limited number of non-Government persons who, for the most part, have rendered regular services to the administration, also have White House passes." Given that these individuals are providing regular services to the White House while some or many continue to hold high paying outside jobs, we should know:

First. Who are these non-Government persons who have rendered regular services to the administration? (Regardless of whether they have White House passes or not.)

Second. Have these individuals obtained White House clearance and have they filed financial disclosure?

Third. Since I would assume these non-Government persons are unpaid, what kind of efforts have been made to determine potential conflicts of interest?

Fourth. For whom do these individuals providing regular services work or who pays their salaries? From whom do they receive outside contracts or consulting fees?

Fifth. What types of positions are these non-Government persons serving in on a regular basis? Do they have use of office and secretarial services? Do they have limited or unlimited passes throughout the White House?

Sixth. If these individuals are providing services to the administration on a regular basis in what way, if any, are they considered different than Government employees?

Seventh. How are the various war rooms being staffed and paid for? Are there nonpaid staff who are paid from other sources on the outside working these war rooms?

Eighth. Is the Democratic National Committee, labor organizations, lobbying groups, for example, Families USA which paid for the families who attended the White House health care event to discuss their health care situations, or other groups paying the salaries of any of these volunteers?

I have been told that many of the staff and volunteers continue to hold temporary passes with many clearances pending and being held in the White House Counsel's office for further review. I am told that information on many individuals is of a nature that would in previous administrations make them ineligible for clearance. What is the status of these pending

clearances? We need to know more. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you join me in requesting from the White House a list of all people who have White House passes and a justification for their holding these passes. Taxpayers deserve to know if the people inside the White House are there to help America or to help themselves.

Further, I am told that earlier this year, White House Administrator David Watkins made inquiries as to whether it would be possible to put privately donated transition money or other private donations into some kind of nonprofit fund that could then be used to hire individuals and pay them on that payroll while allowing them to be volunteers in the White House. Has this been done?

Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us provides more than \$150 million for the operation of the White House and the Executive Office of the President. This is taxpayers' money and should be scrutinized as closely as any other Federal program. With serious questions still unanswered regarding the travel office and unlimited White House access by influence peddlers, I believe the White House has a lot of explaining to do.

I want to publicly state to the chairman that I intend to get to the bottom of each of these issues. I will not let up until I am satisfied that tax dollars are being spent in a prudent and ethical manner. This administration is calling on us to reinvent Government and reinvent health care, but for starters, they need to get their own house in order first.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
WASHINGTON, DC,  
September 22, 1993.

MR. THOMAS MCLARTY III,  
Chief of Staff, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MCLARTY: I am writing in regard to your response to my letter concerning the issuance of White House passes.

While you declined to provide information on individuals who hold White House passes, I continue to remain concerned given that at least some of the non-government persons known to have White House passes are highly paid lawyers, consultants and lobbyists who are not subject to any kind of oversight or disclosure requirements that are routine for regular White House employees. As a member of the Treasury/Postal Appropriations subcommittee, I am concerned with this situation. Serious ethical and conflict of interest problems abound with this kind of loose operation.

In your letter you stated that, "A limited number of non-government persons who, for the most part, have rendered regular services to the Administration, also have White House passes." Given that these individuals are providing "regular services" to the White House while some or many continue to hold high paying outside jobs, I would like to know the following:

1. Who are these non-government persons who have rendered regular services to the Administration? (Regardless of whether they have White House passes or not)

2. Have these individuals obtained White House clearance and have they filed financial disclosure?

3. Since I would assume these non-government persons are unpaid, what kind of efforts have been made to determine potential conflicts of interest?

4. For whom do these individuals providing "regular services" work or who pays their salaries? From whom do they receive outside contracts or consulting fees?

5. What types of positions are these non-government persons serving in on a regular basis? Do they have office space such as was made available to Harry Thomasson earlier this year? Do they have use of office and secretarial services? Do they have limited or unlimited passes throughout the White House?

6. If these individuals are providing services to the Administration on a "regular basis" in what way, if any, are they considered different than government employees?

7. How are the various "war rooms" being staffed and paid for? Are there non-paid staff who are paid from other sources on the outside working these "war" rooms?

8. Is the Democratic National Committee, labor organizations, lobbying groups (for example, Families USA which paid for the families who attended the White House health care event to discuss their health care situations) or other groups paying the salaries of any of these "volunteers"?

I also understand that many of the staff and volunteers continue to hold "temporary" passes with many clearances pending and being held in the White House Counsel's office for further review. I am told that information on many individuals is of a nature that would in previous Administrations make them ineligible for clearance. What is the status of these pending clearances?

I am concerned that this White House seems to be developing a pattern of having highly paid (from outside sources) "volunteers" working on a regular basis in the White House with potentially unknown dubious connections. What outside group or corporation wouldn't mind "paying" an employee to go "volunteer" at the White House if that "volunteer" could promote their cause or have the White House access?

Furthermore, many of these "volunteers" have the best of both worlds: They don't have to give up their outside salaries or subject themselves to financial disclosure or limits on outside income yet they have the access and the cache of working from the White House.

Your letter declining to disclose who holds these passes at least admitted that these individuals who are holding passes are providing "regular services" and as such virtually operate as employees of the White House. If these individuals are providing "regular services" doesn't the public have a right to know who they are, what their connections are and what potential conflicts of interest they might have?

Earlier this year we saw the consequences of providing Harry Thomasson with the wide roaming access that he has with his White House pass. Now we have individuals such as corporate attorney, Susan Thomases, who I understand will be doing the President's scheduling until November 1 on a "volunteer" basis. In addition, Harold Ickes who recently lobbied successfully to get the White House to switch positions on a Puerto Rican tax break and has been put on retainer by the Puerto Ricans to instruct them on "how best to deal with the Clinton administration" (WSJ, 9/21/92) bragged to *The Wall*

Street Journal: "Many people get access to the White House; I am one of those. I see nothing improper about it." The scrutiny of Michael Deaver during the Reagan Administration was for conduct very much like that of Mr. Ickes. It was wrong when Michael Deaver did it; it is wrong now.

Further, I am told that earlier this year White House Administrator David Watkins made inquiries as to whether it would be possible to put privately donated transition money or other private donations into some kind of nonprofit fund that could then be used to hire individuals and pay them on that payroll while allowing them to be "volunteers" in the White House. I would like to know if this has been done in any capacity.

I would appreciate your response to this matter as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,  
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, DC, August 19, 1993.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.  
DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: Thank you for your letter of July 29.

To our knowledge, there have been no material changes in security procedures at the White House when compared to those of previous administrations. The security function as to personnel rests primarily with the Office of White House Personnel Security, which is under the direction of the Office of Counsel to the President. Other security functions regarding the White House are provided by the Secret Service and other agencies, such as the Department of Defense. The Office of White House Personnel Security originates the necessary paperwork for security clearances.

The vast majority of the holders of White House passes are employees or detailees. Certain administration officials employed by various agencies of the Executive Branch, whose duties require regular White House access, possess White House passes. A limited number of non-government persons who, for the most part, have rendered regular services to the Administration, also have White House passes. The list of these persons is confidential. As a result of a review being conducted by my office, in conjunction with the Office of Counsel to the President, there may be some modification of our pass policy with respect to non-government persons.

Personally,

MACK McLARTY.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 21, 1993]

ICKES, CLINTON INSIDER AND PUERTO RICO ADVOCATE, SHOWS NOT ALL WHO LOBBY MUST WAIT IN THE HALL

(By Jeffrey H. Birnbaum)

WASHINGTON.—When New York lawyer Harold Ickes visited the Capitol in early June, a senator's aide asked him quizzically, "Are you here on behalf of the White House or Puerto Rico?"

The confusion was understandable. Mr. Ickes, the son of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Interior secretary, is widely known as an influential friend of President Clinton, has often been mentioned for a top White House job and even has the kind of Secret Service-issued pass that is issued to presidential aides, allowing him to roam the White House corridors at will.

But Mr. Ickes was hardly representing the president that day on Capitol Hill. Rather, he was lobbying for Puerto Rico and working

to defeat one of Mr. Clinton's most important tax proposals, the severe curtailment of a generous subsidy to U.S. manufacturers, especially pharmaceutical makers, with operations in the Island commonwealth. In the end, the president relented, and Mr. Ickes's side won, when most of the tax break was preserved.

#### MANY HATS

During his election campaign, Mr. Clinton insisted that he wouldn't tolerate special access for narrow interests, and promised to "take away power from the entrenched bureaucracies and special interests that dominate Washington." As Mr. Ickes's example shows, however, not only have special interests continued to flourish, but people close to the president are participating in the bazaar.

The Puerto Ricans placed the 54-year-old Mr. Ickes on retainer starting in mid-April, at a fee that lobbyists put at \$10,000 a month. Mr. Ickes won't discuss how much he is being paid. He began meeting with prominent lawmakers and their staffs; he also attended numerous strategy sessions with lobbyists and Puerto Rican officials, helping to plot how to beat the president's proposal. Participants say he gave advice on a variety of matters, including how best to deal with the Clinton administration.

Mr. Ickes's roles as White House adviser and Puerto Rico lobbyist sometimes blurred. The chief of staff of the Senate Finance Committee, Lawrence O'Donnell, talked to Mr. Ickes as if he were the Puerto Rican's conduit to the White House, and even admonished Mr. Ickes for failing to lobby the White House harder.

"It struck me as something of a waste of time being in my office when all the resistance was coming from the administration," Mr. O'Donnell says. "I made it clear that anyone who has access to the White House on this should be lobbying the White House."

Mr. Ickes, whose practice is based in Mineola, N.Y., contends he wasn't lobbying the White House at all at the time. In fact, after serving as the chief operating officer of the Clinton transition in Little Rock, Ark., he had agreed not to lobby any government agency for six months after the start of the new administration. He insists that the advice he gave to lobbyists didn't violate that agreement, and adds that "I certainly had no information and did not attempt to obtain any information about where different people in the White House stood" on the issue.

But he did meet with several Democratic lawmakers whose influence proved to be pivotal. These included such tax writers as House Ways and Means Chairman Dan Rostenkowski of Illinois, New Jersey Sen. Bill Bradley, New York Rep. Charles Rangel and Connecticut Rep. Barbara Kennelly. Mr. Ickes' also met with twofreshman lawmakers of Puerto Rican descent, Reps. Nydia Velazquez of New York and Luis Gutierrez of Illinois, whose personal pleas to the president on June 10 were said by Clinton aides to have been critical to his decision to bend on the issue.

Despite those meetings, Mr. Ickes insists that he doesn't have to register as a lobbyist because he is serving as a strategist and adviser to the Puerto Ricans in dealing with the Democratic Party. The current lobbying-registration laws are so loosely worded that he appears to be correct.

#### REDUCING THE CUT

But his work produced results nonetheless. The original Clinton proposal would have cut the Puerto Rican tax subsidy by \$6.8 billion

over five years. The final tax change reduced the break by \$3.7 billion over the period.

Mr. Ickes is continuing to represent Puerto Rican interests, and has been meeting with the White House officials on their behalf since the six-month ban on contacts by former transition staffers lapsed in July. He arranged a meeting for himself and the governor of Puerto Rico with senior White House aide Marcia Hale at the National Governors Association meeting in Tulsa, Okla., last month. He also arranged, and stayed for the start of, a meeting between the governor and Hillary Rodham Clinton at the same Tulsa event.

Meanwhile, he continues to use his White House pass to come and go at 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. "Many people get access to the White House; I am one of those," Mr. Ickes says. "I see nothing improper about it."

And clearly he is still welcome there. "His work with the government of Puerto Rico involved a whole wide range of issues; the tax issue is just one aspect of it," says White House Communications Director Mark Gearan. "Harold is a valued friend of the administration."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 21, 1993]

SHEEEEEEEEEEEEEE'S BAAAAAACCK . . .

(By Keith Jenkins)

It's kind of hard to imagine, but White House scheduling is obviously in such disarray right now that staffers are actually hoping that Susan Thomases will temporarily step into her old campaign job.

Several aides yesterday expressed relief—even enthusiasm—that the Clintons' controversial friend will likely fill the scheduling job on a volunteer basis until about Nov. 1. Marcia Hale recently vacated the post to head the White House intergovernmental affairs office, and it's slated to be filled permanently by Ricki Seidman, who's on an extended R&R leave. Lately, the president's schedule has been handled seat of the pants.

We hate to rehash old stuff, but we will: Thomases, a New York lawyer and one of Hillary Clinton's closest pals, drove the campaign staff nuts with her abrupt, controlling and often autocratic handling of the campaign schedule last year. There was even a time when aides went into shock just thinking she might get a White House job.

But time apparently heals old wounds. "She's organized, to the point and she understands the Clintons," said one staffer. "Doing the president of the United States' schedule by committee just isn't making it."

As for Thomases, a call to her New York office went unreturned.

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

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I know the gentleman from Virginia feels very strongly about these two issues. In particular, of course, he talked on this issue when we passed this bill in the House, the issue of the five employees in the White House Travel Office who were removed from the Travel Office. In part because of his interest and the interests of others, I have worked closely with Mr. McLarty in the White House on this issue. I am pleased that all five of these employees have, in fact, been offered jobs at comparable levels and with their seniority intact. I think that was appropriate to do. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] thought that was appropriate as well.

I want to tell the gentleman from Virginia that, as he knows we are still working on the issue of the attorneys' fees, which is also of serious concern, and I think he raises a good point.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say and acknowledge publicly that I think of the reason they have been taken care of is because of the good offices of the gentleman from Maryland. I know of the work, and I publicly want to say that one has been a constituent of mine. He has been very, very concerned. I am not sure any have been the gentleman's constituents, but I do appreciate the good work that the gentleman has done in helping them at least find employment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] for his remarks, but I would point out at no time did the White House indicate any objections to doing that and, in fact, felt that that ought to be done, and I think there was an agreement on that. But the gentleman from Virginia has made that point very clear.

On the second point, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the gentleman had an opportunity to read the Wall Street Journal today. The gentleman has had an impact already and made at least one point. Harold Ickes, a New York lawyer who represented the Puerto Rican government, has had his White House pass revoked, so the gentleman's concerns have been heard, and I am sure that this matter obviously is being reviewed in the light of the fact that they have already taken one action.

So, I think the White House is sensitive to the issue that the gentleman raises.

I would urge the Members, however, to remember that those are only two messages. I understand that, but this conference report, after all, does fund the Department of the Treasury, the General Services Administration, the Secret Service, Customs, and many others. I think the message has been sent. We have taken care of the five employees, Mr. Ickes' pass has been taken back, and I presume this matter is under review.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to support the conference report.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2403. I commend Chairman HOYER, the ranking member, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, the other subcommittee members and staff for their hard work and efforts in bringing this balanced bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, while the chairman has outlined the contents of this conference report, I would like to highlight several of its important provisions. First, this measure appropriates \$170 million less than the Treasury, Postal

Service, general government bill approved by this body in June of this year. The final appropriations contained in this bill are the result of many hard choices.

Second, this conference report contains funds important to law enforcement including drug interdiction efforts, drug treatment and prevention programs, the U.S. Customs Service, the Secret Service, and BATF. This bill also continues the programs and development of the Federal law enforcement training center which provides most of the training for Federal law enforcement personnel.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, several difficult issues are addressed in this conference report including Federal employee salary adjustments, reductions in the number of Federal employees, and subsidized mailing rates for nonprofit organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I again commend the chairman and other members of the conference committee for their diligent efforts and urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 206, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—207

Abercrombie	Darden	Hastings
Ackerman	DeFazio	Hefner
Andrews (ME)	DeLauro	Hilliard
Andrews (NJ)	Dellums	Hinchev
Andrews (TX)	Derrick	Hoagland
Bacchus (FL)	Deutsch	Hochbrueckner
Baesler	Dingell	Houghton
Barca	Dixon	Hoyer
Barrett (WI)	Dooley	Hughes
Bateman	Durbin	Inslee
Becerra	Engel	Jefferson
Bellenson	English (AZ)	Johnson (CT)
Berman	English (OK)	Johnson (GA)
Bevill	Eshoo	Johnson (SD)
Bilbray	Evans	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop	Farr	Johnston
Blackwell	Fazio	Kennedy
Bonior	Fields (LA)	Kennelly
Borski	Fillner	Klecicka
Brooks	Fingerhut	Klein
Brown (CA)	Flake	Kolbe
Brown (FL)	Foglietta	Kopetski
Brown (OH)	Ford (MI)	Kreidler
Byrne	Ford (TN)	Lambert
Cantwell	Frost	Lancaster
Cardin	Furse	Lantos
Carr	Gallo	LaRocco
Chapman	Geddenon	Leach
Clayton	Gephardt	Lehman
Clement	Gibbons	Levin
Clyburn	Gilman	Lewis (GA)
Coleman	Glickman	Lightfoot
Collins (IL)	Gonzalez	Long
Collins (MI)	Gordon	Lowe
Condit	Green	Maloney
Conyers	Greenwood	Mann
Cooper	Gutierrez	Manton
Coppersmith	Hamburg	Margolles-
Coyne	Hamilton	Mezvinsky
Cramer	Harman	Markey

Matsui	Pickett	Swett
McCloskey	Pickle	Swift
McCurdy	Pomeroy	Synar
McDermott	Price (NC)	Tanner
McHale	Rangel	Thompson
McKinney	Reed	Thornton
McNulty	Reynolds	Thurman
Meehan	Richardson	Torres
Meek	Rose	Towns
Menendez	Rostenkowski	Trafiacant
Meyers	Rowland	Tucker
Mfume	Roybal-Allard	Unsoeld
Miller (CA)	Rush	Valentine
Mineta	Sabo	Velazquez
Mink	Sanders	Vento
Moakley	Sawyer	Visclosky
Moran	Schenk	Washington
Morella	Schumer	Waters
Nadler	Scott	Watt
Natcher	Serrano	Waxman
Neal (MA)	Sharp	Wheat
Neal (NC)	Shepherd	Whitten
Obey	Siskis	Williams
Olver	Skaggs	Wilson
Owens	Slaughter	Wise
Pastor	Smith (IA)	Woolsey
Payne (NJ)	Spratt	Wyden
Payne (VA)	Stokes	Wynn
Pelosi	Strickland	
Peterson (FL)	Studds	

NAYS—206

Allard	Gilchrest	Minge
Applegate	Gillmor	Mollnar
Archer	Gingrich	Mollohan
Armey	Goodlatte	Montgomery
Bachus (AL)	Goodling	Moorhead
Baker (CA)	Goss	Murphy
Baker (LA)	Grandy	Myers
Ballenger	Gunderson	Nussle
Barca	Hall (TX)	Oberstar
Barlow	Hancock	Ortiz
Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Orton
Bartlett	Hastert	Packard
Barton	Hayes	Pallone
Bentley	Hefley	Parker
Bereuter	Herger	Paxon
Bilirakis	Hobson	Penny
Bliley	Hoekstra	Peterson (MN)
Blute	Hoke	Petri
Boehler	Holden	Pombo
Boehner	Horn	Portman
Bonilla	Huffington	Poshard
Browder	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Bunning	Hutchinson	Quillen
Burton	Hutto	Quinn
Buyer	Hyde	Rahall
Callahan	Inglis	Ramstad
Calvert	Inhofe	Ravenel
Camp	Istook	Regula
Canady	Jacobs	Ridge
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Roberts
Clinger	Kanjorski	Roemer
Coble	Kaptur	Rogers
Collins (GA)	Kasich	Rohrabacher
Combest	Kildee	Ros-Lehtinen
Costello	Kim	Roth
Cox	King	Roukema
Crane	Kingston	Royce
Crapo	Klink	Sangmeister
Cunningham	Klug	Santorum
Danner	Knollenberg	Sarpaluis
de la Garza	Kyl	Saxton
Deal	LaFalce	Schaefer
DeLay	Laughlin	Schiff
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Sensenbrenner
Dickey	Levy	Shaw
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Shays
Dornan	Linder	Shuster
Dreier	Lipinski	Skeen
Duncan	Livingston	Skelton
Dunn	Lloyd	Slatery
Edwards (TX)	Machtley	Smith (MI)
Emerson	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Everett	Mazzoli	Smith (TX)
Ewing	McCandless	Snowe
Fawell	McCollum	Solomon
Fields (TX)	McCrery	Spence
Fish	McHugh	Stearns
Fowler	McInnis	Stenholm
Franks (CT)	McKeon	Stump
Franks (NJ)	McMillan	Stupak
Gallegly	Mica	Sundquist
Gekas	Michel	Talent
Geren	Miller (FL)	Tauzin

Taylor (MS)	Upton	Wolf
Taylor (NC)	Volkmer	Young (AK)
Tejeda	Vucanovich	Young (FL)
Thomas (CA)	Walker	Zeliff
Thomas (WY)	Walsh	Zimmer
Torkildsen	Weldon	

## NOT VOTING—20

Boucher	Grams	Porter
Brewster	Hall (OH)	Schroeder
Bryant	Lewis (FL)	Smith (OR)
Clay	Martinez	Stark
Dicks	McDade	Torricelli
Edwards (CA)	Murtha	Yates
Frank (MA)	Oxley	

□ 2003

Mr. DE LA GARZA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. VALENTINE changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include therein extraneous material on H.R. 2403, the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to a health concern in my family, and the fact that today's session was not scheduled to run past 6 p.m., I was unable to cast my vote on H.R. 2403: a bill 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.

Had I been here, I would have voted "no," as I did on this bill as it originally passed the House.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was not recorded as voting on Rollcall No. 476. Had I voted, I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on H.R. 2403, the Treasury, Postal Service, General Government appropriations conference report.

Had I been present in the Chamber at the time of the vote, I would have voted "no" on Rollcall Vote No. 476.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House Chamber during Roll-

call Vote No. 476. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

AUTHORIZING PERMANENT AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO CONDUCT QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT PROGRAM

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2608) to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the Quarterly Financial Report Program, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF QUARTERLY FINANCIAL STATISTICS BY THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend title 13, United States Code, to transfer responsibility for the quarterly financial report from the Federal Trade Commission to the Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes", approved January 12, 1983 (Public Law 97-454; 96 Stat. 2494; 13 U.S.C. 91 note) is amended by striking out "September 30, 1993" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1998".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made under subsection (a) shall take effect on September 30, 1993.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for the reauthorization of the collection and publication of quarterly financial statistics by the Secretary of Commerce through fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes."

Mr. SAWYER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I rise in support of H.R. 2608 as amended by the other body and would like to thank my friend and colleague from Ohio, TOM SAWYER for his diligent work on this measure.

H.R. 2608 as passed by the House would have permanently authorized the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the Quarterly Financial Report Program. H.R. 2608 as amended by the other body would authorize the QFR Program for a 5-year period until 1998. The other body was concerned with permanently authorizing the QFR Program at this point until they could consult with experts to learn more about the QFR statistical collection process.

The QFR Program originally conducted by the Federal Trade Commis-

sion was established 45 years ago to provide on an ongoing basis needed statistics on the financial performance of manufacturing, mining, and trading operations. Today, the QFR Program provides financial data for essential calculation of key Government measures of the national economy. The QFR is the principal economic indicator of the U.S. economic performance and the primary source for estimates of the gross domestic product [GDP] and national income accounts.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2608 is non-controversial and recognizes the critical role of the QFR Program. The QFR Program is wholeheartedly supported by the U.S. corporations which supply the information and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

□ 2010

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Maryland. Frankly, I was going to explain the content of the measure, but the gentlewoman from Maryland has done such a marvelous job.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2608 reauthorizes the collection and publication of quarterly financial statistics by the Secretary of Commerce through fiscal year 1998. I am pleased to be the sponsor of this legislation, along with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the gentleman from Indiana, JOHN MYERS.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] for his support and cooperation in bringing this bill to the floor in a timely way.

The Quarterly Financial Report [QFR] Program is the Nation's most current and comprehensive source of data on corporate financial activity. QFR data are essential for calculating key measures of the national economy.

As Members may recall, the House approved H.R. 2608 on September 21 under Suspension of the Rules. The following day, the Senate passed H.R. 2608 with an amendment that reauthorizes the QFR Program for 5 years, through September 30, 1998.

The Senate wanted to have the opportunity to review the QFR Program again in the future. I understand their concerns and am happy to accept the amendments.

H.R. 2608 will ensure the accuracy and continuity of principal economic indicators. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2608, as amended.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on the bill, H.R. 2608, and the Senate amendments thereto.

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

There was no objection.

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2493, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 260 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 260

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2493) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments to the House amendments to the Senate amendments numbered 29 and 164 thereto, and to consider: (1) a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 29 with the amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution; and (2) a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 164 with the amendment printed in section 3 of this resolution. Each Senate amendment shall be considered as read. Each motion shall be debatable for one hour, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. The House amendment to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 29 is as follows: In the matter proposed to be added by the Senate amendment, insert after the word "operations" the following: ", except for marketing year 1993".

SEC. 3. The House amendment to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 164 is as follows: In the matter proposed to be added by the Senate amendment, insert before the period at the end of section 731 the following: ", except in the case of the Food and Drug Administration".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this resolution all

time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

For purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 260 provides for the consideration of the Senate amendments to the House amendments to the Senate amendments to the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

House Resolution 260 makes it in order, any rule of the House notwithstanding, to consider the motions printed in sections 2 and 3 of the rule.

The resolution provides for 1 hour of general debate on each motion which is to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Each motion shall be considered as read.

Finally, the rule provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on each motion without intervening motion.

Mr. Speaker, each of the two motions in the rule contain a technical amendment to the Senate amendments to the conference report. The first House amendment would make clear that the termination of the Wool and Mohair Program would become effective beginning with fiscal year 1994. The second amendment would restore the floor on the level of full-time employees permitted at the Food and Drug Administration. This amendment would in no way affect the Senate language relating to the limitation on funds for Honey Program payments.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, folks who are into C-SPAN have been following the incredible back and forth on this 1994 Agriculture appropriations bill. We have seen just how hard it is to actually shut down obsolete and low-priority Federal programs. Americans want us to cut spending—they want us to cut programs that we do not need and can no longer afford. But in this town cutting a program is infinitely more difficult than creating new ones. And so here we are, round three in the effort to actually shut down two Federal Agriculture subsidy programs that simply have outlived their national significance. The honey price support subsidy has been identified by a whole host of independent taxpayer watchdog groups as an unnecessary and costly boondoggle for the Nation's 2,000 beekeepers. We thought we had killed the Honey Program last month—only to wake up and find out that bees have

more than one life and the thing just would not die. The Wool and Mohair Program, created in the 1950's for strategic purposes to ensure adequate clothing for our troops, was targeted for elimination in Vice President GORE's reinventing Government report. Both of these programs were among the 50 specific spending cuts I offered for debate earlier this year in response to President Clinton's challenge to provide specific spending cuts. So I am pleased to support this rule, which finally brings the tortuous debate to a close and provides that these cuts will, in fact, be made. For once, the taxpayers could come out the winners. Specifically, we were asked for this rule to ensure three things: First, we had to deal with a technicality in House rules that limits the number of times we can bounce an issue back and forth from here to the other body. Second, in the interest of fairness, we were asked to make sure that we not penalize those participating in the Wool and Mohair Program by killing it retroactively. These seem to be reasonable requests, though there is some difference of opinion about retroactivity. But let us be very clear, once this legislation is signed into law, we will have made sure that, as of 1994, the honey subsidy and the Wool and Mohair Program will finally and permanently be put out to pasture. Third, we were asked to help bring this bill into compliance with administration concerns about Congress establishing fixed personnel floors for certain Federal agencies. I applaud the chairman for complying with this request. I only wish he would have gone all the way and not asked for an exception for the FDA—one agency that I think many Americans believe should be reined in, not expanded. A top issue in my mailbox these days is the question of FDA interference in Americans' lives and their ability to buy vitamins. But this is a debate that will have to be resolved another day. For now, I urge support for this rule so we can get on with cutting spending.

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, the honey program was abolished by House floor action, but the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, has a flaw in it which we are correcting with our effort tomorrow in the passage of the Senate amendment. The message, of course, is that the program is to be eliminated, and our language tomorrow will clarify that.

Second, under the wool and mohair program, the Senate has spoken and the House sentiment appears to be in concert. What we will attempt to do tomorrow with the passage of an amendment is to make certain that all of those Americans currently enrolled in the wool and mohair program for this marketing year, marketing year 1993, will be paid as promised. This is absolutely essential for the families and businesses involved in the program.

□ 2020

Over the past several days my office has been inundated by telephone calls from across the United States, from farmers and ranchers and producers who have enrolled in the program in good faith, in an attempt to conduct their business consistent with our Federal mandate and guidelines. This effort by the Senate to eliminate the program retroactively would have been totally unfair.

Our effort tomorrow to make certain that the marketing year of 1993 is protected is I think fair, whether you support the program or oppose it. It is clear that the program for the marketing year 1994 will not be funded. If any further action is to be taken on the wool and mohair program, it will require further action in the Congress.

The final point I would like to make is this: The President, Vice President, and Cabinet have promised the American people they will reduce the number of Federal employees. All of us support that. In fact, when the Office of Management and Budget asked us to eliminate a provision in this bill which set a floor, that is a minimum for the number of employees in various agencies, we agreed to do so, with one exception. The exception is the Food and Drug Administration, and I think it is a critically important exception.

We know that this small agency is responsible for the approval of new drugs and medical devices that will create medical breakthroughs for Americans from one coast to the other. And we want to make certain they have the professionals on hand to do the job. We are working now with the administration. I am confident that we will reach an agreement with them where we will have the necessary men and women doing the professional job at the Food and Drug Administration to make sure that new drugs, new medical devices are brought online as quickly as possible and in a professional manner.

In addition, this Congress passed several years ago a law creating the regulation and inspection of mammography clinics. If your daughter, your wife, your mother, or your friend goes to a mammography clinic in America, she should be confident that the technician and the equipment are the best, and that they are accurate. It is a matter of life and death. This program has

been so slow to start that the subcommittee decided to work to put more resources to make sure that it happened. That is why we are also asking for additional money so that we can make the inspections required by law.

The same is true for nutrition labeling as well as the approval of generic drugs and many other areas such as clinical laboratory inspection. These efforts by the Federal Government for health and safety of our people are consistent with what Americans expect for their tax dollars, and consistent with the message delivered by the President in this Chamber last week. And I am confident by tomorrow we will have worked out an agreement so that the necessary professional personnel will be on hand at the Food and Drug Administration to perform these valuable functions.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Picacho, NM, Mr. SKEEN, the ranking Republican Member.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time and thank him for pronouncing Picacho correctly. You have learned your Spanish very well, and very quickly.

I want to say that it has been a very dramatic few days, because those of us who know what agricultural programs are specifically associated with some of them always wonder at people who have no reason to really give a damn what happens, so long as we are going to save the taxpayers, and that is great. That is wonderful, we are going to save the taxpayers. But you also have commitments that you have made to citizens of this country who happen to be agricultural producers, and you may or may not like the program, but you have a lot of people who have become dependent on these programs because these margins in agriculture are very, very small.

There are no rich people that I know of that make their living strictly from the practice of agriculture. None that I am aware of. It is not a very remunerative type of business. Yet you have the greatest agricultural producers anywhere in the world in the United States because of some of the programs that we have.

I have the feeling that we are going to transport ourselves into a system of doing away with all agricultural subsidies, and it is going to be a mistake, because I do not think we are going to find the quality of agriculture we have today.

But nevertheless, let us go back to what has happened to the wool program. I am more associated with it because I have been in the wool-growing business, I and my family have. I am fourth generation and my son is fifth.

The way the Senate has spoken, I have no argument with it, because it was a fair test. But to make it retro-

active because of their absolute non-acquaintance, or to say ignorance of how the program works was I think something that had to be remedied. And I do appreciate the cooperation of the people on the floor of this House and over in the Senate as well to make them understand that if you made it retroactive right in the middle of this marketing season, because the wool has already been shorn last spring, the lambs are now being delivered, and those prices and those markets are shaking at their very foundations because of the situation that we have introduced here in the House and the Senate or in the Congress of the United States.

So that amendment I think is absolutely essential and necessary to at least give some stability to this market year, and make this transaction go a whole lot easier for people who really need the help that we are going to offer them by removing the retroactivity.

Now in the Food and Drug Administration, I agree with the chairman. The Food and Drug Administration was absolutely and correctly characterized by the chairman, and I want to say that we have taken this on as a cause of great need and serious consequences, that is keeping the FDA with the kind of personnel that they need to do the work that they need to do in an expeditious manner because of the situation in the health spectrum in this country and all of the rest of the world. It is a good amendment. I approve of it and I hope that we will pass it. And I thank the gentleman from the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], from Sanibel Island, another Spanish name.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for pronouncing Sanibel properly.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to my colleague and good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate the opportunity to talk a little bit about this rule. I rise in support of the rule, and I want to thank the Rules Committee and the gentleman from the Agriculture Committee for supporting this rule. I find that there is support even from those who do not necessarily support the program.

So we are talking about two different things here. And this rule is, it seems to me, very important because it allows us to make a change in an amendment that was passed in the Senate, an amendment that would have a devastating effect on an industry, and particularly in the West. And I am very pleased that my friend from Florida supports the rule. I do not agree with his characterization of the industry. Nevertheless, I do agree with the rule.

Let me talk just a minute about the wool industry. It is one that not many

people are familiar with. Most people think of the wool industry as a farm flock, a small number of sheep on a farm that sort of graze around the fences, and pick up the weeds, and keep things mowed, and that is good, and there are lots of them, because there are lots of very small farms. As a matter of fact, I had a list today that was put out about the number of pounds of wool that were produced in each congressional district, I think many Members would be surprised at the amount of wool production there is. There were 300-some congressional districts in which there is a substantial amount of wool.

But the unique things, of course, are the range flocks, and the range herds that we have in the West. And these are herds, frankly, that use a resource, a public resource, that is almost unusable for any other kind of animal. It is one that supports small communities. It is one that supports ranchers that are almost entirely dependent on their sheep operations. They are not hobby people who go out and buy ranches and have income from other sources. These are people who make a living raising sheep.

I also want to mention just in passing that this is not one that has been spending tax dollars. This is one that is supported by a tariff import fee.

So I am very pleased that we have this rule. I think tomorrow we can talk about the program. But certainly if this rule were to be denied, we would have a program where people have borrowed money for operations, which is very ordinary for ranchers in Wyoming and other places, borrow the operating money for this year's operation. The operation is over, depending on participating in this program, and without this amendment we would find that program cut off for the year that has passed, and folks would have bank notes due with the program failing at the end of the program.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support this rule and support the passage of this proposition.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wyoming, that I would not mischaracterize an industry which I think is very important. It was the subsidy that I perhaps overcharacterized in my opening remarks, and I hope he accepts those comments in that spirit.

I also feel the gentleman from New Mexico made a very valid point about the distinction between crop years, and fiscal years, and calendar years, which will come out in the debate tomorrow. And I think it is excellent that we have a rule that is going to allow that distinction to come forward for the edification of the Members of this body. I learned about them yesterday in the Rules Committee for the first time, and I think they are important, and I

think they are part of a very legitimate concern about fair play.

□ 2030

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. Let me just conclude by giving my congratulations to the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], their committee and staff, for bringing these technical corrections to us in such a professional way to conclude this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE 27TH ANNUAL COUNTRY MUSIC AWARDS

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, tonight the eyes of the Nation will be focused on Nashville, TN, site of the 27th Annual Country Music Awards.

Broadcast from the stage of the Grand Old Opry on CBS tonight, the CMA Awards each year bring out the best and the brightest in today's country music scene.

Country music is one of the most popular forms of music in the Nation today. It has a rich tradition, deriving its roots from the folk songs of our workers, capturing the spirit of our religious hymns, reflecting the sorrow and joy of our ballads, and echoing the drive and soulfulness of rhythm and blues.

Over 2,500 stations nationwide broadcast country music, a listening audience of 30 million, and annual sales of country music records now surpass \$700 million.

Tonight, awards for best records, songs, and artists in a multiple of categories will be awarded. The awards will be combined with live performances from some of the top artists around the world. But whoever receives these awards, it will be the audience who wins.

I am proud to represent the country music industry here in the Congress and, Mr. Speaker, I invite my friends and colleagues to join in celebrating the month of October as Country Music Month, beginning with tonight's broadcast of the CMA Awards Show.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all my colleagues will join me as cosponsors of my Coun-

try Music Month resolution (H.J. Res. 106).

Mr. Speaker, I include the following list of finalists:

NASHVILLE, TN.—Finalists for the 27th annual Country Music Association awards:

Entertainer of the Year: Brooks & Dunn; Garth Brooks; Vince Gill; Alan Jackson; Reba McEntire.

Male Vocalist of the Year: John Anderson; Garth Brooks; Vince Gill; Alan Jackson; George Strait.

Female Vocalist of the Year: Mary-Chapin Carpenter; Wynonna Judd; Reba McEntire; Pam Tillis; Tanya Tucker.

Single of the Year: "Ain't That Lonely Yet," Dwight Yoakam; "Chattahoochee," Alan Jackson; "Don't Let Our Love Start Slippin' Away," Vince Gill; "I Don't Need Your Rockin' Chair," George Jones; "Two Sparrows in a Hurricane," Tanya Tucker.

Album of the Year: "A Lot About Livin' (And a Little 'Bout Love)," Alan Jackson; "The Chase," Garth Brooks; "Come On Come On," Mary-Chapin Carpenter; "Hard Workin' Man," Brooks & Dunn; "I Still Believe in You," Vince Gill.

Vocal Group of the Year: Alabama; Confederate Railroad; Diamond Rio; Restless Heart; Sawyer Brown.

Vocal Duo of the Year: Bellamy Brothers; Brooks & Dunn; Darryl and Don Ellis; Sweethearts of the Rodeo.

Music Video of the Year: "Chattahoochee," Alan Jackson; "Cleopatra Queen of Denial," Pam Tillis; "Don't Let Our Love Start Slippin' Away," Vince Gill; "I Don't Need Your Rockin' Chair," George Jones; "Seminole Wind," John Anderson.

Horizon Award: Mark Chesnutt; Sammy Kershaw; Tracy Lawrence; John Michael Montgomery; Trisha Yearwood.

Song of the Year (award to songwriter): "Ain't That Lonely Yet," Kostas, James House; "Boot Scootin' Boogie," Ronnie Dunn; "Chattahoochee," Alan Jackson and Jim McBride; "I Still Believe in You," Vince Gill and John Barlow Jarvis; "Seminole Wind," John Anderson.

Vocal Event of the Year: Clint Black with Wynonna Judd, "A Bad Goodbye;" George Jones with Vince Gill, Mark Chesnutt, Garth Brooks, Travis Tritt, Joe Diffie, Alan Jackson, Pam Tillis, T. Graham Brown, Patty Loveless and Clint Black, "I Don't Need Your Rockin' Chair;" Reba McEntire and Vince Gill, "The Heart Won't Lie;" Tanya Tucker with Delbert McClinton, "Tell Me About It;" Trisha Yearwood with Don Henley, "Walkaway Joe."

Musician of the Year: Paul Franklin; John Barlow Jarvis; Brent Mason; Mark O'Connor; Matt Rollings.

#### H.R. 830, THE REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY AMENDMENTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I take this special order to discuss H.R. 830, the Regulatory Flexibility Amendments Act. This bill will help reduce costly regulations on small businesses and local governments. We all know how important small businesses are to the American economy.

In a time where we have seen the Fortune 500 companies cut back their

employment by 30 percent and, we know, even more, that new jobs are created through small businesses, that most of our job opportunities come from small businesses.

As I travel around my central Illinois district, one of the things that is made very clear to me in visiting small-business people is their unhappiness with what they consider to be excessive Government regulations.

I am constantly reminded by them that they feel terribly burdened, that their costs are greatly increased and, yes, their profitability and their ability to hire new employees is adversely affected by excessive Government regulations.

I hope that my colleagues will take a close look at H.R. 830 and will join the 203 Members of this body who have already cosponsored this piece of legislation.

What is the Regulatory Flexibility Act? Well, the RFA, as it is known, was passed in 1980 and signed by then-President Carter. It requires Federal regulators to review the costs of proposed new regulations by preparing a regulatory flexibility analysis. Regulators must then seek ways to minimize these costs on the small businesses that are being regulated, to find ways to make their regulations effective without being overburdensome. But the agencies were provided in the original act passed in 1980 with an escape hatch, which they have learned to use very effectively. They may approve a certification which states that the rule will not have a substantial effect on a sufficient number of small entities to require an analysis be done. They use this escape hatch almost routinely, and rules and regulations promulgated by the some 5,000 regulators in this country and put into effect without ever analyzing this burden, the effect or the cost in jobs to the businesses being regulated.

Because the Regulatory Flexibility Act, when passed, was flawed, it did not allow for judicial review of the agencies' compliance. The agencies are free to do as they wish without any fear that anyone will challenge their authority.

What then will H.R. 830 do? H.R. 830 will remove the prohibition on judicial review. Yes, I believe H.R. 830 will restore what I think would be a constitutional right on the small businesses and the people who own and operate them in this country.

It will remove the prohibition on judicial review and allow small businesses to take legal actions if the agencies fail to comply with the law, if they fail to analyze their regulations, if they fail to realize and to analyze whether these regulations are overly burdensome.

This will literally put some teeth into the Regulatory Flexibility Act and, I think, will meet the demands

and the requests of my constituents and those, I believe, of every Member in this body.

This small change will do a lot to reduce the cost of new regulations on small businesses and local governments.

While regulators are currently judge, jury, and enforcers, this will level the playing field. H.R. 830 is moving quickly, with over 203 cosponsors. We have bipartisan support, including the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Small Business. H.R. 830 is endorsed by 50 small-business groups, such as National Small Business United, National Association for the Self-Employed, National Federation of Independent Business.

The administration of William Clinton, under Vice President AL GORE, in their Reinventing Government Program, called for the No. 1 action in the section dealing with small business, with the adding of judicial review to the Regulatory Flexibility Act. I am pleased with that, I am pleased with the bipartisan support for this good legislation.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope that all the Members who have not joined as cosponsors of H.R. 830 will contact us so that their names may be added to this fine legislation.

□ 2040

#### \$284 MILLION A YEAR FOR FOREIGNERS WHO LIKE THE CANADIAN HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, lots of conservative commentators and their supporters in Congress love to yak about long lines for health care service in Canada and how Canadian doctors are fleeing to the United States. They are wrong on both counts: There are no lines for emergency care and in one recent year, more United States doctors moved to Canada than came here.

But the really embarrassing news is contained in the September 23, 1993 *The Globe and Mail* of Toronto: "U.S. President Bill Clinton's plan to provide health insurance for all Americans, paid for partly with cigarette taxes, offers two accidental benefits for Canadian government finances: First, Americans would no longer be tempted to slip across the border for free Canadian health care; and second, smuggling of cigarettes from the United States would become somewhat less lucrative, and perhaps less widespread.

"No one knows how many U.S. free riders use Canada's health system, but a leaked report by Ontario Health Insurance Plan investigators earlier this year estimated that use of health cards by ineligible people, some from the United States, costs as much as \$284 million a year.

"There is evidence that Americans cross the border to have babies and get treatment for

AIDS, among other things, the investigators said.

"This past summer, Ontario officials charged a woman from Rochester, NY, with impersonation and attempted fraud, and an Arkansas man with conspiracy to defraud, in connection with use of health cards."

Once again, I hate to bother the ideologues who bad-mouth Canada, but I hope that an occasional fact or two could slip into their brains. I would hope these facts would help shame them into supporting a true reform of our Nation's health care system.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the recognition and the opportunity to address the House this evening and my colleagues who are listening. I am here tonight to talk about an issue that all America is talking about today, an issue that touches the lives of more Americans in a more personal way than any other, an that issue, of course, is health care.

To be honest, Mr. Speaker, I think anybody who was watching CNN today will tell you that we had a pretty tough act to follow, because over the past 2 days the First Lady has appeared before no less than five congressional committees. She has articulated our health care challenge and the administration's solution I think more eloquently and more forcefully than anybody I know, and anybody who has seen her talk about this issue, the over 300 Members of Congress who had this plan unveiled and introduced to them by her over a week ago knows who well she is prepared and how committed she is to making sure we do this well and right. Her testimony has kept the momentum for reform going that started a week ago tonight, and I want to commend her publicly for it.

Mr. Speaker, it was exactly 1 week ago today, actually 1 week ago and 15 minutes, that the President came into this Chamber, to this podium behind me and asked Congress to take up the challenge of providing health security for all Americans. It was a passionate speech. It was an eloquent speech. He outlined his plan to fix what is wrong with our health care system while preserving what is right with it, the good parts of it, to build upon and improve the system we have now to make it fair, to make it better, and to make everybody who participates, and everybody will, to be responsible and above all to guarantee that each American has comprehensive health benefits that never, never can be taken away.

While I was listening to the speech, I could not help but think about history. I could not help but think about a similar speech delivered in this Chamber by a President some 58 years ago,

when President Franklin Roosevelt also stood up and challenged Congress to provide security for all Americans, security in the form of Social Security.

It was 30 years later or thereabouts that Lyndon Johnson came to the Congress of the United States, stood behind us and said we have got to provide Medicare for our elderly so they are covered.

When FDR introduced Social Security back in 1935 he called it a sacred trust between the Government and the people that could never be broken and that trust was symbolized by the Social Security card that we all have.

I think the same can be said about the President's health care plan. If you remember during his speech, the President held up this card, a health security card, a card that guarantees to each American a comprehensive package of benefits equal to or better than the benefits provided by most Fortune 500 companies.

This card, too, will represent a sacred trust between the Government and the people. As the President said in his speech:

With this card, if you lose your job or you switch a job, you are covered. If you leave your job to start a small business, you are covered. If you retire early, you are covered. If you or someone in your family has a pre-existing medical condition, a heart problem or perhaps cancer, you are covered. If you get sick or a member of your family gets sick, even if it is a life-threatening illness, you are covered, and if an insurance company tries to drop you for any reason, you will still be covered because that will be illegal.

The President's health care plan guarantees a comprehensive package of benefits and with this card, you will never leave home without it. It will be with you. It will be the security you need, the security that has been missing on the health care front in this country.

That is the ultimate goal of health care reform, to give every American the peace of mind to know that no matter what happens, health care will be always there for them.

As the First Lady said yesterday:

I hope we can agree on one thing at the outset, that when our work is done every American will receive a health security card guaranteeing a comprehensive package of benefits that can never be taken away under any circumstances.

Because we all know that certainly is not the case today. Every single month, think about this, every single month 2 million people who work hard, who play by the rules, lose their coverage, and over the next 2 years one out of four Americans is expected to be without insurance at some point during that period.

This problem is unraveling the social fabric of our society. It is unraveling the economic competitive advantage we have had for so many years. It is reducing our productivity. It is affecting

our competitiveness. It is draining our Federal and our State budgets and driving down the wages and the living standards of our workforce.

This problem affects us all and we have got to work together to solve it. A national consensus for health care reform is now building. It is forming, and for the first time ever leaders from both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party have embraced comprehensive reform.

The question we will spend the coming months trying to answer is simply this: What is the best way to get there from here?

It is not an easy question. As someone once said, "Gravity isn't easy, but it's the law."

Well, health care reform will not be easy, but it is the law that will most profoundly affect the future of America, and we together, Independents, Democrats and Republicans, have to make it happen. We are on the cusp of making it happen. We are on the verge of making history. We are on the verge of doing something that each and every one of us in this legislative body will be proud of the rest of our lives.

Last week the President's speech started the ball rolling. His plan has shaped the parameters of the debate, and in the coming months we in Congress are going to work with the White House and the public to hammer out all the choices that confront us, and there are a lot of issues before us, believe me; but I hope we can put aside our partisan and our ideological differences that have been conducted in a way that we wish we could move beyond in this Chamber and come up with a final plan that is fair, that is compassionate and that works, a plan that remains wedded to the six principles and basic values on health care reform that the President outlined last week: Security, simplicity, savings, choice, quality, and responsibility. I think they are worth repeating here this evening.

First, security, to provide all Americans with the security of knowing that no matter what happens, whether you switch jobs, you lose your job, you get laid off, you have a preexisting condition, you and your family will never lose your health care coverage. People need to have that sense of security. They have it in Germany. They have it in France. They have it in Canada. I could go on and on. We need it here for the American people.

□ 2050

Second, savings, to control the costs that are crippling American businesses, American families, exploding our deficit here in this Federal Government, as well as in our State Governments.

In 1980, Mr. Speaker, a family of four, the cost of health insurance was about \$2,500 a year. Today it is in the neighborhood of \$6,500, and, if we do nothing,

if we let this system drift and unravel the way it has been, it will be \$14,000 a year by the end of the decade.

The plan will stop the escalating costs of health care premiums and provide discounts to small businesses so they can afford health care for their employees and for their families. It will provide that is needed to help those small, independent businesses provide their employees with a security that they need to perform well, to have confidence in their bosses, to be healthy, to be there at work, on the job, and to be able to be retained so there is not the turnover in our small business system that there presently is today.

Third, simplicity. Everybody has horror stories about the paperwork. We need to reduce paperwork, cut redtape, reduce the regulations that are keeping doctors and nurses and other health care practitioners from giving us the health care they were trained to give us and that they want to give us.

Today there are 1,500 insurance companies, all with a form of their own. This plan, the President's plan, will reduce that to one form, one form, and it will free up our medical practitioners to do what is best, and that is provide health care for us.

Fourth, choice. We have got to, and we will under this plan, preserve your right to choose your doctor and your health plan. There are literally tens of millions of people in this country today who do not have that choice. Under the plans that they have at work they have to have a certain doctor or they have to have a certain plan. This will free up the opportunity to make the choice that you want on the doctor you want, on the health plan you want, so that we all will have a doctor our family has confidence in.

Fifth, quality, to make what is best about American health care even better, and there is a lot of good in the system today. The plan will provide for free preventative care so we can catch things early, so we can keep people healthy, so that the costs will not rise when they get ill. The plan will invest more in training, more family doctors, and will make medical research a priority, and for seniors it will preserve Medicare. I want to repeat that. It will preserve Medicare and cover, in addition, prescription drugs and expand long-term care for the first time.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows someone in their family, in their work, in their neighborhood, who is spending an enormous amount of money, an inordinate amount of money, for prescription drugs. We must ensure that America continues to have the best doctors and the most advanced treatment in the world, and we are with the quality that is going to be built into this system.

Sixth, responsibility, to make sure that everyone pays their part and contributes to health care. Right now we

all pay for those who do not take responsibility, and everybody knows who I am talking about. There are folks out there that do not have insurance. They end up in the emergency room where it is inefficient and particularly costly. That cost gets passed on to us, those who have insurance. It shows up in the bills that we get when we leave the hospital. It shows up in doctor bills.

Every one of us have had that experience. We get home. We see the bills. We want to know why such an inordinate, high amount for this drug or that drug while we were in the hospital this day. That is because we are picking up the costs of the 37 million Americans who do not have health insurance, who end up getting it anyway, and it has got to be paid for.

Responsibility also means changing the behavior that drives the cost and causes suffering like violence from handguns. By God, we are going to do something about that in this Congress this time. And smoking, and excessive drinking. All of these things have to be reined in, and we need to restore the sense that we are all in this together. That is what responsibility means, that we are all in this together. Working together we are going to drive the costs down, and we are going to provide health care for all of us.

Through it all there will be those who will say, and you can hear them now, that we do not need any change, we cannot afford change, that the present system is working fine, that the insurance companies and the drug companies will make changes on their own. We cannot let the special interests dictate this debate. This debate is too important and too powerful for our country. America has been at the mercy, at the mercy, of some of these people for far too long, and it is time we recognize in this country that health care is a right, not a privilege. It is a right.

Mr. Speaker, if every other major industrial country in the world can provide health coverage for its people, we can, too. Germany has been doing it since 1870. Think about that.

In the months to come, Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a lot of statistics, and we are going to hear a lot of numbers to dramatize the health care crisis, but we have got to remember that health care is more than just numbers and more than statistics.

Mr. Speaker, it is real lives, real people. We have to be able to put ourselves into the stories of the people we hear from to give this debate some meaning, some texture, some emotion, people like that man from Michigan who wrote me to say that 14 years ago he was diagnosed with Hodgkin's disease, and, with the help of a strong will, and some good doctors, and a caring family, he fought it, and by 1985 he was pronounced cured, cured by everyone but his employer's insurance company

who refused to cover him because he was, quote unquote, a bad risk. So, after 15 years on the job, his boss was forced to lay him off just because the insurance company would not cover him, and now he has no job, and he and his wife and his two children have no health insurance.

We have all heard these stories before, Mr. Speaker. I have. A couple of years ago I remember going back to my district and meeting with a man who said to me, "You know, Congressman, I'm not quite ready for Medicare. I'm not 65. I'm in my late fifties. But I worked 40 years at this plant." And this guy worked at a job where he worked a tough job, where he came home dirty and sweaty, and all he wanted to do when he got home was just catch his breath, and let some time pass, and feel the peace of being out of the factory. Forty years; felt he earned himself a pension; was getting a pension of \$500 a month, not a lot of money, but certainly a big comfort to him, \$500 a month.

Mr. Speaker, he went to the mailbox to get his pension check a week before he saw me. He said, "You know, Congressman, there was a check there, but it was for 32 bucks, and there was a note that said that's all you're going to get from now on because your health insurance has gone up so much that we have to deduct it from your pension." His life, his dream, what he had worked for, was gone, and I come across people like that each and every day in my congressional district. It is happening all over America.

A group of women came to see me at my office. They were health care workers. They worked at a nursing home. They bathed and took care of our mothers, and fathers, and our grandparents. They made a little more than the minimum wage, \$5½ to \$6 an hour. They had no health insurance themselves, and yet they were taking care of our families, and one woman broke down and told me, "You know, Congressman, I go to bed every night and say a prayer that my son doesn't get sick because I don't have the wherewithal to take care of him."

The choice for her could have been very easy. I mean she could have gotten health care by staying on Medicaid or going on Medicaid. She did not. She had too much feel for the dignity of work, and she went to work.

Should we be penalizing people like this? That is not the way I think this country wants to move.

So, Mr. Speaker, these people come from all walks of life, people who are frustrated. They are frightened, and they are fed up with a system that makes no sense, that provides no coverage at a crucial time and does nothing that protects them from the price gouging and the rising costs of health care today. They come from people whose very idea of security is being

shattered before their eyes. It is time to provide people with the security and the peace of mind to know that no matter where they go, no matter what they do, that health care will always be there for them.

I see that in the eyes, and in the faces, and in the hearts of the people who live across the river from my district in Ontario in Canada. Now, you can say what you will about the Canadian system, but there is a serenity there, a peace of mind. There is a good feeling by Canadians about what their country has done in providing health care for them.

Our ultimate goal here then is health security for all Americans, and the only way to get there is to keep what is right with our system, the best doctors, the best medical technology, the best medical research, while fixing what is wrong.

□ 2100

Nothing we do in this Congress will be as important. Nothing we do will be more longlasting. Nothing we do will touch the lives of more people, than health care reform.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we all have the courage to do what is right, because the future of our children and the future of our country will depend on how we act, how we conduct ourselves, and how expeditiously we move to provide at this most propitious moment, health care for the American people.

#### STATEHOOD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House this evening on a subject of overriding importance to the people of the District of Columbia whom I represent.

Members of this House and of the other body over the past several weeks cannot but have noticed that residents of my district have allowed themselves to be arrested in order to protest their political and civic condition. Each Thursday, and I am told that tomorrow once again they will come to Independence Avenue, before the Cannon and Longworth Buildings, they come, and some of them submit themselves to arrest in the tradition of civil disobedience of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King.

Mr. Speaker, I feel an obligation to address the House concerning what they have told me about their effort. First let me indicate that this is an effort born and bred in the District. It is not an effort of mine nor an effort that I have participated in. But it is an effort that anyone who represents the

residents of the District of Columbia must surely endorse, even as I hope that my efforts as a young student in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee were endorsed when we engaged in similar civil disobedience against injustice.

As we were successful in the civil rights movement more than 30 years ago, I have the faith to believe that with multiple actions, especially actions on this floor, the residents of the District of Columbia will be regarded in their full citizenship.

The number of people arrested thus far is 96. One person has been arrested 12 times. The total number of arrests is 165. There have been 12 weekly demonstrations. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it says something about the nature of this process that among those arrested has been the Mayor of the city, Sharon Pratt Kelly; Rev. Jesse Jackson, who is the statehood lobbyist; Dick Gregory, the famous wit; and two members of the City Council, Mr. Kevin Shavers and Mr. Frank Smith.

The weekly total reads much like that I remember in the early 1960's. On July 1 there were 32 arrested; on July 8, 3; on July 15, there were 6 arrested; on July 22, there were 8; on July 29, 9 people were arrested; on August 5, 11; on August 12, 11; on August 19, 5; on August 26, Mr. Speaker, 38 people were arrested; on September 2, 10 were arrested; on September 9, 22 were arrested; on September 16, 10 were arrested. And so it goes, Mr. Speaker.

They volunteer. Sometimes they come in groups. There will be a group of senior citizens on October 7. There will be religious groups on September 30, tomorrow. There will be a group from the D.C. Public Schools on November 4.

Why would people submit themselves to arrest in the streets adjacent to the free world? They do so, Mr. Speaker, because alone, among the residents of the 50 States and the four territories, they are treated with insidious discrimination based on citizenship.

My constituents alone, among the 50 States and 4 Territories, pay Federal income taxes to the Federal Treasury and have no vote on final passage in this Chamber, and neither voice nor vote in the Chamber of the Senate.

The four Territories have a similar status. There is a large difference between those residents and my own, however. That difference is that the four Territories pay no Federal income tax to the Federal Treasury, and thus the initial promise that created the compact of the United States of America has been kept as to them, no taxation without representation. They are not taxed, and they are not fully represented.

Mr. Speaker, we are taxed, and we are not fully represented. We are third per capita in Federal taxes paid to the Federal Treasury. The word "tax" has

become an evil word in this Chamber. Imagine what my residents feel, what my constituents endure when they pay taxes—not to the crown, which the Founders finally refused to pay taxes to, but to their native land, without full representation.

We are 600,000 strong, larger than three States. We have a productive economy. We have business services higher than 30 States, legal services higher than 41 States, hotel and lodging higher than 27 States, finance, insurance and real estate higher than 14 States. We have 20 million tourists every year.

My constituents do not seek, of course, jurisdiction over Federal territory. If, as we pray, the District of Columbia becomes the State of New Columbia, most of Washington that Members know and that their constituents know will remain Washington, DC, the Capital of the country. The great and expansive Federal enclave created by the great L'Enfant will remain under Federal jurisdiction. This House, all of the territory along Constitution Avenue and Independence Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue, much of Washington, will remain Washington, DC, and that will be called Washington, DC.

But, Mr. Speaker, Washington, DC does not need to be the eight wards of the District of Columbia. The far Northwest and the far Southeast are not now necessary and have never been necessary to the Federal presence. We ask for the liberation of that part of this territory.

□ 2110

This very House has shown that it is within its power to do just that. In the middle of the 19th century, the State of Virginia, which had given some of its land to create this great city, approached this body and demanded back its land, because the District of Columbia, through this House and the Senate, was going to abolish slavery.

To retain the institution of slavery, they told the Members of this body. "We demand back the land we gave you to form the District of Columbia." And what did this body do?

This body gave the land back to Virginia and made the District of Columbia smaller by that amount of land, and it is now in Alexandria and across the other side of the river. And so the part of the Constitution that says that there shall be Federal territory no more than 10 miles square was preserved.

It is less than 10 miles square today, because this body honored the request of the Commonwealth of Virginia in the name of slavery.

My constituents, Mr. Speaker, ask that in the name of freedom you reduce the size of the District of Columbia yet again, leaving the great expanse of the Federal territory and creating the State of New Columbia, this time in

the name of liberating the neighborhoods of the District of Columbia to govern themselves as every community in the territory called the United States does. In American Samoa, in Guam, in Puerto Rico, in the Virgin Islands, there is self-government, Mr. Speaker. Self-government is a travesty in the District of Columbia.

To be sure, we have a Mayor and a City Council. And, Mr. Speaker, as we have seen this very session, at whim any Member may call forth any law passed by my democratically elected council and demand a vote to overturn that law. And if the truth be told, Mr. Speaker, at whim this body could overturn each and every law passed in the 20 years since there has been home rule for the District of Columbia. That is what the Home Rule Act has amounted to.

We have served in our wars, including fifth per capita in the Persian Gulf. When I walked into this House last term, the first item of consequence to be debated was the Persian Gulf war. I got to speak to that question, Mr. Speaker.

At the very time that I rose to speak, we were then fourth per capita. But when the time came, Mr. Speaker, to register one's vote up in the corner there, there was no place for the District of Columbia to vote aye or nay. Yet, we were there in greater measure than almost all who are already represented, free and equally, in this body.

Perhaps you are coming to understand, Mr. Speaker, why there is some consternation among those I represent this day and this evening.

The constitutional qualifications to become a State have all been met. Majority vote of the residents, that was done more than 10 years ago. Requisite population and resources, I have just reiterated our resources, a very productive economy. Commitment to democracy, I dare say, Mr. Speaker, a greater commitment demonstrated than most Americans have had the opportunity to demonstrate.

We carry each and every burden of citizenship willfully, without complaint. And yet, most of the most precious, many of the most precious advantages of citizenship are kept from us.

Mr. Speaker, only the United States of America, as it turns out, denies its Capital City full and equal representation in its national body. How could it be that in countries with names like Albania and Argentina and countries with names like Botswana and China, in countries with names like Gabon and Haiti, in countries with names like Malta and Nigeria, in countries with names like Russia and Ukraine, the residents of the capital city enjoy equal rights with the residents of every part of the nation?

We stand alone, Mr. Speaker, in this regard. And it is a lonely, ignominious place to stand.

Put yourself in the position of the District of Columbia and ask yourself what action you would now take. The action I seek, I seek on this floor alone.

I seek a vote for statehood for the State of New Columbia. I seek a vote to make the 51st State of the United States of America. I seek to wipe from our body politic 600,000 citizens stateless and disenfranchised. I seek to eliminate inequality of citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I am a fourth-generation Washingtonian. My great grandfather walked across the District line from Virginia before the Civil War. My grandfather entered the D.C. Fire Department in 1902. No member of my family has enjoyed full and equal rights in the United States of America, because we are Washingtonians.

People of my race, who did not enjoy full rights, have managed to get them through the largesse of this House and the Senate of the United States. And the great civil rights bills of the 1960's, the equality legislation we continue to pass, has enfranchised those least enfranchised. And so there remains one small place, one small group of people treated invidiously. I represent those people, Mr. Speaker. We can no longer live with this distinction.

"There must be some alternative," I am told, "Truly, there is some other way."

I believe I am told this out of tradition. People cannot imagine that this territory would become something else. I wonder if one would ask, therefore, ask us to hold with this tradition out of some romantic sentimentality somewhere in the country. It is partly tradition and, perhaps, mainly the failure of imagination, the failure to conceive that something that for 200 years has been the Nation's Capital might indeed be something else in order to bring equality of citizenship to the residents of the District.

□ 2120

So people search for other alternatives. Fair enough. Fair enough. We have tried them all. Let me dispose of them tonight so the Members can understand why I stand here with the alternative I propose.

In the 1970's the residents of the District of Columbia put before this body and the Senate an amendment that would have, indeed, given us full representation in the House and the Senate. It was voted out of this body. If you please, Mr. Speaker, it got all of 16 States out of the 38 needed for ratification. Thank you very much, Mr. and Mrs. America, if you please, Mr. Speaker.

Even had we prevailed, look at the anomaly with which we would have been left, Mr. Speaker. We would have had a full voting Representative on final passage in the House, and not merely in the Committee on the Whole, as I now vote. We would have had two

Senators, and these three people would have been put in the position of seeing the budget of their city come to be heard here as if the Congress were the City Council of the District of Columbia.

Yes, that is how it works, Mr. Speaker. When the city council finishes the \$3 billion budget, most of it raised in the District of Columbia, instead of it going into effect, and here I am talking about money raised exclusively in the District of Columbia, the budget then goes to the President of the United States. He sends it to the Congress of the United States, and then it goes to a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, as if the District of Columbia, instead of being a jurisdiction of 600,000 Americans, were the HHS or the State Department.

Then a subcommittee sits down and literally repeats the hearings of the Budget Committee of the Council of the District of Columbia. It goes through it, step-by-step, because, of course, that is what you have to do if the budget resides here.

Then it comes here and it is voted up or down. Members regularly get up and attach to our budget matters that are of interest and concern to their constituents. Members completely unaccountable to the residents of the District of Columbia, elected by none of them, rise up and decide whether we shall have X or whether we shall have Y, and put that in our budget.

Let me try, Mr. Speaker, going into the district of any one of my colleagues to dare to propose what their city council should do. I would not dare to, and I wish that my colleagues would not dare do, but they shall do, until we are no longer subject to congressional jurisdiction.

When the Council of the District of Columbia passes a law, even if that law is, let us say, an alley closing, Mr. Speaker, that law cannot be final until it rests here for 30 legislative days. Considering our recesses and when that law might come, that 30 days could last for several months. If it is a criminal law, it has to be 60 days. When it has rested long enough and no Member has put in a disapproval resolution, and any Member may, it may, indeed, become law if we are fortunate.

Is that any way to run a democracy, Mr. Speaker? Is the hypocrisy of this process not clear enough to those of us fortunate enough to be born in this country and to have observed its most basic principles?

Mr. Speaker, we are told that, "Well, if that is not quite good enough, if it failed in the 1970's, if it would have been half a loaf, anyway, because you would have had representation but your budget still would have come here and your laws still would have come here, if that is not good enough, here is another one for you, District of Columbia residents. Try this one on: why

don't you retrocede to Maryland? After all, Virginia gave part of the land, they took theirs, Maryland gave part of the land. Why does the District of Columbia not become part of the State of Maryland?"

The first answer is one of democracy and impossibility. Both the District of Columbia and the State of Maryland would have to agree. The only mandate I have is for statehood. My residents have voted by a decisive margin for statehood. Let us look at the State of Maryland. The State of Maryland has not had a chance to vote one way or another, but if you have had a chance to follow the politics and the legislative activity of the State of Maryland, you will understand that it is probably easier to get statehood in this body than it is to get the District retroceded to the State of Maryland.

The State of Maryland has one large city, it is called Baltimore, one and only one large city. If you were to follow the way Baltimore is treated, perhaps you would understand what I mean when I say that I don't think there is any chance that Maryland is going to wish to accept the District of Columbia as a city of the State of Maryland.

There are those who think that it will dilute their power. I suppose it would. There would be more of us, relative—there would be a new jurisdiction, making it larger, but also reconfiguring the politics and the political culture itself of Maryland. We have had no takers for that proposition. I might add, Mr. Speaker, no one from Maryland has stepped forward with any serious proposition that this might be a good thing to do.

Voila, there goes the half a loaf, voting representation, and the impossible loaf, retrocession to Maryland.

What is left, Mr. Speaker, under our laws and Constitution? Statehood and only statehood. I defy the Members to come forward with a good reason, other than it is the way it always has been, for denying statehood and thereby denying citizenship rights to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Our country has proudly challenged undemocratic practice throughout the world. I am proud of what my country has done throughout the world. I believe that the democracy movement that has flown around the world many times over now, seizing virtually every continent, has imitated the practices of this country. Everywhere in the world people want to come to this country. We must make ourselves worthy for that emulation.

Most people in the world, most people in this country, do not realize the condition, the political condition, of the capital city of this country. Most Americans simply would not endorse it.

I am not alone in supporting statehood for the District of Columbia, Mr.

Speaker. The President of the United States, Bill Clinton, even before he was elected and sent, has unequivocally supported statehood for the District of Columbia.

He came to testify before the Committee on the District of Columbia before he became President, and did so eloquently on this question. Since becoming President, he has not hesitated to continue to indicate his endorsement of statehood for the District of Columbia, and to indicate that he would sign a bill if this House would pass one, and if the Senate of the United States would pass one.

On May 27 in the Rose Garden, televised for the American people at a town meeting, the President made a statement in response to a question about whether he supported statehood for the District of Columbia from someone in the audience.

□ 2130

I quote his words:

Well, I think frankly, I think having the Senators and the Members of Congress is not as important as having control over your own destiny. The District of Columbia has more people than 5 other States, pays more taxes than 10 other States, and sent more soldiers to fight in the Persian Gulf than 20 other States, and yet every time they turn around Congress can overturn anything they do through their elected officials. If they become a State, yes, it's true, they would get two Senators and a Member of Congress, just like the other small States. But the main thing is they would have more control over their own destiny. It's very frustrating for the people of the District to know that Congress can do or not do anything. Just like this fellow said, they can say no, you can't have \$2 million for police, and you can't do it on your own because they don't have independence. So that's why I've always supported statehood. Once I saw the facts about the size, the taxes, the contribution to the national interest, I thought they ought to have the right to be independent.

End of quote from the President of the United States. Those who have had occasion to study this matter most deeply have also supported statehood for the District of Columbia. The statehood movement is almost 15 years old. Our own hometown newspaper, the Washington Post, did not support statehood for many years.

In a historic breakthrough on January 13 of this year the Washington Post endorsed statehood for the District of Columbia. The Post has thought long and hard. My own view is that it did not support statehood earlier because it was thinking about questions that have begun to be answered, questions about what would happen to the District of Columbia financially, questions about alternatives, questions about the rest of a Federal enclave.

May I quote, Mr. Speaker, from what the Washington Post said in this historic editorial, breaking its silence on this issue. I quote from only part of the editorial:

It is time to right a great historic wrong. Since 1800 the residents of Washington, DC

have been the only taxpaying U.S. citizens denied representation in Congress. With the election of Bill Clinton, it has become politically possible to give them the status that is their due. We believe now is the time to begin defining and then putting in place an arrangement that puts District residents on an equal footing with all Americans. As a step toward that end, Congress passed a proposed constitutional amendment 15 years ago that would have given the city full congressional representation. Only 16 of the required 38 States ratified the proposal, mostly for partisan reasons. Republican lawmakers wanted no more Democrats in the Congress, and as some suspect, many legislators wanted no more blacks there as well. The only achievable alternative, if citizens here are to enjoy their full political participation that is their due is statehood.

That is my hometown newspaper, one of America's great national newspapers, and one that came to statehood thoughtfully, quietly, incrementally. I believe this editorial has significant credibility because it was so long in coming, because it is so thoughtful a position.

But if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, before my hometown newspaper arrived at its conclusion concerning statehood, the newspaper said to be America's greatest newspaper had three times written editorials endorsing statehood for the District of Columbia, and I refer to none other, Mr. Speaker, than the New York Times. In three editorials the New York Times, in a space of little more than a year, has said that statehood for the District of Columbia is the appropriate remedy for the denial of full citizenship for the residents that surround this place this evening.

The first editorial was entitled "Free the Government's Plantation." If I may quote one sentence from that editorial, Mr. Speaker, "The current arrangement is more suited to a dictatorship than a democracy." That is the New York Times.

The second editorial was entitled "The D.C. Plantation: Freedom Soon?" The third editorial was entitled "The State of Misgovernment."

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that I have been discussing a structural change in government. I recognize that it is a departure of a most unusual kind.

May I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that in some ways the request I make for statehood in this House is no different from the request of virtually every State that has entered the Union. We know that it takes only the vote of the House, the vote of the Senate, and the signature of the President of the United States. But, Mr. Speaker, even for those territories that were in the middle of our country, where as it were Manifest Destiny would seem to have said that those places had to be included in the United States of America, even for such States it has always been difficult to become a State of the United States of America.

Before the Civil War, if a slave State wanted to get in, a free State had to

get in, and then it was a wash, and then they both got in. This has always been a profoundly political question, Mr. Speaker. It has not been objectively about whether or not California should come in. They came in quickly, Mr. Speaker, because there was a gold rush at the time.

It has not been about whether or not Utah should enter or Illinois should come in. Underneath those debates, as with this, were questions of politics. I accept that, Mr. Speaker.

But in each and every one of those instances, including the last, Hawaii and Alaska, American principles finally overcame American politics. It must happen this time as well. We cannot leave 600,000 people much longer in the netherland of democracy, in the twilight between real democracy and pseudodemocracy, pretending that there is equality of citizenship here with our fellow Americans everywhere else. We must stop the pretense.

There is a way to do it, and the time has come to do it, Mr. Speaker. As some would say, "Try it, you might like it." Mr. Speaker, what I say is try it, you will not know much difference. Washington, DC, will still be the Washington, DC, we most know, the downtown Federal enclave. The residents who live in the far Northeast, those who live in Southwest, those who live in Northwest and Southeast will have, in reality, the same relationship to this Federal place as they have now, except for one difference. There will be one person here who stands and votes on everything as every American who pays taxes should and must. And there will be two people in the other body who as the Founders would have it will express the wishes and vote them for their constituents.

□ 2140

I ask my colleagues, especially those who are new to this body—and there are 110 of you, you are said to come here for a change, and for many of you change means democracy and democratization of this body—the most significant act you and the rest of us could take to democratize this body would be to admit the last colony of the United States of America.

In their name, in the name of the Mayor of the city called the District of Columbia now, in the name of the 13 members of the city council, in the name of the 600,000 residents who, in virtually every respect, are like each and every one of those you represent, I ask this body to finally deliver to my constituents what, through the good graces of the Congress of the United States, has been delivered to all others, all others who live under the American flag.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that before this session has ended, that this body votes to make Washington, DC, the present Federal enclave, and the eight wards of

the District of Columbia, the State of New Columbia, the 51st State of the United States of America.

#### THE CRISIS IN SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by those who want to prematurely withdraw United States forces from Somalia.

It would be a profound mistake to put a time limit on United States peacekeeping in Somalia. We would undo all the good we have done if we give the warlords and bandits the exact hour they can retrieve their guns and reassert their reign of terror.

It would set a terrible precedent if the U.S. military could be bullied out of its commitments. We cannot allow understandable concern for the protection of United States lives to push us out of Somalia, leaving a larger mess than when we arrived.

I support President Clinton's twin efforts to stabilize the crisis in Somalia and develop a sound policy that will help the Somalians establish peace and tranquility in their strife-torn nation. We should all listen carefully to the words of Gen. Colin Powell who yesterday warned us against an untimely withdrawal of United States forces from Somalia.

General Powell was quite clear:

In the case of places like Somalia—where the mission was nice and clear cut when we went in, but it's becoming a little more difficult now—we will have to continue our calculus of political objectives, means applied to that objective, and sort them out. But because things get difficult, you don't cut and run. You work the problem and try to find a correct solution.

The U.N. Security Council adopted a resolution committing the United Nations to remain in Somalia until March 1995. This includes a program to set up district and national political councils and reconstruct the collapsed police force, judiciary, and civilian administration. We should not act in a manner that undercuts that position.

I support the Clinton policy efforts in Somalia. In August, Secretary of Defense Aspin listed several objectives that still must be achieved if Somalia is ever to recover. According to Aspin, these include: Credible police forces must be established; warlords must give up their heavy weapons; the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity should try to restart the internal reconciliation process; and there must be an economic recovery plan.

I share the anguish of the families and loved ones of those who have suffered trying to keep and enforce the peace in Somalia. But it is clear that the casualties are being shared by sev-

eral nations. This is not a case of the United States being asked to fight alone.

The current cycle of violence began in June 1993, when 34 Pakistani troops were killed by General Aideed's forces. In August, four U.S. soldiers were killed by a remote-controlled bomb. In September, seven Nigerians were killed. Last week, a U.S. Blackhawk helicopter was shot down, killing three of our soldiers.

The United States currently has about 4,700 personnel in support of the U.N. forces. This is about a fifth of the 25,800 troops we have deployed last year. The total U.N. force today is about 25,000 and is expected to reach its authorized level of 28,000 in October. The United Nation estimates that the hardcore guerrillas in Somali warlord Aideed's employ is only 200 follows:

Much remains to be done before Somalia can be said to be secure. Weapons are still in abundance throughout the country, and the various tribal and fractional leaders are still poised waiting to see what will happen next as the United Nation attempts to bring about reconciliation and recovery in the face of the Aideed challenge.

Most experts and foreign governments have praised the U.S. effort. Local leaders who have been fighting each other have been brought together for the first time under U.S. auspices, even if final agreement still eludes us.

There is peace and adequate food supplies throughout most of the country. The attacks on United States and U.N. forces in Mogadishu are the exception. For example, in Kismayu, a formerly troubled city, U.N. peacekeepers have organized negotiations among clan elders, who have publicly thanked the United Nations for its efforts.

The United Nation is also assisting in the following key efforts: The reestablishment of the Somali police force; the development of a program for removing mines; creation of 13 district councils of local representation, with additional councils expected soon; establishment of public information activities; and other activities to provide for the public health, jobs training, and farming and livestock recovery.

I applaud the efforts of majority leader RICHARD GEPHARDT. He has tried to reconcile the U.S. peacekeeping operations with the requirements of the War Powers Resolution. Of course, the Congress must discharge its constitutional responsibilities. The Congress must approve any decision to continue risking the lives of brave Americans in combat.

But, I hope the public debate on this complex issue will not in any way intimidate the President. He now faces some of the great difficulties that often arise when the United States offers its assistance to developing countries. We cannot shrink from this humanitarian challenge.

We cannot abandon the Somali people. We cannot succumb to isolationist idiocy. We cannot let the United States be intimidated by warlords or gangsters.

We must stay the course.

□ 2150

#### EARMARKING IN APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, let me assure those remaining that I will not take the full 60 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time this evening to continue with a minor crusade that I have been carrying on for the last couple of years aimed at reducing the amount of earmarks in appropriation bills. I do so because tomorrow when we take up the appropriations bill for the Defense Department, I intend to offer a motion which will to a small degree alleviate some of the problems of earmarking in that bill.

Let me say in a prefatory way that the bill we have before us tomorrow is one of the best bills emanating from the Appropriations Committee and the Defense Subcommittee that I have seen in this body during my service here. I think the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], have brought us a bill which really is exceptional in many ways. I fully intend to support that bill.

I feel somewhat reluctant to bring up what I consider to be minor flaws in the overall content of the bill, but a major issue in terms of the way the Congress itself operates.

This bill tomorrow will expend almost a quarter-of-a-trillion dollars of the taxpayers' money. It represents a substantial reduction from the prior year and a major move in the direction of focusing substantial resources on the problems of defense conversion and on technology reinvestment, two very important issues which the Armed Services Committee in the military authorization bill has dealt with very well.

As I will point out in my remarks, the funds for these programs have been increased substantially to meet the needs of the country, which is undergoing a very rapid downsizing of the military and the military-industrial base and is seeking to develop in place of that a new and vital advanced technology-industrial structure.

In all the good points of this bill, there are still a few items which I think deserve attention and which I will try to deal with.

Technically, none of the programs in this bill are authorized, because the authorizing committee, on whose bill we

just completed action today, has not yet seen that bill adopted and sent to the President, so we are technically without an authorizing bill. For that reason, the Appropriations bill would be subject to multiple points of order for funding unauthorized programs. That has been dealt with in the rule which waives the points of order, except in a very few cases, and this is appropriate. I think the Rules Committee has acted wisely and the Appropriations Committee has acted wisely in requesting this waiver.

There were a few cases where waivers were not asked, the most important of which was a \$1 billion item for a new defense weapons system. Under our rules, of course, that item can be and will be stricken from the bill tomorrow on a point of order.

The problem from my standpoint is not that there are earmarks in the bill, and again I would compliment the chairman on there not being very many, and those earmarks contained within the bill I would be inclined to support and not to raise a point of order against because they are worthy.

The problem that I am going to focus on is the problem of earmarks contained in the language of the report. This is a practice which has been growing exponentially over the last few years. I have been dealing with it in those matters involving the jurisdiction of my committee, the committee that I chair, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

I have brought these issues to the floor before, including the closing days of last year.

It is not my general intention or practice to intervene in the activities of other authorizing committees. I have great faith and confidence in the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] to raise any necessary points of order with regard to the Appropriations bill as he sees fit, and as I have already indicated he proposes to deal with the issue of an unauthorized weapons system through the normal process of the rule tomorrow; however, I want to point out, and this is partly to save my own conscience, that this bill contains in the Defense reinvestment program and some of the Defense conversion items a number of issues which are germane to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

As a matter of fact, there will be members of our committee who will be conferees on the Defense authorization bill. It is only in that rather small area that I propose to express my views and to express them as politely and as circumspectly as I can.

Within the language of the report on the Defense appropriations bill, there are several dozen earmarks designating specific projects to which money will be allocated which under our rules can-

not be reached in any way by Members of the House on this floor. They cannot be amended. They cannot be subject to a point of order. There is literally nothing that can be done to approach this particular problem.

Now, in what I am saying, I am not trying to derogate the contents of these earmarks. It is sometimes pointed out that these earmarks tend to be beneficial to a relatively few Members of Congress or to one or more small regions of the country. I do not make that criticism of these earmarks contained in the report language of the bill that will be before us tomorrow. I have looked at them very carefully. Although there is inadequate information in the report for me to make a judgment, I notice that they are distributed widely around the country.

As a matter of fact, I note with satisfaction that California gets a full share of these earmarks, along with a dozen or more other States.

□ 2200

So, I have no basis to object to the earmarks on the basis of the quality of the projects, which I cannot judge without any information, or its distribution. It benefits California, although not my own particular district, as much as it does any other State, and, from what I can tell, the intent of these earmarks is to fully carry out the intent of the technology reinvestment program, with one exception. That one exception is that the law which established the technology reinvestment program specifically states that the projects will be allocated, will be selected, on the basis of a competitive system in which applicants will be allowed to submit projects. They will be reviewed, and the best projects will be selected from the standpoint of what will contribute to the national welfare. In the case of the earmarks in the report, in this area there is no such competitive process. In fact, it is specifically precluded.

And this is the point that gives me pause. The total amount of these earmarks amounts to, depending upon how you figure it, at least a quarter of the entire allocation.

Now I have already pointed out that the Committee on Appropriations has increased the amount of funding for this program by more than a quarter. So, in effect you could say, "Well, they have added the additional money, and they, therefore, should have some voice in how that additional money is to be distributed."

There are all kinds of arguments that one could use to defend this process, but I have been taking the point of view, and I will continue to take this point of view, that the taxpayers of this country are entitled to a process in the allocation of the tax money which they contribute to the Government which will produce the very best

return. Such a process does not exist for programs which are not requested by anyone, not the President, not the Defense Department, not any other department; and which are not reviewed by any of the authorizing committees of the Congress, whose role it is to determine whether these projects are meritorious and to recommend in the form of legislation that they be funded. None of these processes have been gone through.

Now, even though I am making this point, and I will continue to make it, and I will seek to get the Members of the House to join with me tomorrow in an amendment to restate the necessity for competition in this process of awarding grants, I am still pleased that the funding has been as generous as it has been. I still think that the program is going to be of great value to the country, and, as I have already said, I feel that this is one of the best bills that has come before us, and I intend to support it.

But I would like to point out what I consider to be the most pernicious effect of this, and I pointed this out last year at a similar time in the cycle when there were earmarks on another bill. In that case it was the energy and water appropriation bill, and through good fortune, more than anything else, I was able to procedurally bring the issue of these earmarks, which were within the bill itself, not in the report, which made it somewhat easier to do, bring it to a vote on the floor of the House, and these projects, which involved a relatively modest sum of about \$100 million, were overwhelmingly rejected by the Members of the House. They had no opportunity to see them, to vote on them, previously in committee, to review them. They had apparently appeared by magic during the closing moments of the conference between the House and Senate, and the mood of the House was to reject them. A week later these exact same earmarks appeared in this bill that we will have up tomorrow; or last year's version of it, the defense appropriations bill. The same identical projects appeared, and this time protected by a rule which made it impossible to do anything about it.

Now the pernicious aspect of this that I am pointing out is very simply this:

About 85 percent of the Members of the House of Representatives are deprived of the opportunity to have an equal voice with their colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations in the determination of those projects and those programs which are best for the American people. They are told, in effect, by our dear friends on the Committee on Appropriations, "Trust us. We know what's best for the United States, and we will pick and choose those programs and those projects which are in our opinion best for the

country, and we will allocate the money, or a substantial portion of it, for those projects."

Now that is bound to create in the eyes of a large majority of the Members of the House the feeling that we have two classes of Members of Congress, one class with the power, and the ability and the wisdom to make wise choices about the allocation of the taxpayers' resources; the second class, lacking that wisdom and lacking that power, are relegated to the role of taking it or leaving it, in effect.

Now in a good bill like this in which the earmarks in the bill are relatively minimal, aside from the \$1 billion which will be stricken, and the earmarks in the report are only a billion dollars or so in a quarter of a trillion dollar bill, many Members of Congress are likely to say it is not worth worrying about. But let me tell all of those Members who think it is not worth worrying about that I used to think it was not worth worrying about, and in the more limited sphere of earmarks for academic research facilities and programs, which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology which I chair, I have seen those earmarks grow from about \$10 million a year in the early 1980's up to more than three-quarters of a billion dollars last year.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, what is happening is a very natural human reaction. The members of the Committee on Appropriations, having seen that they can get away with \$10 million, go for \$50 million the next year, and \$150 million the following year, and they keep increasing it, and they will continue to keep increasing it until all Members of Congress who are not members of the Committee on Appropriations finally decide that perhaps the situation is getting too far out of balance.

Now this has happened before. It was a little before my service in the Congress, nearly 100 years ago, as a matter of fact. But at that time the situation got out of balance, and the Congress abolished the Committee on Appropriations.

Now it is not my intention to try and act tomorrow to abolish the Committee on Appropriations. I think that committee does a valuable service, but it is composed of fallible human beings who do what most fallible human beings do, and they try to go as far as they can in probing the limits of what they can do to achieve their own personal goals. Being a fallible human being myself, Mr. Speaker, I expect I might even follow that path if I were a member of the Committee on Appropriations. But I am too old to switch, and I am so deeply concerned about the future of this institution that I want to see it operate in accordance with normal procedures, orderly process, fair sharing of responsibility and the right

to serve their constituents so that we can achieve, through the processes of the Congress and the rules of the Congress, the best welfare for the people of this country and the most harmonious workings of this great institution.

Now I should not refer to the workings of the other body, but I have to point out that the sins that I am referring to are not confined to the House of Representatives. The Members of the other body are equally adept at using the power and influence that comes with being a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations and they do their own set of earmarking. So, I have to point out that on top of the approximately, say, \$1 billion of earmarks, of which perhaps a quarter are in the program that I referred to, the technology reinvestment program, on top of that our distinguished colleagues in the other body, when it comes to conference with the House on this particular appropriation bill, are going to want to have their \$1 billion.

□ 2210

We operate with appropriation caps around here. You can only stretch those so far. But one of the things that we will do tomorrow is to eliminate \$1 billion in this bill for that weapons system that I referred to. That will leave us \$1 billion under the 602(b) allocation, more or less, and that vacuum will be filled by \$1 billion worth of earmarks coming from the other body.

That process has been going on and on at an accelerating rate. Now, in the other body, they are somewhat more proud of their prowess in this situation than we are. It is I think a more acceptable practice. Their rules are more flexible and they are able to accommodate this in a more collegial way than we are in the House.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia who chairs the Appropriations Committee has publicly stated many times that he feels that this process of earmarking is reasonable and necessary and desirable, and that he feels that the Members of that body, the other body, should not be required to go through the processes of authorizing committee reviews and the other methods by which we seek to get additional input into the process of making wise decisions on the expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

I am not saying this to criticize the Members of the other body. They, like other human beings, are using their opportunities, their influence, their power, to achieve their goals in the most effective and least onerous way that they can. This is normal. I am just pointing out the pernicious nature of this process when carried to extremes. I am going to, in saying this, of course, make it clear to all of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate that I have the greatest respect for them. In no way am I trying to belittle or defame them.

As I have said, it ill behooves me to throw rocks at them, when I would perhaps be doing the same thing if I were in their shoes. But I am not in their shoes, and I have another motive. That motive, which is forced upon me by the nature of my own responsibilities, is to protect the prerogatives of those Members of the House who are not on the Appropriations Committee, and, if necessary, to fight with the Senators who would use their rules and their power to make it more difficult for those Members of the House to be treated as full equals in this process of allocating funds for the benefit of the people of this country.

Now, I want the junior Members of this body, who now number 115 or so, to particularly understand this process. They were elected to come here and make the system better. They were elected to reduce the vestiges of special privilege that exist, to make the Members of this body and the other body responsive to the wishes of the American people. And it is fairly clear that the American people do not want those of us elected to serve them to take it upon ourselves to assume that we have some special wisdom.

We are a collective body, and it is from the wisdom of the collective body that the people of this country expect to benefit. So I am asking these junior Members of Congress, who have not been through this process, even the one last November to which I referred, to take special note of what happens tomorrow.

We have already had one or two examples in early appropriations bills in which the authorizing committee chairman and the appropriations subcommittee chairman became engaged in a contest over the appropriation of funds which had not been authorized. In that contest so far, it seems that the authorizing committee has enjoyed both the predominant support of the Members of the House, and, in their effort to fully implement and abide by the rules of the House, they have enjoyed the support of those who interpret the rules.

What will happen tomorrow is difficult to ascertain. It is my intention to offer a motion to amend the bill. The amendment that I am going to offer is in the form of a restriction on obligating the funds in that bill.

Under the rules, I will be precluded from offering that amendment if the chairman of the subcommittee moves that the Committee rise, and it will be necessary to defeat that motion before I can offer an amendment.

The amendment that I will offer is the most innocuous amendment that I could think of offering. It is a restatement of existing law that requires that the funding for the Technology Reinvestment Program be subjected to a competitive review. That is the existing law. It is contained in the Defense

authorization bill from last year and it is contained in the Defense authorization bill that we passed today.

Now, why do I take the trouble to merely restate existing law on the appropriation bill? Well, I wonder about that myself. Because it is my view that if the administration officials to whom these funds are appropriated to spend are willing to spend them today in violation of the law, as they are, they will be willing to spend them tomorrow in violation of the law, even though I restate that law on the bill.

The problem here goes beyond the law. The appropriators say, "We tell you to spend the money for these projects which we have selected." They are not authorized. But the order to spend it occurs in the language of the report, which cannot be attacked for failing to deal with authorized projects.

The implication is that if they do not spend the money as directed by the Appropriations Committee, despite the fact that the law says that they will not spend it for those projects, but only on projects which have been reviewed on a competitive basis, the implication is that if they do not go ahead and fund those projects their funding may be cut in the next appropriations bill.

This is a powerful, powerful tool to use on those dedicated public servants who may lose their jobs if their appropriations get cut in the next round. So I do not fault them for obeying the language of the committee report, which is not binding in law, because they know that behind the directives contained in that report is the possibility of very severe action which they will not like in the next round of appropriations.

There are other ways in which this problem can be addressed. I have, for example, after last year's fiasco in which I was thoroughly beaten over the head, sought to make some minor changes in the rules of the House and the rules of the caucus.

Last year I was not even notified that these earmarked projects would appear. We changed the rules to require that notification be given to the authorizing committee chairmen so that they would be aware of it. That is contained in changes in the rules of the Democratic caucus which were made. Then in the rules of the House there were changes made to allow for the authorizing committee chairmen to be in control of a certain amount of debate time to offer a motion to refuse to go along with these earmarks, in effect.

□ 2220

Obviously, these changes in the rules did not seem to give a very strong signal to those members of the Committee on Appropriations who continued to earmark. We said at the time that we are not trying to overturn the or-

derly processes of the House. We are trying to make them work. And if we are not able to make them work through modest changes in the rules, we will look toward less modest changes in the rules. Of course, one of those changes might be to make any earmarking in committee reports subject to the same points of order and adherence to the rules that that same language would be exposed to if it were in the bill. I do not know how difficult that would be.

I suspect a lot of Members would resist it. But that would be the next step in the orderly procedure for trying to bring this situation under control.

Another step might be for the administration, the President, to give the dedicated public servants, who now spend this money in violation of the law, instructions not to violate the law. And the President and the Vice President have indicated, in statements that they have made, that they do not approve of earmarking. They would like to see it curtailed.

We have written to the Vice President, calling his attention to the situation and suggesting that the administration take some action to deal with this problem through instructions to the Federal bureaucracy.

I have no way of knowing whether the administration will take kindly to that. As a matter of practical fact, the administration itself does not like to tangle with powerful members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, because so much of their program depends upon favorable action by these distinguished gentlemen.

Of course, the court of last resort is the people of this country. I have not hesitated, in my own small way, to let the people of this country know that I think that there is a flaw in the way the system works here. In my own committee, we have had exhaustive oversight investigations; we have had hearings. We have called before us both the members of the executive branch, who have been charged with the responsibility of spending this money for earmarked funds, and representatives of the institutions and organizations which received it. And we have asked them to explain why it is that they have acted in the way that they have.

We have compiled an interesting history of this process. We intend to compile an even more interesting history. It may be that because these actions of the Committee on Appropriations which curtail the responsibility of the authorizing committee, these authorizing committees will feel more and more compelled to use their oversight responsibility, which cannot be curtailed by the Committee on Appropriations.

As a matter of fact, my own committee has very broad oversight responsibility. It includes oversight of all civilian research, development and dem-

onstrations. I think I might enjoy using all the spare time that I am going to have by not being able to authorize by conducting a more vigorous oversight of these projects which are earmarked. I am not implying that any of these projects would be subject to public criticism, if their genesis and their operations were thoroughly laid out in the public record. My own suspicion is that most of them are good projects. But would it do any harm if we got a second opinion from the authorizing committees before we fund them? I do not think it would. And since we cannot get that second opinion before we fund them, we are forced into the posture of getting that second opinion after they are funded.

It is my intention to pursue that course vigorously over the coming months.

Now, I am not trying to be a crusader. I have said this before. I am very fond of my friends on the Appropriations Committee. I want merely to be treated as an equal, as I am in terms of my responsibility to my constituents. I will not argue the case that they may all be smarter than I am.

The course that I am taking, I think, is eminently reasonable. I do not intend to change it in the near future. I will resort to whatever methods are necessary to begin to remedy this situation that I see.

This is grandiose talk, as far as one individual is concerned. I am humbly going to avoid being grandiose and try and bring this matter to my colleagues in the most logical and rational way that I can and beg for their support. If they disagree with me, if they feel that they are better served and their constituencies are better served by abdicating their own responsibilities to a few select members of the Appropriations Committee, then I say God bless them. I will probably not belabor the issue all that much. But I am going to seek, as I did last year, to enable an expression of views by the Members of this body. And based upon the experience of last year, I think that the large majority of the Members of this body would rather have a system in which they have some input and in which they have a voice, in which their responsibilities as members of authorizing committees are fully implemented. And they will have a more satisfying and satisfactory service here in this great body in which we are all so proud to serve.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue this discussion tomorrow when I get the opportunity to offer my amendment, assuming that I do get that opportunity. I am looking forward to what happens on that occasion.

I will close merely by expressing my hope that all of the Members of this body will understand the importance of the principles which are at stake here and not be diverted by the fact that the

individuals involved are all good friends and highly respected colleagues. There is nothing in any way, shape or form intended to cast any other light on this. I have been particularly pleased, as a matter of fact, over the last year to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman MURTHA, on a number of issues and find that he is, as I have always known, a genial, able, very understanding person. I hope that he will understand that whatever I am doing tomorrow was not intended in any way to reflect on the excellent work that he has been doing.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter to which I referred:

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE,  
AND TECHNOLOGY,  
Washington, DC, September 27, 1993.

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.,  
Vice President of the United States of America,  
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I want to congratulate you on your report, "Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less." You have outlined an ambitious and much needed program. Among your many recommendations, one in particular caught my attention: "Minimize congressional restrictions such as line items, earmarks, and eliminate FTE floors." As you may remember, eliminating earmarks for academic research projects and facilities has long been one of my priorities.

During the past year, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has been investigating the scope of academic earmarks and their effects on U.S. government priority-setting and budgeting. We found that in the past ten years, earmarking has increased seventy-fold and now totals three-quarters of a billion dollars per year. This explosion in earmarking has come at a time when fiscal constraints imposed by budget deficits have limited the ability of federal departments to fully fund research programs that meet established national needs. The result is that more and more of those scarce research dollars are being fenced off by a handful of Members of the Appropriations Committees determined to ensure that pet projects for institutions in their states are funded, usually without regard to merit or national priorities.

I do not question the goals of most earmarked projects, but rather the method by which the funds are awarded. Dollars are allocated to particular institutions for particular purposes based on nothing more than that school's ability to approach a member of the Appropriations Committees (a process often facilitated by a high-priced lobbyist) to ask for a favor. The projects themselves rarely undergo even the quick scrutiny of public testimony before Congress; the vast majority of these earmarks are written into report language in House-Senate Conferences by staffers.

More than ninety percent of earmarks appear in the report language that accompanies legislation. These reports are neither legally binding on an agency nor subject to review or amendment by either the House or Senate. Just as importantly, these reports are not signed by the President. Although report language is in effect nothing more than the studied opinions of those members of the Appropriations Committees that were a party to the Conference, agencies in the executive branch testified before the Science

Committee earlier this month that they treat such language as if it represented the legally binding will of Congress.

I want to work with you to develop a mechanism which would give agencies a greater voice in determining which (if any) earmarks they will follow and which they should reject. One possibility is an Executive Order which would give agencies guidance on how to respond to earmarks in appropriations report language. The Executive Order could clarify the notion that report language is merely advice, not legally binding instruction. The strongest approach would be to require agencies to disregard earmarks appearing in report language that are not also explicitly delineated in the appropriations legislation.

If you feel that such an approach is too severe, I offer two more moderate alternatives.

1. Require agencies to seek the approval of the relevant authorizing and appropriating committees before obligating the funds for an earmarked project. If the committees cannot come to any agreement during the current fiscal year, the funds would be returned to the Department of the Treasury.

2. Subject to the approval of the relevant authorization and appropriations committees, require agencies to transfer any funding for earmarks to existing authorized programs which have the general programmatic goals embodied in the earmarked project. If the committees cannot come to any agreement during the current fiscal year, the funds would be returned to the Department of the Treasury.

At three-quarters of a billion dollars annually, academic earmarks have clearly grown out of control. An Executive Order that places Appropriations Reports in their proper perspective in the eyes of executive departments and agencies would serve as an important and immediate check on this practice. So long as agencies continue to treat such report language as the law of the land, more and more of our research dollars will be directed through these reports, which are neither voted upon by Congress nor agreed to by the President. From the perspective of our economic vitality and the integrity of Constitutional government, this is a dangerous situation.

With your support, I and like-minded Members of Congress would be able to work more effectively to eliminate earmarks in appropriations legislation. I would appreciate hearing your views on my suggestions and look forward to working with you on this issue, as well as the many other worthwhile ideas that you have articulated for "re-inventing government."

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,  
Chairman.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCDADE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness.

#### 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 Ms. NORTON) to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KENNEDY, for 5 minutes today.  
Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes today.  
Mr. CONYERS, for 60 minutes today.  
Mr. BROWN of California, for 60 minutes each day, on September 29 and 30.  
Mrs. MALONEY, for 60 minutes, on September 30.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EWING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, in two instances.

Mr. SCHAEFER.  
Mr. SOLOMON.  
Mr. SANTORUM.  
Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
Mr. FISH.  
Mr. BAKER of California.  
Mr. SCHIFF.  
Mr. WELDON.  
Mr. RIDGE.  
Mr. GEKAS, in two instances.  
Mr. SMITH of Michigan.  
Mr. HASTERT.  
Mr. CAMP, in two instances.  
Mr. GINGRICH.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. NORTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON.  
Mr. STARK.  
Mr. BONIOR in three instances.  
Mr. HOYER in two instances.  
Mr. MOLLOHAN.  
Mr. SWETT.  
Mr. MATSUI.  
Mr. JACOBS.  
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.  
Mr. KANJORSKI.  
Mr. CLEMENT.  
Mr. LEVIN.  
Mr. CLYBURN in two instances.  
Mr. STUDDS.  
Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.  
Mr. GEPHARDT.  
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.  
Ms. VELAZQUEZ.  
Mr. PASTOR.  
Mr. FARR of California.  
Mr. FILNER.  
Mr. TUCKER in two instances.  
Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
Mr. COSTELLO.  
Mr. TAUZIN.  
Mr. MINETA.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 30, 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:

1956. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1957. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report on the operations of the Exchange Stabilization Fund [ESF] for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 5302(c)(2); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1958. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Final Regulations—Training Program for Federal TRIO Programs, Upward Bound Program, and the Student Support Services Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1959. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from passage of H.R. 2010, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1960. A letter from the U.S. Commissioner, Susquehanna River Basin Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1961. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the 1992 annual report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts together with the March and September proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States held during 1992, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 604(a)(4), (h)(2), 2412(d)(5); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1962. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report for 1992 on the relative cost of shipbuilding in the various coastal districts of the United States, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1123(c); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1963. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of Reports of Building Project Survey for Jacksonville, FL, and Greeneville, TN, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1964. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Restoration and Waste Management, Department of Energy, transmitting a business plan; transfer of Hanford's extrusion press and other selected metalworking equipment to city of Richland; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Armed Services.

1965. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "United States-Mexico Border Water Pollution Control Act"; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Foreign Affairs.

#### 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. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3167. A bill to extend the

Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program, to establish a system of worker profiling, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 103-268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONIOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 265. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3167) to extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program, to establish a system of worker profiling, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-269). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1188. A bill to provide for disclosures for insurance in interstate commerce; with an amendment (Rept. 103-270). 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. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 3167. A bill to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, to establish a system of worker profiling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 3168. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to establish requirements to ensure safe operation of recreational vessels, and to improve State recreational boating safety programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 3169. A bill to provide for public access to information regarding the availability of insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H.R. 3170. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to consult with representatives of physicians and to use the most recent available data in making geographic adjustments to the payment rates for physicians' services under part B of the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA (for himself (by request), Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PENNY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. THOMPSON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. MINGE, Ms. LONG, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 3171. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

H.R. 3172. A bill to amend the definition of rural community to expand eligibility for economic recovery funds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

H.R. 3173. A bill to prohibit the admission to the United States as refugees of individuals who served in the armed forces of Iraq during the Persian Gulf conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY:

H.R. 3174. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on finasteride and finasteride tablets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3175. A bill to extend retroactively until January 1, 1996, the prior suspension of duty on L-alanyl-L-proline, also known as Ala Pro; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3176. A bill to extend retroactively until January 1, 1996, the prior suspension of duty on diflunisal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3177. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on levodopa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3178. A bill to extend retroactively until January 1, 1996, the prior suspension of duty on amiloride hydrochloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCREY:

H.R. 3179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to individual investment accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 3180. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide a charter for the National Guard Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 3181. A bill to redesignate the J. Edgar Hoover Federal Bureau of Investigation Building located at Ninth and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, as the Federal Bureau of Investigation Building; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3182. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the admission to the United States of nonimmigrant students and visitors who are the spouses and children of United States permanent resident aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 3183. A bill to assure that tax increases contained in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 are used solely for deficit reduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

H.R. 3184. A bill to prohibit the transfer or possession of semiautomatic assault weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALENT:

H.R. 3185. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide insurance benefits for elevating structures incurring serious damage from floods and increase the maximum coverage amounts under the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. HAYES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCCREY, and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana):

H.R. 3186. A bill to designate the U.S. courthouse located in Houma, LA, as the "George Arceneaux, Jr., United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3187. A bill to amend the Aleutian and Pribilof Islands Restitution Act to increase authorization for appropriation to compensate Aleut villages for church property lost, damaged, or destroyed during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. FIELDS of Texas):

H.R. 3188. A bill to amend the Central Bering Sea Fisheries Enforcement Act of 1992; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3189. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a charitable contribution deduction for certain expenses incurred by whaling captains in support of Native Alaskan subsistence whaling; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 3190. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue a discharge permit which modifies certain requirements with respect to the discharge of pollutants into the ocean from a publicly owned treatment works where an aggressive water reclamation program is being implemented jointly to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STARK:

H.J. Res. 270. Joint resolution to ensure all residents equal access to quality health care services if a managed competition health plan is enacted by requiring Members of Congress to enroll in the lowest cost health care plan offered in a health alliance area, and to impose an excise tax on Members of Congress equal to three times any amount the Member pays in health care premiums above the amount paid by enrollees in the lowest cost health care plan in the health alliance area; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 66: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.
- H.R. 68: Mr. KOPETSKI and Mr. WYNN.
- H.R. 70: Mr. QUINN.
- H.R. 108: Mrs. FOWLER.
- H.R. 166: Mr. ROYCE.
- H.R. 290: Mrs. SCHROEDER.
- H.R. 411: Mr. PARKER.
- H.R. 466: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.
- H.R. 790: Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 799: Mr. KASICH.
- H.R. 823: Mr. SCHIFF.
- H.R. 830: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. HOKE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HORN, and Ms. SNOWE.
- H.R. 892: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.
- H.R. 1181: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1277: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 1295: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KING, Mr. QUINN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DICKEY, and Mr. SCOTT.

H.R. 1314: Mr. REED, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MANN, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1442: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 1490: Mr. KYL, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CANADY, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H.R. 1494: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1534: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. APPLE-GATE.

H.R. 1546: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1552: Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 1604: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1605: Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 1687: Mr. DIXON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SARPALIUS.

H.R. 1738: Mr. EWING.

H.R. 1786: Mr. DICKS and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 1900: Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LANTOS, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1922: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1933: Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.R. 2043: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2171: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2173: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 2238: Mr. CLINGER and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 2286: Mr. MINGE, Mr. DEAL, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 2305: Mr. PICKLE and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2376: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2441: Mr. SANDERS and Ms. LOWEY.

H.R. 2612: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2641: Mr. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2644: Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 2736: Mr. WILSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2769: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2786: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2830: Mr. TORRES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 2837: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. FROST, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 2878: Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 2884: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 2898: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 3029: Mr. PACKARD and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 3030: Mr. KYL.

H.R. 3039: Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 3098: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BACHUS of Florida, and Mr. MANN.

H.R. 3125: Mr. POMBO and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 3138: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3146: Mr. ARCHER and Mr. COX.

H.J. Res. 113: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. ROTH.

H.J. Res. 171: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.J. Res. 178: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EWING, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SISISKY, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.J. Res. 197: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.J. Res. 212: Mr. COX, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. WELDON, Mr. SABO, and Mr. GORDON.

H.J. Res. 234: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KASICH, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. EWING.

H.J. Res. 257: Ms. FURSE.

H.J. Res. 265: Mr. REED and Mr. PASTOR.

H. Con. Res. 59: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. WYNN.

H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. CARDIN.

H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. TEJEDA.

H. Con. Res. 153: Mr. PENNY, Mr. GALLO, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 156: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. MANN, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H. Res. 165: Mr. PACKARD, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. TANNER.

H. Res. 234: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LEVY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. SPENCE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1734: Mr. SKAGGS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

59. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, NY, relative to Federal funding for the D.A.R.E. Program; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.