

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, April 19, 1993

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

April 19, 1993.

I hereby designate the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Gracious God, from whom comes every good gift and to whom we respond with the words of thanksgiving, we come before You with our petitions for this day. We remember people who are ill and have great need, that they will know Your presence and the power of Your healing spirit; we remember those who suffer from the pain of strife and violence, that they will know peace; we pray for those who are hungry and who do not have the necessities of life, that they may be filled; we pray for those who sorrow, that they may have hope. O loving God, may Your grace be sufficient for all our needs and Your peace that passes all human understanding guide and guard us today and in all the days to come. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Pledge of Allegiance will be given by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. FROST led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to designate the weeks beginning April 18, 1993, and April 17, 1994, each as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week."

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 103-3, Mr. INOUE announced, on behalf of the majority leader, the appointment of Mr. DODD, Lenore Miller of New Jersey, and Donna Lenhoff of the District of Columbia, as members of the Commission on Leave.

BUDGET OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103-3)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate:

I have the honor to transmit to you the *Budget of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 1994*.

In my February 17th address to the Congress, and in the report, *A Vision of Change for America*, that followed the address, I outlined the basic elements of the plan that forms the basis of this budget. The plan has three key elements: economic stimulus to create jobs now and lay the foundation for long-term economic growth; long-term public investments to increase the productivity of American workers and businesses; and fair, balanced, and equitable deficit reduction measures to stop government deficits from preempting the private investments needed to create jobs and raise living standards.

The plan flows from the demand of the American people for change and my vision of what America can be if we embark upon an economic strategy of investing in people and putting people first. Achieving this change will not be easy, but the cost of not changing is far greater. To ensure that our children's generation is not the first generation of Americans to do worse in life than their parents, we must restore the American dream.

This budget extends the elements of the plan into each department and agency of the Federal Government and proposes appropriations language and other required information for the Congress to place the plan fully into effect. Enactment of the proposals in this budget will bring the vision that underlies my plan—a vision of a brighter, more prosperous future for America—a step closer to reality.

Although powerful special interests that profit from the status quo may oppose the plan, the American people have demanded change, and it is our responsibility as their elected servants to answer their call and take the action they demand.

I am gratified by and grateful for the support this program has received in the Congress thus far. However, much remains to be done. Therefore, I ask for your continued support and help. Together, we can get the American economy moving again, bring Federal finances back to a sound footing, and restore hope in the hearts of the American people.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 8, 1993.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO THE FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of section 204(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3015(a)), as amended by section 205 of Public Law 102-375, and the order of the House of Wednesday, April 7, 1993, authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on April 7, 1993, did appoint to the Federal Council on the Aging on the part of the House the following members from private life:

Mr. Raymond Raschko of Spokane, WA, to a 3-year term;

Mr. Max Friedersdorf of Sanibel Island, FL, to a 3-year term;

Mr. E. Don Yoak of Spencer, WV, to a 2-year term;

Mr. Eugene S. Callender of New York, NY, to a 2-year term; and

Mrs. Josephine K. Oblinger of Williamsville, IL, to a 1-year term.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4355(a)

□ 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.

of title 10, United States Code, and the order of the House of Wednesday, April 7, 1993, authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on April 8, 1993, did appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following Members of the House:

Mr. HEFNER of North Carolina;
Mr. LAUGHLIN of Texas;
Mr. FISH of New York; and
Mr. DELAY of Texas.

SELECTION OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE FOR ACCREDITATION AS ADDITIONAL OFFICIAL ADVISERS TO U.S. DELEGATIONS TO INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES, MEETINGS, AND NEGOTIATION SESSIONS RELATING TO TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of section 161(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2211), and the order of the House of Wednesday, April 7, 1993, authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on April 7, 1993, did select the following members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to be accredited by the President as additional official advisers to the U.S. delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiation sessions relating to trade agreements:

Mr. DINGELL of Michigan;
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois; and
Mr. MOORHEAD of California.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (2 U.S.C. 473(a)), and the order of the House of Wednesday, April 7, 1993, authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on April 8, 1993, did appoint to the Technology Assessment Board the following Member of the House:

Mr. MCDERMOTT of Washington.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b) of Public Law 93-642 (20 U.S.C. 2004(b)), and the order of the House of Wednesday, April 7, 1993, authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to ac-

cept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on April 8, 1993, did appoint as members of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation the following Members of the House:

Mr. SKELTON of Missouri; and
Mr. EMERSON of Missouri.

CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUES MAY BE FOCUS IN FORT WORTH SKINHEAD CASE

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, Saturday morning a Federal court jury in Los Angeles handed down a verdict which achieved a significant degree of justice in the Rodney King beating case. Two of the four police officers were found guilty of violating the civil rights of Mr. King. This rectified an earlier decision by a California State court.

Recently in Fort Worth, TX, a State court jury found a neo-Nazi skinhead guilty of murdering a black man in a racially inspired hate crime. Unfortunately, the same jury then gave the defendant a 10-year probated sentence.

Following that decision, I asked Attorney General Janet Reno to determine whether Federal civil rights charges could be brought against that defendant, Christopher William Brosky. That matter is currently under review by the Justice Department.

The case in Fort Worth, like the Rodney King case in Los Angeles, is an example of an opportunity for the Federal courts to correct an injustice in the State court system.

I applaud Attorney General Reno's willingness to examine the skinhead killing in Fort Worth, and I hope that, just as in the King case in Los Angeles, justice can be achieved.

□ 1210

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE YAMAMOTO SHOOTDOWN

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday marked the 50th anniversary of the American shootdown of the plane carrying Adm. Isoroku Yamamoto, the World War II commander of Japan's combined fleet and the strategist behind the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Because of his role in the planning of the Pearl Harbor attack, Yamamoto became one of the most hated men in the United States during World War II. Ironically, Yamamoto was an admirer of the United States, having attended Harvard and served as Japan's naval attaché in Washington. He also advised against attacking the United States,

predicting early in 1941 that Japan would be unable to defeat the United States in a prolonged conflict.

In the 1940's, United States cryptologists deciphered Japan's naval code. American intelligence continued to break subsequent codes during the war and gained access to Japan's top-secret radio transmissions. When American listeners intercepted a message that Admiral Yamamoto would be flying from Rabaul to Bougainville to visit his frontline troops, the U.S. forces knew exactly when and where to strike.

On the morning of April 18, 1943, American Army Air Force pilots left their base in Guadalcanal and completed one of the most daring and successful missions of the Pacific war. Even knowing Yamamoto's schedule, the odds were a million-to-one that the U.S. fighters would be able to intercept the admiral's plane. John Mitchell, commander of the 339th Fighter Squadron, navigated with nothing more than a wristwatch, an airspeed indicator, and a Navy compass.

But the odds were on our side that day, as American P-38 pilots attacked the two Japanese Betty bombers and their six Zero escorts. Pilots Rex Barber and Tom Lanphier share victory credits for shooting down Yamamoto's bomber. By shooting down Yamamoto, the United States took from Japan one of its most brilliant military leaders as the Allies worked toward victory in the Pacific war. Today, 50 years later, the wreckage of Admiral Yamamoto's plane still lies in the jungles of Bougainville.

MESSAGE FROM THE PEOPLE: CUT SPENDING, NOT MORE TAXES

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, day before yesterday on Saturday evening, Senator MALCOLM WALLOP and Senator ALAN SIMPSON and I held a town meeting in Casper, WY. It was probably the only State in which the whole delegation was involved in a town meeting.

The message was loud and clear. That is cut spending and not more taxes.

We can get into great details, of course, of budgets. There are a lot of numbers.

A couple of numbers were very interesting. One is \$1.937 billion, a trillion dollars. That is the amount the President's budget will add to the debt over 4 years, precisely the same amount that was added over the previous 4 years. This notion of arguing constantly about Republican Presidents being at fault or Democrat Congresses being at fault is not useful. The fact is we need to do something.

The other number that was interesting is 57 cents; 57 cents out of every \$1

you and I paid last Thursday in personal income taxes goes to fund the deficit interest. That is a pretty interesting figure.

Mr. Speaker, people do not want increases before cutting spending. The people do not want new spending without paying for it. People want their tax payments taken seriously. So should Government.

No one wrote a blank check last Thursday. Neither should Congress.

PRESIDENT'S STIMULUS PACKAGE

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, there is a continuing war of wills and a war of words between the White House and the other body concerning the President's economic stimulus package. In it we have many wonderful things, extension of unemployment benefits, childhood immunization programs, Head Start programs, nutrition programs.

But I would like to concentrate today for just a few brief seconds on the summer jobs program for our Nation's youth. We have a very vibrant program for summer jobs in Louisville and Jefferson County, KY. We have put together a program that will employ perhaps over 1,000 young people this summer. But, Mr. Speaker, if agreement can be reached between the White House and the other body on the stimulus program, we might double that number to something like 2,500 summer jobs. And I think it would be very appropriate and important to put our young people to work, to teach them crafts and trades, and teach them the discipline of the workplace.

To that extent, Mr. Speaker, I was very happy, as a native son of Kentucky, to hear the President speak very approvingly and glowingly of a program in Louisville and Jefferson County, a partnership program involving education and job training conducted at Seneca High School involving local government, local businesses, and the Metro United Way.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think our State, and I use those words correctly to the current occupier of the chair, is in the forefront and the vanguard of putting our young people back to work, and I would hope that this impasse between the White House and the other body can be resolved so that Kentucky can put even more of its young people to work this summer.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT DECISION ON REMOVING STATUE OF FREEDOM FROM CAPITOL DOME

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed that the Defense Department decided not to let National Guardsmen from Mississippi, Alabama, and Pennsylvania use a heavy lift helicopter to remove the Statue of Freedom off the Capitol dome for repairs.

The Architect of the Capitol, George White, was in agreement to let the National Guard do this historic and patriotic mission. We had been working on this for a year and then along comes a private company which put pressure on the Defense Department not to approve the mission for the Guard.

The lawyers at the Pentagon said this was not a training mission and they were afraid of being sued. It is a training mission for the National Guard and I think it is a sad case when one Government Agency can't help another.

It is going to cost the taxpayers over \$60,000 for this private firm to do the job when the National Guard could do it on training time.

Mr. Speaker, the Defense Department ought to be helping its own and not worrying about whether to allow this private Johnny-come-lately firm to bid on the project. No one else put in a bid to relieve the National Guard on the streets of Los Angeles or to stand as backup in the Ohio prison standoff. The Guard is trained and ready for jobs like that, just as it is to lift the statue off the Capitol dome.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and make them bipartisan remarks. The gentleman is right on.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DELAURO-LOWEY WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AND ESTUARY RESTORATION ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduced legislation which Congresswoman DELAURO and I coauthored last year, to restore the Federal Government's commitment to investing in water pollution control and economic growth. H.R. 1720, the Water Pollution Control and Estuary Restoration Act, is designed to reaffirm the consensus that shaped the original Clean Water Act 20 years ago, that sound investments in water quality yield major economic benefits.

The past 12 years have seen a dramatic decline in our Nation's commitment to investing in our environmental infrastructure, and we are paying the consequences. Long Island Sound, Puget Sound, Narragansett Bay, San Fran-

cisco Bay, and dozens of other vital waterways are at risk, due in part to the failure to upgrade our environmental systems to meet the demands of our economy. The influx of pollution is poisoning our fisheries, fouling our beaches, and destroying the economic foundation of many communities. Moreover, under-equipped sewage facilities all across the country are stifling private investment and stalling economic recovery.

President Clinton and Vice President GORE clearly recognize the economic importance of investments in clean water. The economic stimulus package, already approved by the House but still awaiting action in the other body, includes \$892 million in supplemental funding to upgrade sewage treatment plants and other water quality systems. These funds will create jobs in the near term and build a foundation for economic expansion across the Nation. The administration has also made reauthorization of the Clean Water Act a top priority for this year. It is time for Congress to respond.

Mr. Speaker, over a year ago, Congresswoman DELAURO and I decided to develop legislation to renew and expand the Federal Government's role in controlling pollution and in stewarding our coastal resources. Our work was inspired by local governments and citizens, who are spearheading the effort to save Long Island Sound but who lack the resources to do the job. To them, the environmental and economic consequences of neglecting our infrastructure are real.

My colleague from Connecticut and I have written legislation which, we believe, can reignite Federal, State, and local cooperation in water pollution control. The measure would provide a 7-year, \$33 billion Federal commitment to expanding and modernizing the Nation's water pollution control infrastructure. The bill increases funding for the State Revolving Fund [SRF] Program from approximately \$2 billion provided this year to \$4 billion and eventually \$5 billion.

In the context of our continuing budgetary problems, these authorizations may appear high. But our Nation faces an estimated \$200 billion shortfall over the next decade in sewage treatment upgrades alone. Without a renewed Federal commitment to clean water, States across the Nation are left with two unacceptable alternatives. They can swamp their residents with higher taxes, or they can allow vital waterways to die and their economies to stagnate.

In addition to providing more money, we must support efforts to spend clean water dollars as intelligently as possible. To that end, H.R. 1720 departs from past practice by earmarking a portion of the SRF funds for the implementation of comprehensive estuary management plans. These plans have been or are currently being developed for approximately 20 of the Nation's major estuaries, under the auspices of the National Estuary Program [NEP].

Rather than throwing money at a problem, these comprehensive conservation and management plans are designed to utilize the most cost-effective mix of policies to reduce water pollution in sensitive coastal regions. Rational watershed planning is widely recognized as the most effective way to maximize

the environmental and economic impact of water pollution control investments. H.R. 1720 would provide unprecedented support for implementing out such plans.

H.R. 1720 also seeks to strengthen section 320 of the Clean Water Act, which authorizes the National Estuary Program. First established under the Water Quality Act of 1987, the NEP provides a mechanism for bringing together Federal, State, and local authorities—and interested citizens—to develop comprehensive, watershed-based plans for cleaning up and protecting nationally significant estuaries. In Long Island Sound, Puget Sound, Narragansett Bay, and a number of other estuaries, the NEP has helped bring about unprecedented cooperation aimed at saving these threatened waters.

H.R. 1720 would build on the success of the NEP by clarifying the funding and staffing responsibilities of Federal agencies concerned with the program, including the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Specifically, the bill states that implementation of estuary management plan is a nondiscretionary duty of the EPA. The measure seeks to improve Federal leadership in the NEP by directing the EPA to promulgate guidelines for development, approval, and implementation of comprehensive management plans. Other important proposed changes include measures to improve coordination of cleanup efforts with other Federal activities in estuaries. In short, this bill is designed to make certain that those plans do not end up on shelves in bureaucrats' offices, but instead truly clean up these critical bodies of water.

The plight of Long Island Sound and our economy has inspired an unprecedented development in our area that is giving rise to similar efforts around the Nation. Environmental, labor, and business groups have set aside traditional differences to work together on securing the investments needed to rescue Long Island Sound and strengthen our economy. I want to recognize the central role of this coalition in the development of H.R. 1720. I also want to acknowledge the contributions and support of a coalition of State and local agencies and citizen groups involved with cleaning up estuaries all across the country.

A Federal Government that abdicates leadership on this issue cannot effectively address numerous other challenges facing our country. By failing to help our municipalities meet their infrastructure needs, we are forcing them to tie up scarce local dollars that otherwise could be used to improve schools, fight drugs and crime, provide housing and health care, or meet the needs of the elderly and disabled.

In their zeal to lighten Federal responsibility by getting out of the water treatment business, the previous two administrations have hung our communities out to dry. For more than a decade, the faulty logic of jobs versus the environment has shaped two administrations' policies and rhetoric. We now face an appalling backlog of infrastructure upgrade needs that threatens to choke our economy just as it is robbing our waters of life-giving oxygen. We must not let this happen.

We need leadership at the Federal level to match the energy and ingenuity of our communities—who are working toward a better en-

vironmental and economic future. Without strong Federal leadership and substantial funds to back it up, we run the risk of squandering over 20 years of progress in cleaning up and protecting our waters. But working together, we can reinvigorate the Federal-State-local partnership that launched our Nation's clean water programs.

In conclusion, I want to thank all 49 of my colleagues who have joined Ms. DELAURO and me in introducing this legislation. Mr. Speaker I request that a section-by-section summary of H.R. 1720 be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 1720, WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AND ESTUARY RESTORATION ACT

SECTION 1: SHORT TITLE

"DeLauro-Lowey Water Pollution Control and Estuary Restoration Act"

SECTION 2: FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

(a) FINDINGS.—(See text of bill.)

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) To expand and strengthen efforts designed to combat the serious and growing water and sediment quality problems in estuaries of national significance identified under the Clean Water Act;

(2) To reauthorize Section 320 of the CWA in order to improve the development and implementation of comprehensive conservation and management plans for estuaries of national significance;

(3) To provide significant levels of Federal assistance to States and localities seeking to implement comprehensive conservation and management plans; and

(4) To extend and increase Federal support for the State Revolving Loan Fund program in order to address serious water and sediment quality problems in the waters of the United States.

SECTION 3: EXTENSION OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING LOAN FUND PROGRAM

Authorize \$4 billion for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 and \$5 billion per year for fiscal years 1996 through 2000 for grants to capitalize State Revolving Loan Funds (SRF).

SECTION 4: FUNDING FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF ESTUARY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS

Allot a percentage of SRF funds for the restoration of estuaries of national significance (i.e. Puget Sound, Long Island Sound, Narragansett Bay, Santa Monica Bay, etc.). Percentage of set-aside would rise from 2.5% to 15% over the life of the bill to account for the increased number of estuary programs reaching implementation.

2.5 percent for fiscal year 1994 (\$100,000,000);
5.0 percent for fiscal year 1995 (\$200,000,000);
7.5 percent for fiscal year 1996 (\$375,000,000);
10 percent for fiscal year 1997 (\$500,000,000);
12.5 percent for fiscal year 1998 (\$625,000,000);

15 percent for fiscal year 1999 (\$750,000,000);
15 percent for fiscal year 2000 (\$750,000,000).

Qualify States, which have approved Section 320 estuary management plans, to receive Estuary Funds to be used to implement their estuary management plans. Estuary Funds would be provided in addition to a State's regular SRF allocation.

Require States receiving Estuary Funds to set up a special account within their SRFs to manage the disbursement of those funds. Reduce State matching requirement for Estuary Funds to 15 percent.

Require that States, on an annual basis and in coordination and with the approval of

the management conference, provide specific estimates of funding needs that reflect an effort to maximize efficiency in implementation. Such estimates shall be reported to the Administrator.

Direct the Administrator to submit to Congress on an annual basis a report containing cost estimates for implementing approved estuary management plans in each State and recommended allocations of Estuary Funds. The Administrator shall allocate to each State available Estuary Funds based on the percentage of that State's need, as identified in the Administrator's report, relative to all estuaries in the program.

Amend Title VI of the Clean Water Act to authorize States, which are implementing estuary management plans, to utilize additional funding mechanisms designed to assist financially restricted communities. Those mechanisms include: extended loan amortization periods (up to 40 years) and principal subsidies.

SECTION 5: DISCRETIONARY GRANTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF ESTUARY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS

Authorize \$50 million per year through fiscal year 1999 for EPA grants to State and local governments or other public or non-profit organizations for implementation of estuary management plans. Grants shall be used to support implementation projects not generally funded by States under the SRF program, such as innovative technology demonstrations, integrated farm management planning and other polluted runoff abatement efforts, and public education.

Authorize use of Section 310(g)(2) grants for implementation of interim actions to protect water quality of estuaries during development of comprehensive management plans.

SECTION 6: EXTENSION OF CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN DEVELOPMENT GRANT PROGRAM

Increase to \$28 million per year authorization for Section 320(i) grants to support development of estuary management plans.

SECTION 7: NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Direct EPA and NOAA to provide necessary levels of funding and staff resources to effectively carry out their functions related to the development, approval, and implementation of management plans.

Clarify that implementation of estuary management plans is a non-discretionary duty of EPA.

Direct EPA to publish and promulgate guidelines setting out criteria for development, approval, and implementation of comprehensive management plans.

Clarify that each management conference shall ensure full coordination and implementation of the Clean Water Act and the updated Coastal Zone Management Act.

Require estuary management conferences to set priorities early on and coordinate their plans with the activities of all Federal agencies.

Require each state to conduct a review of statutory authority required to implement a comprehensive management plan, and require that prior to final approval of a plan the affected Governor of Governors certify that they have the authority to undertake the actions called for in such plan.

Expand opportunities for public comment and participation in the development, approval, and implementation of management plans.

Upon approval of management plans, authorize the extension of management con-

ferences an additional 5 years for the purposes of implementing and monitoring those plans.

WAR POWERS AND SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in order to bring to the attention of my colleagues the unprecedented step that President Clinton has taken with regard to recognition of the constitutional war powers and the authority conferred therein approved by Congress in 1974.

During the deliberations, I took some part with the then leading proponent from the Judiciary Committee, my colleague from Texas then, Mr. Robert Eckhardt, who is quite an authority.

For the first time that I know of a President in the shape and form of President Clinton has stated in writing that he is willing to address the long-time conflict, or what is assumed to be a conflict, between the executive and the legislative branches over who has the Nation's warmaking power, though that should be limpidly clear that the Constitution spelled out unequivocally, and it is inherent exclusively as one of the, in my opinion, nondelegable powers deposited in Congress. In a letter dated March 31 which I would like to introduce for the RECORD now, the President for the first time since I have been addressing these collateral issues beginning with the war powers debate, a President has replied.

Prior to that, before the enactment of the War Powers Act, I would, from the first day in the 1960's, rise and point out in this same forum, in this well of the House that Presidents, if they had the power to compel and conscript an unwilling American and impress him into service against his will outside of the continental United States in an undeclared war or one not explicitly authorized by the Congress, that we had then reached the point where our basic structural system known as the American unique constitutional system was not operative. Unfortunately, it was pretty much not listened to and not addressed.

The Congresses have, since 1945 or before 1945, not been willing to shape up and accept and discharge this prime function involving the declaration of war, and it finally took the great divisive and to this day still detrimental Vietnam experience to bring it to the fore at the height of the unpopularity in 1974 by the Congress attempting to define, and which at the time I halfway criticized what the Congress did, with saying that the Congress could not find a way any more than it could setting its own salary. These are constitutional mandates. The Congress cannot delegate to anybody else to set its sal-

ary. The Constitution says only the Congress shall set its rate of pay, and it is the same thing with the War Powers Act, and when we got away from that, no matter what justification, that we had entered a period of great contraction in the world where instantaneous electronic communication and the ability to carry warheads from one continent to another in a fraction of minutes, impelled the need to have the unitary power reflected in the Presidency to make those critical decisions.

The only point I was critical about in the War Powers Act of 1974 was that for the first time the Congress said that a President had 60 days in which to make war. Of course, it defined some of the limitations a President in article 3 of the War Powers Act was supposed to consult with the Congress before taking action. That has not been done clear up to the Persian Gulf, and when it is said that the Congress debated the power of the President in the case of the Persian Gulf, or for that matter even before that, the invasions of Grenada, Panama, Beirut, even beginning with President Truman in Korea in which thousands of draftees died, the fact remains that a power was without any perceptible countenance or overt debate given to the Presidency and, therefore, when we had on January 11 or 12, somewhere around there, 1991, the so-called debate on the Persian Gulf, it was not that at all.

What the debate turned around to be, as it did in 1982 in the case of the Nicaraguan Contra issue, was whether or not we were loyal to the President in the actions he had already taken or were not loyal to him.

So I want to sum this up by saying that I wrote the President, that is, President Clinton, on March 5 calling on him to comply with the war powers resolution with regard to United States action in Somalia and later on I will point out in Bosnia as well.

Now, some of my colleagues might say, "Well, wait awhile, what has Somalia got to do? Why there was no introduction of troops into hostilities," but the war powers resolution does not limit the introduction of troops to be defined as invoking the War Powers Act into areas where there is the possibility of aggression or some kind of difficulty against the United States.

□ 1230

It is introducing the troops into areas in which there is conflict and the likelihood, and the chances are good, that it would involve those troops.

So, in writing the letter to the President, I was afraid that the overlooked issue of Somalia—the Congress has never passed a resolution approving President Bush's introduction of those 28,000 or 30,000 troops into Somalia, of which we still have a goodly contingent.

I am very sensitive to the war powers conflict, as I said, and repeat, because

of my associations in the attempt then to legislate in 1974. And I clearly recall the debate over the resolution's language, and I know that the intent in passing the resolution was to ensure that Congress, and through Congress the American people—this is what has been forgotten—has an affirmative role whenever U.S. forces are sent in harm's way, in recognition of the enumerated war declaration power set forth in the Constitution.

So, our involvement in Somalia has dragged on and it has involved two administrations, first President Bush's and now President Clinton's. I became concerned that our mission was not clearly articulated or defined, as it has not been in any of the cases since World War II, the active, hot shooting phase. Let me remind my colleagues there really has not been any peace treaty with respect to World War II.

So, that is still what I call in a state of inaction.

But when the hot shooting phase of World War II came to a close in 1945, I believed that the imperceptible involvement in our country's—by our country's leadership in the sequela wars, Korea, then over across in Southeast Asia in Vietnam, and since then in multiple places throughout the world—clearly indicate that we have not addressed this up front as it should have been years ago.

I became concerned that our mission was not clearly articulated, I repeat. It has not been. When the 2,000 marines were sent to Beirut in 1982, I took to the floor and raised the same issues. Of course, as I said, the first President to answer letters since Lyndon Johnson is President Clinton. So, when I raised the issue in October 1982, asking the President what was the military mission of the marines, I received no answer. But about 3 months later, December, or January of 1983, in a press interview in response to a question asked by a reporter, he said, "They are there as peacekeepers."

Well, then, I pointed out that if they were peacekeepers, whose peace were they keeping in Lebanon?

There were four warring factions. So, he answered to another reporter's question, "They were also there in behalf of the Gemayel regime." But that regime was one of three other, four in all, factions. So that when the marines are introduced as peacekeepers but they are on the side of one of the four factions, you are not peacekeeping, you are endangering their lives, and I said so. And I said so until the Thursday that we adjourned.

Mine was the last special order that fateful day where that following Sunday, when the 240 marines were killed. And I pointed out to my colleagues, all of whom had left, and I said, "When you go home, have a nice meal, sleep in a nice comfortable bed," and I said the same thing to the President, very re-

spectfully. I said, "Remember that the marines in Beirut are in extreme danger of their lives or serious bodily harm."

You can imagine my terrible anguish when, that following Sunday, they were killed.

Then the American public's attention was carried away from that because less than 36 hours after that, the President announced the invasion of Grenada. And that took the public attention away from this fatal mistake.

What I had also brought out was that the Commander in Chief, President Reagan, had gone against the unanimous advice of the Joint Chiefs, who had not been in favor of the deployment of the marines under the circumstances that they were, as I have pointed out in my special orders.

So, I speak from a depth of great concern. I consider this one of the several that I have addressed on the floor, very basic, basic issues involving ultimately the freedom and liberty of our people, which has come under great threat and still practically imperceptibly so. And this is the reason that I rise today, because I think that when a President takes the time to respond, address the issue forthrightly in a letter, in writing that we should take note.

When I have written the Presidents, in every one of these I have asked, "What is their mission?"

I did the same thing when it was announced right before his departure from the Presidency by President Bush, that he was sending these troops—humanitarian, on the face of it—to keep from starvation literally hundreds of thousands of Somalians. But underneath it were other, basic issues, very fundamental. And our troops were going to face a situation in which arms that were loose in that country, supplied by us, by two Presidents, though actually the policy began with President Carter, in a very mild way, but with the advent of the dictator Siad Barre of Somalia, President Reagan and President Bush gave him near a billion dollars' worth of armaments, everything from automatic weapons to recoilless rifles, to name some, and they got it; that is the armament that has been responsible for the death of the marines that have died thus far in Somalia.

When Siad Barre was deposed, it left the United States exposed.

Now, what is very little known is that when General Schwarzkopf was the head of the general command staff, he appeared before the Senate committee to recommend that the appropriations, which some Senators were protesting, of moneys to this dictator Siad Barre, would be canceled, and he appeared to argue the other war, saying that Somalia was of vital strategic importance to the United States for several reasons: One, it is there, right below the gulf, the Arab ocean, the life-

line of transportation for, among other things, Saudi Arabian oil. On top of that, our leading oil companies entered into agreements amounting to, I forget how many, billions of dollars' worth of exploration and oil rights exploration with Siad Barre. That is your underlying big stake.

And if you think those big oil interests do not have influence, well, then I am afraid you are ready to believe in the tooth fairy.

□ 1240

I became concerned that our mission was not clearly articulated or defined and that it was based on falsely reported reasons and goals. So I wrote the President. I will ask that a copy of my letter, as well as the President's response, be included in today's RECORD.

His response, his recognition of the existing condition between the executive and legislative branches over warmaking and his most significant agreement to address the issue is I think the most hopeful thing that I have seen and to minimize this tension through discussion with congressional leaders, assuming the congressional leaders are interested, is of monumental importance.

I reported this several times, in fact, and had released, and I would ask that my release be appended following the two letters that I am introducing for the RECORD.

In that release, I stated and related the facts. Nobody would pick up on it.

Now, there was a local rag on the Hill that picked up the fact that I had written the President, but I do not think that it is very favorable to President Clinton. So when I reported the letter, it just simply was not reported anywhere, even in our local press, nowhere, just blacked out.

Now, this is the first President that in writing says, "Yes, it is something that I want to look into very carefully and in consultation with the congressional leaders." He was the first one to do so.

President Bush when I challenged even the announcement on August 3, 1990, of the first sized expeditionary force to the Persian Gulf, he replied to a reporter and said, "Oh, I think that act is unconstitutional."

Now, that compounds the sin. For since when does a President who takes the oath under the Constitution to faithfully execute the laws pick and choose which laws he shall respect and obey?

But President Bush's own record publicly, oh, he was not going to pay any attention to it because he considered it unconstitutional.

I must admit that Congress has failed the American people. But what is Congress?

Well, in the words of President Wilson, it is a conjuncture of association of groups and individuals elected at large

throughout the country. Ostensibly we are supposed to be representing the people and discharging our own oath to the Constitution. That is the only oath we take. It is the only oath any Federal official takes to uphold, support, defend, and protect the Constitution against all enemies, domestic as well as foreign.

But I recall in the sixties, the big argument I heard, and it was not an argument, it was, "Well, HENRY, what do you know about what the President knows about these commies over there in Asia? Suppose he is right?"

And I say that is not the issue. The issue is what we are supposed to know and do.

I take the floor and I point out that the first peacetime draft in 1940, was passed after great debate, and that was the day when they really had the date and a lot of amendments were taken in. That is when we had the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act which I did not see invoked again until the recent gulf war when the Reserves were pressed into duty and all of a sudden these constituents were writing and saying, "What about my job?"

I was the one that resurrected and first brought to attention the fact that the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act mandated that any person subject to the terms of that draft call would be insured that his job would be preserved when he was discharged, that if his home was going to be foreclosed on, it would be suspended and that at no time should he have to pay more than 3 percent interest.

Now, that was when you had people's representatives, and that was what was first in the 1940's.

Then they came and they sunsetted it, 1 year. Why?

Because it was the first time since the Civil War that you had that kind of conscription. If anybody wants to read the most riotous era, especially in New York, in the history of our country, read the history of the draft riots in New York.

So my colleagues, the issue is still the fundamental one. This is where the men who wrote the Constitution dwelt on the most. You read the debates, such as were preserved by Madison and others of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, you will see this was the prime issue.

First, whether they should even have a Presidency, which they called a Chief Magistrate, and then changed it to the Presidency.

Their fear was that they would go back to where they had fled from, king-made wars.

Well, I ask my colleagues, what are we getting now if not king-made wars, if the people's representatives to now represent and uphold the Constitution as politically unpalatable as it may be.

I will tell you this. Once the soldiers are in the field and you have any kind

of shooting, one of us are going to go back and ask questions. We are going to support him.

This is what has enabled Presidents to get away and duck the issues.

Now we have a President who says, "Yes, I agree. This is an issue that a President should be very sensitive to, and I am, and I will pledge that I am going to follow through in concert. There should be some way in which in concert with the Congress a suitable compromise or interpretation can be made."

What more can we ask of a President, I say?

As I say and repeat, I do admit that the Congress has failed the American people with regard to warmaking by a failure to carry out its own laws, but it is also incumbent upon Congress, as well as the President, to uphold the law of the land and the war powers resolution is the law of the land.

Now, there are some who would say, "Oh, we ought to change it."

Well, it is like P.K. Chesterton said of Christianity. He said, "It was tried, found difficult, and then left alone untested."

The United Nations surprisingly when President Bush ran for the U.S. Senate in Texas in 1966. He said that if he were elected the first thing he would do as a U.S. Senator was to demand that the United States pull out of the United Nations.

Well, fate has such a way of calling back the words we throw to the air, not knowing when they will come back.

Well, sure enough, comes 1972 President Nixon has not helped him much in getting elected against Senator—or rather, 1970, in getting elected against Senator Bensten, now Senator Bensten, or was Senator Bentsen, and sends him then after the defeat as the U.N. Ambassador.

□ 1250

And what was one of his first acts? Moving to allow Communist China to enter the United States, which during that campaign in 1966 said that he would demand the United States pull out before any such contemptible action was taken.

So, this is what I mean when I say that it is, most of all, incumbent upon us who have this grave responsibility of presuming to be representatives, which is always, I say, like in mathematics where we study curves, and I am most fascinated by one, and this was a curve that was defined in what we used to call coordinate geometry as one that was always approaching, but never reaching, the axis. It is known as the asymptote.

And that is the way it is with us attempting to represent all of the constituency, which is great in number, not less than 550,000 American citizens of all kinds, backgrounds, religions, ethnic, racial, economic, and so it is a

constant challenge: How can we be a representative fairly and squarely, above all honestly, but responsibly, to everyone? Well, everyone has to decide that for him and herself.

In the last 12 years we have widened the scope of intervention in the Western World by the invasion of Grenada, Panama, which I think was a day of infamy where we slaughtered, incinerated, better than 4,000. Of course they were all black in that Turillo district in Panama, and we did this with Stealth bomber action, literally burned them, and we had massacres and we never reported them. Did Hitler ever do worse? Let us be fair. I do not know of anything worse, where you incinerate in these flimsy wooden structures that were constructed in 1908 in order to house the laborers, black, from the Caribbean to work on the building of the canal, and they have been there since.

Where are we now in Panama? Well, look what happened last year when President Bush was there at the base and the riots that took place. That is how happy they are about that invasion. We never have done justice to the Panamanian people. But, you know, when you are a big bully—but look at the consequences.

Right now we have two-thirds of the total number of American troops we had at the height of the invasion, and let me tell my colleagues something else. American lives are not safe in Panama. That never used to be the case. We overlook what the facts are in Panama. You have about one-tenth white, dominant, 300 years domination, apart from the people they look down on: Creoles, mixed, mostly black, and you think that the invasion of December 20, 1989, 1990, is something that we won? Any more than the Persian Gulf?

Why the so-called ending and/or great jubilation and parades here celebrating that one in April 1991 was just the beginning of the war. We are now emerging into the most dangerous threshold of all, particularly with the developments, very little reported in our American press, so I do not blame either of you or the people not knowing, but in the Balkans with the terrible bloodletting, cruelty. It is one of the most barbarous wars going on now.

What is the role of the United States there? Even in airlifting we have the war powers resolution actually involved, and this is what I had written in my letter to President Clinton.

So, in the last 12 years we have seen not a lessening, but a far more dangerous widening, in the scope of this intervention by Presidents.

In El Salvador look at the terrible destruction. I objected to that in a special order on April 1, 1980. Now those who like to think that I am partisan, who was the President on April 1, 1980? President Jimmy Carter, a Democrat, and it was the first time that we sent

military troops—first reported like they did back in Vietnam in 1963, which incidentally I also raised an issue. That was the issue I had been disturbing President Kennedy with for 3 months on the fateful day of November 21, 1963, that I and only two other Congressmen were aboard Air Force One going to the first stop which was my hometown, San Antonio. That was the issue because I had been nettling him, I had been needling him. I had been bothering him about the fact that I had constituents that had been so-called advisers in South Vietnam, had been on what they called missions facing hostile fire, but without the right to bear arms because they were supposed to be advisers.

Lo and behold, how do you think I felt, my colleagues, when in 1980 we do the same thing in El Salvador, and I have a constituent who calls me and says, "Hey, what's going on? In the Capital here every night when we walk out on the streets they are shooting or bombing, and we can't carry a gun."

Now the Embassy is a compound, and it is a fortress, and the Embassy employees are being given hazardous duty pay. I ask why they cannot at least have a gun.

Well, I cannot tell my colleagues the dismay to find that in 1980 we had learned nothing since 1963. But it is all in the RECORD. I reported it. In fact, I even had it in one special order, and this is before we had television come in. Remember, my colleagues, that I have been making use of this great privilege since 1 week after I was sworn in 32 years ago. There was no TV or anything. TV did not come in until somewhere around the seventies. I forget exactly the year, but about 1970 or somewhere around there. So, it is in the RECORD if anybody wants to look it up.

Now let me remind my colleagues that I saw where the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Colin Powell, said when asked when President Bush first announced the sending of the troops—they said, "Why are you sending them? What's their mission?"

He said, "Oh, this is to teach those warlords a lesson."

Well, that is not a military mission. My gosh. Somalia. That used to be British Somaliland, Italian Somaliland, French Somaliland, and they occupy that, and they could never have any kind of peacekeeping. In fact, why did they withdraw?

The situation in Somalia is the very kind of involvement that the war powers resolution was designed to address, my colleagues. President Bush sent 20,000 United States troops—more than that; it was about 28,000—to Somalia last December in an operation that will cost over 500 million and has already cost several United States service personnel's lives. When the U.S. troops were first deployed by President Bush,

I questioned that lack of open debate and the fact that established law in sending U.S. forces into areas of conflict were not followed. I also outlined the historic relationship of United States support for the ousted Somali President Siad Barre. It turns out that it went much further than that, much deeper into the vast reserves of oil resting beneath sands and soil of Somalia, and even offshore and where you have conflicting ambitions. Saudi Arabia, Iran, Israel; they are all there. But we had General Scowcroft say—or rather not Scowcroft—I do not know. I have my mind on one of those psychological stresses, I guess, but we had our U.S. commander go before the Senate committee and lay it out from a defense or military standpoint.

□ 1300

One reason he gave was that it was sort of a bulwark against Libya and the dictator there, and also against Ethiopia. It should have been brought out that United States troops were being sent to Africa to protect oil reserves, not for the humanitarian purposes loudly touted and so willingly believed by so many.

As I pointed out last December, former Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf testified in 1990 before the Senate Committee on Appropriations that United States aid to Somalia should be continued to offset the threat of Libya in the region, that is, to protect our oil interests. Remember, the vital flow of Saudi Arabian oil is through that gulf passage.

The consequences of this U.S. alliance with Siad Barre are quite clear—mass starvation, social anarchy and ultimately, U.S. intervention.

But it ends up going beyond counteracting the influence of Libya in the region. The importance of Somalia oil was pointed out by then-Vice President Bush when he was in Yemen in 1986. Yemen borders Saudi Arabia to the south on the Red Sea. Across the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden lies Sudan, Ethiopia, and Somalia. On the northern shore of Saudi Arabia lies the Persian Gulf, Iraq, Kuwait, Iran, and the Strait of Hormuz. While in Yemen, George Bush stated the importance of developing oil reserves away from the tumultuous Persian Gulf and the treacherous Strait of Hormuz. This included the development of oil in Somalia.

Under the Somalian strong man, Siad Barre, four United States-based oil companies were granted the rights to two-thirds of Somalia's oil and natural gas reserves: Conoco, Amoco, Chevron, and Phillips. During the deployment of United States troops in Somalia last December, the office of Conoco in Mogadishu, Somalia, worked closely with the United States Government in this military action.

The need for some humanitarian relief in Somalia was obvious. But this

has not been enough to mobilize thousands of U.S. troops for such international humanitarian crises before. We need look no further than Bosnia for proof of this. And in our own country, murder is rampant, handguns and automatic weapons are endemic, poverty has increased and children go hungry; yet no such dramatic action has been taken here either. We cannot find some \$40 or \$50 million to make sure every one of our children is immunized against disease, but we could find \$100 billion for the Persian Gulf and exempt it from budget accountability—just like in our Banking Committee, in all of these celebrated closeouts of the S&L's and banks that have been exempted from the budget. Now, if that is not Alice in Wonderland, I do not know what it is, except that it is Alice in Wonderland with a tragedy.

All of the bankers that were recently reported as receiving salaries of \$2.5 and \$3 million, not counting stock options and all, are insured by the taxpayer as depository institutions. And, oh, how they take after me when I point out that there are some minimal rules that they should follow. When one banker got nasty not too long ago, I just said, "Well, you know, when you are on relief"—and they have been, and they are—"there are a lot of rules, and if you don't believe so, go ask the recipients of food stamps."

What is the cost of our Somalia adventure ultimately? We do not know. Where is the United Nations? It was supposed to have taken over several months ago.

We now pay about \$20 a barrel for oil in the open market. That is what these oil procurers say. But the real cost to the American citizen, if you factor in all of the defense money we have had to spend to protect those oil lines in the Persian Gulf and everywhere else, is much greater, and we are paying over \$50 a barrel. Of course, the oil companies are not about to factor that in or let the American people know that.

The war powers resolution goes further to govern more limited engagement for U.S. military forces to be used. That is the trigger—U.S. forces and the introduction thereof, period. By dodging these basic laws and principles, open debate never occurs, and the true nature of many actions abroad are never known. Ultimately, democratic government itself is undermined, as it has been, though imperceptibly so.

But now this President, President Clinton, has agreed to meet with congressional leaders to discuss war powers, and I cannot overemphasize the significance of his willingness to address this matter which has been a source of attention, confusion, and which has ultimately been a great disservice to the American people, particularly to those who have had to sac-

rifice, sacrifice not only their lives but their fortunes in U.S. military action overseas. When Congress has failed to stand behind its own legislative enactments, the fact that we have a President who is willing to address the issue in the interest of adherence to the dictates of the Constitution and the interests of the American people, this is in my opinion a tremendously meritorious and monumental occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I include the material to which I referred previously, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 5, 1993.

HON. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President, United States of America,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is good reason to point out that as of February 8th, the order of former President Bush sending armed forces into areas of imminent hostility expired. I respectfully urge you to ask Congress for an extension of the 60-day deadline contained in Section 3 of the War Powers Resolution if it is your intention to maintain the commitment of U.S. troops in Somalia.

I have served in Congress for many years, and I served during the debate on and passage of the War Powers Resolution. I clearly recall the debate and remember that what we meant with the Resolution's reference to "hostilities" was in general terms—hostilities between and among groups other than the U.S. as well as hostilities directed at the United States. Clearly, hostilities are present both in Somalia and Bosnia. Further, the intent in passing the War Powers Resolution was to ensure that Congress, and through Congress the American people, has an affirmative role whenever U.S. forces are sent in harm's way in recognition of the enumerated war-declaration power set forth in the Constitution.

Mr. President, I urge you as the first President in many years to share party affiliation with the majority in both the House and Senate, to fully utilize the War Powers Resolution by consulting with Congress and by complying with the deadlines contained in the Resolution. This law was passed with events in mind just as those we face in Somalia and Bosnia—being those events where missions are confused, outcomes are uncertain, where the U.S. feels a moral responsibility and yet the issues are not clear.

It is incumbent upon Congress as well as the President to uphold the law of the land, and the War Powers Resolution is the law applicable to these situations. The United Nations is no substitute for Congress—consultation with the Members of the United Nations is no substitute for consultation with Members of Congress who are the elected representatives of the people of the United States. I urge you to immediately and publicly state recognition of the War Powers Resolution and to move to comply with its provisions.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 31, 1993.

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 5 expressing your views on

the use of U.S. military force and the War Powers Resolution.

Effective foreign policy requires close cooperation between the President and Congress. This imperative applies to the sensitive questions surrounding the use of our nation's armed forces.

The current operation in Somalia was preceded by consultations with Congress which helped ensure support for this humanitarian effort. Similarly, the airdrop of humanitarian supplies in Bosnia was consistent with the views expressed in Congressional resolutions (S. Res. 330 and H. Res. 554 passed August 11, 1992) urging decisive action to ensure provision of relief to the affected populations.

While I appreciate your concern for those American troops still in Somalia, I am sure you appreciate that the current phase of operation is almost at an end, and we expect the bulk of our military presence to be withdrawn in the very near future.

I recognize that there have been longstanding differences between Congress and the Executive Branch on the authority of each under the Constitution with respect to war powers. It is in the national interest that our relations on this vital matter minimize unnecessary tensions between our branches while maximizing those constructive discussions dictated by the Constitution and the public good. Clearly this is a subject that deserves serious discussion in the days ahead.

We will be reviewing the complex issues related to the War Powers Act in close consultation with key members of Congress. I look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Sincerely,

BILL.

PRESIDENT RESPONDS TO GONZALEZ' CALL FOR COMPLIANCE WITH WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Representative Henry B. Gonzalez released the President's response to his March 5th letter to the President calling on him to comply with the War Powers Resolution with respect to Bosnia and Somalia. Gonzalez argued in his letter to the President that the War Powers Resolution "was passed with events in mind just as those we face in Somalia and Bosnia—being those events where missions are confused, outcomes are uncertain, where the U.S. feels a moral responsibility and yet the issues are not clear."

With regard to Bosnia, Clinton replied, "The airdrop of humanitarian supplies in Bosnia was consistent with the views expressed in Congressional resolutions (S. Res. 330 and H. Res. 554 passed August 11, 1992) urging decisive action to ensure provision of relief to the affected populations." The President's letter was dated March 31st, but it did not address the United Nations Security Council vote on the 31st to authorize NATO warplanes to shoot down Serb aircraft that violate a ban on flights over Bosnia. The United States and its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are making final preparations to enforce the no-fly zone.

Regarding Somalia, Gonzalez stated in his letter to Clinton, "As of February 8th, the order of former President Bush sending armed forces into areas of imminent hostility expired. I respectfully urge you to ask Congress for an extension of the 60-day deadline contained in Section 3 of the War Powers Resolution if it is your intention to maintain the commitment of U.S. troops in Somalia." Clinton replied, "The current phase of operation is almost at an end, and we expect the bulk of our military presence to be withdrawn in the very near future."

In his letter to the President, Gonzalez cited his large role in passage of the War Powers Resolution, and recalled the debate over the Resolution's reference to "hostilities." Gonzalez said, "I clearly recall that what we meant with the Resolution's reference to 'hostilities' was in general terms—hostilities between and among groups other than the U.S. as well as hostilities directed at the United States. Clearly, there are hostilities in both Somalia and in Bosnia."

Gonzalez argued that the intent in passing the Resolution "was to ensure that Congress, and through Congress the American people, has an affirmative role whenever U.S. forces are sent in harm's way in recognition of the enumerated war-declaration power set forth in the Constitution."

On the war powers issue, Clinton replied, "I recognize that there have been longstanding differences between Congress and the Executive Branch on the authority of each under the Constitution with respect to war powers. It is in the national interest that our relations on this vital matter minimize unnecessary tensions between our branches while maximizing those constructive discussions dictated by the Constitution and the public good. Clearly this is a subject that deserves serious discussion in the days ahead. We will be reviewing the complex issues related to the War Powers Act in close consultation with key members of Congress. I look forward to hearing your thoughts."

Gonzalez expressed encouragement over the President's response because the President "clearly showed that he had carefully considered the war powers issue and my arguments." Gonzalez said, "This is the first time since the War Powers Resolution was enacted that a U.S. President has shown any understanding and consideration of the law of the land. I am greatly encouraged that, finally, the American people, through Congress, will have a voice in whether their friends and relatives are sent outside the borders of the United States to die in military action. I look forward to working with the President as he reviews these issues."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOLOMON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WOLF, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, on April 21.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, on April 21.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MEEK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARTINEZ, for 5 minutes, on April 20.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 60 minutes, each day on April 28 and 29.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 30 minutes, each day on May 4, 5, and 6.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOLOMON) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. SOLOMON in five instances.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MEEK) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. REED.

Mr. BARCIA.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKAGGS.

Mr. SWETT.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 20, 1993, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1032. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting their annual report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1833; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1033. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on the Youth Conservation Corps Program in the Department for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1705; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1034. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of a proposed Technical Assistance Agreement for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Israel (Transmittal No. DTC-9-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1035. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Marshall Fletcher McCallie, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Namibia, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1036. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Harry Gilmore, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Armenia, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1037. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report on the implementation of section 620(s) of the Foreign

Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1038. 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. 750, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1039. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1040. A letter from the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1041. A letter from the Director of Operations and Finance, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1042. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1043. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting copies of a report of altered Privacy Act systems of records, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(r); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1044. A letter from the Chairman, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, transmitting a copy of their audited financial statements for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1992; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1045. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1046. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of a lease prospectus, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

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. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 328. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of historic structures within the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 326. An act to revise the boundaries of the George Washington Birthplace National Monument, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 194. A bill to withdraw and reserve certain public lands and minerals within the State of Colorado for military uses, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-56, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. OBEY: Joint Economic Committee. Report of the Joint Economic Committee on the 1993 Economic Report of the President (Rept. 103-57). 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. SKAGGS:

H.R. 1716. A bill to amend the act of January 26, 1915, establishing Rocky Mountain National Park, to provide for the protection of certain lands in Rocky Mountain National Park and along North St. Vrain Creek and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 1717. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to extend the temporary suspension of the duties on certain infant nursery intercoms and monitors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois):

H.R. 1718. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Lou Rawls; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 1719. A bill to promote the implementation of programs to improve the traffic safety performance of high-risk drivers; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Ms. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MALONEY, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BLACKWELL, Ms. FURSE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KREIDLER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FALCOMA, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 1720. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide special funding to States for implementation of national estuary conservation and management plans, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1721. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant a special use permit; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MINK, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FROST, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr.

SARPALIUS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. OBEY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. WISE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PARKER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. NATCHER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GORDON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. GALLO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WOLF, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. APLEGATE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. FURSE, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. SWETT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. BYRNE, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution designating October 1993 and October 1994 as "National Domestic Violence Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution authorizing the 1993 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capital Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

73. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, relative to the Naval Station New York; to the Committee on Armed Services.

74. Also, memorial of the Legislature of Guam, relative to defense matters affecting Guam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

75. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, relative to banking laws; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

76. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, relative to the "Federal Mandate Relief Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

77. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to unfunded Federal mandates on States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

78. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to threatened and endangered species; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

79. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to a veterans' medical facility in northern Virginia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

80. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to the repeal of

23 U.S.C. 159; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Public Works and Transportation.

81. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to American POW's/MIA's in Southeast Asia; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of April 7, 1993]

H.R. 346: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SWETT, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. REED, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. EVANS, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. OWENS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HORN, Mr. YATES, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. KING, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOKE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 347: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HORN, Mr. YATES, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FROST, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SWETT, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. REED, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. EVANS, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 543: Mr. DORNAN.
H.R. 602: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 605: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 606: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 611: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 662: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 918: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 999: Mrs. ROUKEMA and Mr. GRAMS.
H.R. 1007: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1096: Mr. WALSH, Ms. BYRNE, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1142: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1167: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1168: Mr. SMITH of Oregon and Mr. GRAMS.

H.R. 1245: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1278: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MALONEY, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1319: Ms. LOWEY.
H.R. 1411: Mr. SOLOMON.
H.R. 1505: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 1507: Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 1520: Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 1521: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 1560: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1573: Mr. MAZZOLI.
H.R. 1630: Mr. STARK.

H.J. Res. 80: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FISH,

Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCCREY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PARKER, Mr. QUILLLEN, and Mr. ROBERTS.

H.J. Res. 118: Mr. FORD of Michigan.
H.J. Res. 119: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. REED, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SCHIFF, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 148: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, and Mr. STARK.

H.J. Res. 166: Mr. FILNER, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H. Con. Res. 73: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H. Res. 86: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HORN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. ZELIFF.

[Submitted April 19, 1993]

H.R. 43: Mr. BLACKWELL.
H.R. 159: Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 163: Mr. GRAMS, Mr. EVERETT, and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 166: Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 167: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 171: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.
H.R. 173: Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 349: Mr. COMBEST.
H.R. 419: Ms. THURMAN.

H.R. 431: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. KREIDLER.

H.R. 455: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 509: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 522: Mr. GILCHRIST.

H.R. 715: Mr. COMBEST.
H.R. 726: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 749: Mr. UPTON, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GALLO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 769: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 881: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 882: Mr. COYNE, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 886: Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOKE, and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 921: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 960: Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. PARKER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 967: Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. POMBO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 972: Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1007: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. GINGRICH.
H.R. 1059: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. EWING, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1078: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. KIM.
H.R. 1079: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 1080: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GRAMS, and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 1081: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. KIM.
H.R. 1082: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 1083: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. KIM.
H.R. 1096: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1099: Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GRAMS, and Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 1114: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1121: Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 1124: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 1126: Mr. GRAMS, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1127: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1128: Mr. GRAMS, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1129: Mr. GRAMS.
H.R. 1130: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1138: Mr. MINGE.
H.R. 1141: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1150: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. MEEK, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 1155: Mr. EVANS, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MINETA, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1188: Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MEEK, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 1191: Mr. OXLEY and Mr. KIM.
H.R. 1285: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1337: Mr. PARKER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1392: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 1407: Mr. LEVY, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. YATES, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 1437: Mr. FROST, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 1492: Mrs. MEEK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. SHEPHERD.

H.R. 1502: Mr. SWIFT.
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.J. Res. 129: Mr. OXLEY and Mr. KIM.
H.J. Res. 139: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HENRY, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. FROST, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. PARKER.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. OLVER, Mr. FROST, Mr. YATES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 21: Ms. DELAURO.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. PACKARD and Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H. Res. 40: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. STARK, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. MINGE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,
25. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, NY, relative to a special envoy to Northern Ireland and the appointment of an ambassador to the Republic of Ireland; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.