

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 23, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Dr. William A. Holmes, senior minister, Metropolitan Memorial United Methodist Church, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and loving God, Lord of all our houses, the personal ones in which we live our lives as families and to which we turn for shelter, rest, and comfort; Bless, we pray, our individual homes.

Lord of public places, including this representative House of all the people: Bless, we pray, the deliberations of this body. May the business conducted here truly be the people's business, may the issues debated here truly be the people's issues, and may the floor of this House so resonate with the sounds of a commitment to the common good, that it can be said of all who occupied this House: "They served You through serving others." O God of all our houses. 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. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS] will please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine 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 without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3724. An act to designate the United States courthouse located in Bridgeport, CT, as the "Brien McMahon Federal Building";

H.R. 4568. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 222. Authorizing the placement of a bust of Raoul Wallenberg in the Capitol.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2739. An act to amend the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2739) "An act to amend the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. FORD, Mr. EXON, Mr. DANFORTH, and Mr. PRESSLER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2099. An act to establish the Northern Great Plains Rural Development Commission, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution commemorating June 22, 1994, as the 50th anniversary of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize 10 Members on each side for 1-minute requests.

### INTRODUCTION OF THE GULF OF MAINE ACT OF 1994

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce the Gulf of Maine Act of 1994, legislation that seeks to protect the future of this vital resource.

The Gulf of Maine is in trouble. We can see it in the crises facing Maine fishermen and women, with dwindling groundfish stocks, the contamination of sensitive wetlands, and the threat to a way of life for millions who depend on the Gulf of Maine for recreation and economic opportunities.

For too long our approach to saving this resource has been fragmented among various Federal agencies, States, provinces, businesses, and environmental and citizens groups who have a stake in its future. For too long the left hand of government has not

known what the right hand is doing in dealing with the challenge before us.

Groundfish stocks will not be restored by limiting access to fishing if pollution continues to contaminate coastal waters. The Gulf of Maine Act of 1994 will assure that this precious resource is viewed as a whole, and that actions to protect it are taken as a whole. It focuses on four key areas—marine research, fisheries management, economic development, and environmental management. Action in these areas will be coordinated by the Gulf of Maine Council made up of representatives of each of the Gulf of Maine States and Canadian Provinces, with the involvement of a full range of groups and individuals and interests with a stake in the future of the Gulf of Maine.

This legislation is the result of the vision and hard work of a number of concerned people. Chief among them is GEORGE MITCHELL, who will introduce this bill in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the Gulf of Maine has been a vital resource for millions and millions of people for generations. It is time to do what needs to be done to make sure it is a vital resource for future generations.

### THE MYTH OF SMALL BUSINESS SUPPORT FOR MANDATED HEALTH REFORM

(Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, whenever the issue of mandated health care and the concerns of small business are discussed, someone always claims that those businesses who currently provide health insurance for their employees would support such a mandate to level the playing field. This is a fallacy.

Small business owners are fiercely independent by nature. Those who currently provide health insurance are able to determine the coverage they can offer and at what cost. A government mandate removes all future control from the small business owner over the type of benefit he will offer to his employee, and how much he will pay. The Government will specify the terms and conditions of coverage. The Government will tell the entrepreneur that he must pay 80 percent of the premiums. The Government will create a huge new bureaucracy to collect the new payroll taxes and administer health care reform that is supposed to

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

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

reduce the cost of health care. If anyone listening right now thinks that getting the Government more involved in health care will save money, I would love to talk to you about some beach front property I own in Kansas.

Small business owners know that the basic benefits package will continually expand, as interest groups appeal to Congress to add more and more services. They know that health care costs and paperwork burdens will increase in a big Federal bureaucracy. They know that mandated health care will cause some businesses to fold, and possibly millions of jobs to be lost.

Small business owners, including those currently offering health care, still believe that the Government that governs best, governs least. Let us heed their wisdom and real world experience—oppose employer mandates in health care reform.

#### NO TIME FOR PARTISAN POLITICS ON HEALTH CARE REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words.

On health care reform, Republicans sound like they want to be part of the solution, but their actions—loudly and clearly—make them part of the problem.

While the Democrats are working to fashion a health care bill that will control costs and cover all Americans, the Republicans are trying to score political points by saying “no” to health care and “yes” to gridlock.

According to the New York Times, House Republicans, at the urging of their deputy leader, are trying to keep health care legislation from reaching the House floor in a form that could pass. With the goal of creating a health care train wreck, Republicans have been urged to vote against amendments that they actually support.

Unfortunately, instead of working for the best health care bill possible, many on the other side have placed politics over the best interest of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to put partisan politics aside and work honestly to deliver the health care reform that the American people want and deserve.

#### WORLD CUP HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, The United States beat Columbia in World Cup soccer yesterday. So, why can we not pass commonsense health care reform in this session of Congress?

We, in the House, could learn a few things from our American soccer team.

The Americans used teamwork to win. We need to drop the partisanship and work together for commonsense health care reform.

The Americans played tough defense, while moving forward on offense to score the two goals. We should be vigilant in defending our small businesses, and to protect the jobs of our workers as we move forward on health care reform.

Our soccer team, unlike the Colombians, did not shoot themselves in the foot by shooting into their own net. We should remember not to kill our small businesses by forcing a job-killing employer mandate on our private sector.

And most importantly, the American team never gave up in the face of long odds and limited expectations. I urge my colleagues to never give up in the effort to achieve commonsense health care reform.

[Mr. MAZZOLI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### COMMONSENSE HEALTH REFORM

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, health care reform seems to be revolving around the Democratic Party's Big Brother-like mentality of more government-run systems. Being a proponent of individual accountability, I am particularly appalled by this reckless disregard for personal responsibility.

Specifically, President Clinton's proposal forces small businessmen to abdicate their right to design an employee benefits package that meets their employees' needs and makes good business sense. As a former small businessman, I find this very disturbing.

So who would fill this role? A new crop of State and Federal bureaucrats, equaling yet another unfunded Federal mandate for the States, a nightmare for employees and a bigger tax bill for American taxpayers.

These newly empowered State and Federal health care bureaucrats would be responsible for: Determining corporate and individual eligibility; setting subsidy amounts; formulating subsidy distribution; and even monitoring changes in eligibility status.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear to me that employer mandates are unacceptable. This explosive increase in State and Federal employees, and the lack of small business control over employee benefits design are not in the American public's best interest.

Let us make sure that health care reform today does not translate into big government tomorrow.

#### MEXICAN PIPE COMPANY STEALING AMERICAN JOBS

(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, Japan is teaching, teaching, and teaching, and Mexico is learning, learning, and learning.

Tamsa, a Mexican pipemaker, is stealing the pipe business in America. American companies say that this Mexican pipemaker is selling pipe so low it looks like a loss leader at a fire sale. That is called dumping below production costs, killing American jobs.

And what does Congress do? Congress sits here and rearranges the deck chairs on the biggest Titanic we have ever seen, called NAFTA. Free trade with Mexico? This isn't free trade; this is a joke. And the laugh all over the world, especially in Mexico, is on the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of this tragic comedy.

#### THE COST OF THE CLINTON HEALTH CARE PLAN TO SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note some of the things that small business owners are saying to me about the Clinton health care plan:

Mr. Chuck Keagle, who runs several small restaurants in my district, told me that “if the Clinton plan were enacted as it stands now, my problems as a small business owner would go away because we simply would not survive.”

Barbara Price, owner of A-plus Mailing Systems, testified that “The plan is going to mean one of two things: we will be out of business, or we are going to severely reduce the number of employees.”

These comments were not unique. In fact, I recently held a small business forum at which every small business owner told me that if the Clinton plan passes, they would have to either lay off employees or close entirely.

When you listen to this kind of testimony, which comes from real people running real businesses, it becomes extremely clear that the employer mandates in the Clinton plan pose a life-or-death threat to small businesses.

For this reason, I strongly urge my colleague to reject the Clinton administration's attempt to place a costly new burden on this Nation's small businesses, this ill-written employer mandate.

#### DENY GUNS TO SPOUSE ABUSERS

(Mr. TORRICELLI asked and was given permission to address the House

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, while America focuses on the tragedy of family violence, all eyes are riveted on spousal abuse, there is something real and substantive that this Congress can do. Contained in the crime bill, in the Violence Against Women Act, is a provision that the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] and I have offered, to put a barrier to those who abuse their spouses in getting access to handguns.

A history of spousal violence, a court order to stay away from a spouse that has been abused, that individual would be denied the ability to buy a handgun.

America can mourn, we can debate the issue. But this Congress can do something real and lasting if the conference committee now considering the crime bill will take this commonsense approach that we have offered.

#### COMMONSENSE HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee predicted that if President Clinton wanted it, the Congress could pass a health care reform bill that would make insurance available to everyone within 10 years.

But it seems the administration does not want such reform. For the President, it is his way or the highway. And that is too bad.

The Clinton reform plan has many serious flaws. It has price controls which will diminish health care quality. It has employer mandates which will kill jobs. And it greatly enhances the presence of the Government in the health care delivery system which makes most Americans very nervous.

I urge the President to support commonsense health care reform. If Congress can agree on a plan that would extend coverage to millions of Americans now unprotected and contain costs, that bill should be signed.

Let us fix the problems that plague our current system, without resorting to job killing employer mandates or a huge Government bureaucracy. And let us do it now.

#### GUNS SHOULD BE DENIED TO PEOPLE WITH FAMILY VIOLENCE CONVICTIONS

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] in pleading with the conferees on the crime bill to please keep in our provision vis-a-vis

denying guns to people who have a long, long list of family violence convictions. Many States do not call these criminal, and so therefore it does not fall under the Brady bill. But if we have not seen the deadly, deadly outcome of so many family disputes this week, we will never see it.

We are asking Members of Congress to collect names of people who have been killed in family violence just in recent times in their area and start putting those in the RECORD. It is time this country finally brings this issue out into the sunshine and work to do something about it. We can in the crime bill, we must in the crime bill. And when we are seeing over 1,500 women a year killed, it is time that this stopped.

#### WHEN IS IT WARRANTED TO TREAT JUVENILES LIKE ADULTS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise my colleagues about a case in Warwick, RI, where a convicted murderer is soon scheduled to be released from prison this coming October because he will then be 21 years old.

He was convicted of killing four females, was sentenced as a juvenile, and therefore will be released because of the way the law is written.

Upon his release from the juvenile detention center, his entire record will be expunged. Yes, you heard me correctly. Craig Price will have no criminal record at all. Not only does this add insult to injury, it makes a total mockery of our criminal justice system.

I cannot begin to imagine how shattered the families of these victims must be, knowing this killer, who robbed them of their loved ones, is due to be released after serving only 4 years for his crimes.

What is even more galling is that it has been widely reported by the press that Craig Price has shown absolutely no remorse for these brutal crimes.

It is imperative that the final crime bill that the House and Senate are currently trying to reconcile should contain a provision authorizing the prosecution of armed, violent, juveniles as adults.

An even more compelling reason to charge juveniles as adults is that the FBI is reporting a nearly fourfold increase in the murder arrest rate of people under 17 from 1965 to 1992.

□ 1020

#### A CALL FOR BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, in the 1930's, the chairman of the Republican National Party went on a national radio network and before the microphone he started jingling a set of metal dog tags. And he said, "Ladies and gentlemen of America, what you hear are the dog tags that every American will have to wear if we pass Social Security."

He argued then that if Social Security were enacted, it would be a step toward socialism that would take away the personal freedoms of America. We do not hear that Social Security argument today from either side of the aisle. But we do hear the same slogans about big brother and big government and socialism, when it comes to the health care reform to date.

In the history of our country, there have been Members in this body who have risen above party discipline and above cynical slogans to respond to our national needs. In the weeks ahead, the Nation can only hope that some Republican Members will defy their party's marching orders to sabotage health care reform and join in to find a truly bipartisan solution to our Nation's health care problem.

The Republican National Committee is determined to defeat President Clinton's efforts to solve our health care crisis. But can anyone truly believe that the American people are more interested in political gridlock than in progress? American families across this Nation are looking for guaranteed private insurance coverage that can never be taken away. There has to be a bipartisan solution. We need Members on both sides to work together to make it happen.

#### FOREST SERVICE TIMBER SALES PROGRAM IS VITAL TO U.S. ECONOMY

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I am asking Congress to continue at the present level the Forest Service timber sales program. We must remember that our actions have a tremendous impact not only on loggers, and people in the industry, but also on every American.

In 1995, the Nicolet National Forest may face a 25-percent reduction in board feet offered for sale.

These reductions profoundly affect the economy of the entire United States. The price of lumber has more than doubled in just over a year. The cost of the average home has been driven up an additional \$4,000.

The timber sales program is also vital to forest management. Thinning of our national forests is essential to pest control, to wildlife habitat, and to prevent forest wildfire.

The timber sales program is good for the economy and for forest management. I ask Congress to consider these facts in its deliberations, and I ask Congress to continue the timber sales program at its present level.

#### SUPPORT URGED FOR THE REEMPLOYMENT ACT

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the Reemployment Act is all about building a reemployment system that meets the needs of workers and businesses in the 1990's and beyond. The more than 2 million workers who will be dislocated this year and in the years to come need the assistance that this new system would bring.

At the heart of the Reemployment Act is an effort to improve our current unemployment offices which all too often offer little in the way of employment or services. The REA would put in their place one-stop career centers that would bring real help to workers struggling to find good jobs in a rapidly changing economy.

These career centers would offer immediate access to all of the programs available to workers looking for a new, or better job. Workers would be paired with career counselors who would work with them, guide them to the best programs, and commit themselves to seeing that workers succeed in finding that new and better job.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass the Reemployment Act this year and get one-stop centers up and running in each of our communities. We need to work to put on the President's desk legislation that would put in the hands of all workers the information and assistance they need to make the jobs connections in the 1990's and beyond.

#### CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a source of frustration to me and others who served on the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress: The lack of commitment by the leadership to true congressional reform.

I have here the only tangible product set forth by the committee, "A Guide to Training Programs for Congressional Staffers."

Mr. Speaker, I ask, where is the full report of the committee? Has the last year of work come to this one pamphlet? While the intentions may have been good, we cannot call this reform.

The leadership has not kept their commitment. After an understanding

with the leadership, we were led to believe that they would act upon the recommendations early in the year. Now, the session is almost over and where is the full report? Why is the leadership so reluctant to send it to the floor?

It is time we take these reforms seriously. Not only does this institution need these reforms, the American people deserve them. They are tired of seeing Congress elevate itself above everyone else in the country.

This is not a partisan issue; Members on both sides of the aisle want congressional reform. I believe if we bring this matter to the floor, the Members in this body will respond.

Again I ask the leadership, where is the commitment to reform we were all led to believe? Now is the time for congressional reform.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, many politicians present themselves as champions of change when, in reality, they are best friends of the status quo. A favorite trick for some of them is to sound like reformers while really playing politics as usual by preying upon people's fears.

When Social Security was proposed over half a century ago, Republicans tried to scare the American people out of supporting it. When Medicare was proposed in the 1960's they did the same. Last year, when we passed President Clinton's economic plan, the Republicans predicted doom and not a single Republican voted "yes." But one indicator after another shows an economy on the rebound. Almost 2½ million more jobs have been created since Bill Clinton became President than in the whole 4 years under President Bush.

Now the Republicans are at it again, Mr. Speaker. They put politics above people when they try to scare people out of making change. They would rather win partisan advantage than pass a bill that gives all Americans health care that can never be taken away. Mr. Speaker, I hope we will not give in to the fearmongers. Let us give American families the peace of mind they deserve by providing health care that's always there.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO THE HOUSTON ROCKETS

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

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am enormously proud to announce, for anyone who may have missed the news, that the Houston Rockets last night won their first ever NBA champion-

ship, defeating the New York Knicks in game seven of the basketball finals. This was a great season, a great series, and a great victory for the Houston Rockets. I want to congratulate Coach Rudy Tomjanovich, series MVP Hakeem Olajuwon, who also won regular season MVP honors and was the defensive player of the year, the first time anyone has done that. I want to congratulate the entire Rockets squad and each and every Houstonian who cheered on the Rockets, even when it looked like victory was slipping away in the seven-game series.

The Rockets showed their strength, their determination and poise throughout the series, but particularly when they came back from being down 3 to 2, not only against the Knicks but also against the Phoenix Suns, to win the final two games of both series.

Finally, let me say that Houston has many nicknames. We are called the Bayou City. We are called Space City. Now we take pride in being known as Clutch City. We thank our Houston Rockets, the coaches, the players, and the fans alike, for the new nickname.

We like our new nickname, Mr. Speaker. We like the fact that Houston is now the home of the NBA champions, and we plan to repeat next year.

#### COMMEMORATING THE HOUSTON ROCKETS VICTORY

(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, today the city of Houston and our Nation is celebrating the accomplishments of the Houston Rockets who have for the first time brought a national championship to Houston. The city of Houston has a great deal to be proud of including its position in world trade with the Port of Houston and its status as a world class city in energy, medicine, higher education, and space exploration.

Today we have one more reason for pride in our city because of the Houston Rockets. Just like the city of Houston, the Rockets have struggled in the past but always maintained their composure. The Houston Rockets serve as a shining example of a diverse group of people coming together and combining their talents to produce tremendous results. This Congress and this Nation can learn a great lesson in patience, perseverance, and professionalism from the Rockets and as we take time out from the constant deliberations of Federal spending, crime, and health care we are reminded that excellence and perfection are achievable through personal motivation and a commitment to succeed through teamwork.

□ 1030

**EMPLOYER MANDATE "TRIGGERS"**

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

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, the President's health care reform scheme and its single-payer cousin are foundering on the rocks of intense public scrutiny. That is good news for America.

The bad news is that big government types in Congress are trying to throw a buy-now-pay-later life preserver to the plan in the form of a delayed mandate, commonly known as a trigger.

When will the Democrats in Congress and the White House realize that Americans are wise to their wily buy-now-pay-later ways? Deficit spending, for example, saddles future Americans with debt, but it makes politicians look good today. Similarly, imposing an employer mandate via a trigger kills jobs when it goes into effect down the road, but makes politicians look good today.

Study after study shows that an employer mandate will force between 600,000 and 3.8 million Americans out of work. With increased unemployment on the horizon it is no wonder the Democrat leadership and the White House are trying to delay implementing an employer mandate.

I always thought Trigger was Roy Rogers' horse. Now it means employer mandate. Now, it means job killing employer mandate. Now it means buy-now-pay-later job killing employer mandate.

If the Democrat leadership and the White House think that a trigger is the life preserver that will save Government-run health care, they are wrong. It is a lead weight that is going to sink that monstrosity.

**REEMPLOYMENT ACT—ONE-STOP CAREER CENTERS**

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the President's Reemployment Act and the one-stop career centers which are a critical provision.

These centers will provide all Americans—not just the unemployed—with an incredible amount of information on labor markets, training programs, job counseling, and job benefits.

In addition to providing benefits to a larger group of Americans, one-stop career centers will eliminate much of the bureaucracy which often saps the energy and drive of people looking for work. Under current programs, too many people spend their time moving from agency to agency, line to line.

One-stop centers simplify this process, so workers expend their energy

using these programs instead of applying for them.

These centers are a simple idea which will hot-wire Americans into job markets and training opportunities. Let us keep Americans working: Support the Reemployment Act and its one-stop career centers.

**THE NAYSAYERS WILL BE PROVEN WRONG AGAIN**

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, what do Social Security, Medicare, minimum wage, the 1993 Budget Act, all have in common, spanning from 1935 to 1993? What they have in common, Mr. Speaker, is that the naysayers all stood on this floor and predicted dire economic gloom and doom, particularly saying that each was going to kill jobs in this country.

Yet, 30 years later, everyone lines up to support Social Security. Thirty years later, Medicare is a tenet of faith. Several years later, people acknowledge that the minimum wage increase did not kill jobs; and even though it will not be acknowledged right now by the naysayers, the studies are already coming back that show the Budget Act that passed here did not kill jobs, it created them, in fact, at a rate four times greater than the Bush administration in under 4 years.

What all that has in common is that they said all these things about some very important institutions of American Government and American society. Thirty years later, they always support them. We do not have 30 years to wait for health care. It needs to get done this year.

**A TAX BY ANY OTHER NAME**

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase Shakespeare, "A tax by any other name would cost as much."

Call them what you will—mandates, caps, triggers, they will still act like what they are: taxes. And they will cost America just as they always have in lost jobs, in increased costs, in foregone raises, in lost wages, in lost opportunities.

To get the right answers you have to ask the right question, the basic question such as, who pays? Regardless of how the administration tries to disguise it, the answer is: Everyone who works, everyone who aspires to work, and everyone who has had to work.

The something-for-nothing promise of Mr. Clinton and the liberal Democrats always degenerates into nothing-for-something for America.

As my friends will recall, Trigger was what Roy Rogers rode into the sunset. President Clinton appears saddled and ready to do the same. Of course, Mr. Rogers also now owns a fast-food restaurant chain, so perhaps the President is thinking ahead.

**ILLEGITIMACY: AN UNPRECEDENTED CATASTROPHE**

(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, Illegitimacy: An Unprecedented Catastrophe.

"Illegitimacy—An Unprecedented Catastrophe." That was the headline of a column in yesterday's Washington Post written by David Broder. In the article Mr. Broder includes some interesting statistics. From 1940 to 1956, the national rate of illegitimacy stayed flat at about 4 percent. Starting in 1956, it went up, and since 1970 every year it has been worse than the year before.

Currently the national rate of illegitimacy is 30 percent, and is figured to be at least 50 percent by the turn of the century. In some parts of America, it is already exceeding 70 percent. This is catastrophic, according to Mr. Broder and to Senator MOYNIHAN, who has studied demographics for a long time.

There is even a new term called speculation, which describes the impending creation of a different breed of human being, one born and raised outside the mother-father relationship.

Illegitimacy is catastrophic as to cost, Mr. Speaker, catastrophic as to human cost and financial cost. While the welfare reform bill has some pregnancy prevention measures in it, and they would be welcome, until this Nation returns to values, to commonly shared values, commonly shared principles, I think we will continue to have a deepening, not a lessening, of this national catastrophe.

**HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW**

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VISCLOSKEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1995**

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4602) making appropriations for the Department

of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1037

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. 4602, with Mr. GLICKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 22, 1994, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] had been disposed of, and title II was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS OF ALABAMA

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BACHUS of Alabama: Page 76, line 25, strike "\$141,950,000" and insert "\$49,293,100".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

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

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, without losing my time and place, I would like the opportunity to discuss my amendment first, but I will enter into a discussion with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] if I do not lose my time.

Mr. YATES. All I propose to do is fix a time limit, which I had understood the gentleman agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will protect the gentleman on his time.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I believe the arrangement with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is for 15 minutes on each side.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, that is correct. Is that satisfactory to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. It is very satisfactory, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YATES. With the gentleman controlling time on his side, and I on mine.

Mr. Chairman, I make that as a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Illinois that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes on each side?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes \$91 million from the appropriation for the National Endowment for the Arts.

□ 1040

That is the amount awarded in the program grants and administrative cost. It reserves \$8 million in administrative cost. It preserves those funds awarded to the States to be disbursed at their discretion. It also reserves all matching funds. Currently our States are given only 23½ percent of the total amount that we appropriate for the NEA. I do support the arts, but I am finding it increasingly obvious that Jane Alexander's staff at the NEA is having real problems with these individual grants. I think the discussion yesterday about what happened in Minneapolis is evidence of that. I think every time the NEA appropriation comes up, there is a long list of very offensive projects that the NEA has funded. If we look at those projects, almost in their entirety they are projects of individual grants or program grants. On the other hand when we have awarded money to the States or given matching grants, matching funds, we seem to have no problem with that.

I think that is evidence, Mr. Chairman, that the States are in a much better position to distribute this money as opposed to some committee or panel over at the NEA.

Mr. Chairman, I also say that because to me it is outrageous that the administrative expenses at the NEA are \$25 million. This House appropriates \$171 million in program grants, both State programs and program grants. Yet it costs \$25 million here in Washington to distribute that money. As opposed to that, I think that the States can make a much better decision on where that money is needed.

Yesterday we had a long discussion on the floor of this House about the merits and the benefits of the National Endowment for the Arts programs. Time and time again speakers came to the well of this House and they talked about a project in my home State. It was a Shakespeare Festival. In fact, the gentleman from Ohio in my party discussed a letter from a young gentleman who said that without this appropriation to the Shakespeare Festival in Montgomery, AL, he would never have an appreciation of Shakespeare, he would have never had an opportunity to hear a Shakespeare program. Mr. Chairman, in all respect for that statement, I think it is very condescending to the people of Alabama and it claims tremendous credit for a very small contribution.

I will say to the Members in all candor that I have a letter from the

Shakespeare Festival saying to me, support this over \$200 million appropriation to the National Endowment for the Arts, because we get some of this money. I requested from the National Endowment for the Arts a list of the appropriation.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for a moment?

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Without losing my time and place. Let me say this. I would like to give an organized discussion. At the end of that, I would be glad to engage the gentleman in a discussion. Let me say this, then I will invite the gentleman's comment about this.

Mr. DICKS. Just on a fact.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Let me tell the gentleman what a fact is. A fact is that all this talk about the Shakespeare Festival, last year they received \$14,100 in a grant. We are talking about a multimillion-dollar budget for the Shakespeare Festival. Yet people stood in this very House and said without this appropriation, without these program grants, that this Shakespeare Festival would close and lock its doors. We are talking about a multimillion-dollar project. We are talking about many corporations in Alabama that support this project with greater grants. We are talking about a minuscule amount. Not that it is not appreciated, but what I am saying to the gentleman is let us give that money to the State, let them appropriate money, which they do out of their share. We get \$5,000 for the opera in Mobile. We get \$10,000 for the children's theater. Those are good projects. But there is no need for us to appropriate for what I am talking about, the program grants.

Mr. Chairman, with that, without yielding my time and place, I yield to the gentleman from Washington. I just yield for one fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that if the gentleman yields, he yields his time.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I just wanted to point out to the gentleman, that the budget for the National Endowment for the Arts is not over \$200 million. It is \$171 million. That is the only point I wanted to make. I would just say to the gentleman, that oftentimes an NEA grant serves as the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval. When people see that the panel review and the NEA has approved a grant, then the private sector will come in and contribute money to it because they know that this is a quality production. So this does have a point.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the gentleman's Shakespeare Festival get more money for support of its festival.

But it is not going to happen if we cut \$91 million out of this budget. What we are going to do is totally destroy a good quality program. In 1979, the budget for the National Endowment for the Arts was \$146 million. This is not a budget that is growing.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Bachus amendment is the Crane amendment in another form and for half that amount. If the Bachus amendment is accepted by the House, it proposes to reduce the NEA budget by 53 percent. That is what the effect of the \$92.6 million would be. Obviously that would be an almost impossible reduction for the NEA to cope with.

With respect to the gentleman's assertion that more money should go to the States, that that is where the action is on the local level, the authorizing committee which authorized the extension of the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities recognized a part of the justice of the gentleman's position by allocating a change in the amount going to the States, from 25 percent to 35 percent. So that the States now get a third of all the moneys, slightly more than a third of the moneys that go to the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the gentleman's arguments about the Shakespeare Festival, let me read from the testimony before our committee of a fellow Alabamian, the respected former Postmaster of the United States, Red Blount, of Alabama, in which he said, on page 1205 of our hearings for fiscal year 1993:

Funding from the National Endowment for the Arts program serves as a symbol of quality and an important endorsement of the Alabama Shakespeare Festival's other funding sources. NEA support also plays a crucial role in enabling the Alabama Shakespeare Festival to move in new directions to better serve the people in our arts in our region. An NEA investment of \$36,000, only one-half of 1 percent of our budget, in the Alabama Shakespeare Festival this year is helping to create new southern artistry, provide professional theater for hundreds of thousands, generate \$10 million in tourism, and educate 50,000 students a year. Where else do so few Federal dollars have such a large multiplier effect and enormous ultimate value? Any businessman would be happy with a fraction of such returns on their investment.

I, therefore, trust that you will continue to invest precious Federal resources where such a high and valuable return is achieved.

□ 1050

The Bachus amendment would eliminate all support for the National Endowment for the Arts to the arts organizations throughout the Nation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the executive director of the National Assembly of state Arts Agencies, which represents all State arts agencies in the country, opposes the Bachus amendment. The executive director, Jonathan Katz,

wrote, "The States' arts agencies want a strong and effective partner at the Federal level. The Bachus amendment would destroy that relationship."

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the comments of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, I think what the gentleman from Illinois said is a very succinct argument, and that is that the Shakespeare Festival has written and said that this is one-half of 1 percent of our budget, but it means so much to us. It attracts corporate donors.

I can tell you three of those major corporate donors have also stated that it makes absolutely no difference to them whether or not the NEA puts some stamp of endorsement on it or not.

Also, I would say this: The former Postmaster, who I have great respect for, has also written me and urged me on several occasions to balance the budget. He very much believes that this deficit spending is putting obligations on our children and our grandchildren, and I would hope that the gentleman from Illinois would agree with me that when we have deficit financing and deficits that this is an extravagance we cannot afford.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS]. Let me pick up where I left off yesterday. First the private sector supports the arts to the tune of \$9 billion, so this \$171 million is a drop in the bucket by comparison. Second, the vast majority of grant requests are turned down, including the Shakespeare Theatre in my district. The point is, this money is given out to self-proclaimed artists who should be able to compete in the marketplace.

All the money has dried up for my high school art programs, so I have not, in the last year, been able to run an art contest in my district to have a picture hung proudly in the tunnel leading to the Cannon Building.

But look where we do find allocations of our tax dollars. Porno jerk, jerk, porno jerk Tim Miller got almost \$15,000. Holly Hughes, porno female jerk, she got \$9,375. Kitchen Theater, porno scum, \$20,000; Frameline, porno slime, got almost \$20,000; Marlin Riggs, \$50,000, used the taxpayers' money from both the NEA and public broadcasting, our tax dollars, to produce the pornographic, profanity-filled, prohomosexual documentary titled, "Tongues Untied," absolute gutter garbage.

The Walker Art Center: Now, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], got up and defended the Walker Art Center and said, "Leave it alone."

Let me put it in context. The gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] grew up in Minneapolis. He explained to me that the Walker is the Dorothy Chandler Pavilion of Minnesota. It is the John F. Kennedy Center in Minneapolis. At that beautiful Walker Art Center is where Karen jerk scum Finley first came to national attention; Ron Athey recently sliced designs into the flesh of another man's back and soaked the blood up with paper towels. One of my distinguished colleagues said, "Well, there was not much blood, and it was only blotted up, and it went over the audience's head, but they did not drip on the audience," and the people who fled we are told, knew they were going to see this mutilation performance. I have seen attendees, moving images, sight, sound, motion, color, saying they did not know they were going to be subjected to this insanity.

The Walker Art Center got \$210,800 of our tax dollars. Franklin Furnace Archive in New York, where Karen Finley, Holly Hughes, Tim Miller, and all the others have been using our tax money, they got \$33,000.

This thing goes on and on and on.

Highway, Inc., in Santa Monica, they got \$44,980. This is where Tim Miller, jerk develops his homosexual "shock" material and serves on their board of directors.

Then there is the Centro Cultural de la Raza, which gave away taxpayers' \$10 crisp new bills and gave them to illegal immigrants.

And then Cavah Zahedi got \$20,000 for a narrative film on the vagaries of sexual obsession. It goes on and on and on and on.

NEA's Jane Alexander has said we must gently introduce our Nation to homosexuality. I went to her introductory luncheon. She impressed me. I thought she was going to stop this nonsense, and here is what she says in response to an angry Senator, Democrat ROBERT BYRD, and an angry Senator, Republican DON NICKLES, with respect to the Athey performance: "His work is a study exploring modern-day martyrdom." This is Jane Alexander's moment to retract her confirmation conversion.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is the gentleman is not allowed to refer to the Senators by name.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed in order, but he should be aware to avoid characterization of members of the other body.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DORNAN. It was a respectful reference, and I went on for a year referring to it as the other body. Somebody informed me, it must be 2 years ago, that now we were allowed to call it the U.S. Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct, But referring to individual Members of the other body—

Mr. DORNAN. I just wanted to indicate respectfully it was a bipartisan anger with the very distinguished head of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. BYRD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed in order.

The gentleman has an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DORNAN. With respect to the Athey performance itself, still quoting Jane Alexander, this excellent actress, "His work is a study exploring modern-day martyrdom as it relates to AIDS." So Athey cuts up the back of this person. Athey, of course, is HIV positive, and we will read in a little blip one day, "Great artiste, Ron Athey, dies of AIDS."

The whole thing, Mr. Chairman, is nuts.

I am voting for this amendment. We will cut 5 percent with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS]. Most people here are terrified of the homosexual lobby, but some of us are not.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman, on my time, respond to a question? You mentioned that there are billions in private contributions, and I think that is great.

Mr. DORNAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DORNAN. Look at the last price of a Van Gogh painting.

Mr. REGULA. Yes. Those are all tax deductible, which, in effect, means the Government is subsidizing them in the form of tax deductions, and with \$2 billion, it would be about a \$600 million subsidy in the form of a tax deduction. Do you favor continuing tax deductions for contributions to our arts, cultural things similar to what NEA funds?

Mr. DORNAN. If the gentleman will yield further, absolutely, and that is how we should stimulate the Medicis of modern America, the patrons of the arts. I love the arts, and I voted for this for 10 years. That is the way to go.

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman.

Just a couple of comments, because it was mentioned about the Shakespeare Arts Festival, which I discussed yesterday.

What I said yesterday was to quote the people from Alabama. It was not my statement at all. It was what people from there said during our hearing.

And I would quote again from that hearing, and I might say we had sev-

eral witnesses from the Shakespeare Festival, and they point out, and I quote Mr. Thompson, the artistic director of the Shakespeare Festival, who said, "This grant from the National Endowment is vitally important to our theater, because we are the only major performing arts institution in Alabama. In short, the NEA helps us leverage \$2.8 million in additional gifts and grants." And I think that is great. "Also here today in support of the NEA are two Members of the community we serve, Effie Cannon, a secondary-school teacher, and Clint Gullatte," who was a student.

□ 1100

Basically, what they said is that the grant was used to, in some instances, help students get there by giving a reduced price on the ticket. So there is no allegation that this was the key funding mechanism.

I think it is wonderful that the people down there support this theater in such a strong way.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

Mr. Chairman, let us focus on what the NEA really does: All over America, local artists and local arts groups rely on the National Endowment for the Arts for essential support. These groups are doing tremendous work, but they are struggling for survival.

No one has ever questioned the work of hundreds of groups around the Nation. They have enriched our community and the quality of life.

Let me tell you some of the things the NEA does in my district: Support for the Westchester Council for the Arts; support for the Hudson River Museum in Yonkers; support for the Emelin Theatre for the Performing Arts in Mamaroneck, and fellowship support for artists in Bronxville and City Island.

But this amendment could put many of them out of business. It will shut down deserving arts organizations all over this Nation, and it will do real damage to the cultural vitality of our Nation.

But that is not all. Abolishing the NEA would do damage to our local schools who rely on the endowment to expand arts education in difficult financial times. It would take funds out of our schools and away from our children, at a time when the NEA is developing innovative programs to reach and educate at-risk youth. The APPLE Corps Program, for example, is an innovative partnership of artists and law enforcement officials who understand

that participation in the arts provides young people an opportunity to build self-confidence and self-esteem, and strengthens their resolve against drugs. This amendment would cripple programs like APPLE.

And finally, this amendment would also undermine the economy of many areas of this country.

Last year the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey released a study on the economic impact of arts activities on the New York economy. The findings were dramatic, and cannot be ignored: While the economy of the New York metropolitan region has suffered, one sector of the regional economy has grown—the arts; indeed, the arts directly employ over 40,000 people, and pump at least \$9.8 billion a year into the economy of the New York area.

An amendment to cut the NEA is an amendment to undermine an important growth area in our economy. The arts are a lifeline not just for the creativity of many New Yorkers, but also a lifeline for the economy of our region.

Mr. Chairman, an amendment that will harm our Nation's schools, damage our cultural heritage, and damage local economies, at the same time, does not deserve the support of this House. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I would just like to say that on this question of the controversial grant, anyone who knows anything about the granting process understands there is going to be some controversy. What is remarkable to me is that over the years since 1965, when the Endowment was created, over 100,000 grants have been awarded, and frankly only about 25 to 30 have been controversial.

Let me also point out this fact about the situation in Minnesota. The money is granted to the museum. They have 110 separate performances of which one is controversial. However, they did not tell the Endowment for the Arts what those 110 performances were going to be. That is a decision they make during that year.

The grant actually occurred in March of that year, and it was a year later that this performance actually occurred. So I do not think you should blame the Endowment if you have any questions about it. I think this institution has a reputation for excellence, unquestioned excellence, and so the Endowment was perfectly legitimate in making a grant to them.

Let me just read from the statement of Jane Alexander, chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, about some of the specific things where young people have been helped by the Endowment.

She says:

I've seen young Native American children in Tucson learning the history of their own

culture from native storytellers in a public school. In Chicago, I saw a young African-American child, no older than eight playing the violin at the People's School, one of our grantees. He was not a virtuoso yet, but he was determined. In the inner city of Detroit, one of our artists-in-residence organized the Mosaic Youth Theatre and performed a Midsummer's Night Dream for us. In Birmingham's Space One Eleven young people were making Wedgewood-type bricks. In Colorado, I saw how the arts are helping at-risk children on the road to self-discovery through dance. In communities across the country, the arts are part of the lifelong learning process so vital to our health as a society.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that we have over the years restrained the funding for the Endowment. It used to be \$149 million in 1979. This is not a program that is growing out of control. This is a program that has been under great restraint.

The purchasing power, from 1979 to the present, actually has been reduced by 46 percent. The State art organizations oppose the gentleman's amendment. They understand the importance of the National Endowment for the Arts.

In our State of Washington, my home area, art institution after art institution has been strengthened over the years because of challenge grants and matching grants that have been funded by the Endowment for the Arts.

In Washington State, arts have grown dramatically because of this.

So, I say to the gentleman this is a positive program. I would urge the gentleman to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to say to the House that if the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] had read my amendment, he would be aware that it does not address matching grants. But I appreciate the wonderful words that he said about them.

With my amendment in place, that wonderful program would go forward without any reduction.

I would also like to say to the gentleman that—which he brings up again—the performance in Minnesota, using that as a positive, saying that the NEA has absolutely no culpability in this, let me state to you what the art critic for the Minneapolis Star-Tribune said about the performance and about NEA:

The Walker Art Center must defend its decision to stage a performance involving human blood-letting and mutilation—or ritual, "ritual scarification" and "erotic torture," as the institution describes it. The NEA must defend its decision to endorse that program.

That is the Minneapolis, Minnesota, Star-Tribune. "The NEA must defend its position to endorse that program."

I also point out to the gentleman from Washington and to the body as a whole that on November 10, 1993, I in-

roduced legislation in this body with 25 cosponsors, which would address, I think, the concerns that you have expressed and I have expressed, which simply reads as follows—and this would be a very positive step, and I would like your support in the future. It says,

None of the funds received by the Endowment or by any State agency to provide financial assistance for a program production workshop can depict or describe in a patently offensive way sexual or excretory activities or organs or religion or religious symbol.

Let us get these offensive words out. The Supreme Court actually has interpreted "displaying in a patently offensive way," and I think it is time for this body to vote on this legislation and to end it, even if it is 100 projects. These are taxpayer funded.

□ 1110

Mr. Chairman, let me point out very quickly that the Founders of our country considered whether to fund the arts or ask the taxpayers to do that, and they almost unanimously rejected that. These were the Framers of the Constitution. They realized—and it was true—that private funding of the arts was sufficient, and in fact the arts flourished, as did public education, all through the past century. And we are talking about less than 1 percent.

The claims of what the NEA does are to me totally outlandish. One would think that the whole economy of this country depended on it. I will say this: In truth, New York City does receive about \$40 million in funding, so perhaps with the exception of New York City, I do not think that statement is true.

Finally, I would say this in conclusion: City Stages, Birmingham, AL, last weekend, 264,000 people attended an art festival there. There was not NEA funding, in fact. There was a private funding. It was the largest of its kind in the State.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge that my amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] has expired, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, just let me say that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] is interested in killing the appropriation for the National Endowment for the Arts. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BAUCHUS] is interested in killing the appropriation for the National Endowment for the Arts. He voted with Mr. CRANE yesterday in support of Mr. CRANE's amendment. This is the Crane amendment in lesser form.

Under this amendment the gentleman from Alabama proposes to take 53 percent of the appropriations away from the National Endowment for the Arts and give it to the States, in effect killing it again.

I do not think the House is going to accept the Bachus amendment, nor should it accept that amendment.

With respect to the comments of the gentleman from California—and I am sorry the gentleman is not on the floor at the present time—and the comments made by the gentleman from Alabama about the Minneapolis Tribune's critic, let me say that if she is the one who wrote the article that first appeared that was the basis of the protest by two Members of another body to which he referred and the gentleman from California referred, there is an editorial in today's Sun-Times to indicate the person who wrote that article did not even see the performance, that her article was written without benefit of actually seeing what the performance was like. Nevertheless, whoever wrote that said that the audience was horrified and many fled, knocking down chairs to get from underneath the clothes lines. That was obviously untrue. We discussed that yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the Bachus amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 132, noes 297, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

AYES—132

Allard	Fawell	Linder
Archer	Fields (TX)	Livingston
Army	Gallely	Lucas
Bachus (AL)	Gekas	Manzullo
Baker (CA)	Geren	McCandless
Baker (LA)	Gilchrest	McCollum
Ballenger	Gillmor	McCrery
Barcia	Gingrich	McHugh
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	McKeon
Bartlett	Gooding	Mica
Barton	Grams	Miller (FL)
Bereuter	Greenwood	Molinari
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Moorhead
Boehner	Hancock	Myers
Bonilla	Hansen	Nussle
Brown (OH)	Hastert	Orton
Bunning	Hayes	Oxley
Burton	Hefley	Parker
Buyer	Heger	Paxon
Callahan	Holden	Petri
Calvert	Hunter	Pombo
Canady	Hutchinson	Porter
Coble	Hutto	Portman
Collins (GA)	Hyde	Pryce (OH)
Combust	Inglis	Quillen
Condit	Inhofe	Quinn
Cox	Istook	Roberts
Crane	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Cunningham	Kasich	Ros-Lehtinen
DeLay	Kim	Roth
Diaz-Balart	King	Royce
Dickey	Kingston	Sarpalus
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Schaefer
Dornan	Kyl	Sensenbrenner
Dreier	Laughlin	Shepherd
Duncan	Levy	Shuster
Emerson	Lewis (FL)	Skelton
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Smith (MI)
Ewing	Lightfoot	Smith (NJ)

Smith (OR)	Stump	Taylor (NC)
Smith (TX)	Talent	Valentine
Solomon	Tanner	Vucanovich
Stearns	Tauzin	Walker
Stenholm	Taylor (MS)	Wolf

## NOES—297

Abercrombie	Franks (NJ)	Menendez
Ackerman	Frost	Meyers
Andrews (ME)	Furse	Mfume
Andrews (NJ)	Gallo	Michel
Andrews (TX)	Gejdenson	Miller (CA)
Applegate	Gephardt	Mineta
Bacchus (FL)	Gibbons	Minge
Baesler	Gilman	Mink
Barca	Glickman	Moakley
Barlow	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Barrett (WI)	Gordon	Montgomery
Bateman	Goss	Moran
Becerra	Grandy	Morella
Bellenson	Green	Murphy
Bentley	Gunderson	Murtha
Berman	Gutierrez	Nadler
Bevill	Hall (OH)	Neal (MA)
Bilbray	Hamburg	Neal (NC)
Bishop	Hamilton	Norton (DC)
Blackwell	Harman	Oberstar
Billey	Hastings	Obey
Blute	Hefner	Oliver
Boehlert	Hilliard	Ortiz
Bonior	Hinchee	Owens
Borski	Hoagland	Packard
Boucher	Hobson	Pallone
Brewster	Hochbrueckner	Pastor
Brooks	Hoekstra	Payne (NJ)
Browder	Hoke	Payne (VA)
Brown (CA)	Horn	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Houghton	Penny
Bryant	Hoyer	Peterson (FL)
Byrne	Huffington	Peterson (MN)
Camp	Hughes	Pickett
Cantwell	Inslie	Pickle
Cardin	Jacobs	Pomeroy
Carr	Jefferson	Poshard
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Price (NC)
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Clayton	Johnson (SD)	Ramstad
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Clinger	Johnston	Ravenel
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Reed
Coleman	Kaptur	Regula
Collins (IL)	Kennedy	Reynolds
Collins (MI)	Kennelly	Richardson
Conyers	Kildee	Ridge
Cooper	Kleczka	Roemer
Coppersmith	Klein	Rogers
Costello	Klink	Romero-Barcelo
Coyne	Klug	(PR)
Cramer	Kolbe	Rose
Crapo	Kopetski	Rostenkowski
Danner	Kreidler	Roukema
Darden	LaFalce	Rowland
de la Garza	Lambert	Royal-Ballard
de Lugo (VI)	Lancaster	Rush
Deal	Lantos	Sabo
DeFazio	LaRocco	Sanders
DeLauro	Lazio	Sangmeister
Dellums	Leach	Santorum
Derrick	Lehman	Sawyer
Deutsch	Levin	Saxton
Dicks	Lewis (CA)	Schenk
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Dixon	Lipinski	Schroeder
Dooley	Long	Scott
Dunn	Lowey	Serrano
Durbin	Maloney	Sharp
Edwards (CA)	Mann	Shaw
Edwards (TX)	Manton	Shays
Ehlers	Margolies-	Sisisky
English	Mezvinsky	Skaggs
Eshoo	Markey	Skeen
Evans	Martinez	Slattery
Farr	Matsui	Slaughter
Fazio	Mazzoli	Smith (IA)
Fields (LA)	McCloskey	Snowe
Filner	McCurdy	Spence
Fingerhut	McDade	Spratt
Fish	McDermott	Stark
Flake	McHale	Stokes
Foglietta	McInnis	Strickland
Ford (MI)	McKinney	Studds
Ford (TN)	McMillan	Stupak
Fowler	McNulty	Sundquist
Frank (MA)	Meehan	Swett
Franks (CT)	Meek	Swift

Synar	Upton	Williams
Tejeda	Velazquez	Wilson
Thomas (CA)	Vento	Wise
Thomas (WY)	Visclosky	Woolsey
Thompson	Volkmer	Wyden
Thornton	Walsh	Wynn
Thurman	Waters	Yates
Torkildsen	Watt	Young (AK)
Torres	Waxman	Young (FL)
Torricelli	Weidon	Zeliff
Trafiacant	Wheat	Zimmer
Unsoeld	Whitten	

## NOT VOTING—10

Chapman	Lloyd	Tucker
Engel	Machtley	Underwood (GU)
Faleomavaega	Schumer	Washington
(AS)	Towns	

## □ 1135

Mr. BARTON of Texas changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS: Page 77, after line 19, insert the following:

## REDUCTION FOR FUNDING

Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this title for "National Endowment for the Arts" is hereby reduced by 5 percent.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes, with 15 minutes on each side, the time for the amendment to be controlled by the gentleman from Florida and the time on my side to be controlled by me.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would that mean that I would have the closing then?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, no, I have the closing, regardless of the time limitation. I would have the closing.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I think 15 minutes apiece is satisfactory.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat my proposal to limit time on this amendment and to all amendments thereto to 15 minutes on each side.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my colleague, I do not want my time to be taken away if for some reason the gentleman has an amendment to my amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will have his full 15 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I will have my full 15 minutes?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. STEARNS. So if, in fact, the gentleman comes in with an amendment to my amendment, he gets 15 minutes, and I get 15 minutes.

Mr. YATES. That will come from my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, with that understanding, that would certainly be acceptable to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request is the time limit of 30 minutes on this amendment and all amendments thereto, but the gentleman from Florida has reserved 15 minutes out of this time regardless of whether there is an amendment to the amendment.

## □ 1140

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DICKS. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I can offer my amendment to the gentleman's amendment after he makes his opening statement, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can offer it any time he is recognized after that, but under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is protected for 15 minutes total out of the 30 minutes time period.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has the other 15 minutes total out of the 30 minutes time.

Mr. STEARNS. Just to clarify, Mr. Chairman, I received a full 15 minutes. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] starts to use his time and his side amends my amendment, they have to take their time out of their time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to reduce the NEA by a simple 5 percent. Such a savings would result in the amount of \$8.6 million, taking the fiscal year 1995 funding level from \$171.1 million to what I believe is still a generous amount of \$162.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, for the past several years I have offered amendments to the Interior appropriations bill that would reduce the level of the NEA. My colleagues should realize when I offered 5 percent and we were successful last year, in the conference committee they cut it in half, so it resulted in 2.5-percent reduction. I judge from the conversation we just had, Mr. Chairman, that it appears that my colleagues on that side of the aisle are going to amend my amendment to reduce the 5 percent. I find that a little bit disconcerting, because if they cut my 5 percent down, and I do not know what the gentleman is going to offer, then the conference committee cuts it further, and there will be no cuts.

Mr. Chairman, let me be very clear about this, that that side of the aisle wants to move the 5 percent down to almost zero. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to concentrate the debate so much today on the controversy that was talked about earlier. I think we hashed that out. I do want to mention a little bit about it, because for the first time now we have the senior Senator BYRD of West Virginia involved, a Democrat, a distinguished Democrat on the Senate side. He focused his attention, as well as did Senator NICKLES and Senator HELMS, in a letter to the NEA chairwoman, Jane Alexander. The Senators wanted assurance from Jane Alexander that "projects are not funded, nor performances undertaken, which misuse taxpayer funding."

Mr. Chairman, we have been through this for at least the 6 years that I have been in the House. Controversy seems to stay with the NEA. We now have a senior Senator from the Democratic Party also coming onboard. This all involves the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, which sponsored art exhibits at area night clubs.

Mr. Chairman, we have all talked about what happened with Ron Athey, an HIV-positive artist, in the scarification on another individual's back, and how he used the blood soaked rags on a clothesline. The audience panicked. Of course the audience would panic. They just witnessed a horrendous scene, one that not only disgusted them, but in their minds, put them in danger.

The question we would have to ask the taxpayer, the man who is a plumber, a farmer, a schoolteacher, is: Do they consider that art? I would think that they would say simply no, it is not art.

Mr. Chairman, I think what we see here is almost tortured art, and this art is not something we want to endorse. Art should provide us with a whiff of greatness, provide optimism, and instill a feeling of individuality. It should cultivate good taste and elevate the human spirit. It should not turn toward pessimism and negation, and be sponsored by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, the simple question is, does a bloody towel represent the ideals of the American people? Does it ennoble us and give us a greater capacity for appreciation and understanding of the arts? Does it educate us for improvement of our souls and minds? Are we any better off having witnessed such a scene?

Mr. Chairman, the NEA should open up the way for the decent, hard-working American to enjoy art. There should be a renewed spirit and a strong commitment to traditional values, including the feeling, "I am glad that the Government is supporting this project. I am very proud of it."

This is a simple declaration that we are seeking, as I mentioned earlier, from the plumber, the electrician, the

schoolteacher, the businessperson, and the farmer, and all other people across this country. Instead all I hear in my district is: "Enough is enough."

Mr. Chairman, I am asking in my 5-percent cut for the Members to send a signal, not only on this project, but also for fiscal responsibility, and all of us know that the Federal Government has a huge deficit. We must reduce and eliminate funding for those projects that are not vital to the economic well-being of our country. We must concentrate, Mr. Chairman, our scarce resources on what is absolutely necessary, not on what is simply desirable. I seriously question the validity of Federal funding for programs like this through the NEA.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will start the 2 minutes running after the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] is read.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DICKS to the amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS: On line 4 of the amendment, strike "5" and insert "1.5".

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the budget for National Endowment for the Arts, which I think is a serious mistake, but we are faced with the prospect of a 5-percent cut, and I think that this cut is more rational and more reasonable.

Mr. Chairman, this would be 1.5 percent. It would total \$2.56 million. This reduction would bring the Endowment's total budget down by \$1 million below its current operating level of \$170 million. This amount will reduce the National Endowment for the Arts' budget by \$1.4 million below the level of the Subcommittee on the Interior of the Committee on Appropriations of \$171.1 million, bringing the NEA's budget down to \$169 million.

Therefore, the substitute amendment serves as a vehicle for fiscal restraint for those Members who want to make a cut in the name of deficit reduction and fiscal conservatism.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute amendment, however, is more responsible, in my judgment, than the Stearns amendment. The substitute will not devastate arts programs nor handicap critical initiatives. It will allow the chairman and the Endowment to, for example, use funding to allow for inner city youth outreach efforts with arts funding, an effort that can contribute to fighting crime, youth violence, and other urban problems.

Last year, when the 5-percent amendment was put in place, the NEA had to cut 18 programs, primarily dance programs and theater such as opera and ballet, areas of the arts that have never been controversial but have had to pay a price nevertheless because of the Stearns amendment.

A Stearns amendment for 1995 of a 5-percent cut would not actually be a 5-percent cut to a neutral base. On the contrary, it would mean a 10-percent cut over 2 years. This would be devastating to arts programs throughout the country that already have threadbare funding. I remind my colleagues that in fiscal year 1979, the NEA's total budget was only \$149 million. Since that year, real purchasing power for the NEA has eroded by 46 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Dicks amendment to the Stearns amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a few moments to explain what has just happened.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] has amended my amendment by changing it from 5 percent to 1.5 percent, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Will the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] answer a question?

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, certainly.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman believe that with the 1.5-percent reduction, that he and his colleagues need to send a signal to the NEA that we need to cut the NEA now? Is that what the gentleman is saying by his amendment?

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think what we are trying to do is here is to minimize the damage to the National Endowment for the Arts. We have sent them a signal. There is language that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and I and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] agreed to a couple of years ago that said, "Go out and fund artistic excellence, and do not fund anything that is obscene under the law."

□ 1150

Mr. STEARNS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I think what the gentleman is saying is that we do need to send a signal to the NEA. I believe it should be 5 percent, he believes it should be a 1½-percent reduction. My concern is what I saw in the conference committee last year when they cut my 5-percent reduction 1½ percent.

I ask my colleagues who are listening and on the House floor that obviously we want to vote no against the amendment to mine so that we can have the vote on the full 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

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

Mr. Chairman, the great movie producer Louis B. Mayer of Metro Goldwyn Mayer once said about movies with a message, if you want to use a message, he would tell his screen writers, "If you want to send a message, use Western Union."

The problem is, when we use the U.S. Mails or our faxes and write to the people at NEA, we get what two of our good Members from the other body have said, and that is diverting language.

Here is one of the Senators saying that Ms. Alexander has refused to respond in detail to a series of questions. He says:

If she gives me the kind of half answers or non-answers that she's given to Senator BYRD, we really have a problem. I don't intend to let this slip through the cracks.

Mr. Chairman, what my pal, the gentleman from the great State of Washington, wants to do is send them a tiny little telegram, kind of a gentle little knock where Jane Alexander says:

Who's that knocking at the gold-dang door?

Norm Dicks, trying to give you a gentle little cut before a 5 percent axe comes down.

Mr. Chairman, how else do we rattle her cage? He wants to rattle it with a little gentle velvet glove. I just went from the bill of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] to take away half their money.

Mr. Chairman, I am coming back next year with an amendment to give all this money, maybe an increase, to the high schools, because man does not live by bread alone. I will double this if it went to high school art classes, to put your wife in charge of this, a great patron of the arts. I cannot comprehend, and I repeat for the third time in two days, the mystery of how these porno freaks keep getting this money.

Listen to this that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] read and it is worth reading again. Here is Ms. Alexander trying to blame the press.

Here is the angry letter from the Minneapolis Star Tribune who broke the Athey story about all the AIDS-infected blood. Actually this is Jane Alexander defending it:

Walker Art Center must defend its decision to stage a performance involving human bloodletting and mutilation—or ritual sacrifice and erotic torture as the institution describes it.

Mr. Chairman, everybody on that side is not telling the truth. Jane Alexander defends this slopping around of AIDS-infected blood.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to disagree with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

I have great respect for him. He knows how I feel about this. I think we

are off on the wrong track. This is 0.02 percent of the Federal budget. This is education. This is the soul of many of the people who cannot get to the big cities to have the great arts education that is available there.

Mr. Chairman, I live in the rural community. I had nothing when I was growing up. Because of the NEA and the New York State Council of the Arts, my children are better educated, they are more sensitive to the human condition around us. I think it is absolutely crazy. Frankly, I do not think this is a simple 5 percent, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] has said.

Let us take a look at this thing. In 1991, a 4.2 percent reduction was suggested. In 1992, there was a cut of \$3 million. In 1993, there was a cut of 5 percent. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] said this is a simple 5 percent. Frankly, my colleagues, this is an ill-disguised attempt to absolutely eliminate the NEA, and I am against it.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I will reluctantly support the Dicks amendment because what we have here is a case where the NEA and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], they have already been making cuts over the years. They have already squeezed this agency to the point where a lot of deserving arts projects throughout the country are not being funded. But I think the main reason that we should oppose the Stearns amendment is that we have an outstanding new director of the NEA, a world-renowned actress who is going all over the country and talking to the grassroots and dealing effectively with Republicans and Democrats. JESSE HELMS has praised her for her openness. She has got a good start. She has done a good job. Why are we going to hamstring her?

Let me tell Members what the 5 percent amendment does. What it does is it cuts \$8.5 million from the program grant funds awarded by the arts endowment. It cuts \$2.3 million from the basic State grants awarded to State arts agencies. Every one of our arts agencies is going to receive cuts between \$32,000 and \$42,000 a year. Cuts an undeserved almost \$1 million from the rural communities that has been a new initiative of the NEA. Crime control programs that have been started through the arts would be severely cut by the 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, we are all saying, it is only 5 percent, so let us go ahead and everybody can sustain a 5 percent cut. But the reality is that this agency has been getting cut, cut, cut, cut. They are already squeezed to the bone.

Let us have a little strength and let us have a little courage and reject all of these amendments. Support the

Dicks amendment. I wish that he did not have to offer it, but we are talking about a political reality here. Let us stand behind Jane Alexander; let us stand behind the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who has done an excellent job in already making cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD documents in opposition to cutting funding for the NEA, as follows:

STATEMENT BY BILL RICHARDSON, JUNE 23, 1993, OPPOSING STEARNS AMENDMENT

Before my colleagues think about cutting funding for the NEA I want to remind you that federal arts funding benefits every district in the country. The national endowment benefits every region in the United States through state grants, arts education, and anti-crime programming.

35 percent of NEA funding goes to each state's art agency in the form of a block grant. This amendment automatically reduces the size of each state's grants.

Of this 35 percent each state must spend 7.5 percent of these dollars on projects that serve rural, urban and underserved communities.

In New Mexico for the last seven years state grant monies have funded the "Churches" project. Over 100 communities have restored their historic churches because of the cultural and artistic beauty they represent.

A 5 percent cut in the NEA budget means reduced funding for arts education.

Last year a \$22,000 grant to the Chamber Music Residencies pilot project which placed chamber music ensembles in rural communities for a school year. The chamber ensembles taught children in public schools in Tifton Georgia, Jesup Iowa and Dodge City Kansas who would not have otherwise had any music education.

The NEA will also have to reduce funding for crime control programs. A youngster with a paint brush or learning lines for a play is a lot less dangerous than one with a gun.

NEA Anti-crime funds provide for programs like Arizona's APPLE Corps which uses arts programs with anti-drug messages as after school alternatives. Other anti-crime projects the endowment funds include: Voices of Youth Throughout Vermont; First Step Dance Company in Lawrence, Kansas; Boise Family Center Project in Boise, Idaho; Arts in Atlanta Project; Alternatives in L.A. program; and the Family Arts Agenda in Salem Oregon.

IMPACT OF 5 PERCENT FUNDING REDUCTION AMENDMENT

A 5 percent reduction in the FY 1995 appropriation for the National Endowment for the Arts would:

Cut \$8.5 million from the program grant funds awarded by the Arts Endowment.

Cut \$2.3 million from the Basic State Grants awarded to state arts agencies. Individual state arts agencies would lose funding in a range of \$32,000 to \$42,000.

Cut \$638,000 from the Underserved Communities initiative which supports projects in rural, innercity, and artistically underserved areas.

IMPACT OF 5-PERCENT FUNDING REDUCTION ON BASIC STATE GRANTS [BSG]

State	Reduced BSG FY 1995	FY 1994 BSG	Difference <sup>1</sup>
Alabama	\$450,000	\$486,000	\$36,000

IMPACT OF 5-PERCENT FUNDING REDUCTION ON BASIC STATE GRANTS (BSG)—Continued

State	Reduced BSG FY 1995	FY 1994 BSG	Difference <sup>1</sup>
Alaska	411,000	447,000	36,000
Arizona	446,000	483,000	37,000
Arkansas	431,000	457,000	26,000
California	741,000	783,000	42,000
Colorado	442,000	479,000	37,000
Connecticut	442,000	477,000	35,000
Delaware	412,000	448,000	36,000
District of Columbia	411,000	447,000	36,000
Florida	551,000	590,000	39,000
Georgia	478,000	515,000	37,000
Hawaii	417,000	453,000	36,000
Idaho	416,000	452,000	36,000
Illinois	535,000	569,000	34,000
Indiana	468,000	503,000	35,000
Iowa	436,000	471,000	35,000
Kansas	433,000	468,000	35,000
Kentucky	447,000	482,000	35,000
Louisiana	453,000	488,000	35,000
Maine	419,000	454,000	35,000
Maryland	459,000	495,000	36,000
Massachusetts	473,000	507,000	34,000
Michigan	510,000	545,000	35,000
Minnesota	455,000	490,000	35,000
Mississippi	434,000	469,000	35,000
Missouri	453,000	488,000	35,000
Montana	414,000	449,000	35,000
Nebraska	423,000	458,000	35,000
Nevada	418,000	453,000	35,000
New Hampshire	417,000	453,000	36,000
New Jersey	492,000	527,000	35,000
New Mexico	422,000	458,000	36,000
New York	607,000	641,000	34,000
North Carolina	480,000	516,000	36,000
North Dakota	412,000	447,000	35,000
Ohio	528,000	562,000	34,000
Oklahoma	440,000	476,000	36,000
Oregon	437,000	473,000	36,000
Pennsylvania	540,000	573,000	33,000
Puerto Rico	446,000	479,000	33,000
Rhode Island	416,000	451,000	35,000
South Carolina	444,000	480,000	36,000
South Dakota	412,000	448,000	36,000
Tennessee	460,000	496,000	36,000
Texas	598,000	636,000	38,000
Utah	424,000	460,000	36,000
Vermont	411,000	447,000	36,000
Virginia	425,000	461,000	36,000
Washington	460,000	497,000	37,000
West Virginia	425,000	460,000	35,000
Wisconsin	461,000	496,000	35,000
Wyoming	411,000	446,000	35,000
American Samoa	201,000	201,000	0
Guam	201,000	201,000	0

<sup>1</sup> Amount each State will lose if the Stearns amendment passes.

FEDERAL ARTS FUNDING REACHES EVERY DISTRICT IN THE COUNTRY

Achieving geographic diversity in making grants is one of the National Endowment for the Arts' highest priorities.

The Arts Endowment continually makes a concerted effort to encourage applicants from all states, regions, and communities. Consequently, the success rate of applicants from less populous states in receiving grant awards is often much higher than for applicants from the large states.

For example, less than one-quarter of the applications received from California and New York are funded.

40% or more of the applications received from Alaska, Delaware, North Dakota, South Dakota, West Virginia, and Wyoming are funded.

Thirty-one states have 25-40% of their applications funded.

The Endowment's Underserved Communities Initiative, which is supported by 7.5 percent of the Endowment's program funds, specifically supports projects to broaden public access to the arts in rural and innercity areas and other areas that are underserved artistically.

Currently \$8.7 million is earmarked for this initiative, administered through 5 Endowment programs—State & Regional, Local Arts Agencies, Folk Arts, Expansion Arts, and Presenting & Commissioning.

Since its implementation in FY 1991, grants have been awarded under this initiative in all 50 states to benefit their underserved communities.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I support Chairman YATES. I have supported every amendment and support his bill. I think the gentleman is one of the best chairmen, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], however. I think it is time to ask, is an AIDS-tainted bloody towel strung out over a theater audience a work or a demonstration of art? Is a crucifix submerged in a vial filled with urine a work of art? Is a broomstick literally placed up the rectum of an individual captured on film a work of art? If so, Congress, then I say there is no art, there is no distinction from the type of art that our cultural roots compel us to fund.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard talk about this amendment must be reduced because we must minimize the damage of the Stearns amendment to the National Endowment for the Arts. I say the Congress should pass Stearns to minimize the damage to the American people by the National Endowment for the Arts. If we want to get their attention, the only way is in the pocketbook. I am asking everybody to vote for Stearns. It is a realistic message from a realistic Member on a goal that all Congress should support.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I have served in the House for 8 years and it has been a great privilege to do so. Throughout those 8 years, I have watched every year as the appropriations bills come through this House and Congress decided what mattered and what did not to the people of the country.

□ 1200

We spent a lot of money on our military defense, one-third of our budget. Because of that, we are now the remaining superpower in the world.

But not once in these 8 years, as we voted for the military budget, did we ever fret about planes that would not fly, guns that would not shoot, troop carriers named *Bradley* that would not float. Were we concerned about fraud, cost overruns? No. We just throw in some more money for star wars.

But we have got this one little program here, \$171 million to serve every nook and cranny of the United States. To put it in some perspective, that is less money than we spend yearly on military bands.

For every one of those dollars we spend, we get back \$11, and the arts in the United States of America last year generated \$36.8 billion.

I defy anyone who serves in this body to tell me that anything else we spend gives any kind of return even remotely like that.

But the return beyond the monetary is even more important. Every day we talk about what is happening to American children. We have reports daily about the condition of America's children. They have the lowest scores in the world as entry level college students. Their math scores are deplorable. They are damaged by the diet of violence they see every day. What shall we do about it? We have found one way to help.

We can prove conclusively that money we have spent on children who are involved in the arts receives new esteem, gives them the self-respect, they become better students, we can show it cuts out the dropout program, and we know that children who have been damaged can heal themselves when they have this kind of way to allow their emotions to surface and be expressed. Then they can deal with them.

I have watched children in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of New York City as young as 3 years old learning the discipline of the dance. The lesson is if you care about yourself and you work hard, there is nothing in the world that will ever stand in your way.

If we want to turn children away from violence, if we want to make them better students, if we want to stop them from dropping out of school, if we want our country to be able to compete in the next century, and if this little pittance of money that we spend here will go at least part way in helping us do that, is that not money well spent? Does not our national security also depend on a population that is educated, that has some sense of giving back, that learns some decency, some humanity, some gentleness? Is there something wrong with that?

Where are the poets going to come from? The artists? Where are the people who chronicle who we are? Our history in every civilization rediscovered, we determine if they were civilized or educated of if they contributed by the art they leave behind.

For heaven's sakes, do not support the Stearns amendment. This program is already less than it was in 1979. It has been cut 43 percent since then. Enough.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

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

Mr. Chairman, I come as a strong supporter of the arts who is going to reluctantly support this amendment.

I happened to have been a music major in college. I am on the Congressional Arts Caucus. I believe strongly in the place of the arts in American society. I have a son who is at the

Interlaken Music Camp for the summer. My children are all involved in the arts. I am involved with the Ohio Chamber Orchestra, the Cleveland Opera.

You could say that I am a sucker for the arts. I believe in it. Why? Because I think probably, next to religious education, artistic expression is the most important thing we can offer in terms of the redemption and the renewal and the giving back of America, the values that have made it great.

But it seems to me I had a very disturbing luncheon experience yesterday which leads me to want to support this amendment, and that is that I had lunch with the Congressional Arts Caucus, and we had the honor of being with the chairperson, Jane Alexander. We had lunch with Jane. Frankly, I have a tremendous amount of respect for Ms. Alexander and the work that she has done.

But I was extremely disturbed, first of all, when I found out about the Ron Athey exhibit in Minnesota. I had not been aware of it until that lunch yesterday, and I read the letter Ms. Alexander had written to Members of Congress in response to that, and I asked her specifically if Athey's performance, if Athey had personally directed his grant request to the NEA directly as opposed to the Walker Center, would the NEA have granted that kind of request. What we are talking about is the self-mutilation that was advertised as "erotic torture." That is how it was promoted by the Walker Center. And I said, "Ms. Alexander, would you or would you not have funded this from the NEA directly, this grant request?" And she could not say to me, "No, we would not. This does not match our standards."

And what is disturbing to me is that the idea is that we are going to fund artistic excellence, and if that is what we are doing, then what on Earth does this tell us about the leadership at the NEA? That is my concern. That is why I rise in strong support of this amendment.

I encourage my colleagues to also.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to comment on the economics of this cut, that we are already 43 percent behind inflation, that we cut 5 percent last year, and that we are starting from that base this year. I am not going to comment on the economics that the arts generate so much economic business for our country. We have heard all of that.

I am going to comment on the intent of this amendment in terms of censorship, in terms of the un-American goal of saying that we should exercise Federal censorship over the arts.

The National Endowment for the Arts promotes private art. It has com-

mittees to make decisions on who gets grants. There will always be one or two decisions, one or two grants that one can disagree with, that Members of this body will not like or that can be mischaracterized as obscene.

Some people think the art of Mr. Athey at the Walker Center is obscene. But it is not up to us to make that decision. Nor is it up to us to cut the budget of the NEA to send them a message.

Judgments will still have to be made by review committees, and we should not establish a political layer of censorship on top of the artistic decisions made as to who gets grants and for what.

In this case, the NEA gave a grant to the Walker Arts Center, one of the most prestigious arts centers in the Midwest. That grant was used for over 100 different arts events. One of them was a \$150 grant to help Mr. Athey's exhibit, which some people here characterize as obscene, which some people slander and talk about HIV-positive blood and so forth, which was not the case.

But it is not up to us to make those decisions, and if we cut this budget by 5 percent, they are still going to have to make decisions.

And are we going to set up the Congress, a political body, a bunch of politicians, as a board of censors for the NEA?

The point is the NEA makes those decisions, and that is the only place they can be made.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Stearns amendment to cut 5 percent of the budget for the National Endowment for the Arts. \* \* \*

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mrs. MALONEY. I think the arts should not be censored. As Frederic Lewis Allen, the noted historian, said—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will withhold for a moment.

Specifically what words does the gentleman demand be taken down? Her last sentence?

Mr. STEARNS. No. Mr. Chairman, when she started talking about women's breasts and who she ascribed that to, that comment. We would like to find out who she is saying said that comment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the last few sentences of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. NADLER earlier said the same thing, but the point is we just want to establish who she is saying said this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, can we have the—

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

Mr. YATES. I do not think Mr. NADLER did, made reference.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, we are just talking about the present speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] was made of the present speaker's remarks, and the Clerk is in the process of getting ready to read back the remarks of the gentleman from New York.

□ 1210

So let us wait until the Clerk has read.

The Chair would point out that the chairman of the Committee of the Whole does not rule on this kind of an objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, this matter may be resolved by the words being withdrawn, is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. It would take unanimous consent.

Mr. WALKER. Since the words were offensive, all they have to do is be withdrawn by unanimous consent, and I doubt anybody would object to that.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, what are the offensive words? What are the words to be withdrawn?

Mr. WALKER. About the last two sentences.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Stearns amendments wants to censor, but what did Mr. STEARNS say to a Member of Congress who commented on the size of a woman's breasts?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if I understand that, I do not believe I ever said something like that.

Mr. YATES. She did not say "you" did say it. She says "a Member of Congress."

Mr. STEARNS. Regular order. This is not debatable, as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not debatable. Does the gentleman from Illinois have a unanimous consent request?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I object to it because I think she is ascribing motivations to me which are not there.

The CHAIRMAN. The Members will withhold until—

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the words be read again. I do not think they appertain to—

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the words slowly.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Stearns amendment wants to censor, but what did Mr. STEARNS say to a Member of Congress who commented on the size of a woman's breasts?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I think it still sort of indicates some

kind of motivation on my part, and I feel it is sort of negative.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. At this point this is not debatable.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The Chairman just answered it in response to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

The CHAIRMAN. It is not debatable. So the Members will just withhold.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the offending works, whatever they are, be withdrawn so that we may proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the subcommittee asks unanimous consent that the words that were read be withdrawn.

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

Mr. STEARNS. No objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairs hears none.

The words are withdrawn.

The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] may proceed.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, as Frederick Louis Allen, the noted historian, said, "America has something special, a culture which we do not think of as something for the elite, but as something that is accessible to practically everyone."

Over the last 30 years the NEA has clearly and successfully made the arts more accessible to more of the American public. And there is a significant economic benefit to this investment.

According to the Department of Labor, more than 1.3 million people work directly in the field of the arts, and the nonprofit arts industry alone generates \$3.4 billion alone in income tax revenue every year.

The total funding for the NEA is \$171 million per year, or less than 70 cents per person.

For that 70 cents, all Americans share in theater, dance, and museums to which they might not otherwise have access.

Mr. Chairman, society defines itself by the way it preserves and presents its culture as much as by its investments in new technologies or in defense systems.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I do not support the cut of 5 percent for the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA] unless every Federal agency will have a 5-percent cut. I regret disagreeing with my good friend from Florida, Mr. STEARNS. He and I went to the Rules Committee last year and we tried to get a proposal before this House which

would have cut most Federal agencies across the board by limiting their growth.

I do support the 1.5-percent cut as the least bad alternative. This debate reminds me of some of those in this Chamber who waved the \$800 hammer; they were not really talking about the stupidity of procuring the \$800 hammer in the Department of Defense. What the hammer-wavers really wanted was to abolish most or all of the Defense Department. They simply did not like spending money on defense.

What we have here is an art exhibit in question that the NEA did not know about. The NEA gave a general support grant to the Walker Center in Minneapolis. It is one of America's distinguished museums. When the NEA gave that grant money to the Walker Center, it did not know that this exhibit would occur. So, if you adopt the Stearns amendment, you are punishing an agency that had no knowledge of this particular exhibit. And it sounds exactly like the \$800 hammer nonsense, which was a way to get at the Defense Department.

The National Endowment for the Arts has had tens of thousands of grants which have brought enlightenment, hope, and joy to millions of our fellow citizens. That should be recognized.

I would simply say, "Let us support the Dicks amendment and then let us get on with the business of the day."

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, in Escondido, CA, in my district, we have a very beautiful, brand new arts center in which the National Endowment for the Arts gave a grant. Many other people have contributed, just trying to get it going.

NEA has given some effort in that area. But most people in my district do not want their tax dollars going for a project like that. I personally gave \$1,000 to the symphony, San Diego Symphony, and pledged to give money to the Escondido Arts Center, over \$1,000. I give literally thousands of dollars out of my own pocket to education, but I feel it is wrong for me to force other people to take money out of their pockets for projects that they do not want to give money to. That is what the NEA does.

People want a chance to choose where they want to put their money, not to be forced by a bureaucracy to have money go for arts in areas they do not want it to go. So, for that reason I support the amendment and ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues here today to support my

amendment to Mr. STEARNS' amendment. Again, I reiterate that it cuts 1.5 percent, which is a total of \$2.55 million. Although that is a substantial reduction, I do it to minimize the damage to the National Endowment for the Arts.

Last year we adopted the Stearns amendment, which totaled about \$9 million. It affected 18 separate programs in the Endowment.

□ 1220

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues on the other side on both sides of the aisle, why doesn't somebody get up here and focus on the positive things that we have done with the National Endowment for the Arts with over 100,000 grants that weren't controversial, that help the operas, the ballets, help individual artists all over the country?

The Endowment has been a positive factor since 1965, not a negative factor, and this committee has fought to put in language that says, "You cannot fund anything that is obscene, and you must strive for artistic excellence."

Mr. Chairman, this program deserves the support of the Congress.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleagues that in 1989 we funded NEA at \$169 million. Today it is roughly \$171 million. So, for all those colleagues that say we have cut, cut, cut, there have not been these cuts that they have talked about. So, frankly this 5 percent would bring it down a little bit lower than in 1989.

The second statement I hear continually is that this is a great investment. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from New York talked about it and said that we are spending \$171 million, and I think her words were "we are getting \$138 billion back in return." Now obviously the return on this investment is because there is a lot of private investment, too, but that already exists, quite apart from NEA.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to say, just in conclusion, what we have here. We in Congress have an amendment to cut 5 percent. There will be a vote on my amendment. So, for those Members who are scared they will not get another chance to vote for my amendment, they will, so I ask them to vote no on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] and yes on the amendment offered by myself, which is 5 percent. Surely we can cut 5 percent, and surely, if it goes to conference, it is going to be cut in half again. So, if we take 1½ percent, and take it to conference, it is going to come down to next to nothing. History has shown that the NEA has not been cut like my good friend from New Mexico said.

So, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Dicks amendment, and then we will have a vote on the Stearns amendment which will follow to reduce funding by 5 percent.

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

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] was correct in stating what the NEA received in 1989. But unfortunately that does not tell the entire truth. In 1992, Mr. Chairman, the NEA received \$175 million, \$6 million more than the gentleman's figure for 1989. So, when he says that by recommending less, that he is not hurting the NEA much, the NEA is being hurt very, very much.

I have listened to the various gentlemen on the other side and on my side denouncing the NEA and Jane Alexander for the grant that was made to the Walker Arts Center in Minneapolis. The Walker Arts Center is one of the great art institutions of the city, and NEA, under its present practices, makes grants, and the Walker Arts Center and others in the country are given the opportunity to make subgrants. For a while some years back, Mr. Chairman, we put language in the bill which required that the subgrants come back to the NEA for approval. Perhaps we ought to do that again because NEA did not know how this money was going to be spent in the series of subgrants.

At any rate, Mr. Chairman, I take issue with charges that have been made against the NEA. I think NEA is one of the great agencies in our country. I think it has an outstanding staff. I think that Jane Alexander is one of the great administrators; she has proved that already in connection with her administration of NEA and, I think, if she is allowed to do her job properly without the attacks that are going on, that we will see a flourishing NEA. We will see an arts community in the country which will respond to and flower as a result of her efforts and NEA's efforts.

I hope that the efforts to cut this appropriation are defeated.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to any sort of reduction or elimination of Federal funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

As the primary sponsor of the Community Arts Partnership Act, a program which was included in House-passed H.R. 6, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I understand the valuable role that the arts and humanities play in every American's life. Through my work on the Community Arts Partnership Act, I have become increasingly aware of the tremendous impact that the arts and humanities have in the education of our children.

In fact, national studies have dramatically shown that the arts and humanities play an invaluable role in educating our children. The arts have been shown to aid in the development of higher-order thinking skills; an in-

crease in multicultural understanding; an enhanced learning environment; improved self-esteem and positive emotional responses to learning; and engagement of a variety of learning styles. In addition, children who receive instruction in the arts remain in school longer and are more successful than children who do not receive such instruction.

The important work undertaken by the NEA and the NEH significantly expands beyond the educational concept behind my Community Arts Partnership Act. Through the agencies' leadership, public participation and access to the arts and humanities has been enhanced, support for cultural diversity has been expanded, and local economies have been strengthened through jobs creation and tax revenues. In addition, for every Federal dollar allocated to the NEA and NEH, substantial funding is leveraged through private and other public resources. Without continued Federal leadership, thousands of communities across the Nation, and the quality of life for their residents, will be severely impacted through the elimination or reduction in local cultural programs.

I urge my colleagues to oppose any amendment which would weaken the important work undertaken by the NEA and NEH.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to rule XXIII, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for a recorded vote, if ordered, on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], as amended or not, following the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] if there is no intervening debate or business.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 189, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

## AYES—240

Andrews (ME)	Brooks	Cramer
Andrews (TX)	Browder	Danner
Applegate	Brown (CA)	Darden
Bacchus (FL)	Brown (FL)	de la Garza
Baesler	Brown (OH)	de Lugo (VI)
Barca	Bryant	DeFazio
Barcia	Byrne	DeLauro
Barlow	Cantwell	Dellums
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	Derrick
Becerra	Carr	Deutsch
Bellenson	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Berman	Clay	Dicks
Bevill	Clayton	Dingell
Bilbray	Clement	Dixon
Bishop	Clinger	Dooley
Blackwell	Clyburn	Durbin
Blute	Coleman	Edwards (CA)
Boehlert	Collins (IL)	Ehlers
Boehner	Collins (MI)	English
Bonior	Conyers	Eshoo
Borski	Coppersmith	Evans
Boucher	Costello	Farr
Brewster	Coyne	Fazio

Fields (LA)	Lazio	Romero-Barcelo
Fliner	Leach	(PR)
Fingerhut	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen
Fish	Lewis (CA)	Rose
Flake	Lowe	Rostenkowski
Foglietta	Maloney	Roybal-Allard
Ford (MI)	Mann	Rush
Ford (TN)	Manton	Sabo
Fowler	Markey	Sanders
Frank (MA)	Martinez	Sangmeister
Frost	Matsui	Sawyer
Furse	Mazzoli	Schenk
Gallo	McDermott	Schroeder
Gejdenson	McHale	Scott
Gephardt	McInnis	Serrano
Gibbons	McKinney	Sharp
Gilchrest	McMillan	Shays
Gilman	McNulty	Shepherd
Glickman	Meehan	Skaggs
Gonzalez	Meek	Skeen
Grandy	Menendez	Slattery
Green	Mfume	Slaughter
Gunderson	Michel	Smith (IA)
Gutierrez	Miller (CA)	Spratt
Hamburg	Mineta	Stark
Hastings	Mink	Stokes
Hefner	Moakley	Strickland
Hilliard	Mollohan	Studds
Hinchey	Moorhead	Stupak
Hoagland	Morella	Swift
Horn	Murphy	Synar
Houghton	Nadler	Tejeda
Hoyer	Neal (MA)	Thompson
Hughes	Neal (NC)	Thornton
Inslee	Norton (DC)	Torkildsen
Jacobs	Oberstar	Torres
Jefferson	Obey	Torricelli
Johnson (CT)	Oliver	Tucker
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Unsoeld
Johnson (SD)	Pastor	Valentine
Johnson, E. B.	Payne (NJ)	Velazquez
Johnston	Payne (VA)	Vento
Kaptur	Pelosi	Visclosky
Kasich	Penny	Walsh
Kennedy	Peterson (FL)	Watt
Kennelly	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
Kildee	Pickle	Wheat
Kim	Pomeroy	Whitten
Klecza	Price (NC)	Williams
Klein	Rahall	Wilson
Klink	Rangel	Wise
Kopetski	Ravenel	Woolsey
Kreidler	Reed	Wyden
LaFalce	Regula	Wynn
Lambert	Reynolds	Yates
Lancaster	Richardson	Young (AK)
Lantos	Ridge	
LaRocco	Roemer	

## NOES—189

Abercrombie	Cunningham	Hayes
Ackerman	Deal	Hefley
Allard	DeLay	Herger
Andrews (NJ)	Dickey	Hobson
Archer	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Army	Dornan	Hoke
Bachus (AL)	Dreier	Holden
Baker (CA)	Duncan	Huffington
Baker (LA)	Dunn	Hunter
Ballenger	Edwards (TX)	Hutchinson
Barrett (NE)	Emerson	Hutto
Bartlett	Engel	Hyde
Barton	Everett	Inglis
Bateman	Ewing	Inhofe
Bentley	Fawell	Istook
Bereuter	Fields (TX)	Johnson, Sam
Billrakis	Franks (CT)	Kanjorski
Bliley	Franks (NJ)	King
Bonilla	Galleghy	Kingston
Bunning	Gekas	Klug
Burton	Geran	Knollenberg
Buyer	Gillmor	Kolbe
Callahan	Gingrich	Kyl
Calvert	Goodlatte	Laughlin
Camp	Goodling	Lehman
Canady	Gordon	Levy
Chapman	Goss	Lewis (FL)
Coble	Grams	Lewis (GA)
Collins (GA)	Greenwood	Lewis (KY)
Combest	Hall (OH)	Lightfoot
Condit	Hall (TX)	Linder
Cooper	Hamilton	Lipinski
Cox	Hancock	Livingston
Crane	Hansen	Long
Crapo	Hastert	Lucas

Manzullo	Pombo	Smith (TX)
McCandless	Porter	Snowe
McCloskey	Portman	Solomon
McCollum	Poshard	Spence
McCrery	Pryce (OH)	Stearns
McCurdy	Quillen	Stenholm
McDade	Quinn	Stump
McHugh	Ramstad	Sundquist
McKeon	Roberts	Swett
Meyers	Rogers	Talent
Mica	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Miller (FL)	Roth	Tauzin
Minge	Roukema	Taylor (MS)
Molinari	Rowland	Taylor (NC)
Montgomery	Royce	Thomas (CA)
Moran	Santorum	Thomas (WY)
Murtha	Sarpalius	Thurman
Myers	Saxton	Traficant
Nussle	Schaefer	Upton
Ortiz	Schiff	Volkmer
Orton	Sensenbrenner	Vucanovich
Owens	Shaw	Walker
Oxley	Shuster	Walters
Packard	Sisisky	Weldon
Parker	Skelton	Wolf
Paxon	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)
Petri	Smith (NJ)	Zeliff
Pickett	Smith (OR)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Faleomavaega (AS)	Lloyd	Schumer
Harman	Machtley	Towns
Hochbrueckner	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Underwood (GU)
		Washington

□ 1247

Messrs. EDWARDS of Texas, DORNAN, LEWIS of Georgia, MCCOLLUM, GILLMORE, and ABERCROMBIE, changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CARR, HINCHEY, HILLIARD, KIM, FORD of Michigan, HOUGHTON, POMEROY, and PALLONE, and Ms. WOOLSEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS OF ALABAMA AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS, AS AMENDED BY MR. DICKS

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BACHUS of Alabama as a substitute for the amendment as amended: Strike the language proposed and insert the following:

REDUCTION OF FUNDING

Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this title for "National Endowment for the Arts" is hereby reduced by 4.99 percent.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a nondebatable substitute under the time limitation. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] insist on his point of order?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is that it is not in order as an amendment to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would rule that under rule XIX it is in order

as a substitute for the Stearns amendment assembled by the Dicks amendment, but it is not debatable.

□ 1250

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS OF ALABAMA AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS, AS AMENDED.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES to the amendment offered by Mr. BACHUS of Alabama as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS, as amended: On line 4 of the amendment, strike "4.99" and insert "1.0".

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, for those who have not been following the debate, does this mean 4.99 percent down to 1 percent?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is a reduction of the bill amount by 1 percent.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, did the Chair say a reduction of 1 percent from 4.99 or a reduction to 1 percent from 4.99?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment would change the reduction of 4.99 percent in the Bachus substitute to a reduction of 1 percent.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, is it not an increase in total appropriations?

The CHAIRMAN. That may not be an appropriate parliamentary inquiry. The overall effect of the amendment would still be a reduction of amounts in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to rule XXIII, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for a recorded vote, if ordered, on the

Bachus substitute, as amended, and following the vote on the Yates amendment thereto, if there is no intervening debate or business.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 214, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

AYES—218

Abercrombie	Furse	Norton (DC)
Ackerman	Gejdenson	Oberstar
Andrews (ME)	Gephardt	Obey
Andrews (TX)	Gibbons	Olver
Applegate	Gilman	Owens
Bacchus (FL)	Glickman	Pallone
Baessler	Gonzalez	Pastor
Barca	Gordon	Payne (NJ)
Barlow	Grandy	Payne (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Green	Pelosi
Becerra	Gutierrez	Peterson (FL)
Bellenson	Hamburg	Pickle
Berman	Harman	Price (NC)
Bevill	Hastings	Rahall
Bilbray	Hefner	Rangel
Bishop	Hilliard	Ravenel
Blackwell	Hinchey	Reed
Boehlert	Hoagland	Reynolds
Bonior	Hochbrueckner	Richardson
Borski	Horn	Ridge
Boucher	Houghton	Roemer
Brewster	Hoyer	Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Brooks	Hughes	Rose
Brown (CA)	Inslee	Rostenkowski
Brown (FL)	Jacobs	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Rush
Bryant	Johnson (CT)	Sabo
Byrne	Johnson (GA)	Sanders
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Sangmeister
Cardin	Johnson, E.B.	Sawyer
Carr	Johnston	Schenk
Clay	Kaptur	Schroeder
Clayton	Kennedy	Scott
Clement	Kennelly	Serrano
Clinger	Kildee	Sharp
Clyburn	Klecicka	Shepherd
Coleman	Klein	Skaggs
Collins (IL)	Kopetski	Slattery
Collins (MI)	Kreidler	Slaughter
Conyers	LaFalce	Smith (IA)
Coppersmith	Lambert	Spratt
Costello	Lantos	Stark
Coyne	LaRocco	Stokes
Danner	Leach	Strickland
Darden	Levin	Studs
de la Garza	Lewis (GA)	Stupak
de Lugo (VI)	Lowey	Swift
DeFazio	Maloney	Synar
DeLauro	Manton	Tejeda
Dellums	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Thompson
Derrick	Markey	Thornton
Deutsch	Martinez	Torres
Dicks	Matsui	Torricelli
Dingell	Mazzoli	Tucker
Dixon	McDermott	Underwood (GU)
Dooley	McInnis	Unsoeld
Durbin	McKinney	Velazquez
Edwards (CA)	Meehan	Vento
Ehlers	Meek	Visclosky
Engel	Menendez	Waters
English	Mfume	Watt
Eshoo	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Evans	Mineta	Wheat
Farr	Mink	Whitten
Fazio	Moakley	Williams
Fields (LA)	Mollohan	Wilson
Filner	Moran	Wise
Fingerhut	Morella	Woolsey
Fish	Murphy	Wyden
Flake	Murtha	Wynn
Foglietta	Nadler	Yates
Ford (MI)	Neal (MA)	
Frank (MA)	Neal (NC)	
Frost		

NOES—214

Allard	Ballenger	Bereuter
Andrews (NJ)	Barcia	Bilirakis
Archer	Barrett (NE)	Billey
Armey	Bartlett	Blute
Bachus (AL)	Barton	Boehner
Baker (CA)	Bateman	Bonilla
Baker (LA)	Bentley	Browder

Bunning	Hutchinson	Pomeroy
Burton	Hutto	Porter
Buyer	Hyde	Portman
Callahan	Inglis	Poshard
Calvert	Inhofe	Pryce (OH)
Camp	Istook	Quillen
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Quinn
Castle	Kanjorski	Ramstad
Chapman	Kasich	Regula
Coble	Kim	Roberts
Collins (GA)	King	Rogers
Combust	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Condit	Klink	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooper	Klug	Roth
Cox	Knollenberg	Roukema
Cramer	Kolbe	Rowland
Crane	Kyl	Royce
Crapo	Lancaster	Santorum
Cunningham	Laughlin	Sarpalius
Deal	Lazio	Saxton
DeLay	Lehman	Schaefer
Diaz-Balart	Levy	Schiff
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Doolittle	Lewis (FL)	Shaw
Dornan	Lewis (KY)	Shays
Dreier	Lightfoot	Shuster
Duncan	Linder	Sisisky
Dunn	Lipinski	Skeen
Edwards (TX)	Livingston	Skelton
Emerson	Long	Smith (MI)
Everett	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Ewing	Mann	Smith (OR)
Fawell	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Fields (TX)	McCandless	Snowe
Fowler	McCloskey	Solomon
Franks (CT)	McColum	Spence
Franks (NJ)	McCrery	Stearns
Gallely	McCurdy	Stenholm
Gallo	McDade	Stump
Gekas	McHale	Sundquist
Geren	McHugh	Swett
Gilchrest	McKeon	Talent
Gillmor	McMillan	Tanner
Gingrich	McNulty	Tauzin
Goodlatte	Meyers	Taylor (MS)
Goodling	Mica	Taylor (NC)
Goss	Michel	Thomas (CA)
Grams	Miller (FL)	Thomas (WY)
Greenwood	Minge	Thurman
Gunderson	Molinari	Torkildsen
Hall (OH)	Montgomery	Trafiacton
Hall (TX)	Moorhead	Upton
Hamilton	Myers	Valentine
Hancock	Nussle	Volkmer
Hansen	Ortiz	Vucanovich
Hastert	Orton	Walker
Hayes	Oxley	Walsh
Hefley	Packard	Weldon
Herger	Parker	Wolf
Hobson	Paxon	Young (AK)
Hoekstra	Penny	Young (FL)
Hoke	Peterson (MN)	Zeliff
Holden	Petri	Zimmer
Huffington	Pickett	
Hunter	Pombo	

NOT VOTING—7

Faleomavaega (AS)	Lloyd	Towns
Ford (TN)	Machtley	Washington
	Schumer	

□ 1309

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Schumer for, with Mr. Machtley against.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Messrs. KIM, CRAMER, and CRAPO changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. SCHENK changed her vote from "no" to "aye".

So the amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(d) of rule XXIII, the Committee rises.

□ 1310

Pursuant to clause 2(d) of rule XXIII the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of California) having assumed the chair, Mr. GLICKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4602) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, directs him to report that on a recorded vote on an amendment the votes of the Delegates and of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico were decisive.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES to the amendment offered by Mr. BACHUS of Alabama as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS, as amended: On line 4 of the amendment, strike "4.99" and insert "1.0."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair will now put the question de novo on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

the vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 216, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

AYES—210

Abercrombie	Clay	Fazio
Ackerman	Clayton	Fields (LA)
Andrews (ME)	Clement	Finer
Andrews (TX)	Clinger	Fingerhut
Applegate	Clyburn	Fish
Bacchus (FL)	Coleman	Flake
Baessler	Collins (IL)	Foglietta
Barca	Collins (MI)	Ford (MI)
Barlow	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Barrett (WI)	Coppersmith	Frost
Becerra	Costello	Furse
Bellenson	Coyne	Gejdenson
Berman	Danner	Gephardt
Bevill	Darden	Gibbons
Bilbray	DeFazio	Gilman
Bishop	DeLauro	Glickman
Blackwell	Dellums	Gonzalez
Boehlert	Derrick	Gordon
Bonior	Deutsch	Grandy
Borski	Dicks	Green
Boucher	Dingell	Gutierrez
Brewster	Dixon	Hamburg
Brooks	Dooley	Harman
Brown (CA)	Durbin	Hastings
Brown (FL)	Edwards (CA)	Hefner
Brown (OH)	Ehlers	Hilliard
Bryant	Engel	Hinchee
Byrne	English	Hoagland
Cantwell	Eshoo	Hochbrueckner
Cardin	Evans	Horn
Carr	Farr	Houghton

Hoyer	Mineta	Scott
Hughes	Mink	Serrano
Insole	Moakley	Sharp
Jacobs	Mollohan	Shepherd
Jefferson	Moran	Skaggs
Johnson (CT)	Morella	Slattery
Johnson (GA)	Murphy	Slaughter
Johnson (SD)	Murtha	Smith (IA)
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Spratt
Johnston	Neal (MA)	Stark
Kaptur	Neal (NC)	Stokes
Kennedy	Oberstar	Strickland
Kennelly	Obey	Studds
Kildee	Oliver	Stupak
Kiecicka	Owens	Swift
Klein	Pallone	Synar
Kopetski	Pastor	Tejeda
Kreidler	Payne (NJ)	Thompson
LaFalce	Payne (VA)	Thornton
Lambert	Pelosi	Torres
Lantos	Peterson (FL)	Torricelli
LaRocco	Pickle	Tucker
Leach	Price (NC)	Unsold
Levin	Rahall	Velazquez
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Vento
Lowey	Reed	Visclosky
Maloney	Reynolds	Waters
Manton	Richardson	Watt
Margolies-Mezvinsky	Roemer	Waxman
Markey	Rose	Wheat
Martinez	Rostenkowski	Whitten
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Williams
Mazzoli	Rush	Wilson
McDermott	Sabo	Wise
Meehan	Sanders	Woolsey
Meek	Sangmeister	Wyden
Menendez	Sawyer	Wynn
Mfume	Schenk	Yates
Miller (CA)	Schroeder	
	Schumer	

NOES—216

Allard	Fawell	Lehman
Andrews (NJ)	Fields (TX)	Levy
Archer	Fowler	Lewis (CA)
Armye	Franks (CT)	Lewis (FL)
Bachus (AL)	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (KY)
Baker (CA)	Gallely	Lightfoot
Baker (LA)	Gallo	Linder
Ballenger	Gekas	Lipinski
Barcia	Geren	Long
Barrett (NE)	Gilchrest	Lucas
Bartlett	Gillmor	Mann
Barton	Gingrich	Manzullo
Bateman	Goodlatte	McCandless
Bentley	Goodling	McCloskey
Bereuter	Goss	McColum
Bilirakis	Grams	McCrery
Bliley	Greenwood	McCurdy
Blute	Gunderson	McDade
Boehner	Hall (OH)	McHale
Bonilla	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Browder	Hamilton	McInnis
Bunning	Hancock	McKeon
Burton	Hansen	McMillan
Buyer	Hastert	McNulty
Callahan	Hayes	Meyers
Calvert	Hefley	Mica
Camp	Herger	Michel
Canady	Hobson	Miller (FL)
Castle	Hoekstra	Minge
Chapman	Hoke	Molinari
Coble	Holden	Montgomery
Collins (GA)	Huffington	Moorhead
Combust	Hunter	Myers
Condit	Hutchinson	Nussle
Cooper	Hutto	Ortiz
Cox	Hyde	Orton
Cramer	Inglis	Oxley
Crane	Inhofe	Packard
Crapo	Istook	Parker
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Paxon
Deal	Kanjorski	Penny
DeLay	Kasich	Peterson (MN)
Diaz-Balart	Kim	Petri
Dickey	King	Pickett
Doolittle	Kingston	Pombo
Dornan	Klink	Pomeroy
Dreier	Klug	Porter
Duncan	Knollenberg	Portman
Dunn	Kolbe	Poshard
Edwards (TX)	Kyl	Pryce (OH)
Emerson	Lancaster	Quillen
Everett	Laughlin	Quinn
Ewing	Lazio	Ramstad

Ravenel	Shuster	Taylor (MS)
Regula	Sisisky	Taylor (NC)
Ridge	Skeen	Thomas (CA)
Roberts	Skelton	Thomas (WY)
Rogers	Smith (MI)	Thurman
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Torkildsen
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (OR)	Trafficant
Roth	Smith (TX)	Upton
Roukema	Snowe	Valentine
Rowland	Solomon	Volkmer
Royce	Spence	Vucanovich
Santorum	Stearns	Walker
Sarpalius	Stenholm	Walsh
Saxton	Stump	Weidon
Schaefer	Sundquist	Wolf
Schiff	Swett	Young (AK)
Sensenbrenner	Talent	Young (FL)
Shaw	Tanner	Zeliff
Shays	Tauzin	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

de la Garza	Lloyd	Towns
Ford (TN)	Machtley	Washington
Livingston	McKinney	

□ 1334

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

Mr. PETERSON of Florida changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of California). Pursuant to rule XXIII, clause 2(d). The Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4602.

□ 1335

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. 4602, with Mr. GLICKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by Mr. YATES to the Bachus substitute has been adopted on a recorded vote on which the votes cast by the delegates and the resident commissioner were decisive.

That result has since been reversed by the House. Accordingly, the amendment offered by Mr. YATES to the Bachus substitute is not agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS OF ALABAMA AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS, AS AMENDED

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DICKS to the amendment offered by Mr. BACHUS of Alabama as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS, as amended: In line 4 of the substitute amendment strike "4.99" and insert "2.0"

The CHAIRMAN. There is no debate on this amendment, pursuant to the unanimous consent request earlier on.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wash-

ington [Mr. DICKS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] as amended.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 204, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

AYES—222

Abercrombie	Fazio	Martinez
Ackerman	Fields (LA)	Matsui
Andrews (ME)	Fliner	Mazzoli
Andrews (TX)	Fingerhut	McDermott
Applegate	Fish	McHale
Bacchus (FL)	Foglietta	McKinney
Baesler	Ford (MI)	McNulty
Barca	Frank (MA)	Meehan
Barcia	Frost	Meek
Barlow	Furse	Menendez
Barrett (WI)	Gedjenson	Mfume
Becerra	Gephardt	Miller (CA)
Bellenson	Gibbons	Mineta
Berman	Gilman	Mink
Bevill	Glickman	Moakley
Bilbray	Gonzalez	Molohan
Bishop	Gordon	Moran
Blackwell	Grandy	Morella
Boehlert	Green	Murphy
Bonior	Gutierrez	Murtha
Borski	Hall (OH)	Nadler
Boucher	Hamburg	Neal (MA)
Brewster	Harman	Neal (NC)
Brooks	Hastings	Norton (DC)
Brown (CA)	Hefner	Oberstar
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Obey
Bryant	Hinchee	Oliver
Byrne	Hoagland	Owens
Cantwell	Hochbrueckner	Pallone
Cardin	Horn	Pastor
Carr	Houghton	Payne (NJ)
Clayton	Hoyer	Payne (VA)
Clement	Hughes	Pelosi
Clinger	Inslee	Penny
Clyburn	Jacobs	Peterson (FL)
Coleman	Jefferson	Pickle
Collins (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Pomeroy
Collins (MI)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Conyers	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Coppersmith	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Costello	Johnston	Reed
Coyne	Kaptur	Reynolds
Danner	Kennedy	Richardson
Darden	Kennelly	Roemer
de la Garza	Kildee	Romero-Barcelo
de Lugo (VI)	Klecicka	(PR)
DeFazio	Klein	Rose
DeLauro	Klink	Rostenkowski
Dellums	Kopetski	Roybal-Allard
Derrick	Kreidler	Rush
Deutsch	LaFalce	Sabo
Dicks	Lambert	Sanders
Dingell	Lancaster	Sangmeister
Dixon	Lantos	Sawyer
Dooley	LaRocco	Schenk
Dunn	Leach	Schroeder
Durbin	Levin	Schumer
Edwards (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Ehlers	Lipinski	Serrano
Engel	Lowe	Sharp
English	Maloney	Shays
Eshoo	Manton	Shepherd
Evans	Margolies-	Skaggs
Farr	Mezvinsky	Slatery

Slaughter	Thompson	Waters
Smith (IA)	Thornton	Watt
Spratt	Torres	Wheat
Stark	Torricelli	Whitten
Stokes	Tucker	Williams
Strickland	Underwood (GU)	Wilson
Studds	Unsoeld	Wise
Stupak	Velazquez	Woolsey
Swift	Vento	Wynn
Synar	Visclosky	Yates
Tejeda	Walsh	

NOES—204

Allard	Gunderson	Parker
Andrews (NJ)	Hall (TX)	Paxon
Archer	Hamilton	Peterson (MN)
Armey	Hancock	Petri
Bachus (AL)	Hansen	Pickett
Baker (CA)	Hastert	Pombo
Baker (LA)	Hayes	Porter
Ballenger	Hefley	Portman
Barrett (NE)	Herger	Poshard
Bartlett	Hobson	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Hoekstra	Quillen
Bateman	Hoke	Quinn
Bentley	Holden	Ramstad
Bereuter	Huffington	Ravenel
Billrakis	Hunter	Regula
Billey	Hutchinson	Ridge
Blute	Hutto	Roberts
Boehner	Hyde	Rogers
Bonilla	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Browder	Inhofe	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (OH)	Istook	Roth
Bunning	Johnson, Sam	Roukema
Burton	Kanjorski	Rowland
Buyer	Kasich	Royce
Callahan	Kim	Santorum
Calvert	King	Sarpalius
Camp	Kingston	Saxton
Canady	Klug	Schaefer
Castle	Knollenberg	Schiff
Chapman	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Kyl	Shaw
Collins (GA)	Laughlin	Shuster
Combest	Lazio	Sisisky
Condit	Lehman	Skeen
Cooper	Levy	Skelton
Cox	Lewis (CA)	Smith (MI)
Cramer	Lewis (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Lewis (KY)	Smith (OR)
Crapo	Lightfoot	Smith (TX)
Cunningham	Linder	Snowe
Deal	Livingston	Solomon
DeLay	Long	Spence
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Stearns
Dickey	Mann	Stenholm
Doolittle	Manzullo	Stump
Dorman	McCandless	Sundquist
Dreier	McCloskey	Swett
Duncan	McCollum	Talent
Pastor	McCrery	Tanner
Edwards (TX)	McCurdy	Tauzin
Emerson	McDade	Taylor (MS)
Everett	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Ewing	McInnis	Thomas (CA)
Fields (TX)	McKeon	Thomas (WY)
Fowler	McMillan	Thurman
Franks (CT)	Meyers	Torkildsen
Franks (NJ)	Mica	Trafficant
Gallely	Michel	Upton
Gallo	Miller (FL)	Valentine
Gekas	Molinari	Volkmer
Geren	Montgomery	Vucanovich
Gilchrist	Moorhead	Walker
Gillmor	Myers	Weidon
Gingrich	Nussle	Wolf
Goodlatte	Ortiz	Young (AK)
Goodling	Orton	Young (FL)
Goss	Oxley	Zeliff
Grams	Packard	Zimmer
Greenwood		

NOT VOTING—13

Clay	Ford (TN)	Towns
Faleomavaega	Lloyd	Washington
(AS)	Machtley	Waxman
Fawell	Markey	Wyden
Flake	Minge	

□ 1353

So the amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as amended, offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, offered as a substitute for the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], as amended.

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 380, noes 41, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

AYES—380

Ackerman	Coble	Gejdenson
Allard	Coleman	Gekas
Andrews (ME)	Collins (GA)	Gephardt
Andrews (NJ)	Collins (MI)	Geren
Andrews (TX)	Combust	Gibbons
Applegate	Condit	Gilchrest
Archer	Conyers	Gillmor
Army	Cooper	Gilman
Bacchus (FL)	Coppersmith	Gingrich
Bacchus (AL)	Costello	Glickman
Baesler	Cox	Goodlatte
Baker (CA)	Coyne	Goodling
Baker (LA)	Cramer	Gordon
Ballenger	Crane	Goss
Barca	Crapo	Grams
Barcia	Cunningham	Grandy
Barlow	Danner	Green
Barrett (NE)	Darden	Greenwood
Barrett (WI)	de la Garza	Gunderson
Bartlett	Deal	Gutierrez
Bateman	DeFazio	Hall (OH)
Becerra	DeLauro	Hall (TX)
Bentley	DeLay	Hamilton
Bereuter	Derrick	Hancock
Bevill	Deutsch	Hansen
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart	Hastert
Billirakis	Dickey	Hayes
Bishop	Dicks	Hefley
Blackwell	Dingell	Hefner
Billey	Dooley	Herger
Blute	Doolittle	Hoagland
Boehlert	Dornan	Hobson
Boehner	Dreier	Hochbrueckner
Bonilla	Duncan	Hoekstra
Bonior	Dunn	Hoke
Borski	Durbin	Holden
Boucher	Edwards (CA)	Horn
Brewster	Edwards (TX)	Houghton
Brooks	Ehlers	Hoyer
Browder	Emerson	Huffington
Brown (CA)	English	Hughes
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Hunter
Brown (OH)	Evans	Hutchinson
Bryant	Everett	Hutto
Bunning	Ewing	Hyde
Burton	Farr	Inglis
Buyer	Fawell	Inhofe
Byrne	Fazio	Inslie
Callahan	Fields (TX)	Jacobs
Calvert	Fingerhut	Jefferson
Camp	Fish	Johnson (CT)
Canady	Flake	Johnson (GA)
Cantwell	Ford (MI)	Johnson (SD)
Cardin	Fowler	Johnson, E. B.
Carr	Franks (CT)	Johnson, Sam
Castle	Franks (NJ)	Kanjorski
Chapman	Frost	Kaptur
Clement	Furse	Kasich
Clinger	Galleghy	Kennedy
Clyburn	Gallo	Kennelly

Kildee	Mollinari
Kim	Mollohan
King	Montgomery
Kingston	Moorhead
Kiecicka	Murphy
Klein	Myers
Klink	Neal (NC)
Klug	Nussle
Knollenberg	Oberstar
Kolbe	Obeys
Kopetski	Ortiz
Kreidler	Orton
Kyl	Owens
LaFalce	Packard
Lambert	Pallone
Lancaster	Parker
Lantos	Pastor
LaRocco	Paxon
Laughlin	Payne (VA)
Lazio	Penny
Lehman	Peterson (FL)
Levin	Peterson (MN)
Levy	Petri
Lewis (CA)	Pickett
Lewis (FL)	Pickle
Lewis (KY)	Pombo
Lightfoot	Pomeroy
Linder	Porter
Lipinski	Portman
Livingston	Poshard
Long	Price (NC)
Lucas	Pryce (OH)
Mann	Quillen
Manton	Quinn
Manzullo	Rahall
Margolies-	Ramstad
Mezvinsky	Rangel
Markey	Ravenel
Martinez	Reed
Matsui	Regula
Mazzoli	Reynolds
McCandless	Richardson
McCloskey	Ridge
McCollum	Roberts
McCrery	Roemer
McCurdy	Rogers
McDade	Rohrabacher
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen
McHale	Rose
McHugh	Rostenkowski
Green	Roth
McKeon	Roukema
McMillan	Rowland
McNulty	Royal-Allard
Meehan	Royce
Meek	Sanders
Menendez	Sangmeister
Meyers	Santorum
Mfume	Sarpalius
Mica	Sawyer
Michel	Saxton
Miller (CA)	Schaefer
Miller (FL)	Schenk
Mineta	Schiff
Minge	Schroeder
Mink	Schumer
Moakley	Scott

## NOES—41

Abercrombie	Harman	Neal (MA)
Beilenson	Hastings	Norton (DC)
Berman	Hilliard	Olver
Clayton	Hinchee	Payne (NJ)
Collins (IL)	Johnston	Pelosi
de Lugo (VI)	Leach	Sabo
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Dixon	Lowe	Slaughter
Engel	Maloney	Stark
Fields (LA)	McKinney	Studds
Filner	Moran	Waters
Foglietta	Morella	Watt
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Yates
Hamburg	Nadler	

## NOT VOTING—18

Barton	Lloyd	Strickland
Clay	Machtley	Towns
Faleomavaega	Oxley	Tucker
(AS)	Romero-Barcelo	Underwood (GU)
Ford (TN)	(PR)	Washington
Gonzalez	Rush	Zeliff
Istook	Serrano	

□ 1406

Messrs. ABERCROMBIE, DIXON, and DELLUMS, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. NOR-TON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have asked him to do so for the purpose of getting his and the subcommittee's clarification of the action regarding the road maintenance budget of the Forest Service.

Is it the chairman's intent that this bill includes funding for reconstruction of the Kooacanusa Bridge, which is located on the Kootenai National Forest in Northwest Montana?

Mr. YATES. The committee understands the importance of this project to the gentleman from Montana and in providing a budget level for road maintenance which is \$1 million less than the President's request, it is the committee's intention that under this bill the project will move forward next year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Regarding the \$1 million reduction in the road maintenance budget, was it the committee's intent that this be taken across the board or from one particular region?

Mr. YATES. The committee intended that this reduction be taken across the board, appropriately balanced among all regions of the Forest Service.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 58, line 9, strike "\$445,544,000" and insert "\$418,271,000".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I offer a second amendment, and I ask unanimous consent it be considered en bloc with the amendment just offered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 59, line 9, strike "\$824,585,000" and insert "\$834,585,000".

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I object. The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] is recognized for 5 minutes on his first amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin is agreeable to a time restriction of 30 minutes for consideration of this amendment and all amendments thereto, with 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman

from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I am agreeable, with the caveat that if this one passes, we will then discuss the second one.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer this as a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time limit is 30 minutes total time on this amendment and all amendments thereto, equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] is recognized for 15 minutes.

□ 1410

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

This series of amendments is an attempt to cut \$28 million which represents the President's funding levels for coal technology research and to save roughly half of that money or a little bit more than half of that money and also shift, if we are successful in the original cut, about \$10 million into additional conservation programs.

The administration requested \$128 million for coal research and development, and the committee has put \$155 million into this bill. So the Interior appropriation one more time is more than \$27 million what the administration wanted.

Even under these cuts, we still continue to invest roughly 27 percent of the fossil fuel budget into coal research and technology. That is a reduction right now from a level of about 39 percent.

My colleagues should keep in mind that for the 1970's and through the 1980's, we funded a wide array of potential markets for coal from electric power to industrial processes to residential and commercial heating. If Members check the long history of these projects, we discovered we have funded some of them since the early 1940's. I believe that at a time when we have shrinking resources, it makes more sense to move to emerging technologies rather than to continue to fund technologies that have been worked since the 1940's.

This actually confirms what the authorizing committee has attempted to do. This is an October 5, 1992 colloquy between the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology on their understanding of the coal and research development authorization in the Energy Policy Act.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] said:

In the titles XIII which authorizes coal research and development of \$278 million,

\$139,000 is authorized for 1993. This is \$42 million less than the current funding level and sets the policy of the Federal Government that starts with graduating that mature technology to the private sector.

In other words, the Government should be weaned from the program.

And then he asks, "Would the gentleman from California be good enough to confirm this is the intent of the committee?"

And the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the chairman of the Science Authorization Committee says, "I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to state that this is exactly my understanding."

Now, one quick example, since the early 1940's, there has been an ongoing coal liquefaction research and development project. But the private sector cost of this program is only about 12 percent. So we have been doing it for 45 years, and the private sector still does not see enough of an investment that they really allow us to pay more than 88 percent of the cost of the research projects. If industry does not have any confidence in this program after more than 50 years, why should we? I do not think it is necessary for the Federal Government to continue to fund it, and that is why we would like to see a substantial cutback and also attempt to move some money into the conservation program itself.

Let me make it very clear that the Executive Office of the President, the OMB, sent a statement over yesterday saying, "The Administration urges the House to restore \$27 million to fund important initiatives, and this could be achieved by reducing lower priority items funded under the Fossil Energy Research and Development Act."

That is exactly what we are attempting to do at this point.

Mr. Chairman, in brief, we have had similar cuts on this program in the past which have all passed. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] was successful last year. The administration has attempted to reduce these funding levels. The Senate continues to protect them and so we find ourselves year after year after year having the same debate.

I think, clearly, since we have been funding projects since the 1940's which have not had commercial payoffs yet, since we are facing a \$200 billion deficit, it is absolutely appropriate that we reduce the funding levels to the administration's concerns, bank a chunk of it and put the rest in conservation programs which, in my mind, have a priority, a higher priority. And it is the same higher priority in this case that the Clinton administration even supports the case.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we have go to set the record straight here.

No. 1, this cut will come out of coal, oil, and gas, because they are lumped together in the bill.

The amount in the bill for coal is \$155 million. The amount in the bill for oil and gas is \$201 million.

This cut will come out of both.

It is important that we do the continuing research, because as stated by the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, economic growth and clean environmental achievements in the 21st century, that is out the next 100 years, need high-efficiency fossil fuel technologies.

What we are talking about here is the research needed to perfect these fossil fuel technologies.

It was stated that there is a very small industry match. I would point out that the average is 20 percent industry, private sector; 80, public, and in the clean coal program, it is a minimum of 50/50.

We are not going to nuclear in this country. Let us face it. Fifty-five percent of our Nation's electricity comes from coal; 40 percent of the world's electricity comes from coal. We are going to be using coal and oil and gas as far into the future as we can see, because nuclear is off the board.

Therefore, it is vitally important that we continue the research. But let us also make it clear that this is not a reduction from the President's number in total. As a matter of act, it is down under last year's level by \$2 million, and it is inconsistent with the President's request in terms of a total amount for coal and oil and gas.

I have got to emphasize that we are not just talking about coal here. We are talking about coal, oil, and gas. I would point out also that in terms of Btu's, the production of energy, from the U.S. coal reserves is equal, equal to all of the world's known oil reserves, all the oil in the world, we equal with coal.

But we have got to be able to use our coal in an environmentally safe way. That is what this research is all about.

I think it would be foolish at this juncture to go below last year, to go below the President's request and, certainly, for those of my colleagues that were here in the late 1970's, and even if they were not here, they remember the energy crisis. We were doing all kinds of things. People were sitting in gasoline lines and, as we look at the numbers prospectively, we will be dependent on foreign sources for oil and gas, up to about 70 percent. We are probably at about 50 percent today.

We absolutely need to use our coal to produce electricity. We need to think of ways to enhance the oil and gas reserves of this Nation so we are not dependent on foreign energy resources in a world of turmoil and particularly in the Middle East for 60 to 70 percent of our energy resources.

I think it is vitally important that we continue the research on the ways to burn coal environmentally safely, that we continue research to enhance our oil and gas production. There are millions of Btu's in the ground that can be recovered if we develop the right techniques.

I would lastly point out what the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy said in the committee hearing.

The recommendations (for further reductions) appear to be based on the assumption of a rapid transition away from fossil fuels, particularly coal, to an energy infrastructure dominated by energy conservation and reliance on renewable energy sources. At some point in the future that transition may indeed occur, but it is doubtful it will occur as rapidly as assumed and, in any event, as shown by the EIA projections, it is not going to happen in the next 20 years. Further cuts in the coal R&D budget will delay or possibly eliminate the potential for use of cleaner, more efficient U.S.-based coal technology throughout the world. However, as projected by the EIA, worldwide coal use will continue to increase. In this event, the coal utilization technology employed will be existing, less environmentally sound systems, or, more likely, the technology gap will be filled by our European and Japanese competitors who continue to work aggressively on developing cleaner coal-power systems technology.

□ 1420

Mr. Chairman, it is vitally important to the energy future of this Nation, that we continue our research on coal, oil, and gas to make it environmentally safe and to extend the use and make our Nation independent of offshore sources.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what was said in the committee hearing that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] quoted from, but also let me point out that the Executive Office of the President has sent down a letter telling us that they support the cut, and moving more money to additional programs in fossil energy and research. So for now, the administration is on our side, despite what was said in the earlier hearing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD], one of the cosponsors of this bill, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues, the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG and Mr. KLECZKA] in offering this bipartisan amendment to reduce the appropriation for coal research and development.

Mr. Chairman, the President is right on this one. Last year the House was right in voting overwhelmingly to reduce this program by \$49 million. Today we simply ask that the House cut this appropriation by \$28 million and bring the appropriation in line with the President's request.

Coal is hardly a new energy source, Mr. Chairman. Research and development in the private sector is well established. It is high time Congress reduces subsidies to these mature technologies. With a projected deficit in this country in the \$200 billion range, we simply cannot afford to continue these subsidies.

Our amendment is supported by several national taxpayers' groups, the National Taxpayers Union and Citizens Against Government Waste, to name but two. This would save the American taxpayers at least \$18 million. Our amendment is also supported by several environmental groups: Friends of the Earth, the National Resources Defense Fund, and Environmental Action. It would dedicate \$10 million to energy conservation, which is very, very crucial at this time.

Mr. Chairman, let us cast a vote for fiscal responsibility. Let us cast a vote for environmental responsibility at the same time. Let us bring the spending level down to President Clinton's request. Support the Klug-Ramstad-Kleczyka amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I know most of the Members will find this interesting, that I am opposing the amendment of my best friend in the Congress, but I think the amendment is going in the wrong direction. We are trying to cut funding in this Congress, we are trying to save money, but we also realize that we have a responsibility in this Congress to make sure that there is proper investment in our country in areas where the private sector cannot do it alone.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the energy needs of this country, no one can look the other way when it comes to coal. We have vast resources of coal in this country, but because it has high sulfur in some cases, because of the particulate matter involved in it, if we can find ways to have cleaner coal technology developed in this country, we are going to do our children and their children in the next generations behind us a very, very big favor.

So while we want to reduce spending, and we want to cut expenditures, we should not be penny wise and pound foolish. That is exactly what this amendment does. This basic research that is done in clean coal technology will benefit our Nation.

In Ohio, we have a separate fund that has been developed, that takes the basic research that is done out of this program, adds more money to it to try to commercialize those process. I think this is exactly the type of program that the Federal Government ought to have.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I opposed an amendment on the NEA because I did not think it was within the proper

scope of the Federal Government to be involved in it. This is the kind of project, though, that is within the scope of what the U.S. Congress ought to be doing.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the gentleman's amendment and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLDEN].

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

I am proud to represent a significant part of the largest anthracite deposit of coal in this country. Anthracite coal is a low-sulfur burning fuel that has a future. It has a future in industrial use, it has a future in domestic use. More importantly and most significantly, great progress has been made recently in the process of turning anthracite coal into a gasoline component.

As the previous speaker mentioned earlier, we are too dependent on foreign oil in this country, and we have large deposits of anthracite coal and bituminous coal that can be of great use to us if we face another energy crisis. I ask all my colleagues in the House to oppose the amendment and keep investing in our future, keep investing in research and development, in rich coal deposits that we have in this country.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to talk a little bit about the importance of this research in the energy future of this country. Just this morning we talked considerably about offshore oil. We talked about the domestic oil industry and its decline. We talked about what we are going to do in the longrun future. We talked about the future of gas, and particularly, coal, coal being, I suspect, the greatest volume of energy that we have available, particularly for electric power generation.

Mr. Chairman, we have to find ways to use this abundant energy resource in better ways than we do now. For example, we have coal that costs \$5 or \$6 in the Powder River Basin in Wyoming, but costs \$27 or \$28 in Texas. We need to find ways to make that more efficient.

We have to find ways to continue to reduce the water content, for example, and increase the Btu content so shipping costs can go down, so this can be more efficient. That is what this is designed to do.

Mr. Chairman, this kind of research is essential, it seems to me, to the future of our economy. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also thank the gentleman for his amendment, and it is an amendment that I have brought to the floor on several occasions in the past. I want to agree with a lot of people who have talked about the importance of the coal research and what goes on.

Mr. Chairman, I never have had any doubt about that whatsoever. Coal is one of our most important natural resources. It is an energy source of the future. We need to figure out ways to utilize it better.

Mr. Chairman, here is my problem with the programs that we have in place right now. Instead of being leading edge R&D programs, what we have is a lot of programs that are basically on a research and development life support system. They are programs where we have proven the technology, where we know how to do it.

The problem is that what we have found out is that having gotten there, it is too expensive to put into the energy stream. In order to keep the technologies alive, we have put them on an R&D life support system, rather than going to the commercialization.

Mr. Chairman, my point is R&D always ought to be aimed at making certain that we are out on the leading edge, finding the new technologies that make things better. In this particular case, what we have is an inability to commercialize what we have already found out because it is too expensive, and therefore we are retaining it on life support.

Mr. Chairman, I think what we can do is assure that all of the money heads toward doing real leading edge R&D. That is fine. What we ought to do is withdraw the programs where we have already found out that they know how to do it and it is just too expensive to commercialize. That it seems to me to be something that the taxpayers can no longer afford to do. That is a subsidy which, in my view, does not constitute research and development.

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

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, in the committee we rejected an \$18 million subsidy for fuel cells for the very reason the gentleman says, because it is commercial. Therefore, it should be sold and developed commercially. Coal, oil and gas research has not quite reached that point. That is our concern.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

□ 1430

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

They say in politics for every issue that is debated, there is a good reason and a real reason for a vote. I will leave it to those listening to reach their conclusion on what I have to say. I would like to at least preface my remarks by saying that when the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Wisconsin come before us and say we are talking about a subsidy to the coal industry, they are dead wrong. We are talking about a Federal investment in energy research to try to find a way to develop coal resources in an environmentally safe manner in the United States. Subsidy programs are historically programs like the dairy program in Wisconsin or the dairy program in Minnesota. This is not a subsidy program. This is a research investment program.

Let me tell Members why we should oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. First, what is at stake here are American jobs. In my home State of Illinois, about 10 years ago there were 20,000 men and women engaged in coal mining. It is a tough job, a dirty job, and a dangerous job, but it pays pretty well and the folks who went to work each day struggled and toiled to make a living, raise their families in communities all across Illinois, 20,000 of them. Today that number is down to around 5,000 because of new environmental standards nationwide, standards which I accept. We need cleaner air. America wants it. We must produce it. But we also ought to keep in mind that as we go through this transition and lose these jobs, we need to invest more in research to find ways to use the coal reserves already in America.

At this point what we are calling for is more fossil fuel energy research as my colleague from Ohio has asked for to reduce America's dependence on imported oil and gas.

Mr. Chairman, we remember not too long ago waiting in lines at gas stations, waiting to determine whether the OPEC cartel would say, "OK, America, it's OK to be in business another year." Does America want to return to those days? I think not.

In conclusion, we do not need to return to the days of energy dependence, to put our head in the sand, to ignore research which could produce energy sources right here in America. Energy dependence on foreign sources can lead us into all sorts of involvement, some say even the Persian Gulf war was created because of our energy dependence. We do not need that. If we are going to put research on a dubious questionable space station, if we are going to put re-

search into Star Wars, for goodness sakes, should not we put research into energy sources to put Americans back to work?

The amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] is a vote for energy dependence on foreign oil and gas and it is a vote to eliminate jobs in the United States. Please vote "no" on the Klug amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, do I have the right to close debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has the right to close debate.

Mr. KLUG. Let me take a couple of more minutes if I could, Mr. Chairman, to simply make a couple of final points before the other side has an opportunity to do this.

I appreciate the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies, who obviously has the ability to shape dairy policy differently if he disagrees with me. What we are talking about here, however, let me make this point one more time, we have subsidized, and I think that is the correct term, coal liquefaction research since the 1940's. If it has not paid off in 50 years, how much more time will it take?

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we are in the never-ending box that we always debate here about science research programs. It is never too early to kill it because we do not know the potential, and it is always too late to kill it because it may still pay off at some point in the future. I suggest after five decades of research and millions of dollars of Federal money, if it has not paid off to this point, it will never pay off in the future.

Again, the thrust of my amendment had I offered both of them together was to, first, cut some of the money devoted to coal research, save some of the money; and, second, shift some of the money to conservation research projects which is another way to reduce our dependence on foreign oil by reducing our need for energy use and, instead, shift to energy conservation. That is why I think in this case we get strong support from taxpayer groups like the Citizens Against Government Waste and the National Taxpayers Union because from an economic perspective, this program is tough to justify. From an environmental perspective, from folks like the Friends of the Earth or the Citizens Against Government Waste Research Project or the Natural Resources Defense Council, the sense is there is a better priority by

spending money and shifting money into new energy technology, and, into technologies which will help us reach the goals of both global warming and also reach the goals that are stated in the Clean Air Act.

Mr. Chairman, again, I think from both an environmental perspective and from a taxpayer perspective, it makes sense to, first, make this cut; then, second, if we are successful in a few minutes, talk about shifting some of the money to another research project.

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

Mr. KLUG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to our Members that we have increased the conservation budget \$135 million over last year. So that we have recognized, as the gentleman points out, the importance of conservation with a very substantial increase already in the bill.

Mr. KLUG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, my point simply being I would still like to see even more money shifted into that program.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Klug amendment to cut coal research and development funding. It reminds me of the old Hurt America First fuels approach. More than half of all the electricity in this country each day comes from coal. Coal makes up about 90 percent of our Nation's domestic fossil fuel resource. In North Dakota, lignite coal provides electricity for more than 2 million homes throughout the Upper Midwest and at present rates of production we can do this for the next 1,000 years, our resource is so plentiful. There is no doubt going to come a day when we will have alternative fuels. We will have solar, wind, renewables we have not even thought of. But that day is far away. Right now the choice is coal, or more dependence on foreign oil sources.

Mr. Chairman, a stand for domestic energy is a stand for coal. In that light it only makes sense to try and improve this resource further; cleaner burning, more efficient. It is not as though coal has not taken its hit in terms of trying to get this budget under control, the national budget under control. This year the committee recommendation was a full \$12 million below funding for fiscal year 1994 which means it has been cut enough.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Klug amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA].

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I believe that we should be doing

research into the use of coal, but the question is at what level should this research support be at. That is where the basic question comes in. The OMB and President Clinton have recommended that we cut it back by \$27 million more and this is the level at which I believe the private sector can begin to contribute more towards these R&D kinds of efforts.

Mr. Chairman, these are difficult times. The President is putting forward significant and substantial deficit reduction efforts in my estimation, but we have to support him in those efforts. This was one of his strong recommendations and I believe we should follow it.

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

Mr. Chairman, final points. I want to make it very clear to my colleagues as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] said before, this is not a new fight. In fact, the Walker-Brown-Penny amendment to last year's appropriations bill passed 276 to 144 and that amendment cut \$49 million from coal-related spending. This amendment only cuts \$27 million.

Let me also point out that even that \$40 million cut was eventually added back in in the conference committee with the Senate. For those Members who voted for the Penny-Kasich amendment, it rescinded funds for fossil energy research and development to 25 percent of its baseline level and this amendment before us is much tamer than that.

Let me also point out finally, the President requested \$976 million in energy conservation. The committee actually delivered \$824 million, which is \$152 million in conservation levels below what the White House itself requested.

□ 1440

So one more time from the perspective of those of us in this Chamber who want to save money, I believe this amendment makes sense, which is why it has the endorsement of the National Taxpayers Union and the Citizens Against Government Waste, and again, for those of you in this Chamber who are motivated by environmental reasons, that is why we find a number of colleagues including Friends of the Earth and the National Resources Defense Council trying to make the case that this is technology we have funded for 50 years. It has not paid dividends, and increasingly we need to shift money away from coal research into other kinds of projects.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would affect oil and gas programs which have been receiving increased emphasis in the research program.

Techniques to recover significant quantities of oil traditionally left in the ground as unrecoverable will be delayed or abandoned.

Promising work on advanced gas turbines and fuel cells, both of which are clean and efficient technologies, will be delayed.

The committee has recommended modest increases in this area, but still below the budget request.

I point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], we have made progress in the field of coal research. A barrel of oil from coal which was \$95 a few years ago is now down to \$35 as a result of the research. It is very hopeful and expected that in the near future if the research programs are allowed to continue the cost will be reduced even further, perhaps to \$25 a barrel.

I oppose the amendment, and I urge the committee to defeat it.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment offered by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG]. The Klug amendment would cut \$27 million from the coal research and development budget, a cut that would do great harm to our country's most abundant energy resource.

One of the byproducts of the 1990 Clean Air Act is to try and find ways and incentives to burn high-sulfur coal using clean, environmentally-safe methods. This is an issue close to the heart of my congressional district, where several coal mines—and thousands of miners—have lost their jobs since 1990. If Congress continues to cut funding for coal research and development, we will only see these losses continue at a faster pace.

Pick up a newspaper almost daily in my district and you can read about another mine closing, another hundred families shifting from private employment to public support. Without ways to use these abundant coal resources, without this research, we will continue to import more foreign oil, relying more and more on overseas imports to sustain our Nation's energy base, and more hard-working Americans will be unemployed.

This amendment makes an unjustified cut in a program that is shouldering more than its share of the deficit reduction burden. The committee, in this bill, is recommending an overall figure for fossil energy research that is less than what Congress approved last year. In addition, the committee is recommending for coal research and development a figure that is \$11 billion less than what Congress approved last year. The coal program cannot sustain these cuts and keep this vital industry alive. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Klug amendment.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. In recent years we have seen the budget for coal research and development decrease as offsetting increases appeared in energy conservation. I applaud our new emphasis on energy efficiency but I want to add a cautionary note. The administration's request for the coal R&D programs reflects changing priorities but does not provide

enough funding to complete ongoing programs.

As an example, the department has been funding a project to develop and construct a 1.6 megawatt pressurized fluidized bed facility. The department did not include funding for completion of the facility nor did it include operating funds needed to obtain testing results from the facility. The department's lack of foresight to bring this project to a logical conclusion is disturbing in terms of protecting our prior year investments and bringing new technologies forward to utilize our abundant coal resources. These technologies are also vital for our environmental future as the developing nations of the world continue to utilize their vast coal resources. By completing the development of more efficient and environmentally friendly coal technologies, we can provide technological leadership.

In restoring \$28 million to the budget request, the committee allows current programs to continue. Even with the additional \$28 million, the coal budget is reduced by \$12 million from last years funding levels.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Klug amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill and I commend the gentleman from Illinois and the committee for their efforts.

I am pleased with the substance of the bill as it pertains to programs in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. I am pleased that it is relatively free of the kind of legislative language that should be left to the proper authorizing committees—but that nevertheless appears all too often in appropriations bills. And I am pleased that the committee has continued to be one that keeps inappropriate academic earmarks to a minimum.

With respect to the substance of the bill, I am pleased that the committee has produced a bill consistent with the administration's requests for energy R&D and consistent with the Energy Policy Act of 1992. Unfortunately, in this tight budget environment the committee's recommendation provides only half the increase in energy conservation R&D requested by the President. Still, the recommended funding represents a substantial increase over last year's level. R&D investments are critical to raising the Nation's productivity and standard of living, yet they all too often are singled out for reduction or elimination by zealous deficit cutters who overlook their longer term payoffs in order to achieve short-term budget savings.

The Interior appropriations bill is not entirely free of pork, but staff of the Science Committee has identified less than \$10 million in academic earmarks, and Mr. YATES is to be recommended for his efforts to keep academic earmarking under control.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Klug amendment.

Here is the headline in one of my newspapers this morning "Old Ben No. 25 To Close—200 Jobs Lost by August."

Those are families in my district who have about 60 days to determine what they're going to do next—and perhaps they will have no

choice but to leave a profession which has been in their families for generations.

The Clean Air Act has taken hope from these families.

What hope they have left is largely invested in the promise of research—research into promising technologies which will enable us to use these coal resources and provide jobs for our people.

The Interior appropriations committee has done difficult work in parceling out scarce resources.

We are already operating under very austere conditions and cannot afford additional reductions in this account.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the amendment.

OLD BEN NO. 25 TO CLOSE—200 JOBS LOST BY  
AUGUST

(By Nick Mariano)

Zeigler Coal Co. will stop mining coal at Old Ben No. 25 near West Frankfort in two months, the firm announced Tuesday.

Company officials told the mine's 200 employees about the decision on Friday, when the workers received 60 days' notice of the impending layoffs.

Company spokesman Vic Svec said the closing is a result of the 1990 Clean Air Act, which sets limits on sulfur dioxide emissions.

"We will cease mining operations in mid-August. This is a direct result of the Clean Air Act," he said.

The mine will remain open to recover equipment and to remove stockpiles of coal. Reclamation work also will continue, Svec said.

He said the contract with the mine's only customer, Georgia Power, expires on June 30 and will not be renewed.

The contract was in effect from the mid-1970s until 1993, and then was extended for one year. The mine produced 1.6 million tons of coal in 1993.

United Mine Workers Local 2250 President Kenneth Craig said the announcement was not a surprise. The closing has been rumored since the UMW strike ended in December.

He, too, blamed federal regulations.

"The Clean Air Act is the culprit behind the closing. Companies buying western coal will make Illinois suffer and Illinois will continue to suffer until politicians put scrubbers on power plants" he said.

Southern Illinois coal is high in sulfur, while that mined in the western United States contains less of the pollutant.

The union represents 160 of the employees at the mine. The remaining 40 employees hold management positions.

West Frankfort Mayor John Simmons said losing the mine will not only damage the income base in the city, but also eliminate revenue that the city receives from the mining company for water.

That money, he said, is used to maintain city property at the West Frankfort City Lake. Work will continue at the lake as it has been done, on an as-needed basis, he said.

The announcement did not surprise him either.

"The mining industry, has been dying for several years," he said.

According to Svec, unsuccessful attempts were made by Zeigler Coal Co., the mine's parent company, to find other customers for the high-sulfur coal.

It is unlikely, however, that the mine would reopen even if a customer were found after the mine closes.

"Conditions at the mine are probably not practical to reopen it," he said, citing problems with water leaking into the mine.

Repairs at the mine were made after a spring storm this year that ripped the roof off a washhouse at the mine and damaged about 20 mining vehicles.

The mine has coal reserves that would last another decade, Svec estimated.

The last layoffs at No. 25 were in 1990 and involved 76 workers. At that time, there were 330 employees.

Two Zeigler Coal-owned mines will continue to operate in Franklin County, No. 24 near Benton and No. 26 near Sesser.

Svec said those mines are not in jeopardy now, but he added that it will be a challenge for all of Southern Illinois to keep mines open past the year 2000, when the second phase of the Clean Air Act goes into effect. That phase will require power companies to install scrubbers, devices used to remove sulfur dioxide.

"By the time Phase Two comes around, many of the mines will have been forced to exit the market," he said.

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by Mr. KLUG, my colleague from Wisconsin.

We should be doing research into the use of coal, but the question is at what level should we support it.

The Office of Management and Budget, as well as President Clinton, have proposed to scale this program back by \$27 million.

Certainly, some of this research could receive a greater contribution from the private sector.

I would urge my colleagues to support the President's efforts at cutting spending in this area.

In these times of high budget deficits, our first priority must be to put our fiscal house in order.

Mr. Chairman, passing this amendment would advance us toward our needed goal of balancing the budget.

We must continue making progress on meeting this goal. Passing this amendment would be a step in the right direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 242, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 271]

AYES—182

Allard	Blute	DeFazio
Andrews (ME)	Boehert	DeLauro
Andrews (NJ)	Bonilla	Deutsch
Andrews (TX)	Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart
Archer	Burton	Dickey
Army	Calvert	Doolittle
Baesler	Camp	Dornan
Baker (CA)	Canady	Dreier
Baker (LA)	Cantwell	Duncan
Ballenger	Castle	Ehlers
Barca	Coble	Engel
Barrett (NE)	Collins (GA)	Farr
Barrett (WI)	Condit	Filner
Bartlett	Coppersmith	Fingerhut
Barton	Cox	Fish
Bereuter	Crane	Fowler
Bilbray	Cunningham	Frank (MA)

Franks (CT)	LaFalce	Ravenel	Moorhead	Reynolds	Stokes
Franks (NJ)	Lambert	Richardson	Moran	Ridge	Strickland
Furse	Lazio	Rohrabacher	Murphy	Roberts	Sundquist
Gallely	Leach	Ros-Lehtinen	Murtha	Roemer	Swift
Gekas	Levin	Roth	Myers	Rogers	Synar
Gilchrest	Levy	Royal-Allard	Neal (MA)	Romero-Barcelo	Tanner
Gilman	Lewis (CA)	Royce	Neal (NC)	(PR)	Tauzin
Gordon	Lewis (FL)	Sanders	Norton (DC)	Rose	Taylor (MS)
Goss	Lewis (GA)	Schenk	Oberstar	Rostenkowski	Taylor (NC)
Grams	Linder	Schroeder	Obey	Roukema	Tejeda
Grandy	Maloney	Schumer	Ortiz	Rowland	Thomas (CA)
Green	Mann	Sensenbrenner	Orton	Rush	Thomas (WY)
Greenwood	Manzullo	Sharp	Owens	Sabo	Thompson
Gutierrez	Margolies-	Shaw	Oxley	Sangmeister	Torkildsen
Hamburg	Mezvinsky	Shays	Packard	Santorum	Torres
Hancock	Markey	Shepherd	Parker	Sarpalius	Torricelli
Harman	McCandless	Skaggs	Pastor	Sawyer	Trafiacant
Herger	McCollum	Slattery	Payne (VA)	Saxton	Tucker
Hinchey	McCrery	Smith (MI)	Pelosi	Schaefer	Underwood (GU)
Hoagland	McDermott	Smith (NJ)	Peterson (FL)	Schiff	Unsoeld
Hoekstra	McHugh	Smith (OR)	Peterson (MN)	Scott	Valentine
Horn	McKeon	Snow	Pickett	Serrano	Velazquez
Houghton	McKinney	Solomon	Pickle	Shuster	Vislosky
Huffington	McMillan	Spence	Pomeroy	Sisisky	Volkmer
Hunter	McNulty	Stearns	Poshard	Skeen	Waters
Hutchinson	Meehan	Studds	Price (NC)	Skelton	Wheat
Hutto	Menendez	Stump	Pryce (OH)	Slaughter	Williams
Inglis	Meyers	Stupak	Quillen	Smith (IA)	Wilson
Inslee	Miller (FL)	Swett	Rahall	Smith (TX)	Wise
Jacobs	Minge	Talent	Rangel	Spratt	Woolsey
Jefferson	Molinari	Thurman	Reed	Stark	Yates
Johnson (SD)	Morella	Upton	Regula	Stenholm	Young (AK)
Johnson, Sam	Nadler	Vento			
Kennedy	Nussle	Vucanovich			
Kennelly	Oliver	Walker	Blackwell	Hilliard	Towns
Kim	Pallone	Walsh	Clay	Johnson (CT)	Washington
King	Paxon	Watt	Dellums	Lloyd	Whitten
Kingston	Payne (NJ)	Waxman	Faleomavaega	Machtley	Zeliff
Kleccka	Penny	Weldon	(AS)	Quinn	
Klein	Petri	Wolf	Gunderson	Thornton	
Klug	Pombo	Wyden			
Knollenberg	Porter	Wynn			
Kreidler	Portman	Young (FL)			
Kyl	Ramstad	Zimmer			

## NOT VOTING—15

	Towns
	Washington
	Whitten
	Zeliff

□ 1504

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Gunderson for, with Mrs. Lloyd against.

Mr. GLICKMAN and Mr. FIELDS of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. FURSE, Messrs. HERGER, KENNEDY, and OLVER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. HAMBURG changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contract where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation under this Act shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture for the leasing of oil and natural gas by noncompetitive bidding on publicly owned lands within the boundaries of the Shawnee National Forest, Illinois: *Provided*, That nothing herein is intended to inhabit or otherwise affect the sale, lease, or right to access to minerals owned by private individuals.

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for any activity or the publication or distribution of literature that in any way tends to promote

public support or opposition to any legislative proposal on which congressional action is not complete.

SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 305. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of such department or agency except as otherwise provided by law.

SEC. 306. No assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, sub-activity, or project funded by this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees.

SEC. 307. (a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the funds the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c; popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.—

(1) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or product that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided using funds made available in this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving the assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(2) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in paragraph (1) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 308. The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management may offer for sale salvageable timber in the Pacific Northwest in fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That for public lands known to contain the Northern spotted owl, such salvage sales may be offered as long as the offering of such sale will not render the area unsuitable as habitat for the Northern spotted owl: *Provided further*, That timber salvage activity in spotted owl habitat is to be done in full compliance with all existing environmental and forest management laws.

SEC. 309. None of the funds in this Act may be used to plan, prepare, or offer for sale timber from trees classified as giant sequoia (*sequoiadendron giganteum*) which are located on National Forest System or Bureau of Land Management lands in a manner different than such sales were conducted in fiscal year 1994.

SEC. 310. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to implement any increase in government housing rental rates in

## NOES—242

Abercrombie	de la Garza	Hochbrueckner
Ackerman	de Lugo (VI)	Hoke
Applegate	Deal	Holden
Bacchus (FL)	DeLay	Hoyer
Bacchus (AL)	Derrick	Hughes
Barcia	Dicks	Hyde
Barlow	Dingell	Inhofe
Bateman	Dixon	Istook
Becerra	Dooley	Johnson (GA)
Beilenson	Dunn	Johnson, E. B.
Bentley	Durbin	Johnston
Berman	Edwards (CA)	Kanjorski
Bevill	Edwards (TX)	Kaptur
Bilirakis	Emerson	Kasich
Bishop	English	Kildee
Billey	Eshoo	Klink
Boehner	Evans	Kolbe
Bonior	Everett	Kopetski
Borski	Ewing	Lancaster
Boucher	Fawell	Lantos
Brewster	Fazio	LaRocco
Brooks	Fields (LA)	Laughlin
Browder	Fields (TX)	Lehman
Brown (CA)	Flake	Lewis (KY)
Brown (OH)	Foglietta	Lightfoot
Bryant	Ford (MI)	Lipinski
Bunning	Ford (TN)	Livingston
Buyer	Frost	Long
Byrne	Gallo	Lowe
Callahan	Gejdenson	Lucas
Cardin	Gephardt	Manton
Carr	Geren	Martinez
Chapman	Gibbons	Matsui
Clayton	Gillmor	Mazzoli
Clement	Gingrich	McCloskey
Clinger	Glickman	McCurdy
Clyburn	Gonzalez	McDade
Coleman	Goodlatte	McHale
Collins (IL)	Goodling	McInnis
Collins (MI)	Hall (OH)	Meek
Combest	Hall (TX)	Mfume
Conyers	Hamilton	Mica
Cooper	Hansen	Michel
Costello	Hastert	Miller (CA)
Coyne	Hastings	Mineta
Cramer	Hayes	Mink
Crapo	Hefley	Moakley
Danner	Hefner	Mollohan
Darden	Hobson	Montgomery

excess of 10 percentum more than the rental rates which were in effect on September 1, 1994, for such housing.

SEC. 311. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended by the National Park Service to enter into or implement a concession contract which permits or requires the removal of the underground lunchroom at the Carlsbad Caverns National Park.

Mr. YATES (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 84, line 23, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RAHALL

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

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAHALL: Page 84, after line 23, insert the following new section:

SEC. 312. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Fossil Energy Research and Development", and increasing the amount made available for "Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund", by \$10,000,000.

Mr. RAHALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] to agree to a time limitation of 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from West Virginia and 5 minutes to be controlled by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Illinois making a unanimous-consent request that the time for debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from West Virginia and 5 minutes to be controlled by himself?

Mr. YATES. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would withdraw my reservation of objection if we can have half the time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will be very glad to give the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] 2½ minutes of my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time for debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] is limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by

the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL], 2½ minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and 2½ minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to first commend Chairman YATES and ranking Republican member RALPH REGULA for the excellent work they have done on this bill in light of the extremely tight budget allocation they had to work under.

But with that said, I am compelled to offer this amendment.

This amendment would strike \$10 million from the \$446,544,000 proposed for fossil energy research and development.

This \$10 million would then be added to the abandoned mine reclamation fund appropriation.

Let me be clear. I offer this amendment with no malice toward fossil energy research.

Indeed, I have always been very supportive of this research.

And if I had my preference, I would simply increase the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program funding without this offsetting reduction.

This, however, is not a viable way to proceed under the existing budgetary situation.

And so it is appropriate, in my view, to slightly reduce the fossil energy research account in order to provide an increased appropriation for a program aimed at mitigating the health, safety, and environmental consequences of past fossil energy production, in this case, from coal mining.

This is what is happening under the abandoned mine reclamation fund.

Under the programs supported by this fund, jobs are created and immediate environmental benefits are received through the restoration of lands left unreclaimed by past coal mining practices.

We are talking about the letting of contracts and dirt being moved in a similar fashion to the highway program.

It is important to note that financing for this program is provided for through a fee assessed on every ton of coal mined in the United States.

These fees, paid by the coal industry, are deposited into the abandoned mine reclamation fund.

In effect, this fund serves as the coal industry's version of the Superfund.

However, enactment of the administration's request for this program would result in an unappropriated balance of over \$1 billion in the abandoned mine reclamation fund.

That is \$1 billion.

Now, I would suggest that the Congress did not impose these fees on the

coal industry simply to allow these money to sit idle in a Government trust fund.

Money sitting idle, I might add, while people's homes and livelihoods are being threatened by burning refuse piles, landslides, and things of this nature.

While the Appropriations Committee increased the administration request slightly—by \$5.7 million—the overall recommended amount of \$172.4 million is still far below the \$190 million in current fiscal year funding.

What I am proposing is a tradeoff. Fossil energy research should, in the future, lead to technologies that allow for the use of fossil fuels in a more environmentally sound fashion.

However, I do not think we can turn our backs on the very real and pressing problems that people face today, on the ground, in many regions of the country as a result of past coal mining practices.

And so I would transfer this \$10 million to the abandoned mine reclamation fund, and it is my intent that this \$10 million be made available for the Rural Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program, or RAMP.

Amounts appropriated from the fund are utilized through three delivery mechanisms: State grants, the Federal program and under RAMP.

While I believe the State grants program should also be increased, the RAMP Program would be wiped out under this bill. It is only proposed to receive \$2.5 million rather than the \$13 or so million normally appropriated for it.

So I say to Chairman YATES and to Mr. REGULA that it is my hope you will accept this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

□ 1510

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the fossil energy R&D budget was already cut substantially at the committee level.

Further cuts will have two adverse consequences. First, the cuts will mean a decrease in natural gas research funding, the fuel the administration is pushing as the cornerstone of our Nation's energy policy, for good reason. Natural gas is clean and abundant.

The second adverse consequence of the cuts will be to threaten the research and development necessary to keep stripper wells open and operating. There are 1 million such marginal wells operating today and they produce nearly 20 percent of our domestic oil. Without additional research and technology to make them more efficient and profitable, the United States is likely to see oil and gas production eroded even further. This year the

United States already has set a dubious record of importing 50 percent of its energy. To protect our national security as well as our economy, we need to increase, not decrease, the funds spent on research and development.

In fact, recent Department of Energy estimates suggest that as much as 60 to 70 percent of the known remaining domestic oil resources could be abandoned in less than 15 years unless effective technologies are developed and utilized.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Rahall amendment which would reinstate funds to the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program, better known as RAMP.

Mr. Chairman, coal operators have paid over \$489 million into a trust fund which is used to reclaim lands left by past coal mine activities.

This is money that our coal communities have paid but cannot use to restore their land and protect their property because it is sitting by idle in a Government trust fund.

It is wrong to deny communities protection from these dangerous reclamation problems, and RAMP funds provide this protection.

We must take action now so that we can provide immediate help to people whose homes and lives are in danger, and restore funds to a program which addresses reclamation problems before they turn into emergencies.

In Kentucky, over 300,000 acres of abandoned mined lands have been reclaimed and another 102,000 acres of abandoned surface mined lands still need major reclamation work.

I see no justifiable reason for us to ignore the severe subsidence problems, property damage, and flooding that result when restoration of abandoned mine lands does not occur.

These problems can lead to serious slides or other emergencies which threaten the homes and lives of the families in my district.

Mr. Chairman, not only does RAMP funds provide assistance to families who have been affected by mine-related problems, but it also works to improve water quality in lakes and streams. It also improves the visual quality of lands that have been exposed due to the effects of strip mining.

Mr. Chairman, the list of program benefits goes on and on. This is a valuable program to eastern and southern Kentucky and other communities throughout this country.

I have seen first hand the excellent reclamation work that is accomplished through this program. The W.H. Bowlin Coal Co. in Saxton, KY, recently was awarded the national Surface Mining Reclamation Award for excellence in land reclamation. It is quality reclamation efforts such as these which benefit from RAMP funds.

Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility to provide immediate help to those who need it and to insure the health and safety of those whose livelihood is threatened by mine related emergencies.

I urge my colleagues support the coal communities who need these funds to restore their land and protect their homes and property.

I urge my colleagues to support the Rahall amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I conclude by reinforcing what I and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] have stated. We have gone to the mat on a number of occasions in Congress to authorize and to extend the life of the abandoned mine reclamation fund. We set up this fund in 1977 when Congress wisely enacted the Surface Mining Reclamation Act, and it has been on the books since. The industry has fought us in our efforts to extend this program. We have invoked their wrath a number of times, yet they have abided by the law as Congress has passed this legislation.

I would say that it is only fair to the American people, it is only fair to the Appalachian States, and only fair to the coal industry, now that they are abiding by the law, paying this tax into the fund, that this money not sit idle here in Washington, but be spent for the purposes for which the original legislation was enacted. The receipts into this fund have been increasing over the years, since 1987, yet the actual appropriations for the AML have been declining. This is a small step in trying to restore that balance in fairness.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am very sympathetic to the gentleman's amendment. I wish we could comply with his request. I recognize the importance of the RAMP Program, except we are prisoners of caps and of budget agreements. And in order for this program to be approved, it will be necessary to find an appropriate offset.

The gentleman suggests we take it out of coal research, out of research for fossil fuels. This would reduce fossil energy research by \$10 million, and we have already reduced that program by \$23 million below the President's request. It would have the effect of cutting oil and gas programs already reduced below the President's budget, and reducing coal programs that have already been reduced for the past 3 years.

I wish we could do it, Mr. Chairman, but the offsets that are suggested cannot be used for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly have to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1995".

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4602, the fiscal year 1994 Interior appropriations bill, and in opposition to any damaging amendments which would eliminate or reduce funding for the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA] or the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH].

Efforts to eliminate or slash funding for the NEA and NEH seems to have become an annual occurrence in the U.S. Congress. Fortunately, many Members recognize the valuable contribution that these organizations make to our country and, as a result, efforts to terminate or cripple the NEA and NEH are usually unsuccessful. The reason that so many Members support funding for the NEA and NEH, including myself, is simple—the arts are important to the health and prosperity of all of American society and should be supported by the U.S. Congress. When we decide to appropriate a teeny speck of our Federal budget to the NEA and NEH, only 65 cents per American in 1993, these organizations are then able to expand these dollars and turn them into artistic appreciation and opportunities for millions of Americans.

To determine whether the NEA and NEH have any positive impact on our constituents, only one needs to take a look around one's congressional district. In the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, which I represent, students from Bellwood, Berkely, Maywood, Oak Park, River Forest, Westchester, Hillside, and Elmwood Park attended special concerts by the world-renown Chicago Symphony. The Community Television Network in Chicago received a grant to support the neighborhood video program which is targeted at young people who have dropped out of public schools and have little exposure to the arts. I could go on and on and I am certain that many of my colleagues also have many examples of activities sponsored by the NEA and NEH in their districts.

Mr. Chairman, the arts are good for America and for that simple reason, we should continue to support Federal funding for the arts and oppose any efforts to cut NEA and NEH funding.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I support the Interior appropriations bill before us today. It provides \$13.2 billion to help preserve our important natural and biological resources. This bill funds the National Park System, the National Wildlife Refuge fund, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Americans are visiting our national parks and appreciating the natural beauty of our country in record numbers. Money for the Interior has been reduced by \$195 million less than last year, a reasonable reduction considering our national deficit. This cut will not hurt the ability of Americans to enjoy the natural assets of our country.

This bill comes close to home for my constituents because it provides the money needed to operate the Weir Farm National Historic site. Connecticut is proud of having been the summer home of the American impressionist painter J. Alden Weir. Volunteers and private donors have worked to make this park a place of beauty and historical meaning. I have introduced a bill to expand the boundaries of the Weir Farm Historic Site. Every member of the Connecticut delegation has cosponsored this bill.

This bill also funds the National Endowment for the Arts. In no way do I support the offensive performances that have been funded by the NEA. At the same time, I realize that the vast majority of projects funded by the NEA are respected and worthwhile. I feel it is best to handle the NEA controversy by cutting the program, but not completely eliminating it. I do not understand why these few offensive projects get chosen for funding, and we in Congress need to make sure that this problem stops.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my opposition to a little-known provision in the Interior appropriations bill that will effectively close an important research center in my district. With this language the Bureau of Mines Research Centers in Tuscaloosa, AL and Rolla, MO, the latter being in my district, will be closed over a 2-year period. This will happen under the guise of reorganization by the Bureau of Mines. In fact, this proposal is politically motivated and not based on scientific analysis. Furthermore, this proposal was done with hardly any input from rank-and-file employees of the Bureau of Mines. The proposed reorganization ignores the primary customer of the Bureau of Mines—the mining community. There is certainly no secret that this plan was put together with political considerations overriding any logical criteria.

Closing the Rolla facility would be a serious mistake. It would not only irreparably harm this rural community, but it would significantly undercut the Bureau's own efforts in environmental research. In fact, the Rolla Research Center devotes 75 percent of its budget to waste remediation and reuse investigations. It is also my understanding that about half of the Bureau's expertise in environmental remediation and pollution control and prevention—as related to mining and metallurgical problems—takes place at the Rolla Center. The Center has developed unique capabilities in the treatment of hazardous wastes through the use of innovative and selective systems to clean up contaminated sites resulting in clean soils plus valuable and usable byproducts.

This administration has emphasized the importance of cleaning up our past environmental mistakes with regard to the mining community and other areas. Missouri, as well as other States across the country have serious problems that must be addressed. The thrust of the Center's research is complimentary to the very ideals espoused by this administration. In my mind, the Bureau would better serve itself and the country by starting its reorganization efforts from the top down. The Bureau should first make cuts with the bureaucracy here in Washington, rather than with the people and the facilities in the field where the work and research is actually done.

Mr. Chairman, Missouri produces about 94 percent of the Nation's primary lead. The Roll Center is located approximately 60 miles from what's known as the New Lead Belt. The State is eighth in nonfuel minerals, with a mineral value of \$1.5 billion. It is home to eight lead, silver, zinc, copper, cobalt, and iron mines with three smelters and six mills. All told, the industry employs about 12,000 people from all over the State, but undoubtedly the majority of them make their home and their livelihood in my district.

We in Missouri have benefited from our God-given natural resources. Lead which once contributed invaluable to the civilized world in the form of plumbing, shelter, and high-octane fuels, we now know to be a mixed blessing. It is still invaluable to us for the lead-acid battery found in every car and for extensive use in radiation shielding. Yet, it is a heavy-metal toxin. Research into its safe extraction and use is as necessary as research into stabilization and clean up of old waste piles and impoundments—something that we have plenty of in Missouri. The Rolla Center is involved in this technology.

The Center has worked closely over the years in coordination with the industry concerning some of the technologies I mentioned earlier. The industry in Missouri is strongly united in keeping the Center located in Rolla. Furthermore, the Center has worked closely with the USGS, the University of Missouri-Rolla—formerly the Missouri School of Mines—and State officials as well. I would challenge anyone to prove to me that the Rolla Research Center is not a good bang for the Federal buck. Furthermore, the Rolla Chamber of Commerce estimates that the economic value of the Center to this rural community is approximately \$28 million—so for a little over \$4 million of Federal funds, the Center is returning \$28 million to the community in economic activity.

Mr. Chairman, as I conclude, I want to also point out that the work being done by the Research Center is unprecedented. While it gets 3 percent of the Bureau's research budget, it accounts for 30 percent of in-house R&D awards and 19 percent of the Bureau Center's awards overall. It would appear to me that the Center is doing something right. I seriously question the rationale and the criteria used by the Bureau of Mines to come to the conclusions it has reached regarding the Rolla Research Center.

In my mind, a prudent and complete examination of this plan will find that the Rolla Research Center is a good investment to guide us in future environmental technologies for the mining community.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

As chairman of the authorizing subcommittee with general jurisdiction over matters concerning the U.S. insular areas—including the smaller areas which receive special assistance through the Interior Department, I want to commend my friend and distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, SIDNEY YATES, for his masterful work in putting this bill together.

In particular, I want to express my appreciation for his cooperation and sensitivity on several insular matters, especially a few which in-

involved both authorizing and appropriating committee responsibilities.

One of these matters is the epidemic of violent crime which in the territory that I am privileged to represent, the Virgin Islands. It has become so serious that it justifies special assistance.

Much of it is due to the trafficking of illicit drugs from the outside through and in our islands.

The brutality of some crimes has imperiled our tourism-based economy. But, more importantly, violent crime rates which are far above the national average have substantially worsened the quality of life of every Virgin Islander.

Our Governor, Alexander Farrelly, was realistic enough to recognize that Federal resources are needed to help protect what in other ways is America's tropical paradise both for its people and our million visitors from the States each year.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased to see that H.R. 4602 includes funding for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to partially offset the costs that have been incurred by these two insular areas since implementation of the Compact of Free Association With the Micronesian States.

The Compact permits Micronesians open entry into the United States and insular areas. The law which actually defines the relationship, Public Law 99-239, included an amendment, which I and others authored, which authorized appropriations to cover the cost imposed on the educational and other social systems of insular governments by Compact migration.

The executive branch is supposed to calculate these costs and recommend appropriate reimbursement; but the Interior Department's territories office, OTIA, has consistently tried to avoid the responsibility to pay for the costs by saying that it didn't know what the cost were.

It also has tried to pass off the responsibility to calculate the costs to the insular governments involved—and then disputed insular estimates.

The gentleman from Illinois has moved to end this ruse by rejecting funds for more studying of the matter—and proposing the funding that the law actually intends: To reimburse the insular governments. I also want to note the role of the Delegate from Guam, ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, in getting us to this point.

The bill also includes another reimbursement intended by Congress in establishing free association with the Marshall Islands through another provision that some of us helped write.

The Compact signed by a representative of President Reagan would have provided Federal tax and trade law exemptions to encourage economic activity in the Marshalls and Micronesia—which had been little developed by OTIA economically but which would need to become more self-reliant under self-government.

The incentive proposals were irresponsible, however. Outlandish loopholes that would have created tax havens were proposed. They would have provided greater encouragement for investment in essentially independent sovereign States than are provided in U.S. areas.

This House changed the provisions, still providing a very attractive investment climate but not violating defensible policy.

At the same time, we recognized that the peoples of the islands had been misled in approving the compact on the economic benefits that it would bring. We also recognized the need to provide assistance for economic development.

We added a number of Federal programs and capital to facilitate U.S. economic activity in the islands. Some of the capital was guaranteed; other amounts were authorized.

The bill includes a small portion of the funds we authorized to make up for what had not been done otherwise.

There is one other matter that Chairman YATES and our committee have worked on which involves the freely associated states that I should mention. It concerns the safety of the atoll of Rongelap, contaminated by a U.S. nuclear weapons test 40 years ago, and the health and welfare of the atoll's people.

In acting on the compact with the Marshalls, our committee insisted on a provision to commit our Nation to answer the people of Rongelap's questions about the seriousness of the contamination and take the measures necessary to overcome any problems.

The distinguished chairman of the full committee, GEORGE MILLER, and I have fought to get these commitments implemented.

We now know that there has been good reason for the concerns of the people of Rongelap—in spite of the assurances of safety provided by Federal bureaucrats. Way out of proportion cancer rates and heart-rendering birth defects prove that there is a problem.

The bill includes a portion of the further funding that will be needed to address it. We expect that some of the additional funds will come through the Defense Department appropriations bill due to the origin of the problem and also due to the understanding of our distinguished colleague who chairs that subcommittee, JOHN MURTHA. Other funds will have to be provided later.

Since all that needs to be done is still not clear, the funds—for cleanup and resettlement of Rongelap as well as other needs of the community—would be spent with the approval of OTIA. Given its record of relative insensitivity to problem, however, we will also expect to be given adequate notice of the spending plans. This will provide us with an opportunity to act if bureaucrats against try to push the people back to the island before the problems are sufficiently dealt with.

The people of Rongelap, who have been away from their homes for years now, can be more easily pressured to prematurely return because of the desperate conditions under which many are living in exile. We will expect their essential human needs to be met while they have to be away from Rongelap so that they can make truly free decisions about their future and they can live decently while a mess that our Government created is clean-up.

Mr. Chairman, as Members may know the administration expects to enter into free association with the last remaining part of the Pacific Islands Territory that we have been responsible for under an agreement with the United Nations—Palau—on October 1. This relationship is authorized to be implemented

under a law and terms which I am very proud to have sponsored.

The bill includes the appropriate funding for this compact. It also, however, includes funds which I and others recommended, to fulfill responsibilities for developing these islands into self-reliance.

In noting this, I want to also note that we will have to provide further funds for Palau if the compact cannot actually be implemented as agreed October 1.

I also want to explain why the bill includes more special assistance than almost anyone had anticipated for the development of the one part of the Pacific Islands Territory that has become a part of the United States political family: The Northern Mariana Islands.

Current law requires \$27,720,000 in such assistance annually until this requirement is changed; but the law also contemplated a change after Congress considered recommendations. OTIA recommended a \$120 million commitment of assistance from fiscal year 1994 to fiscal year 2000.

We objected to a new commitment of special assistance without conditions related to the commonwealth's tax and alien labor policies. The tax policies fail to meet the commonwealth's responsibilities for self-reliance.

The alien labor policies have let in massive numbers of nonresident workers, imposing costs on public services and threatening the social fabric of the community. They have allowed too many nonresidents to be treated inhumanely. And they use low-paid, non-residents and the Commonwealth's free-trade relationship with the United States to unfairly compete with the garment industry in the States and other insular areas.

OTIA hindered agreement on a commitment with conditions last year, so the will of the House was to provide no funds rather than special assistance without conditions.

In spite of this, OTIA recently recommended a scaled-down package of assistance—\$27 million between fiscal years 1995 and 1996 without real conditions. This was amazing in light of the insistence of Chairman MILLER and others that there be conditions.

OTIA's proposal is, obviously, unacceptable and, thus, \$27,720,000 will continue to be provided.

Mr. Chairman, in all of the Pacific issues I have mentioned, OTIA has performed disappointingly. The office, perhaps fortunately, also, though, has much less of a role than it once did.

In fact, most of our frustrations with it relate to it interfering in areas outside of its real mandate in policies and programs which other agencies now handle directly with self-governing insular areas.

Further, OTIA will lose one of its most important remaining missions when the Compact with Palau is implemented, scheduled, as I mentioned earlier, for October 1. While OTIA now oversees and subsidizes the Government of Palau, relations will then be conducted by a State Department Office and most assistance will then be provided on an automatic basis.

OTIA once oversaw and subsidized the governments of all of the insular areas. But it now oversees none other than Palau and only subsidizes American Samoa with funds that in-

volve any substantial work on its part. Most of its work is in providing the special assistance that I have mentioned.

In spite of this, OTIA spends a substantial amount of funds in ways that relate to its former role as an overseer of insular governments and lead agency on matters concerning them. These expenditures especially involve intergovernmental liaison, travel, and the responsibilities of other agencies.

At the same time, it doesn't attend to its real areas of responsibility well.

In case there is still any question about this, I want to mention an issue that is not covered by this bill because it doesn't require funding—but is one of OTIA's few remaining major responsibilities: Disposing of Water Island in the Virgin Islands.

The disposal was complicated by a deficient lease that the Department entered into in 1952. But legal complications arising from the lease really only involve a portion of the property and a settlement could have been worked out.

We have done everything possible to help OTIA find its way, from hearings, to a law requiring a plan, to House passage of a process, to an agreement with the Senate chairman on the parameters of a disposal.

I have given guidance on every policy question; but OTIA has tied itself in legal and political knots. And a year and a half after the end of the lease, the island still has not integrated into the local community, hundreds of people involved are in limbo, and some of the most precious property under the U.S.-flag cannot be put to its best uses.

OTIA's performance and reduced role does not justify the level of funds that have been provided for it. So, Chairman MILLER and I worked with Chairman YATES to reduce funding for OTIA's own expenses, while increasing funding as appropriate to meet needs in and Federal responsibilities regarding the insular areas themselves.

The reduction in the bill is the least that we believe should be agreed to.

In conclusion, I want to commend Chairman YATES and the ranking member of the subcommittee, RALPH REGULA, for the continued support they have shown to the peoples of the U.S. offshore areas. I also want to note the work and cooperation of the staff, especially Kathy Johnson.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reaffirm my full support of the National Endowment for the Humanities and in opposition to any amendments which would weaken either program. Both endowments support artistic excellence and expanded opportunities for all Americans to experience and participate in the arts and humanities.

Let me commend Chairman YATES of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee for bringing us a bill clearly within the discretionary allocation for both budget authority and outlays. As we all know, the country's budget problems are not due to discretionary spending programs, particularly the important programs included in this bill.

The NEA's budget is less than 2/100ths of 1 percent of the Federal budget and \$20 million less than the budget for military bands.

Most endowment grants must be matched by nonfederal funds—from 1:1 to 1:4—and

therefore generate significant revenue. For example, in 1992, the NEA awarded \$123 million to 3,500 organizations. This resulted in generating an estimated \$1.4 billion in matching funds or ten times as much as the NEA awards themselves. This is an example of a sound Federal program.

Investing in arts organizations creates jobs and more importantly, improves the quality of American lives. The NEA and NEH stimulate both private and public sector investment which further creates jobs and opportunities for both educational and enriching experiences. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the NEA and NEH and to defeat the ill-conceived amendment attempting to weaken these programs.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, before I move that the committee rise, I just want to express the gratitude of myself and the members of our committee for the superb job that they did in conducting the administration of this bill. It was very well done.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WISE] having assumed the chair, Mr. GLICKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4602) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MYERS OF INDIANA

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in its present form, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion to recommit offered by Mr. MYERS of Indiana: Mr. MYERS of Indiana moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4602, to the Commit-

tee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On Page 50, line 11, strike \$62,131,000 and insert \$61,131,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I will just take one minute to simply explain, this is a simple motion to recommit, striking \$1 million from the land acquisition account for the Forest Service for acquisition of some property in the district of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], in the Cherokee National Forest, and specifically for the highlands of Roan. The local authorities say that it is going to take the land off the taxing base. The Forest Service has not adequately taken care of the land they do have.

□ 1520

It is a simple amendment.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I have examined the amendment. I have discussed it with the gentleman from Indiana. We can accept this amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. He has a good bill. With this, I will be able to vote for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE). 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 motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House, I report the bill, H.R. 4602, back to the House with an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On Page 50, line 11, strike \$62,131,000 and insert \$61,131,000.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

Mr. BUNNING. 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 338, nays 85, not voting 11, as follows:

Abercrombie	Franks (CT)	Margolies-
Ackerman	Frost	Mezvinsky
Andrews (ME)	Furse	Markey
Andrews (NJ)	Gallegly	Martinez
Andrews (TX)	Gallo	Matsui
Applegate	Gejdenson	Mazzoli
Bacchus (FL)	Gephardt	McCandless
Baesler	Geren	McCloskey
Barca	Gibbons	McCrery
Barlow	Gilchrest	McDade
Barrett (WI)	Gillmor	McDermott
Bateman	Gilman	McHale
Becerra	Gingrich	McInnis
Bellenson	Glickman	McKeon
Bentley	Gonzalez	McKinney
Bereuter	Goodlatte	McMillan
Berman	Goodling	McNulty
Bevill	Gordon	Meehan
Bilbray	Goss	Meek
Bilirakis	Grandy	Menendez
Bishop	Green	Meyers
Blackwell	Greenwood	Mfume
Blute	Gutierrez	Mica
Boehlt	Hall (OH)	Michel
Bonilla	Hamburg	Miller (CA)
Borski	Hamilton	Mineta
Boucher	Hansen	Minge
Brewster	Harman	Mink
Brooks	Hastert	Moakley
Browder	Hastings	Mollohan
Brown (CA)	Hayes	Montgomery
Brown (FL)	Hefner	Moran
Brown (OH)	Hilliard	Morella
Bryant	Hinchee	Murphy
Byrne	Hoagland	Murtha
Calvert	Hobson	Myers
Canady	Hochbrueckner	Nadler
Cantwell	Hoekstra	Neal (MA)
Cardin	Hoke	Neal (NC)
Carr	Holden	Nussle
Castle	Horn	Oberstar
Chapman	Houghton	Obey
Clayton	Hoyer	Oliver
Clement	Hughes	Ortiz
Clinger	Hutchinson	Orton
Clyburn	Hutto	Owens
Coleman	Hyde	Packard
Collins (GA)	Inhofe	Pallone
Collins (IL)	Inslee	Parker
Collins (MI)	Istook	Pastor
Conyers	Jefferson	Payne (NJ)
Cooper	Johnson (CT)	Payne (VA)
Coppersmith	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Costello	Johnson (SD)	Penny
Coyne	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (FL)
Cramer	Johnston	Peterson (MN)
Danner	Kanjorski	Pickett
Darden	Kaptur	Pickle
de la Garza	Kasich	Pomeroy
Deal	Kennedy	Porter
DeFazio	Kennelly	Portman
DeLauro	Kildee	Poshard
Dellums	Kleczka	Price (NC)
Derrick	Klein	Pryce (OH)
Deutsch	Klink	Quillen
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Rahall
Dicks	Kopetski	Rangel
Dingell	Kreidler	Ravenel
Dixon	Kyl	Reed
Dooley	LaFalce	Regula
Dunn	Lambert	Reynolds
Durbin	Lancaster	Richardson
Edwards (CA)	Lantos	Ridge
Edwards (TX)	LaRocco	Roemer
Engel	Laughlin	Rogers
English	Lazio	Ros-Lehtinen
Eshoo	Leach	Rose
Evans	Lehman	Rostenkowski
Everett	Levin	Roukema
Ewing	Lewis (CA)	Rowland
Farr	Lewis (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Fawell	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Fazio	Lightfoot	Sabo
Fields (LA)	Linder	Sanders
Filner	Lipinski	Sangmeister
Fingerhut	Livingston	Sawyer
Fish	Long	Saxton
Flake	Lowey	Schenk
Foglietta	Lucas	Schiff
Ford (MI)	Maloney	Schroeder
Ford (TN)	Mann	Schumer
Fowler	Manton	Scott
Frank (MA)		Serrano

[Roll No. 272]  
YEAS—338

Sharp	Sundquist	Visclosky
Shaw	Swett	Volkmere
Shays	Swift	Walsh
Shepherd	Synar	Waters
Shuster	Tanner	Watt
Sisisky	Taylor (NC)	Waxman
Skaggs	Tejeda	Weldon
Skeen	Thomas (CA)	Wheat
Skelton	Thomas (WY)	Whitten
Slattery	Thompson	Williams
Slaughter	Thornton	Wilson
Smith (IA)	Thurman	Wise
Smith (NJ)	Torkildsen	Wolf
Snowe	Torres	Woolsey
Spratt	Torrice	Wyden
Stark	Traffant	Wynn
Stenholm	Tucker	Yates
Stokes	Unsoeld	Young (AK)
Strickland	Valentine	Young (FL)
Studds	Velazquez	
Stupak	Vento	

## NAYS—85

Allard	Duncan	Oxley
Archer	Ehlers	Paxon
Armey	Emerson	Petri
Bachus (AL)	Fields (TX)	Pombo
Baker (CA)	Franks (NJ)	Ramstad
Baker (LA)	Gekas	Roberts
Ballenger	Grams	Rohrabacher
Barcia	Hall (TX)	Roth
Barrett (NE)	Hancock	Royce
Bartlett	Hefley	Santorum
Barton	Herger	Sarpalius
Bliley	Huffington	Schaefer
Boehner	Hunter	Sensenbrenner
Bunning	Inglis	Smith (MI)
Burton	Jacobs	Smith (OR)
Buyer	Johnson, Sam	Smith (TX)
Callahan	Kim	Solomon
Camp	King	Spence
Coble	Kingston	Stearns
Combest	Klug	Stump
Condit	Knollenberg	Talent
Cox	Levy	Tauzin
Crane	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (MS)
Crapo	Manzullo	Upton
Cunningham	McCullum	Vucanovich
DeLay	McHugh	Walker
Dickey	Miller (FL)	Zimmer
Doolittle	Molinari	
Dreier	Moorhead	

## NOT VOTING—11

Bonior	Lloyd	Towns
Clay	Machtley	Washington
Dornan	McCurdy	Zeliff
Gunderson	Quinn	

□ 1543

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Lloyd for, with Mr. Quinn against.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Florida changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, I was not available for rollcall No. 270.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on No. 270.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 269, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 4602, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1995

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 4602, the Clerk shall be authorized to make any necessary technical corrections.

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

There was no objection.

### WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 4603, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1995, AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1994

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 461 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 461

*Resolved*, That points of order against consideration of the bill (H.R. 4603) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and making supplemental appropriations for these departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, for failure to comply with clause 2(L)(6) of rule XI or clause 7 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill, all points of order against provisions in the bill or failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with "notwithstanding" on page 3, line 18, through "Act," on line 19; beginning with "That" on page 36, line 16, through, "Provided further," on page 37, line 6; and beginning with "Provided" on page 48, line 25, through "Treasury" on page 49, line 4. Where points of order are waived against only part of a paragraph, any 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. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall have precedence over a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, if the amendment is offered by a Member designated in the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], 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 461 is the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4603, the fiscal year 1995 appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, and for the Judiciary and related agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. The rule waives clause 2(L)(6) of rule XI, requiring a 3-day layover, and clause 7 of rule XXI, requiring that relevant printed hearings and report be available for 3 days prior to consideration of a general appropriation bill, against consideration of the bill.

In addition, clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in a general appropriation bill, is waived against all provisions in the bill with certain exceptions. This waiver, protecting certain sections of the bill against points of order, is necessary because the bill contains appropriations for several agencies that have not yet been reauthorized.

The bill also contains a number of general provisions, many of which have been carried for several years. This waiver we believe is reasonable, especially since the bill provides funding for agencies and activities for which authorizing legislation has not been finalized.

For example, authorization has not yet been enacted for most of the appropriations items in the Department of Justice needed for the war on crime and drugs, including the FBI, the DEA, the INS, the U.S. attorneys, and the Byrne grants for State and local law enforcement assistance.

In addition, the bill recommends over \$2 billion in funding for programs included in the crime bill, which is currently awaiting action by a conference committee.

Several programs under the Department of Commerce also await reauthorization as do several independent agencies and commissions, including the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. Speaker, there are several exceptions to this waiver, as I mentioned all of which are clearly defined in the rule. The exceptions were made at the request of the authorizing committees with jurisdiction over those particular provisions; they are made in accordance with a longstanding tradition in the Rules Committee to honor such requests. The rule provides that if only a portion of a paragraph is protected, a point of order may lie only against the balance of the paragraph.

The provisions which remain unprotected under the rule deal with the Anti-Car Theft Act of 1992, a provision dealing with the Securities and Exchange Commission, and a provision dealing with user fees under the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration.

□ 1550

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides that the amendment printed in

the report to accompany the rule, if offered by the designated Member, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, will have precedence over a motion that the Committee on the Whole rise. The amendment made in order limits funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce EEOC guidelines covering religious harassment.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4603, the bill for which this rule provides consideration is a \$26.6 billion appropriation for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1995. The bill is \$1.2 billion below the President's request and \$36 million below the subcommittee section 602(b) allocation.

A number of important programs are funded by this bill, including several for law enforcement and immigration, including substantial increases in the number of Border Patrol agents, which are among the most popular in Congress and the most important to our constituents. The committee is operating under severe budgetary restraints and has, unfortunately, been unable to fund some of the programs many of us had hoped to see funded.

As one Member who represents the area in Los Angeles that was hardest hit by the January earthquake, I would like to thank the committee for recognizing the need to transfer the unspent money from the Transportation account in the earthquake supplemental bill to the Small Business Administration.

The SBA has been faced with an overwhelming number of applications for loans from residents and businesses in the area whose homes and companies were damaged or destroyed by this disaster.

Mr. Speaker, we commend the new chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and his friend Mr. ROGERS, the ranking minority member, for their good work in bringing us a fiscally responsible measure for financing some of the most visible and important agencies of the Government. We know this has been a very difficult task for them under the budget constraints.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat, this is an open rule, and I urge my colleagues to support it so that we may proceed to consideration of the bill as soon as possible.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I begin by urging my colleagues to look closely at this bill—it is chock full of important programs, like immigration and border control and increased funding for prisons. And that is why I am disappointed that the arbitrary pressures of scheduling have forced the Rules Committee to waive the normal 3-day layover period and rush this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it seems we are on a roll in the Rules Committee—for the sixth time this year we have an open amendment process on an appropriations bill. That is good news for Members and good news for taxpayers, because it means we can make reductions where appropriate. But openness does not necessarily mean fairness and there is a disturbing aspect to the trend we seem to be setting. These appropriations bills are coming to the House floor through the Rules Committee, under special protections and waivers even though appropriations bills should not have to go through the Rules Committee at all. But the Rules Committee has been meeting just about daily to crank out these special exceptions, which have the effect of making some Members of this House more privileged than others. You see, at the same time as we grant permission to certain Members to violate the rules of this House, we are denying that same permission to the rest of the House membership.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle still do not seem to understand the fairness argument. But we are being consistent in our request: Either do not waive the rules of the House for anyone, or waive the rules of this House equally for all Members. In today's case, the rules are waived for most of the bill as written—with a few exceptions for provisions that step on the toes of the chairmen of the Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means Committees. And, in a welcome surprise, the rules have been waived to allow our colleague, Mr. TAYLOR, to offer an amendment suspending the highly questionable new religious harassment guidelines at the EEOC—these guidelines are outrageous and unworkable and they should not be implemented. Your friendly government is telling you you must work in a religious free environment. I congratulate Mr. TAYLOR for his persuasive testimony before the Rules Committee yesterday.

But the rules were not waived for other Members seeking the same opportunity—the chance to have important and relevant matters addressed on this floor. For instance, the House will not consider an important shift in priorities—cutting money from the antitrust division at Justice to ensure that sufficient funds are devoted to combating violent crime. Mr. SCHIFF was turned down despite the excellent case he made that this President and most Americans have asked for more funding and attention to violent crime—not antitrust crime. And we will not consider an amendment pertaining to deportation of felony criminals who happen to be from Mexico, and who end up turned loose in society rather than taken out of society because of problems with the law. LAMAR SMITH gave us a remedy. And we will not have a

chance to consider a crucial amendment offered by the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. ROGERS, to cap the U.S. contribution to U.N. peacekeeping missions at 25 percent. This is a matter not just of U.S. funds, but also of U.S. involvement in potentially open-ended, ill-defined and dangerous multilateral peacekeeping adventures.

I doubt most Americans know the bill for peacekeeping right now is about \$1.25 billion. A billion of that is already owed. A quarter of a billion is out there prospectively for other adventures that we may go into, things like Haiti that some of us do not think are such a great idea.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially troubled that we will not consider three different amendments dealing with United States involvement with Haiti. Mr. LIVINGSTON and Mr. LIGHTFOOT raised this issue to ensure that United States troops do not get sucked into a quagmire in Haiti. While some might say this bill is not the proper place for the Haiti debate—I warm my colleagues again that timeliness is a major issue here.

We have significant indication that the administration is heading toward unilateral military intervention in Haiti—apparently at the will of the Black Caucus, Randall Robinson and Haitian exile President Aristide. In the words of one unnamed administration official: "We are no longer in the negotiating business." As U.N. official Dante Caputo noted in his now infamous memo cited by ABC News and the Wall Street Journal, the United States has actually served as "a brake to a diplomatic solution" in Haiti. Caputo also concluded that the administration considers an invasion of Haiti a "chance to show, after strong media criticism of the administration, the President's decisionmaking capability and firmness of leadership in international political matters." Last month this House voted against military intervention in Haiti—a vote that was reversed after 2 weeks of heavy pressure on majority Members by their own leadership. With the House clearly divided on the issue of United States military invasion of Haiti, Members should be concerned that we may end up with troops in Harm's Way in Haiti in the coming weeks. That certainly makes the prospective peacekeeping funds in this bill, \$222 million, which could be used for a Haiti operation, especially relevant. But under this rule, we won't have the opportunity to debate that question unless a procedural motion to rise is defeated—a rare occurrence on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, the unfair nature of this rule is not just a partisan problem—we were even prevented from extending fairness to majority Members seeking flexibility in one of their amendments. Members should be

clear—just because something is labeled an "open rule" does not make it fair or mean it is the best it can be. In this case, we have certainly come up short of that mark.

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE RULES COMMITTEE ON AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSED RULE ON H.R. 4603, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1995, JUNE 22, 1994

1. Rogers—An amendment providing that no funds in the bill may be used to pay more than 25% of a U.N. peacekeeping operation. Vote (Defeated 3-6): Yeas: Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Bonior, Wheat, Solomon.

2. Livingston—An amendment providing that U.S. troops may not be used against Haiti unless contingency plans for using U.S. troops against Cuba have been developed. Vote (Defeated 3-7): Yeas: Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Bonior, Wheat, Solomon.

3. Livingston—An amendment providing that no funds in this bill may be used to support U.S. troops against Haiti unless contingency plans for using U.S. troops against Haiti have been developed. Vote (Defeated) 3-7): Yeas: Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Bonior, Wheat, Solomon.

4. Lightfoot—An amendment to prevent peacekeeping funds from being used for a U.N. operation in Haiti including U.S. troops without first seeking authorization from Congress. Vote (Defeated 3-7): Yeas: Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Bonior, Wheat, Solomon.

5. Smith (TX)—An amendment providing that no funds in the bill may be used to return to Mexico any Mexican national who is a prisoner convicted of a felony in the U.S. without a final order of deportation. Vote (Defeated 3-7): Yeas: Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Bonior, Wheat, Solomon.

6. Schiff—An amendment to transfer funds from the Anti-Trust Division of the Justice Department to the U.S. Attorneys appropriation. Vote (Defeated 3-7): Yeas: Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Bonior, Wheat, Solomon.

7. Condit/Thurman—An amendment to provide \$600 million to reimburse states for costs of incarcerating illegal aliens to be paid for by an across-the-board cut of 2.3 percent. Vote (Defeated 4-6): Yeas: Quillen, Dreier, Goss, Beilenson. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Bonior, Wheat, Solomon.

8. Adoption of Rule—Vote (Adopted 7-3): Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Nays: Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Not Voting: Bonior, Wheat, Solomon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I have to rise in opposition to the rule, and I do so reluctantly.

The Commerce-Justice-State bill can be separated into two parts in my

mind. One is the peacekeeping for the U.N. portion of the bill, part 1; part 2 is the rest of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, overall I strongly support the rest of the bill. But there is a grave deficiency with respect to the U.N. peacekeeping contributions that the United States is being asked to make that should concern every Member of this body and certainly every taxpayer in this country. This bill contains \$1.2 billion to pay the bills the United Nations sends us for peacekeeping just for this year. Included in this amount is \$670 million for a fiscal 1994 supplemental appropriations bill embedded in the 1995 appropriation bill.

□ 1600

This fiscal 1994 supplemental, Mr. Speaker, is being paid for by using the savings the Congress voted last February as part of the supplemental appropriation to aid the victims of the Los Angeles earthquake. Where did those savings come from, Mr. Speaker? They came from very hard-earned savings that Congress made, they came from popular domestic programs like education, low-income housing, among others.

Also included in this bill is another \$533 million for both fiscal 1994 and 1995 U.N. peacekeeping bills handed to the United States by the United Nations. I would point out that the \$670 million in the 1994 supplemental as well as the \$28 million in the 1995 bill go to what the United Nations calls our arrearage to them, past-due bills they say we owe. There is only \$222 million in the fiscal 1995 bill for prospective peacekeeping operations and we all know that that will be insufficient. Why are we providing all this money? Because the United Nations has sent us \$1.1 billion in bills we have not appropriated and should not fully pay, in my view. And why should we not fully pay those bills? Mr. Speaker, because the number and the costs of peacekeeping missions voted by the United Nations have exploded without any regard for the budget constraints that the U.S. Congress faces. A mere two missions existed just 6 years ago, just two peacekeeping missions. And now they number 16 for which we are assessed. The price tag, 6 years ago, was \$30 million. Today it is \$1.5 billion. And because the United Nations continues to bill the American taxpayer for too much of these costs, the United Nations sends our taxpayers a bill for nearly one-third of the cost, 31.7 percent, and our allies do not pay enough. Japan is billed for only 12.5 percent, Germany for 8.9 percent, Great Britain for 6.4 percent, and China 0.9 percent. Is that fair burdensharing, I ask you? I do not think a single Member of this body could say, "yes."

If we are going to give the United Nations a billion dollars, is it not time that the Congress demanded fairness? This bill does not do that.

I asked the Committee on Rules to make in order an amendment to give us some fairness at the United Nations. My amendment would have kept the U.S. share at 25 percent at a savings to us of \$214 million for use for other priorities, which we certainly have. The Committee on Rules refused. Now while I appreciate that the Committee on Rules made in order the Taylor amendment, and while I support the overall bill, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this rule.

I reluctantly say that because I think the chairman and the subcommittee have done a very good job. But I rise to reluctantly oppose this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I am disappointed, although not surprised, that the Rules Committee has declined to grant the waiver Mr. LIVINGSTON and I requested with respect to an amendment concerning Haiti.

The Lightfoot-Livingston amendment limits funds in the peacekeeping section of the Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary appropriations bill from being used for a U.N. peacekeeping operation in Haiti, in which United States troops are to be deployed, without first seeking authorization of Congress. For the House to consider this amendment we must now defeat a motion to rise and report at the end of consideration of the bill.

I do not offer this amendment out of any disrespect to the new chairman of the Commerce Appropriations Subcommittee and my friend, Mr. MOLLOHAN. He and HAL ROGERS have done a fine job in crafting a bill under difficult financial circumstances. As Mr. ROGERS has said previously, remove the sections on U.N. peacekeeping and we have ourselves a good bill.

But what an interesting brand of leadership the majority party brings this House. The leadership of the majority routinely defies the President on matters like Bosnia, NAFTA, and China. However, when American lives are potentially at stake, they twist arms to reverse votes and evade their responsibility as members of the legislative branch.

The Lightfoot-Livingston amendment does not prevent the President from committing the United States to acting unilaterally in Haiti. Nor does the amendment prejudice how this House would vote on such an invasion. But if the President decides time and policy allows the United States to work through the Security Council process, then time also allows for an authorization from Congress. By denying Mr. LIVINGSTON and me the opportunity to offer this amendment, the

majority party is clearly showing its lack of confidence in the President's ability to persuade the American people why we should invade Haiti.

Let me also comment on the Rules Committee's decision to deny Mr. ROGERS the opportunity to offer his amendment to limit our contribution to peacekeeping operations to 25 percent of all U.N. peacekeeping expenses. The U.N. is headed down an expensive road and this administration is so enamored of multilateral solutions that it refuses to see the long-term costs and risks.

For example, the U.N. has increased its peacekeeping staff by 99 percent in last 9 months. You can be sure the U.N. did not reduce staff in other parts of its operation to cover that increase. This administration now provides intelligence information to the United Nations on a regular basis, the only nation that provides such information acknowledged to come from its intelligence service. Most alarming of all, U.N. Ambassador Albright does not feel that U.S. personnel are at any special risk in peacekeeping operations.

Frankly, there are other serious questions about the President's new peacekeeping policy. Despite the President's allegedly tough new criteria, which are actually no different than the criteria announced at the President's speech before the United Nations last fall, the United States has not voted against a single peacekeeping mission.

Second, despite these new criteria, allegations have arisen that the United States vote-swapped peacekeeping votes in the security council with the French last fall. Although we have requested the U.S./U.N. cables which might clarify this situation, so far the administration, citing executive privilege, has refused to supply Congress with those cables.

Finally, it appears that Colin Powell's language to protect U.S. soldiers serving in the field in U.N. operations was removed at the request of Ambassador Albright after U.N. Secretary General Boutros Ghali objected. Again, attempts to clarify this situation have been stonewalled.

I would hope this House, at the least, agrees that if we are going to deploy troops to Haiti, the people's elected representatives should be consulted before our sons and daughters are placed in harms way.

So I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and, if necessary, vote against the motion to rise at the end of this bill so this House can perform its constitutional duty with regard to Haiti.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to our friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak because of a matter outside the scope of the bill

to which this rule applies has a significant effect on an issue within the bill's scope. First, however, I wish to salute the subcommittee as well as its chairman, because I believe no prior Congress and no prior administration have done so much to help with the serious problems of illegal immigration in the United States, particularly in the Southwest.

The bill which we will take up following adoption of this rule provides for \$54.5 million for up to 950 new and desperately needed Border Patrol agents. This legislation recognizes that illegal immigration patterns may have changed, possibly as a result of a shift away from locations that received additional Border Patrol positions in fiscal year 1994, the so-called bubble effect.

In Nogales, AZ, which did not receive supplemental new agents, we have seen a dramatic increase in undocumented immigrants and illegal border crossings. The resources we spend stemming illegal immigration at the border should pay great future dividends in the form of savings on medical, education, public safety, and corrections costs.

However, we face another problem even with the adoption of this bill. To fund the INS at the level called for in this bill, the crime bill conferees must increase the authorization for the INS from the Crime Control Trust Fund by at least \$185.4 million for fiscal year 1995.

A draft conference report circulated by the crime bill conferees indicates that out of the \$30.2 billion in the proposed crime control trust fund, only \$400 million over 6 years would be authorized for the INS—approximately \$66.6 million for fiscal year 1995.

The integrity of our immigration initiatives will be seriously undermined without an adequate authorization from the pending crime bill.

Today, I joined with 25 of my colleagues in a letter to the crime bill conferees urging them to provide at a minimum \$252 million in fiscal year 1995 authorizations to the INS from the crime control trust fund.

Given what I believe will be strong support for the Commerce, Justice, and State appropriations bill coming before us today, I believe the crime bill conferees can increase the INS authorization levels knowing that this Congress and the country stand behind them.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a distinguished member of the committee.

□ 1610

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule on the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill. The rule is allegedly open. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the rules

of the House do not allow funding limitation amendments unless the motion to rise is defeated, and that is a fact which confuses the issue so that we will not directly confront matters which, I believe, are extremely important.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] and I requested waivers from the Committee on Rules so that we could offer our important amendment requiring congressional approval for a peacekeeping invasion in Haiti. Without waivers, which we did not get, the administration's plans for the invasion of Haiti may never receive adequate scrutiny by this Congress.

President Clinton's administration has notified the United Nations that unless Mr. Aristide is reinstated, we may invade Haiti within a couple of months. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that is a very dangerous and ill-advised policy. If the President wants to use the United Nations as a tool to send United States troops to Haiti, he should have to seek authorization from Congress, just as President Bush did before the commencement of Operation Desert Storm.

There is no United States strategic national interests at stake in Haiti. The Haitian military force would be easy to defeat. But what happens afterwards? Our troops will be vulnerable to mob attack, sniping and terrorism. Furthermore, the CIA has briefed Members of Congress, evidently, that Aristide is mentally unstable and prone to violence. Mr. Aristide is not worth risking a single U.S. life in uniform.

Lawrence Pezzullo, the former special adviser on Haiti for the Clinton administration, claims that the United States backed away from a plan for national reconciliation in Haiti because of domestic pressure from supporters of Aristide. Writing in the Washington Post, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pezzullo said:

By abandoning the track of multilateral negotiations, which was forcing Haitians to take political responsibility for effecting change in their country, we have taken on full responsibility for Haiti's future.

Mr. Speaker, we should not put United States servicemen at risk so that President Clinton, by force of arms, can rescue his wholly failed policy of restrictive sanctions against the poor Haitians. The President should be required to seek approval from Congress if he wants to put more United States lives on the line in a United Nations peacekeeping expedition to Haiti.

Taking the administration's plans further, I think the administration could bring some much needed consistency to its foreign policy if it persists in this effort however. That is why I asked yesterday the Committee on Rules to make an amendment in order that, if the Clinton administration persists in its plans to invade Haiti, they should not stop there. They should go

forward and also invade Cuba in which all of the horrors of Haiti also exist and have existed for so many years since the takeover by Fidel Castro.

Now I do not think we should invade Haiti or Cuba, but, if we are going to invade Haiti to restore democracy, we should do the same thing in Cuba. The Committee on Rules did not waive the rules necessary to offer this amendment obviously, or the one to force President Clinton to come to Congress before invading Haiti. I am not serious about the Cuban thing, but I do think and do believe that my colleagues should defeat this rule because, if it fails, they should defeat the motion to rise so that at least the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] can offer our important amendment on Haiti, and maybe the President will come to Congress before he launches that ill-advised invasion.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. —, AS REPORTED (COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1995) OFFERED BY MR. LIGHTFOOT OF IOWA

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the payment of any United States contribution for a United Nations peacekeeping operation, when it is made known to the Secretary of State that—

- (1) such operation relates to Haiti;
- (2) military personnel of the United States will be deployed in such operation; and
- (3) such operation has not been specifically approved by the Congress.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] who had an amendment before the Committee on Rules yesterday.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for yielding this time to me. I also rise to oppose this rule, and I also rise, as my colleagues have said before me, reluctantly.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a proposed open rule, which is a welcomed development. We have seen several already this year, and I commend the Committee on Rules on making that recommendation to us.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the idea of an open rule, as has been stated, is not the only issue before us. It is not the only matter in which the Committee on Rules can influence the outcome of a bill. The other issue is, as in the word used by the gentleman from California; it is in the word "protection." The Committee on Rules can offer protection to the bill, or amendments, or parts of the bill. Protection of course in this context means protection from the otherwise rules of procedure in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I sought a protection in that I sought to be able to offer what should be two amendments and which will be two amendments as one amend-

ment. I am seeking to transfer funds from the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to the U.S. Attorney's Office. If my plan is adopted, the Antitrust Division will still get an increase in funds for the next fiscal year. They will get an increase of 5 percent instead of the 13 percent now recommended by the subcommittee. The difference between 5 percent and 13 percent, which is about \$5.5 million, will go to the U.S. Attorneys where their fight is against violent crime.

Now, in order to put these together; in other words, in order to consolidate them so the Members would have one vote, yes or no, on this idea, I needed to be allowed to offer an en bloc amendment. The Committee on Rules declined, and ordinarily I would walk away from that because no Member has a special right to special protection, even though, without this special protection, my amendments could be confusing to Members because the first amendment would be just a cut in the Antitrust Division without a specific reference to where the money will go if that cut is granted, a cut in the increase. Now, if that is all there were to it though, I would say these are the procedures that ought to be followed, but the rule is filled with protections for other parts of the bill and for another amendment. A number of provisions in the bill are protected against points of order. An amendment is being offered, an amendment that I believe I will support, that seems very reasonable under the circumstances. It is there because we have offered it through the Committee on Rules, a protection from the rules of the House.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, the bill that is being presented on the floor is in violation of the rules of a 3-day layover before it is presented, and the whole point is, Mr. Speaker, that all Members should be on a level playing field. Either everyone who requests a reasonable protection on a rule of procedure should be granted that protection or nobody should be granted such protection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding the time, and I rise to join him in opposing this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am mindful of the fact that my friends on the other side of the aisle are about to start asking, "What is it that will make you Republicans happy?"

Here we have a rule that permits all Members to exercise their right to offer amendments to cut or strike—and the one legislative amendment that is made in order is by a Republican.

"So, what do you Republicans want?"—I can hear it now.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why Republicans go before the Rules Committee to ask for legislative amendments on appropriations bills to be made in order is very simple: this is very often the only chance Members have to express the will of Congress concerning Federal agencies and programs.

If this House focused as much effort on conducting the public's business, as it does on preserving the prerogatives and interests of the one-party Democrat leadership, we would not be faced with appropriations bills such as this.

Fully 54 percent of the funds to be appropriated by this bill will go to agencies and programs that are acting without the cover of authorizing legislation.

Fifty-four percent. That is more than \$14 billion in this bill alone.

That is not the fault of the appropriators.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] and the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. ROGERS], and their subcommittee members have done the best they could with this bill and the funds they have to work with.

The fault is with the one-party Democrat leadership that rules—and misrules—this House.

So, Republicans are going to continue to ask for legislative amendments on appropriations bills—for as long as large numbers of Federal agencies and programs continue to function without proper authorization because this House cannot do its job.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would, at least, like to thank the Rules Committee for making in order the very important amendment to be offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

The proposed guidelines—mandates—on so-called religious harassment in the workplace should not be enforced; indeed they should be trashed.

The Senate evidently thinks so, by a vote of 94 to 0. And the House will be given an opportunity to be heard on this same question when the Taylor amendment is presented.

There are several other important Republican-sponsored amendments that are not made in order under this rule: Amendments concerning the escalating costs of U.N. peacekeeping missions; possible United States military intervention in Haiti; the financial burden on State governments that is caused by illegal immigration; and the crushing caseload that is being carried by Federal prosecutors.

The issue of U.N. peacekeeping can be addressed, at least in part, by a straight amendment to cut. And I will offer such an amendment at the appropriate time.

But I do urge a "no" vote on this rule. A vote against this rule is a vote against the continuing abuse of power by the Democrat Party in this House.

□ 1620

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Sanibel for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as is more often than not the case, we are here talking about an issue of fairness. I know that my friend from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] likes to refer to this as an open rule. It does call for an open amendment process. But the fact of the matter is, there are a great many items here that emerged from the Committee on Appropriations that require protection. By protection, it means that they cannot be struck down, because in the rule, we protect those items.

So what it means is that members of the Committee on Appropriations are treated above the rest of our membership here. I think that that is a major mistake and it is a very serious attack on the whole prospect of allowing Members to be able to work their will on this issue.

I would like to raise one particular item in this bill that concerns me as we proceed. We have reported out \$1.2 billion for the U.N. peacekeeping forces, and at the same time there is a reduction in funding for the National Endowment for Democracy. It seems to me as we look at this issue, the work of the National Endowment and Democracy has been so important in trying to encourage democratic expansion and free markets, that if we had a greater opportunity to expand the work of the National Endowment for Democracy, it would naturally follow that the necessity for numbers like \$1.2 billion for U.N. peacekeeping forces would be reduced.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule. It is not fair. It in fact does impinge on the opportunity that Members who are not on the Committee on Appropriations should have, and I hope we reject it and come back down on the floor under the standard operating procedures.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the gentleman to a certain extent. Anything that anyone finds objectionable in the bill can be got at by a motion to strike. Under an open rule, everything in this bill can be got at by a motion to strike.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we will be allowed to consider the Taylor-Wolf amendment to the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill.

The Taylor-Wolf amendment merely suspends any funding for the October 1, 1993 proposed guidelines that all sides agree are flawed. All sides oppose the

present language and this amendment does not restrain the EEOC from proceeding on refining and improving new guidelines and does not stop the EEOC from proceeding on religious harassment cases under title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

The ACLU:

Under the guidelines as originally proposed, an employer could conclude that the mere utterance of a religious reference or the sighting of a religious symbol, if offense to a single employee, must be expunged from the premises.

The American Jewish Congress:

There is a danger that the guidelines will be used by some to justify suppression of legitimate religious speech in the workplace. There is, indeed, already evidence that the fear of lawsuits alleging religious harassment has already done so, as employers put prophylactic measures into effect in order to ward off potential religious harassment suits\* \* \*.

Gary Bauer of the Family Research Council:

The guidelines broaden employer liability for religious harassment to the point where it would be rational for an employer simply to impose a religion-free workplace\* \* \* many of our constituents are very concerned that they will be forced to remove religious calendars, take the Bible off their office shelf, stop wearing a cross or a star of David\* \* \*.

A major airline has already issued guidelines stating that all personnel are not to:

Possess nor display, in any manner on\* \* \* premises any material which may be construed by anyone to have racial, religious, or sexual overtones, whether positive or negative\* \* \*.

In the majority of workplaces the employer does not independently know the religious beliefs of employees and should not be required to abide by such an overly broad standard that would force employers into a religious-free zone at the workplace.

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

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE COMMISSION OF  
THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION,

June 22, 1994.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I'm writing to urge you to oppose the motion to rise on the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations Bill in order for the House to be able to consider Taylor/Wolf amendment. As you know, this amendment would deny funding to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for the purpose of implementing, administering or enforcing the guidelines covering harassment in the workplace based on religion.

The Christian Life Commission is the public policy and religious liberty agency of the Southern Baptist Convention—America's largest Protestant denomination with 15.4 million members in more than 38,400 congregations nationwide.

On June 20, I sent a letter to Representative Wolf to inform him of our support for his amendment. We have now learned that the Taylor/Wolf amendment may be impeded from consideration due to parliamentary rules.

Last week the Southern Baptist Convention in its annual meeting overwhelmingly adopted a resolution which warned that the guidelines "pose a grave risk to religious freedom in the workplace." The resolution urged, "religion should be deleted from the proposed guidelines and that the subject of religious harassment should be addressed separately in the guidelines on religious discrimination."

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of our position that the motion to rise on this appropriations bill will be regarded by our organization as the critical vote on whether the House of Representatives opposes the EEOC proposed guidelines on religious harassment.

Please support the Taylor/Wolf amendment—by opposing the motion to rise—and protect religious liberty in the workplace.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. SMITH,  
Director of Government Relations.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 22, 1994.

SUPPORT TAYLOR-WOLF AMENDMENT

DEAR COLLEAGUE: You may have received a letter recently from the ACLU, the People for the American Way and some religious groups regarding an amendment that we intend to offer to the Commerce, State, Justice Appropriations bill this week. This letter mischaracterized the reach and scope of the amendment we will be offering.

Our amendment will merely limit the funding for the EEOC's proposed guidelines of October 1, 1993 covering religious harassment in the workplace. The amendment reads as follows:

"None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any guidelines of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission covering harassment based on religion, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which such funds are made available that such guidelines do not differ in any respect from the proposed guidelines published by the Commission on October 1, 1993 (58 Fed. Reg. 51266)

The amendment applies to the October 1, 1993 proposed guidelines only. It is a very narrow amendment. It would prevent the implementation during the next year of the proposed guidelines that virtually all sides agree are misguided. This amendment would not prevent religious harassment claims from being pursued at the EEOC; it would only prevent these proposed guidelines from being used to do so.

If you have any questions regarding this amendment please call Caroline Choi (x56401) or Barbara Comstock (x55136).

Sincerely,

CHARLES TAYLOR,  
FRANK R. WOLF,  
Representatives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 22, 1994.

RELIGION-FREE—"WORKPLACE REALITY"

"Rather than wasting critical time resolving these conflicts\* \* \* all personnel are requested to observe the following guidelines:

"Technical operations personnel should not possess nor display, in any manner, on\* \* \* premises, any material which may be construed, by anyone, to have racial, religious, or sexual overtones, whether positive or negative, or which contain or suggest profanity or vulgarity.

"Supervisors are requested to conduct periodic inspections to ensure that all areas are clear of material \* \* \*—Delta Airline guidelines, January 1994.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: A "religion-free" workplace is what is threatened by the EEOC proposed guidelines. The above guidelines have already been promulgated by a major airline under the current climate on this issue. (See memo on back.)

The "Taylor-Wolf" amendment rejects this notion that the workplace must be "religion free" and that supervisors must be engaged in "periodic inspections" to clear out Bibles or other religious items an employee might have at work just because they might be "offensive" to one employee. Religious freedom is a fundamental right enshrined in the First Amendment of our Constitution; it cannot be regulated away and should not be attempted by any government agency.

The "Taylor-Wolf" amendment will prevent the EEOC from using any funds to implement the guidelines as proposed on October 1, 1993. These proposed guidelines have been criticized as unduly broad by those across the ideological spectrum.

If the Rules Committee does not protect this amendment from a point of order, it will be necessary to DEFEAT THE MOTION TO RISE in order to consider and vote on this amendment. We would appreciate your support in this effort to ensure religious freedom in the workplace.

Sincerely,

CHARLES STENHOLM,  
FRANK R. WOLF,  
CHARLES TAYLOR,  
BUCK MCKEON.  
*Representatives.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 22, 1994.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Earlier today, leading NASCAR drivers came to Congress to express their support for the Taylor-Wolf amendment to the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill. Their statement is reprinted below.

We urge you to support the Taylor-Wolf amendment when the House takes up the appropriations bill tomorrow. If the Rules Committee does not make the amendment in order it will be necessary to DEFEAT THE MOTION TO RISE in order to vote on this amendment.

Sincerely,

CHARLES TAYLOR,  
FRANK R. WOLF,  
*Representatives.*

LEADING NASCAR DRIVERS SUPPORT TAYLOR-WOLF AMENDMENT TO STOP EEOC'S ATTEMPT TO CURTAIL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Statement by: Darrell Waltrip, Ernie Ivan, Hut Stricklin, Jr., Lake Speed, Don Miller, and Max Helton.

The professional racing community, like many others in professional sports, participate in a number of religious activities in the workplace. Chapel services prior to Sunday races are an important part of our lives. Of necessity these services must take place within the confines of our somewhat unusual workplace.

We believe we speak for the vast majority of the drivers and other members of the racing community, as well as the sentiment of most of our millions of fans, when we say that we find any limitation upon our religious liberty to be absolutely unacceptable.

It is for this reason that we urge the Congress of the United States to pass the Tay-

lor-Wolf Amendment to the budget bill which funds the EEOC and other agencies. The EEOC regulations, which are the target of this Amendment, have been criticized by religious and legal organizations from all sides of the political perspective. And in a non-binding vote last week, the Senate voted 94 to 0 to urge the EEOC to delete the so-called religious harassment guidelines from its proposed order.

We are here today to make sure that the EEOC's efforts which would curtail our religious liberty are stopped by binding legislation. Our freedoms are too precious to be left to non-binding votes alone. We want protection that is effective and that is why we urge the House to pass the Taylor-Wolf Amendment.

A major airline has already implemented the proposed guidelines by banning all religious speech whatsoever from the workplace. Legal departments of other agencies may reach similar conclusions. And it doesn't take a first class pit mechanic to understand that some Federal judge somewhere might eventually rule that any discussion of religion or display of religious symbols or materials violates the EEOC's rules.

No one favors true religious harassment. We are informed such harassment is already made illegal by Title VII and other federal laws. But voluntary chapel services, Bible studies, religious symbols, and discussions of the gospel and other religious topics among adults in the workplace would be threatened if these EEOC guidelines are allowed to become final.

In an effort to strain out the last gnat of religious harassment, the EEOC appears ready to swallow up major portions of our religious liberty. We are unwilling to remain in the stands when our liberty is at stake. The EEOC needs to have the brakes applied to this effort. And we hope that Congress will bring this sorry episode of big government intrusion upon our liberties to a screeching halt.

U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE,  
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,  
Washington, DC, June 13, 1994.

DOUGLAS A. GALLEGOS,  
*Chairman, Office of Executive Secretariat,  
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission,  
Washington, DC*

DEAR MR. GALLEGOS: The United States Catholic Conference ("Conference") submits the following comments in response to the notice of proposed rulemaking regarding Guidelines on Harassment Based on Race, Color, Religion, Gender, National Origin, Age, or Disability ("Guidelines"). 58 Fed. Reg. 51266(1993) (comment period extended to June 13, 1994. 59 Fed. Reg. 24998 (1994)). The Conference advocates and promotes the pastoral teaching of the U.S. Catholic Bishops in many diverse areas of the nation's life, including the free expression of religious ideas and fair and equal opportunity in employment. The Conference is also an employer, as are the tens of thousands of Catholic institutions throughout the country. Thus, the Conference has analyzed the Guidelines from the dual perspectives of advocate for religious freedom and religious employer.

However, well-intentioned, in the area of religious harassment, the Guidelines need substantial revisions. In their present form, the Guidelines (i) create confusion which will have a chilling effect on religious expression in the workplace, (ii) fail to distinguish between secular employers and religious employers, and (iii) do not take into account the Supreme Court's recent decision

in *Harris v. Forklift Systems, Inc.*, 114 S. Ct. 367 (1993). Each of these three factors is discussed in more detail below.

CHILLING EFFECT ON RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION IN THE WORKPLACE

Plainly words, gestures, and other conduct designed to communicate negatively against a person on account of religion is harassing and illegal. What separates this actionable behavior from protectable behavior is intent. Employees deserve, in clear cases, the benefit of the law against the insults of others, when that behavior seeks to punish or coerce the employee on account of religious belief. For this reason, the Conference believes it appropriate to include "religion" in the categories of protected classes in the EEOC Guidelines. Excluding religion at this point could very well communicate the wrong conclusion, namely, that religion is less worthy of protection.

The difficulty for the EEOC is that positive actions about religion, including expression of personal belief, is at the core of the values protected by the Free Exercise Clause. The Guidelines do not allude to this distinction, although it is very real and, we submit, the cause (in part) of the recent confusion over these Guidelines. Without support for constitutionally protected religious speech, the Guidelines invite contentious behavior or employee zeal in creating a "religion free" environment, despite the Constitution.

Employers generally are pragmatic and cost-conscious. They like to avoid controversy and reduce expenses. One way to achieve these goals is by adopting policies designed to avoid costly litigation. In their present form, the Guidelines are likely to cause some employers to overreact and adopt workplace rules that will suppress religious expression on the part of employees and supervisors. By choosing to sanitize workplaces from religious expression, some employers will undoubtedly hope to avoid problems generated by those employees who might complain about religious expressions of others. This draconian approach is not far-fetched—it has been reported that a major airline adopted just such an approach in reaction to the Guidelines.

Two factors primarily contribute to the Guideline's potential chilling effect on religious expression. First, the use of subjective and ambiguous terms (such as "denigrate", "aversion," "offensive") without concrete examples will only confuse employers. Second, the Guidelines do not even acknowledge the First Amendment rights of employees and employers to the free expression of religious ideas, either in words or through conduct. The Guidelines' emphasis on the alleged victim's perspective, see 1609.1(c), does not inform employers that other employees also have rights. An employer that sanitizes its workplace in response to the Guidelines may very well find itself in violation of Title VII by discriminating against employees who may, for example, wish to wear religious symbols, have religious pictures or materials at their work stations, or discuss religious issues. In short, the Guidelines need to be more balanced in areas involving religious expression.

The Guidelines can be improved in several ways to decrease their potential chilling effect on religious expression. First, reduce the number of ambiguous and subjective terms. They confuse, rather than clarify, matters for employers. Second, expressly state in the Guidelines that employees have rights to free religious expression that employers need to balance in adopting policies. Employers need to know that, if they overreact, they

may find themselves in violation of Title VII. Finally, providing concrete examples of what is and what is not religious harassment would help employers immensely in understanding their Title VII responsibilities. This could be done with specific descriptions of actual situations, or by including questions and answers as was done in the case of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, see Appendix to 29 C.F.R. Part 1604.

#### RELIGIOUS EMPLOYERS

Congress accorded religious employers special treatment in Title VII. Title VII has two provisions exempting religious organizations for activities which, if engaged in by secular employers, could constitute religious discrimination under Title VII. See 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-1, 2000e-2(e)(2). With regard to section 2000e-1, the U.S. Supreme Court noted that the exemption "is rationally related to the legitimate purpose of alleviating significant governmental interference with the ability of religious organization to define and carry out their religious missions." *Corporation of the Presiding Bishop versus Amos*, 483 U.S. 327, 339 (1987). Title VII does not require religious organizations to employ individuals who act contrary to the religious beliefs of the organization. See *Little versus Wuerl*, 929 F. 2d 944 (3rd Cir. 1991). It should be noted that the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 also contains exemptions for religious organizations. 42 U.S.C. § 12113(c) (1) and (2). The Guidelines, however, do not even acknowledge the distinction between religious employers and secular employers.

The failure to acknowledge this distinction invites litigation to test whether the Guidelines or the exemptions control in particular situations. Although it might seem an obvious legal principle that statutes trump regulations (and certainly guidelines), some might even assert the Guidelines are an ultra vires action of the EEOC in not even noting the statutory exemptions. It is not too farfetched in this society to speculate about re-litigation of *Amos* as a religious harassment case. In that case, pressure was brought to bear on the gymnasium employee to correct his status vis-à-vis his church. The Guidelines invite their interposition as a defense against exempt behavior, a "non-adherent's veto". A simple reference to the preservation of the exemption would be of great assistance.

Beyond this scenario, there are other differences between a General Motors and a Catholic seminary, with regard to environment. Both are employers subject to Title VII. Many religious organizations will have religious symbols and artwork throughout their facilities. Often they may have religious activities during the workday. Title VII does not require a religious organization to change its religious mission activities because an employee may be offended by some aspect or another of his environment. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that some disgruntled employee might attempt to utilize the Guidelines to exercise a heckler's veto over the legitimate activities of religious organizations. See May 2, 1994 Press Release of American Atheists (calling for a strict standard of no religion in the workplace). The Guidelines' emphasis on the victim's perspective exacerbates this concern, as does the reality that there is constant litigation attempting to drive religion out of the public square.

The Guidelines must acknowledge the statutory exemptions for religious employers in Title VII. Religious employers must be allowed to conduct their operations and activi-

ties in a manner consistent with their religious beliefs and practices.

#### HARRIS VERSUS FORKLIFT SYSTEMS, INC.

After the EEOC published its Guidelines, the U.S. Supreme Court decided *Harris versus Forklift Systems, Inc.*, 114 S. Ct. 367 (1993). There are some apparent inconsistencies between the Guidelines and the *Harris* decision. These include the following:

1. Quoting an earlier opinion the Court said that the "mere utterance of an epithet which engenders offensive feelings in an employee" does not implicate Title VII. *Harris* at 370. The Guidelines suggest otherwise in footnote 4.

2. The Guidelines adopt a purpose or effect standard, see section 1609.1(b)(1)(i) and (ii), while the Court adopted an objective and subjective standard, *Harris* at 370.

3. The Guidelines incorporate into the reasonable person standard the victim's perspective (relying on the "reasonable woman" standard adopted in 1991 by the Ninth Circuit in *Ellison versus Brady*, 924 F.2d 872). The Court in *Harris* used only a reasonable person standard, *Id.* at 370. While a reasonable woman standard may be appropriate in the sexual harassment context, its utilization in religious harassment cases may be unworkable. The religious affiliations of employees is not readily apparent to employers in contrast to gender. The multiplicity of religious denominations and sects further complicates the matter. How will an employer or the EEOC determine the perspective of the "reasonable" Catholic, Methodist, Jew, Muslim, etc.?

The Conference recommends that the EEOC review the Guidelines in light of *Harris* and make adjustments where appropriate.

#### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RULEMAKING

While the Conference is recommending substantial revisions in the Guidelines, we do recognize that religious harassment can and has occurred. It is a proper area of concern for the EEOC. If handled appropriately, guidelines could be helpful to employers and employees alike. Therefore, we are not recommending that the EEOC withdraw from all efforts to address religious harassment through guidelines.

The task of balancing the free religious expression rights of employers and employees in the workplace with Title VII's goal of protecting employees from illegal religious harassment is a delicate one, as is evidenced by the enormous response to the Guidelines. For the reasons discussed above, we recommend that the EEOC address the distinctive nature of religious issues. We recommend that, given the diversity of opinions and the sensitive issues involved, that any future guidelines on religious harassment be published again in proposed form for public comment before they are finalized. Where important First Amendment liberties are involved, it is more important that guidelines are done correctly than quickly.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.

Sincerely,

MARK E. CHOPKO,  
General Counsel.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the point that has been made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] about EEOC, the religion-free environment problem. Some would say why do we bother to have these hearings at the

Committee on Rules; it is all cut and dried and not worth going up there. Let me tell you, it was worthwhile. We had wonderful testimony yesterday. A lot of people were shocked to find out that in this place here, where we are now working—at least we think we are working, and I hope most people think we are, I feel we are—we would be in violation of that rule because of the inscription over the Speaker's chair that says "In God we trust." This is not a true religion-free workplace.

Now, that is an absurdity I think that most of America would say, "Come on, will you people please get real here?" And that is what we are trying to do. I think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], bringing this process forward through the Committee on Rules, showed just how ridiculous some of these rules and guidelines have become. It is an area of unintended negative consequences, a good idea that went wrong.

I feel that that kind of thing does, indeed, deserve to be noticed, as it has been pointed out, and corrected. But, more important than that, the Committee on Rules hearing process does work, because that is how we got to this point. So there is hope.

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to point out that we have a difference between an open rule and a fair rule. How we keep a rule open is one thing, and I congratulate the majority for helping us on that. How we make it fair, the way we protect things, is another matter. And that is the area of our opposition. It is merely in the protection and the inequity, the unequal treatment, the double standard for some Members as opposed to others. That is what we are asking that we change.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE). The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes and 45 seconds.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Chicagoans have been following some of EEOC's work through the Chicago Tribune and Mike Royko's columns and they are mad. And they have a right to be mad. A Government agency which is charged with the important role of enforcing the laws against job discrimination is proceeding, at least in one case, in a way that is just incredible.

Recently in Chicago, a restaurant owner, Hans Morsbach was notified by the EEOC in writing that he was guilty of hiring discrimination. The letter charged that he placed an ad with a hiring agency for someone who was "young" and "bub," and thus is guilty of age discrimination.

According to the Tribune, Morsbach was informed by EEOC that he must

now hire four people over the age of 40, give them back pay and seniority, and post a notice in his restaurant stating that he will no longer discriminate because of age. The EEOC has decided he is guilty and determined his sentence and if he does not comply, he will be hauled into court and must hire an attorney to defend himself. What really galls, however, is that he is prevented from knowing anything about the genesis of the charge against him. EEOC refuses to give any information on this, citing confidentiality.

Well, Morsbach didn't place any such ad with a hiring agency and his hiring record is excellent—he has employed a diverse group of individuals in his restaurant. Morsbach doesn't know what hiring agency is involved, when the incident occurred, or what the word "bub" means. Regardless, Morsbach must invest time and resources into his defense when he goes to court to prove his innocence.

Mr. Speaker, this is crazy, crazy that out of the blue comes a charge the accused knows nothing about, crazy that the agency deems him guilty but at the same time refuses to tell him anything about the charge, and crazy that his only recourse is an expensive court proceeding.

This is an important agency charged with the role of protecting the civil rights of employees and protecting them against discrimination. But in this case, and apparently many others, it proceeds like the Spanish Inquisition.

□ 1630

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

In concluding, let me remind my colleagues that this is in fact an open rule. The waivers that are included are there to protect agencies without authorization which I believe most of us are fully supportive of and for some general provisions which have been carried in this and similar bills for a great many years and which I think most, if not all Members, are supportive of. While they are protected against possible points of order, as our friends on the other side of the aisle have pointed out ad nauseam, they are all also still subject to a motion to strike.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support this very fair rule. It is in fact a fair rule.

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 SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds 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 243, nays 177, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

YEAS—243

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Neal (NC)
Ackerman	Glickman	Oberstar
Andrews (ME)	Gonzalez	Obey
Andrews (NJ)	Gordon	Olver
Andrews (TX)	Green	Ortiz
Applegate	Gutierrez	Orton
Bacchus (FL)	Hall (OH)	Owens
Baesler	Hall (TX)	Pallone
Barca	Hamburg	Parker
Barcia	Hamilton	Pastor
Barlow	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Barrett (WI)	Hastings	Payne (VA)
Becerra	Hayes	Pelosi
Bellenson	Hefner	Penny
Berman	Hilliard	Peterson (FL)
Bevill	Hinchey	Peterson (MN)
Bilbray	Hoagland	Pickett
Bishop	Hochbrueckner	Pickle
Blackwell	Holden	Pomeroy
Boniior	Hoyer	Poshard
Borski	Hughes	Price (NC)
Boucher	Hutto	Rahall
Brewster	Inslee	Reed
Brooks	Jefferson	Reynolds
Browder	Johnson (GA)	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rose
Brown (OH)	Johnston	Rostenkowski
Bryant	Kanjorski	Rowland
Byrne	Kennedy	Royal-Allard
Cantwell	Kennelly	Rush
Cardin	Kildee	Sabo
Carr	Kleczka	Sanders
Chapman	Klein	Sangmeister
Clayton	Klink	Sarpallius
Clement	Kopetski	Sawyer
Clyburn	Kreidler	Schenk
Coleman	LaFalce	Schroeder
Collins (IL)	Lambert	Schumer
Conyers	Lancaster	Scott
Coppersmith	Lantos	Serrano
Costello	LaRocco	Sharp
Coyne	Laughlin	Shepherd
Cramer	Lehman	Sisisky
Danner	Levin	Skaag
Darden	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
de la Garza	Lipinski	Slattery
Deal	Long	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lowey	Smith (IA)
DeLauro	Maloney	Spratt
Dellums	Mann	Stark
Derrick	Manton	Stenholm
Deutsch	Margolies-	Stokes
Dicks	Mezvinsky	Strickland
Dingell	Markey	Studds
Dixon	Martinez	Stupak
Dooley	Matsui	Sweet
Durbin	Mazzoli	Swift
Edwards (CA)	McCloskey	Synar
Edwards (TX)	McDermott	Tanner
Engel	McHale	Tauzin
English	McKinney	Tejeda
Eshoo	McNulty	Thompson
Evans	Meehan	Thornnton
Farr	Meek	Thurman
Fazio	Menendez	Torres
Fields (LA)	Mfume	Torricelli
Filner	Miller (CA)	Trafficant
Fingerhut	Mineta	Tucker
Flake	Minge	Unsoeld
Foglietta	Mink	Valentine
Ford (MI)	Moakley	Velazquez
Ford (TN)	Mollohan	Vento
Frank (MA)	Montgomery	Vislosky
Frost	Moran	Volkmer
Furse	Murphy	Waters
Gejdenson	Murtha	Waxman
Gephardt	Nadler	Wheat
Geren	Neal (MA)	Whitten

Williams  
Wilson  
Wise

Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn

NAYS—177

Allard	Gilman	Molinari
Archer	Gingrich	Moorhead
Army	Goodlatte	Morella
Bachus (AL)	Goodling	Myers
Baker (CA)	Goss	Nussle
Baker (LA)	Grams	Oxley
Ballenger	Grandy	Packard
Barrett (NE)	Greenwood	Paxon
Bartlett	Hancock	Petri
Barton	Hansen	Pombo
Bateman	Hastert	Porter
Bentley	Hefley	Portman
Bereuter	Herger	Pryce (OH)
Billfrakis	Hobson	Quillen
Biiley	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Blute	Hoke	Ravenel
Boehler	Horn	Regula
Boehner	Houghton	Ridge
Bonilla	Huffington	Roberts
Bunning	Hunter	Rogers
Burton	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Callahan	Inglis	Roth
Calvert	Inhofe	Roukema
Camp	Istook	Royce
Canady	Jacobs	Santorum
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Clinger	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer
Coble	Kasich	Schiff
Collins (GA)	Kim	Sensenbrenner
Combest	King	Shaw
Cooper	Kingston	Shays
Cox	Klug	Shuster
Crane	Knollenberg	Skeen
Crapo	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Cunningham	Kyl	Smith (NJ)
DeLay	Lazio	Smith (OR)
Diaz-Balart	Leach	Smith (TX)
Dickey	Levy	Snowe
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Solomon
Dornan	Lewis (FL)	Spence
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Duncan	Lightfoot	Stump
Dunn	Linder	Sundquist
Ehlers	Livingston	Talent
Emerson	Lucas	Taylor (MS)
Everett	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Ewing	McCandless	Thomas (CA)
Fawell	McCollum	Thomas (WY)
Fields (TX)	McCrery	Torkildsen
Fish	McDade	Upton
Fowler	McHugh	Vucanovich
Franks (CT)	McInnis	Walker
Franks (NJ)	McKeon	Walsh
Galleghy	McMillan	Weldon
Gallo	Meyers	Wolf
Gekas	Mica	Young (AK)
Gilchrest	Michel	Young (FL)
Gillmor	Miller (FL)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—14

Clay	Lloyd	Towns
Collins (MI)	Machtley	Washington
Condit	McCurdy	Watt
Gunderson	Quinn	Zeliff
Kaptur	Rangel	

□ 1654

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Miss Collins of Michigan for, with Mr. Quinn against.

Messrs. LEWIS of California, McKEON, and BUYER 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4603, and that I be permitted to include tabulations, charts, and other extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1995, AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1994

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4603) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and making supplemental appropriations for these Departments and Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1657

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4603, with Mr. BROWN of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, for their assistance in supporting four projects in western New York which I brought to their attention earlier this year. In particular, I want to thank Chairman OBEY and Chairman MOLLOHAN for their support in this regard. These four proposals are referenced in the committee report accompanying the fiscal year 1995 Commerce-Justice-State-Judiciary appropriations bill which the House is considering today.

First, the committee listed ten proposals, including the Project Connect Consortium, which is a proposed fiber optic, interactive video communication network in western New York, describing the projects as " \* \* \* worthwhile projects for demonstration projects." I am pleased that the committee is urging the Commerce Department " \* \* \* to examine the " \* \* \* proposals and provide grants if warranted, and report back its intentions to the Committee."

I have met several times, here in Washington and in western New York, with officials involved with the development of project connect. I am totally persuaded that it has the potential of forging new ground in the development of the information superhighway in the United States. It filed a grant application with the Department of Commerce on May 15, and I am hopeful that this action by the committee will help persuade the Department to look on that application favorably.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the committee supported my proposal to try to locate Federal prison facilities near existing or expanding State or local facilities in order to achieve savings through sharing of infrastructure and in other ways. Last year I worked hard to obtain \$10.3 million to build a new Federal detention facility to serve the needs of both the Buffalo district of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the U.S. Marshals Service, and this year I urged the committee to consider recommending that this new facility be sited adjacent to the existing and soon-to-be expanded Niagara County Jail in Lockport, NY. I have met with local officials as well as officials of the Federal agencies which are involved in this issue on numerous occasions. I am therefore very pleased that the committee report endorses this recommendation, suggesting that the U.S. Bureau of Prisons should " \* \* \* work with local officials to determine the feasibility of such an approach." I believe that the Niagara County site will be an ideal one on which to test this cost-savings theory.

Third, in response to my concern about the need to curb haphazard land development and protect the natural beauty of Niagara Falls, I applaud the committee for including \$100,000 for the State Department's Office of Canadian Affairs to " \* \* \* analyze transboundary issues and propose a plan of action to guide New York and the Canadian province of Ontario in establishing a commission to develop a comprehensive zoning and development plan for the preservation of the area around Niagara Falls on both sides of the border." I have no doubt that this will be the start of a new and better approach toward protecting this wonder of the world.

Fourth and last, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the committee for accepting my sugges-

tion that the Justice Department's Office of Juvenile Justice Programs consider discretionary grants " \* \* \* to a non-governmental, early intervention counseling program that works with the courts to assist young men and women charged with criminal offenses for the first time and who are at risk of stigmatization and recidivism." This describes what has been called the First Time-Last Time program which was founded in 1979 by the Erie County Sheriff's Department and the western New York Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews [NCCJ] to deal with first-time offenders and seek ways of ensuring that recidivism will not occur.

I have met on several occasions with both public officials and representatives of NCCJ in western New York. They have a record of success that is worthy of emulation throughout the nation. Accordingly, I hope that the Justice Department will concur with the committee and support this excellent program when it submits an application for a discretionary grant from the Justice Department later this year.

Mr. Speaker, once again I want to thank Chairman OBEY and Chairman MOLLOHAN for their responsiveness to these ideas. I look forward to working with them and our colleagues as this bill moves forward toward enactment.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to present this evening the fiscal year 1995 appropriations bill for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies.

First, Mr. Chairman, I thank most sincerely my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the ranking minority member on our committee, for his cooperation and active participation in developing this legislation.

□ 1700

He is an especially capable Member of this Congress. His suggestions have been very valuable and are certainly incorporated in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly fortunate that the expertise of the chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], has been on call, as he has been generous in making himself available to assist me since I have assumed these new responsibilities. His distinguished and capable leadership of this subcommittee for many years is widely admired, and I personally appreciate his friendship and continuing guidance.

Mr. Chairman, the members of our subcommittee are a talented group. To a person, each has made real contributions to this bill. They have been active in its crafting. Their input has been incorporated, and I appreciate their hard work and cooperation.

In addition to the chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], our subcommittee includes the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], the gentleman

from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. Chairman, I am indebted to our new full committee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for the assistance he has given to me on this bill. Despite his new responsibilities, he has always made himself available to work on the many challenges faced during the workup of this bill. He is doing an excellent job, and I appreciate his help.

Mr. Chairman, every Member involved in this legislative process knows how crucial are our hard-working, professional staff. Our subcommittee is blessed with an especially fine group of professionals headed by staff director John Osthaus, and assistants George Schafer and Sally Chadbourne, and on detail from the Commerce Department's Office of Comptroller is Soo Jin Kwon, and we appreciate all of their efforts.

Mr. Chairman, the bill provides a total of \$26,549,129,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 1995. This amount is \$1,181,452,000 below the President's budget request for budget authority, and it is \$35 million below the 602(b) budget authority allocation for the bill.

The bill provides a total of \$25,298,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1995, and this amount is \$771,668,000 below the President's budget request for outlays and \$35 million below the outlay allocation for the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is important to Members here and to their constituents. This bill funds most of this country's crime-fighting initiatives, and, my fellow Members, when your constituents ask what you are doing to fight crime, you can point to this bill for the substantive answer. We heard President Clinton's request to enhance Federal law enforcement, and paramount in our consideration was a commitment to employ effectively Federal resources and assets to reinforce the men and women on the front lines in the fight on crime across this great Nation. Addressing our Nation's crime problems is perhaps our most pressing national concern.

It is impossible to turn on the TV or radio, read a newspaper, open constituent mail, or attend a town meeting without hearing about the terrible problem of crime in our neighborhoods and people's fears and concerns about it. The House has responded by enthusiastically passing a comprehensive crime bill. That legislation is, as we speak, in conference with the Senate.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is this bill where we turn our words into action. We are committed to being as responsive as we can to this priority, and we have used every tool we have. We have used every bit of creativity to focus the

money we have to where it is most needed and will be most effective—to the men and women who fight crime and to the communities who support them.

Mr. Chairman, this bill includes \$1.3 billion for community policing, which will put on the street in our local communities 39,000 additional police officers. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, funding for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Drug Enforcement Agencies, two of our most crucial crime-fighting Federal agencies, has been restored to their fiscal 1994 levels, and we provide additional funding to enable the FBI to hire 160 new agents and the Drug Enforcement Agency to hire 132 new agents.

I am also extremely pleased the committee has restored and enhanced the Byrne formula grant program. The bill includes funding to more than double the size of this highly effective program. The expanded program will provide grants that States can use for law enforcement purposes, for incarceration of illegal aliens, and improved criminal recordkeeping as required by the Brady law.

All of this is done with an enhanced program which amounts to 125 percent more Byrne grant money to each State than they received last year. The effectiveness of the Byrne formula grant program is reflected by its popularity with your State and local law enforcement officials, the people who confront our crime problem every single day.

I know that more than half of you, more than half of my colleagues, more than half of the Members of this House of Representatives have signed petitions to this subcommittee in support of the Byrne program, and we have been responsive to those concerns.

We also responded to your concerns about prison space, and this bill includes almost \$52 million to activate or expand 11 new Federal prisons.

The committee has also heard the concerns of Members from States along our southern border. We significantly enhance border control by providing an increase of \$54 million to hire 700 new Border Patrol agents, to reassign 250 agents to the line, and to backfill those agents with 110 support personnel. This provision will provide a total of almost 1,000 new Border Patrol agents on the line in 1995. This is in addition to the 600 Border Patrol agents who were added to last year's bill.

Likewise, Mr. Chairman, the President's immigration initiative is of great importance to many Members. In addition to the enhancement of the Border Patrol, the committee nearly fully funded the request for expedited deportation and review of asylum cases.

Let us not forget that crime prevention is a critical component of our crime control efforts. This year the committee has provided a 35-percent

increase for juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs. We feel that it is imperative to fund programs which help our young people avoid the path to crime.

Mr. Chairman, of course this bill is responsible for much more than crime fighting. The bill contains funding for a reinvigorated Commerce Department. The Commerce programs are the centerpiece of the President's efforts to increase U.S. industrial competitiveness. The committee has strongly supported President Clinton's initiatives to create jobs through civilian technology and economic development initiatives by increasing levels of funding in certain strategic areas.

We have included \$842 million for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and within this amount we provided the full request of \$61 million for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program. This funding will enable the Department to establish additional manufacturing technology centers and support services to help basic industry America introduce new technologies to shop floors. We also provide \$431 million for the Advanced Technology Program, or ATP. ATP helps industry help itself. U.S. industry defines the research priorities, and then industry and the Federal Government share the costs of pursuing high-risk technology development which holds a promise for new commercial products.

The committee included \$70 million in the bill for the very popular information infrastructure grant program. This funding will provide for another round of demonstration projects to highlight innovative ways schools, hospitals, and other public service entities can gain access to the latest information technology available in the deployment of the information highway.

□ 1710

We have funded the Economic Development Administration at \$371 million, a \$50-million increase over last year's level. EDA serves as the central agency for technical and financial assistance to economically distressed areas. Within this amount we have included \$175 million for the traditional public works grant program and \$80 million for targeted grants for defense conversion.

Turning to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, we have provided \$1.8 billion for the agency's programs. We have provided almost \$600 million related to the modernization of the National Weather Service, including the acquisition of improved radar and other automated systems associated with the modernization effort, the continuation of the NOAA geostationary and polar satellite systems necessary for collecting improved weather data, and staffing for the new radars and weather service facilities.

The committee has also included an increase of \$43 million over fiscal year 1994 amounts for the National Marine Fisheries Service for enhancement of fisheries management programs. This funding is necessary to address the virtual collapse of fisheries in New England and the Pacific Northwest by building sustainable U.S. fisheries and protecting threatened and endangered species.

The amounts recommended in the bill also include restoration of funding for other NOAA programs important to Members, such as regional climate centers, national undersea research centers, and zebra mussel research.

#### SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Also on the job creation front, the bill provides a total of \$796 million for the Small Business Administration, an increase of \$10 million over the President's request.

In this time of economic recovery, the committee recognizes the importance of SBA. The growth of small business is truly critical to the economic health of our Nation, and SBA is the central U.S. Government agency responsible for encouraging and nurturing that growth.

Across America, traditional industries have been crippled, and we have begun to work to rebuild and diversify our economy. The success of our Nation's small businesses is integral to this process.

For those of you facing economic crisis in your district due to base closures or other Federal Government cutbacks, the loss of a major contractor or employer, or simply the effect of years of recession, I urge you to support this committee's funding recommendations for SBA.

In fiscal year 1993, loans made through the section 7(a) business loan program were responsible for creating or maintaining 380,000 jobs nationwide—across every one of my colleagues' districts. And this year, by providing \$327 million for the business loans program account, we will leverage loans to small businesses totaling \$10.5 billion.

Also, our recommendation will provide funding for many other valuable programs under the SBA—programs that provide assistance to women, minorities, handicapped individuals, and veterans trying to overcome barriers to achieve success.

#### FISCAL YEAR 1994 SUPPLEMENTAL

In title VII of the bill, the subcommittee has provided funding for important supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1994. We have provided \$400 million in emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for the Small Business Administration's Disaster Loans Program account to meet the remaining disaster loan needs of the victims of the Los Angeles earthquake.

We have also provided \$670 million in supplemental appropriations for fiscal

year 1994 to pay a portion of the assessments for U.S. peacekeeping operations which are estimated to total \$1.1 billion by the end of fiscal year 1994. In title V of the bill we have provided an additional \$288 million for fiscal year 1995 to pay the second year of the multiyear plan to pay off the fiscal year 1994 peacekeeping arrearage.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the subject of peacekeeping because there will be some discussion during the debate on the bill. I would like to point out to the Members that beginning at page 114 of our report there is a rather lengthy, detailed, factual recitation of the history of peacekeeping. I think it would be instructive to the Members to read this prior to debate on the bill. There is also a table which sets forth the peacekeeping missions, the amounts related to those missions that represent deficits for the year 1994 and the date that those missions were committed to.

I would also note with regard to peacekeeping, Mr. Chairman, that legitimate concerns that Members have had for some time are certainly being addressed and I commend the authorizing committee for doing so.

There have been concerns about the rate which represents the United States' share of peacekeeping operations. The rate for some time has been 30.4 percent. There is certainly an effort to reduce that. That effort is agreed to by a broad cross section of the Members.

We commend the authorizers for providing in their bill, which we just passed in this House not very many weeks ago, a reduction of our share of the peacekeeping from that 30.4 percent rate down to 25 percent beginning with fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Chairman, I have talked about the increases provided in the bill and now I need to mention some of the reductions. As I noted earlier the 602(b) allocation for the bill was \$1.2 billion below the President's request. Therefore, the subcommittee was forced to make a number of reductions which required very difficult choices. The committee cut the following amounts below the budget requests for each of the following. With regard to the Federal Judiciary, we reduced the President's request by 218 million; for the State Department, we reduced the President's request by \$102 million; with respect to the U.S. Information Agency, we reduced the President's request by \$78 million. We reduced the President's request for the Legal Services Corporation by \$85 million. The Maritime Administration was reduced by \$125 million. The Justice Department request was reduced by \$402 million. The Commerce Department request was reduced by \$175 million.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, we are pleased to bring this bill to you today. Our committee has worked very hard

to draft a bill which achieves balance, balance between program demands and budget authority and outlay limitations; balance between the President's important crime and civilian technology investment initiatives and proven agency programs; balance between administration priorities and Congressional priorities on both sides of the aisle.

So I bring to you what I believe is unquestionably a fair bill. This bill is not everything to everyone, but given the fiscal constraints facing us today, Congress must strive for responsible compromise. This bill represents such responsible compromise.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to support our work.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from West Virginia, and the gentleman from Kentucky and other members of the subcommittee for developing this bill. This is one of the most controversial bills and one of the most important bills that we have in the Congress. It includes the entire Judiciary, a separate branch of our Government that does not have a constituency. Members are always anxious to vote for more judgeships, but they do not want to pay for them. The subcommittee has to handle that problem in this bill.

This bill also handles the administration of the overseas officers of the State Department. Again, there are people who are quick to criticize what happens overseas, but they do not like to provide funds for the State Department.

Then there are the export programs, technology and research programs that are so important to our competition, to our being competitive in the world; and of course the business section of the bill, and the coastal programs.

Then there are 21 independent agencies in this bill including the SEC, the SBA, and the FCC. About one-half of this bill is not authorized, which is the highest percent of any bill brought to the floor. The authorization committees have not been able to get these programs authorized by the time the appropriations bill reaches the floor.

This makes it even more controversial and even harder to handle.

I just want to say that this one of the most important bills and I really commend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for what they have done here in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the bill.

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

□ 1720

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

Mr. Chairman, before I begin my comments, I must first praise the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] the new chairman of the subcommittee. He has taken the helm of one of the most diverse and complex appropriations bills there is, as the former chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has just indicated, and while we miss the leadership of Chairman SMITH on this subcommittee, we are extremely pleased with the work of the new chairman. In just a few short months he has impressed all of us, particularly this Member, with his dedication, his knowledge and leadership on this subcommittee. He has done a tremendous job in a very difficult year, treating all Members with fairness and respect and working to accommodate a divergent set of needs and priorities. The chairman and all the members of the subcommittee are to be commended for their diligence in crafting a bill which, I believe, Members should support.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this bill. Having said that, I must divide the bill into two parts, as I have said before. There is the U.N. peacekeeping portion, and then there is everything else. I will have some words about peacekeeping at the conclusion, but first let me address the everything-else portion of the bill.

I must reiterate to the Members the diverse and competing needs of this subcommittee. One of the smaller appropriations bills in total dollars, this bill is certainly one of the most diverse and funds some of the Congress' highest priorities. The bill funds everything from the war on crime and drugs, one of the top issues facing our Nation today, to programs to promote economic development, increase our competitiveness, build democracy overseas, and promote our interests abroad.

Again this year, Mr. Chairman, like other subcommittees, pressing needs exceeded our limited resources. Due to a constrained 602(b) allocation we are \$1.2 billion below the President's request for programs in this bill. Unfortunately, funding constraints did not permit us to do everything we would like to have done, and many programs are held at or below the fiscal 1994 level, but we have provided increases for the highest priorities, especially the war on crime and drugs.

For the Department of Justice, Mr. Chairman, this bill provides a total of \$12 billion for the department, a 29-percent increase over fiscal 1994, including \$2.4 billion to fund initiatives authorized in the crime bill such as community policing. In addition, we have not only restored, but given, a 125 percent increase in the Byrne formula grant program for law enforcement grants to

all 50 States and their police and sheriffs' departments.

I am particularly pleased, Mr. Chairman, that the bill rejects the large cuts the administration proposed for our core Federal law enforcement programs. Not only does the bill reject the President's proposed cut of 790 people from the FBI, it adds resources to put an additional 760 agents on the street, and for the Drug Enforcement Administration, we rejected those proposed cuts and added an additional 132 agents, new agents, to stop drug traffickers in their tracks.

On immigration control, Mr. Chairman, we have built on the firm foundation established last year providing almost 1,000 more Border Patrol agents on the front lines. When this bill is signed into law, we will have added over 1,500 agents in the last 2 years to protect our borders from the flood of illegal immigrants, driving costs through the roof, not to mention other things.

For the Commerce Department, significant increases for the Administration's technology initiatives and the information superhighway. We continue National Weather Service modernization, as well as provide moneys for the EDA to assist economically distressed communities and those hard hit by defense cutbacks.

For the Judiciary, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] noted, a 4-percent increase to help the courts cope with continuing demands to fight the war on crime.

Again this year the Department of State will be forced to live with less than current services. Cut by almost 8 percent last year, the State Department's request has been cut significantly, largely to fund U.N. peacekeeping activities, and that brings me to the second part of the bill, the part which troubles me greatly: U.N. peacekeeping.

Mr. Chairman, peacekeeping is simply a runaway fiscal train. Six years ago peacekeeping costs totaled a mere \$30 million to the United States. This year that price tag, our share, is \$1.5 billion, eating up big portions of the other priorities that we would like to fund in this bill, but simply cannot due to peacekeeping demands. Members must understand that for every dollar that goes to peacekeeping a dollar is taken away from other high priority programs right here in the United States. This bill contains \$1.2 billion to pay for the U.S. assessed contribution for U.N. peacekeeping activities. That figure includes \$222 million for expected 1995 requirements for peacekeeping, and we all know that is going to be way too little. In addition, \$288 million is provided to partially pay for what the United Nations says is an arrearage that we owe for past bills, and then finally the bill includes a separate 1994 supplemental embedded in the fis-

cal 1995 bill providing \$670 million, and that amount is, again, to cover only a portion of the fiscal 1994 peacekeeping bills they say are pass due.

Mr. Chairman, the total price tag for the arrearage is \$1.1 billion. That is \$1.1 billion in bills for which our fiscal 1994 appropriation could not cover. And let me put Members on notice now. This will not be the last supplemental for peacekeeping that we will face this year. There is only \$222 million for fiscal 1995 peacekeeping requirements in this bill. The tab for this year, 1994, is \$1.2 billion. So, we know we are going to be faced with a huge billion-dollar, roughly, supplemental for peacekeeping from the United Nations before the year is out. That is too much.

Sadly, Mr. Chairman, the American taxpayer is not being treated fairly at the United Nations. The United Nations continues to demand that we pay more than our fair share. Nearly one-third of the total peacekeeping U.N. operations are billed to Uncle Sam. All the while our allies pay a greatly reduced rate. The next biggest contributor to peacekeeping is Japan who pays only 12.5 percent; Germany, only 8.9 percent; Britain, a mere 6.4 percent; China, a member of the Security Council, nine-tenths of 1 percent. And Uncle Sucker is billed for 31.4 percent. It is too much.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, our taxpayers are footing the bill to pay for billions in military support for the United Nations for which we get no credit or thanks. The United Nations is putting us in a fiscal noose, and we simply cannot ask our citizens to sacrifice anymore. The time is long past due, Mr. Chairman, that we demand equity and burden sharing at the United Nations. Despite the good will and the best efforts of both the Bush and Clinton administrations and pleas from the Congress over the years, all attempts to reduce our share for peacekeeping have been met with a refusal, even to budge. In fact, we say our rate is 30.4 percent. The United Nations says, "no," it has been increased. It is now 31.7 percent. We asked for a reduction. We get an increase. History has shown that the only time the United Nations listens to us and reforms itself is when Uncle Sam pulls on these purse strings. In fact, that is how we got our U.N. general budget contribution reduced 20 years ago to 25 percent on a bill, an appropriations bill out of this subcommittee. We said we are going to pay 25 percent of the general budget of the United Nations and no more. The United Nations later came along and said, OK, they passed a resolution affirming that. I say it is time to do the same thing now with peacekeeping to reduce it to the same rate.

□ 1730

It is time Congress stepped up to the plate and demanded burden sharing at

the United Nations. I regret that this bill does not do that. How much longer can we justify sending billions to the United Nations when they refuse to treat us fairly.

Mr. Chairman, I planned to offer an amendment today to force the United Nations to treat the American taxpayer fairly and with respect. My amendment would have limited to no more than 25 percent the amount the United States could pay for a peacekeeping operation. Twenty-five percent is what is fair and what is right. Thirty percent, what we pay now, or 31.7 percent, what they are billing us, is too much. But the Committee on Rules refused to make that amendment in order so the Members of this House could work their will on the issue.

I hope as the House continues consideration of this bill, and, hear me out, I hope as we consider this bill, there will come a time during that debate where we will be able to address this critical issue, and I think we will, so hold your change.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill, with the exception of the peacekeeping portion, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I think the gentleman is raising a very, very important and significant point. As I understand it, not only do we pay all the expenses attendant to housing the United Nations in New York City and bringing all of the diplomatic corps to the United States for that purpose, but then for peacekeeping purposes, we pay 31.7 percent of all peacekeeping missions. And then, since the United States provides most of the military hardware and uniform personnel and operations, we pay all of the costs attendant with United States personnel involved in those peacekeeping missions as well, such as the feeding of the people in Bosnia and the feeding of the people in Northern Iraq. Is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS. As well as the transportation costs of personnel and equipment and food stuffs and all of that.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You add all that in, we get no credit for all of those expenses. We still pay the highest proportion of any country in the world. It seems the U.S. taxpayer could get a better deal, and I think the gentleman has raised a very, very significant point. I hope the gentleman's amendment is not only allowed in order, but ultimately adopted.

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say to the gentleman that

you have increased the border patrol by almost 1,000 agents, which will take the total number of border patrol agents well over 5,000. I think we need ultimately 10,000, but you are right on track. The Republican Research Committee Task Force on Immigration worked out a schedule which is manifested in an amendment we passed on the crime bill of a little over 1,000 agents per year. You are following that, you are tracking that very effectively.

I might just say to the gentleman, as we put these agents in important places, like El Paso and San Diego, the smugglers start to try to go around the concentrations of agents. And in Imperial County in California, we are now seeing smuggling of both illegal aliens and cocaine surge. I know it is the gentleman's intention that the border patrol agents now be put at other strategic points where smuggling is beginning to increase as a result of the concentrations that we have already in place.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me briefly respond. The gentleman from California came to Chairman MOLLOHAN and myself early on pleading for more Border Patrol agents. We were able to shift around, and, through sacrifice of other priorities, and found moneys to do just that. So the gentleman is to be commended for his dedication to this issue, not just this year, but last year and previous years. Thanks mainly to his efforts, we now have, or will have by the end of this coming fiscal year, 1,500 new agents assigned to border patrol that we otherwise probably would not have had. So I thank the gentleman for his great work.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman. He and the chairman have done a superb job in this area.

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

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from California for his input on this issue during the process of formulating this bill, and thank the ranking minority Member for bringing Mr. HUNTER's concerns to the committee. It was his amendment last year that enhanced the border patrol on this bill, and we appreciate his input.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], a distinguished member of our subcommittee.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I had a 21-minute statement, but I am going to try to wrap it into 2 minutes. Most of it was to just tell what a terrific job our new chairman has done, and of course the very talented staff of our full committee chairman. He already

knows that, but the very talented staff of John Osthaus and Sally Chadbourne and George Schafer and Sue Jin Kwon, have done a wonderful job. They have been spending every day and weekend and evening working of this bill.

It was a tough bill, because the White House wanted \$27 billion, if you put all of their requests together, and the budget resolution only gave us \$26 billion. There was actually a gap of \$1.2 billion that we had to make up. That was tough, because this really does fund the administration's principle initiatives: fighting crime, enabling our economy to grow, expanding international trade in a peaceful, stable world.

So what the subcommittee did, under the excellent leadership of the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. MOLLOHAN, was in fact to expand our ability to fight crime, put 39,000 more police officers on the street. We did not accept cuts in the FBI, and in fact the subcommittee added almost 400 more FBI personnel. Instead of taking the requested cutback on the Drug Enforcement Agency, the subcommittee added another \$20.5 million, and 75 new drug enforcement agents.

Conscious of the Members' concern about our poorest borders and the number of illegal immigrants coming in, we added nearly 1,000 border patrol personnel, on top of the 600 last year. So that gives us about 5,000, I think, total border patrol people. It is as much as the subcommittee could possibly fund, another priority, certainly, of the House of Representatives.

In terms of the economy, we leveraged more than \$10 billion in new loans for small businesses, through a \$79 million increase in appropriation. We doubled the appropriation for the National Institute of Standards and Advanced Technology Program. We nearly tripled the appropriation for the National Information Infrastructure Program.

The fact is this bill helps every single one of our constituents in every community, large and small, rich and poor. It is a good bill. It certainly deserves the support of every single one of our colleagues.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the very able leader of the subcommittee from our side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my wise friend from Kentucky for yielding.

The fiscal year 1995 appropriations bill for Commerce-Justice-State is a bill that has a lot of provisions that many of my colleagues can support. I want to commend the newest cardinal, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], for doing a superb job, along with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], in a very difficult and complex bill. To the maximum extent, they have taken care of a lot of

programs that all of us are interested in, from Border Patrol to programs that bolster exports to initiatives that foster the development of emerging technologies to help us improve our country's competitive position.

However, as has been pointed out in this debate, we are spending an enormous amount on peacekeeping in this bill, \$1.2 billion. In my opinion, this is an excessive amount, without thinking a bit about what we are doing in terms of long-term priorities.

In particular, there is a \$670 million fiscal year 1994. I began my remarks by saying this is a 1995 bill. We are reaching back to 1994 to try to include \$670 million in supplemental funds.

□ 1740

I think it is important for my colleagues to understand why that 1994 money is available. It is there because when we acted on the emergency appropriation to help cover the cost of the Los Angeles earthquake; this Congress rescinded \$3.2 billion in funds previously appropriated for some 64 programs, including education, agriculture, and home ownership for low-income programs, generating savings of nearly \$600 million in outlays. We pulled the savings out of those programs and put them into this supplemental. How many of us have been on this floor looking at the appropriation bills as they have gone through and saying, we need more money to cover shortfalls in health, in housing, in education, and in crime, yet \$700 million in this bill of 1994 money that is taken away from domestic and other programs is being sent up to pay assessments at the United Nations.

Now, that is exactly where the money is coming from. I want to say to my colleagues that I think it is unjustified. I think it is unjustified because that \$670 million is on top of, get this, \$533 million in fiscal year 1995 money, making a total of \$1.2 billion in this bill to pay up at the United Nations; \$670 million of it from 1994 money, taken from domestic and other programs, and \$533 million in this bill in new money.

My friends, before we make such a decision, we need to remember what happened when we passed the United Nations Participation Act with the understanding that we would be a full partner in financing decisions. Yet for 20 years, my friends, 20 years our Government has tried to get some equity on the United Nations assessment formula. It is not equitable. It is not fair, and they simply brush us off at the United Nations.

Listen to this now. We are being asked to vote in this bill to pay United Nations peacekeeping at an assessment rate of 30.4 percent, for a total of \$1.2 billion. What is going on around the world, friends? The Japanese are paying 12.5 percent. Germany's assessment

to the United Nations, 8.9; Russian federation, 8.6; United Kingdom, 6.3; France, 7.6. And China, who votes with us an equal member in the Security Council, 0.095 percent. United States, 30.4 percent. The United States is actually assessed at 31.7 percent but only pays 30.4 percent. We have a billion-dollar decision that we are going to have to make.

When we look at the Federal budget in total, we see that peacekeeping costs have risen from \$30 million in 1989 to over \$1.2 billion in 1994. It is time to begin to prioritize.

My friend from Kentucky is going to offer an amendment that will attempt to do that; applying the 25-percent rule which, my friends, we already voted for. It is in the authorization bill for fiscal year 1996 and beyond.

This amendment that my friend will offer will say, apply that formula, 25 percent, to the fiscal year 1994 and the fiscal year 1995 money. And if we do that, what we will be doing is saving several hundred million dollars.

At this point, all we have is a promise to negotiate a reduction in the assessment rate some time in the future. We know the phrase "manana," sometime tomorrow.

My friend's amendment will say, if we have to appropriate or even think of appropriating over a billion dollars in this bill, let us get the reduction now and let us put it into law. That is what this bill is. This is the law of the United States, and we are the Nation's stewards as lawmakers.

Let us vote to keep this payment at the rate of 25 percent and save the American taxpayer some dollars.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the chairman in a colloquy on the subject of the Auto Parts Advisory Committee under the Commerce Department's supervision.

Mr. Chairman, the ongoing United States-Japan Framework Talks have reached a critical stage, and yet APAC has not met at all this year. I would urge Secretary Brown in the strongest possible terms to expedite the reformation APAC by reappointing APAC members of good standing and to set the first meeting of APAC for the earliest possible date.

The U.S. auto parts manufacturing sector is a diverse, \$100 billion industry, with 4,000 firms directly employing over 700,000 U.S. workers. The Auto Parts Advisory Committee is a valuable forum in which this industry may be heard.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I understand the concerns of the gentleman from Ohio. It is my understand-

ing that the Fair Trade in Auto Parts Act, which was recently extended for 5 years, reauthorized the Auto Parts Advisory Committee. I also understand that the Department of Commerce has solicited congressional input on the appropriate membership of the advisory committee, and that the Department is in the process of appointing new members of the committee.

I join my colleague from Ohio in urging the Commerce Department to set the first meeting of the Auto Parts Advisory Committee at the earliest possible date. I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this matter to the subcommittee's attention.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a very hard-working member of the subcommittee.

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

I rise in support of the fiscal year 1995 Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary bill.

Mr. Chairman, all this talk that we have heard here about the installation of the newest member of the appropriations cardinal, I expect to see a red hat floating over his desk over there. But I join with my colleagues in commending him for the outstanding job that he has done, for his leadership, for his genuine efforts to accommodate Members' concerns.

He has assumed the chairmanship of this subcommittee midway through the process, a difficult circumstance, and he has proven to be a quick study. He has mastered the details of the bill in short order. In the process, we have established some new priorities that I think this House can enthusiastically support. We have produced a responsible bill that recommends a total of \$26 million in discretionary budget authority. This is \$1.2 million below the administration's budget and is within the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation.

Certainly this bill is not perfect—a statement that could be made about most legislation we consider in this House. But, on balance, this is a good bill, one that responds to the widely expressed priorities of this body, particularly in the area of law enforcement, which I will focus my remarks on.

The bill makes a clear statement that we are serious about curbing illegal immigration. It does so by increasing fiscal year 1994 levels for INS by \$301.2 million.

Funding of \$54.5 million is provided for the hiring of 700 new Border Patrol agents and 110 support personnel. \$117 million is provided for improvements in technology in automation, communication systems, and information to enhance border enforcement. The additional support personnel and the technology improvements will enable the agency to redirect 250 other support personnel to line functions.

Put all these numbers together and you have 950 additional agents on our southern borders to help make them safer and more secure. The 950 new agents, according to INS bottom-up reviews, will enable the INS to implement the highly successful "El Paso" model with high-intensity, line of sight, operations.

At my request, the subcommittee has also included report language expressing concern about shifting illegal immigration patterns resulting from the reprogramming of agents in the current fiscal year. That reprogramming assigned 300 new agents to the San Diego sector and 50 to El Paso, but none in between. The result was predictable. The gentleman from California, [Mr. HUNTER] alluded to this.

Since that time, dramatic increases in alien apprehensions have occurred each month in Arizona. This March, for example, alien apprehensions were 77 percent higher than in March 1993. I will be watching closely to see that the INS assigns the new Border Patrol agents and makes adjustments with previously assigned agents to close this glaring gap on the border.

But the INS and this bill reflects concerns that go beyond simply preventing illegal entry into the United States. The INS also has a vital role in the processing of legal entry into our country. With the passage of NAFTA, it is important to improve efficiency for the legal transport of goods and people between the two countries. Unfortunately, long and financially damaging delays in processing have become the norm at many ports of entry from Mexico.

The bill moves in the right direction by including funds to expedite processing for regular land border crossings. Still more needs to be done to reduce the routine delays in border crossing—delays that ironically encourage illegal crossing. I will continue to work with the subcommittee and INS to resolve these problems.

The bill also recognizes that costs associated with illegal immigration are a Federal responsibility. For the first time we have stepped up to the plate and included funds for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program. This fund reimburses States for the cost of incarcerating illegal aliens. It's high time we acknowledged that every illegal alien in our communities is the fault of the Federal Government—not local government. And its time we contributed to these skyrocketing and budget-breaking costs that local communities and States endure on a regular basis.

A total of \$804.3 million is provided in the bill for an expanded Byrne program. These monies will be allocated to States for discretionary use on any of three Federal programs: State criminal alien assistance, Byrne formula grants; and State criminal records updates.

The Byrne formula grants have been of critical importance in all States with highly organized drug trafficking networks, such as Arizona.

The multijurisdictional task forces formed with funds from these grants have provided invaluable assistance in the war on crime. Under the expanded Byrne program, each State will receive a substantial increase in funding.

Finally, this bill goes a long way to restore funds that were cut in last year's bill from key law enforcement agencies. The FBI is funded at a level \$47.2 million above the administration's request and \$120 million above the fiscal year 1994 level. The additional funds will halt the proposed FTE cuts and allow the agency to hire 160 new agents and 234 support personnel over the fiscal year 1994 level.

Similarly, the Drug Enforcement Agency [DEA] is \$22 million above the administration's request and \$21.8 million above fiscal year 1994 levels. This will permit the hiring of 132 new agents above last year's level. The Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force is funded at \$13.3 million above the request and \$869,000 above fiscal year 1994.

We cannot fight the war on crime without resources. This bill puts us back on track in the battle to make our communities safer. It sends a message that this subcommittee is serious about combating crime. Supporting this bill will send the same message from the entire House.

□ 1750

Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Subcommittee in a colloquy regarding this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I know I can speak for the bipartisan membership of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in thanking the gentleman for the inclusion of funds for title XI in this bill. I understand how difficult it is to find funding this year. I assure the gentleman this provision will support the construction of many ships in U.S. shipyards and will create U.S. jobs.

I would also like to address the issue of an appropriation from last year, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time remains unobligated. In fiscal year 1994, the Maritime Administration requested the authority to spend \$118 million for the acquisition of foreign-built ships to expand the size of the Ready Reserve Force. Marad has failed to spend that money for that purpose.

I believe that the \$118 million can now be put to better use by providing initial funding for maritime reform.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. LIPINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Illinois, and I would like to briefly expand on those comments.

Last year, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries opposed further funding for the acquisition of foreign-built vessels. The gentleman's predecessor also opposed the purchase of these foreign-built vessels by Marad without notification to the Appropriations Committee. It is my understanding that these funds remain unobligated.

Last year, the House passed H.R. 2151, the Maritime Security and Competitiveness Act of 1993. This bill would preserve a merchant marine fleet and will set up a program to help U.S. shipyards to convert to commercial work.

This year in our funding bill, H.R. 4003, our committee has established a program to raise \$1.7 billion over 10 years by increasing tonnage fees for all vessels entering the United States from foreign ports. This bill is scheduled to be reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means on July 15. However, to fully fund this program, we had hoped that the unobligated funds for the RRF would be available as start-up money for maritime reform.

With \$118 million, we can build 15 new U.S.-built vessels. If the money remains in the RRF fund, it will be used to purchase five used foreign-built ships.

Mr. LIPINSKI. On behalf of myself and the gentleman from Virginia, is it the Member's intent to keep these funds available until H.R. 4003, the Maritime Administration and Promotional Reform Act of 1993, reaches the House floor later this session.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] for bringing this important matter to our attention. I recognize the importance of the maritime reform legislation and its potential for creating American jobs. I also share the gentlemen's concerns about the purchase of foreign-made ships for the Ready Reserve Force.

I assure both of the gentlemen that I will continue to work with them as this bill, the Commerce-Justice appropriations bill, and the authorization bill, H.R. 4003, continues to move through the Congress.

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

Mr. Chairman, like the chairman of the subcommittee, I will be glad to work with the gentleman to work

through the process to try to relieve the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], a very hard-working member of our subcommittee.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with my colleagues in thanking the chairman of the subcommittee for the fine job he has done. It has been a tough bill. He has been fair in leading it through the committee and I appreciate that fact.

Mr. Chairman, there are many good things in the bill, many things I can support. There is one item that I hope we will address a little later in the bill. That will be the rules promulgated by the EEOC last October. They would virtually prohibit any religious activity in the workplace. When I am talking about activity, I am talking about members discussing among themselves, crosses, Bibles, any artifacts in the place.

Mr. Chairman, I met yesterday with the NASCAR drivers who asked to come and talk about this bill. Let us put things in perspective. Most people out in my district know that the Government would mess up a one-car funeral, and yet we have asked them to produce rules in a sensitive area such as religion in the workplace, and try to tell us how to micromanage our lives in this particular area.

The NASCAR drivers are saying, "We race on Saturday. We have a minister that comes in. We are about to get in a 4 by 4 piece of metal, it is about 140 degrees inside, and go somewhere between 100 and 200 miles an hour around the track many, many times. We would like to have a chaplain or a minister give a bit of time there for a service."

NASCAR approves it, certainly the race drivers want it, and yet the Government would say with these regulations, "You cannot do that." Who are we to tell that person who is participating in that sport and the hundreds of thousands of fans that are watching that sport that the Government knows best, the Government knows what should be done. They are making this illegal for that transaction to take place, for that race car driver to have that comfort, and we spread it on.

Mr. Chairman, I have a marine who wrote to me and said, "Listen, if this passes, I am not sure that chaplains will be able to talk to the troops, because that is their work place. We are not sure we will be able to keep the Marine motto, because it is 'Always Faithful to God and Country' and the word 'God' would have to be removed."

We see as we unravel this ball of twine, we get in people's minds and in their business where the Government should not be. Mr. Chairman, I hope we will have a chance to correct that.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4603, the Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995. I would like to commend Chairman MOLLOHAN for bringing this legislation forward.

Mr. Chairman, because of its history of supporting the competitiveness of U.S. industry, the President has assigned the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce as the lead agency for civilian industrial technology development. I believe this is a wise and appropriate choice.

As a component of the Technology Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology's [NIST] explicit mission has always been to work with industry to develop and apply technology, measurements, and standards to promote U.S. economic growth. More than any other Government agency, NIST has the outlook and expertise necessary to help make U.S. industry, including small business, world-class competitors. NIST's core research and development programs make possible American high technology products manufactured with world-class precision.

Increased funding for NIST's industrial technology services, including the advanced technology program, will provide the necessary support for innovative industrial research projects. This model cost-sharing Government program has already proven its potential. Also, expansion of the Manufacturing Extension Centers can help more small manufacturers become more competitive through access to advanced equipment and processes they could not afford on their own.

Although the proposed funding levels for the programs of the Technology Administration are below the administration's request and the Science Committee's authorization contained in H.R. 820, the National Competitiveness Act, I realize that fiscal restraints have made an especially strong impact on the appropriations process this year. While I am sure that the larger sum would have been invested wisely, I accept the Appropriation Committee's budget allocation of cuts from the President's budget. However, I would strongly oppose any attempt to make any further cuts in these vital technology programs.

Mr. Chairman, I believe an investment in the Department of Commerce's technology programs is an investment in long-term economic growth, market expansion, new products, new businesses, and new jobs, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, and I offer my deep gratitude to the chairman and the ranking member for their very careful attention to California issues.

Mr. Chairman, in his first year as chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and ranking member HAL ROGERS have done an excellent job addressing several items in this bill that are especially important to the people of California and to my constituents. I know the subcommittee had a difficult job working under very tight budget constraints and conflicting priorities. For that reason, I appreciate their willingness to address these important matters.

First, I would like to thank Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. ROGERS for including language regarding the San Clemente checkpoint, which is in my district. INS has been studying and planning expansion of the checkpoint since the Carter administration. Meanwhile, the checkpoint is only operating part of a day, creating traffic congestion, and causing dangerous, high-speed chases with the border patrol 60 miles from the Mexican border.

I appreciate that the committee included language to force decisive action on the checkpoint. If the INS does not intend to immediately upgrade the checkpoint so that it operates 24 hours a day, then the checkpoint should be closed and its resources and agents moved to the California border.

The committee also included funding in this bill to put 950 more border patrol agents on the border. Between 2 to 3 million illegal aliens come into the United States every year. Over 2,000 illegal immigrants come across the 14-mile stretch between San Diego and Mexico every single day. Overwhelmed by these massive numbers, the border patrol simply does not have the resources and agents to enforce the border. I am very pleased that the committee recognized the urgency of this situation. Illegal immigration is a problem that affects everyone and it needs national attention.

I am also pleased that the committee included funds to reimburse the city of San Diego for the costs of treating sewage from Tijuana. San Diego spends \$3 million a year treating raw sewage from Mexico. Despite an agreement between the United States and San Diego, the Federal Government has been reluctant to reimburse the city for these costs forcing San Diegans to pick up the tab. I am pleased that for the second year in a row, the committee has found funds to reimburse San Diego.

I appreciate the tremendous effort by the chairman and Mr. ROGERS on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1800

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I want to also congratulate the chairman and ranking member, in tight budget times, particularly for their emphasis on the National Institute of Standards and Technology and recognizing how important they are in U.S. competitiveness.

Mr. Chairman, the committee, especially the chairman and the ranking member, should be applauded for their efforts and hard work in developing this bill. In our current budget climate, the appropriations subcommittees have had an extremely difficult job to do, and I believe they have done it with fairness and deliberation.

This appropriation includes funding for one of the outstanding technical agencies of the Federal Government which is located in my district—the National Institute of Standards and Technology. As you know, NIST is the only Federal laboratory explicitly charged with helping U.S. industry, and is one of our Government's most important instruments in support of U.S. international competitiveness.

I am grateful for the special consideration given to NIST by Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. ROGERS in the subcommittee, and I appreciate that they both hold it in the same high regard as I do.

This bill provides a total of \$842 million for NIST for fiscal year 1995. While this amount is a reduction of \$92 million from the budget request, it is an increase of \$322 million above the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1994. This seems to be a substantial funding increase in a tight budget year, but let us put this funding level in context.

At this level, NIST appropriations would be approximately 1 percent of the Federal research and development budget. This compares, in recent years, to 55 percent for the Department of Defense and over 8.5 percent for the Department of Energy. I believe these increases are a modest step in the much needed reallocation of the Federal R&D budget between civilian and defense technologies.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is, perhaps, no other place in the Federal Government, than NIST, where for so little money you can accomplish so much to stimulate good, long-term economic growth.

NIST's missions and approach is to work with industry right from the start. Priorities are focused by industry, and industry shares in the cost and conduct of the work. In this way, the yield is direct investments and benefits for our Nation's businesses.

NIST's laboratories are a critical component in the U.S. game plan for succeeding in the critical industries of the 21st century. NIST technologies speed market acceptance of advanced technologies by giving buyers and sellers objective, technically sound methods to agree on product performance and characteristics. The NIST labs serve all sectors of U.S. industry through tightly focused research programs and services that address industry's needs for measurement and scientific technology. While I appreciate the committee's efforts to provide as much funding as possible for NIST's laboratories, I hope, as this bill moves to the Senate, that the budget for its core missions will not be overlooked. The bill provides \$279 million for NIST's laboratory programs, a reduction of \$37 million from the budget request.

The committee, unfortunately, was forced to cut the request for badly needed renovations and modernization of facilities for the NIST Gaithersburg, MD, and Boulder, CO, facilities. This funding is vital for NIST's future. In the 25 years since NIST's Gaithersburg laboratories

were completed, scientific laboratory facilities have changed dramatically.

The deterioration of NIST facilities has already made it impossible for NIST to provide some United States manufacturers with services on a par with our Japanese and European competitors. The deterioration of these facilities is continuing at an alarming rate. We simply cannot afford to let NIST drift into second-rate status.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend my appreciation again to the chairman and the ranking member for their efforts in providing funding for NIST in this very difficult budget environment. While we all share in efforts to cut Federal spending and reduce the Federal deficit, I believe we need to nurture and build on NIST's nearly unique-in-Government expertise in working with civilian industrial firms to bolster our international competitiveness.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, despite my opposition to the rule, I do rise in support of the bill. If, as Mr. ROGERS said, take away peacekeeping and we have a fine bill.

But, I am concerned about the President's new peacekeeping policy. For example, the United Nations has increased its peacekeeping staff by 99 percent in the last 9 months. You can be sure the United Nations did not reduce staff in other parts of its operation to cover that increase. This administration now provides intelligence information to the United Nations on a regular basis, the only nation that provides such information acknowledged to come from its intelligence service. Most alarming of all, U.N. Ambassador Albright does not feel that U.S. personnel are at any special risk in peacekeeping operations.

Frankly, there are other serious questions about the President's new peacekeeping policy. Despite the President's allegedly tough new criteria, which are actually no different than the criteria announced at the President's speech before the United Nations last fall, the United States has not voted against a single peacekeeping mission.

Second, despite these new criteria, allegations have arisen that the United States vote swapped peacekeeping votes in the Security Council with the French last fall. Although we have requested the U.S.-U.N. cables which might clarify this situation, so far the administration, citing executive privilege, has refused to supply Congress with those cables.

Finally, it appears that Colin Powell's language to protect U.S. soldiers serving in the field in U.N. operations was removed at the request of Ambassador Albright after U.N. Secretary General Boutros Ghali objected. Again, attempts to clarify this situation have been stonewalled.

So again I commend the subcommittee for their hard work, but I hope the subcommittee will continue to closely monitor proposed peacekeeping missions.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4603. On behalf of child abuse victims, I want to congratulate the chairman, the ranking member and the staffs for their fine inclusion of these issues in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4603, the Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995.

First, I would like to commend Chairman ALAN MOLLOHAN for his leadership in moving through the Appropriations Committee and bringing to the House floor this important bill that will provide the necessary capital to address the problems of child abuse, to fund needed anticrime initiatives, to assist small and emerging businesses, and to support efforts in developing and implementing strategies to enable U.S. industry to fully realize the commercial benefits of new technology.

Additionally, I would like to commend the staff for their professionalism and attention to details.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has been charged with an almost insurmountable task: funding significant programs on the one hand and acting in accordance with budgetary limitations requirements on the other hand. Chairman MOLLOHAN and the other members of the subcommittee have performed admirably.

I am very supportive of one particular section of this bill. The bill includes funding for the Children's Advocacy Center Program that was authorized in the 1992 amendments to the Victims of Child Abuse Act. The administration included the Children's Advocacy Center Program in its 1995 budget request.

Why is this program important? It is important for several reasons. Based on 1990 revised data, States received and referred for investigation approximately 1.7 million cases of child abuse out of an estimated report of 2.6 million children who are the alleged subjects of child abuse and neglect. In 1991, the number of cases referred for investigation rose to nearly 1.8 million reports. The number reported in 1991 represents an increase of approximately 2.4 percent from 1990 data.

In 1992, approximately 918,263 substantiated and indicated victims of child maltreatment cases were reported from 49 States. Of these, approximately 14 percent (129,982) were sexually abused. The Carnegie Corporation of New York reported, in its publication *Starting Points*, that one in three victims of physical abuse is a baby less than 1 year old and that in 1990, more 1-year-olds were maltreated than in any previous year for which data are available. Additionally, *Starting Points* reported "almost 90 percent of children who died of abuse and neglect in 1990 were under the age of 5; and 53 percent were less than 1 year old." Further, based upon its annual

telephone survey of States, the National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse reported that at least three children a day die from physical abuse inflicted by a parent or caretaker.

The Children's Advocacy Center Program addresses this problem. The mission of this program is to provide technical assistance, training and networking opportunities to help communities establish and maintain child abuse prevention, intervention, prosecution and investigation programs which provide quality services for helping victims of child abuse, particularly child sexual abuse. The purpose of Children's Advocacy Centers is to help abused children by providing a safe and comfortable environment designed to meet their needs for support and protection.

The cornerstone of this program is the use of multidisciplinary teams. A multidisciplinary team consists of representatives from law enforcement, child protective services, prosecution, victim advocates, medicine and mental health who meet on a regular basis to review cases and issue joint recommendations in the best interest of each child. The multidisciplinary team concept that is incorporated in the Children's Advocacy Program works to coordinate the activity of all involved public and private agencies to intervene in the lives of abused children in a meaningful way and to ensure that the judicial system does not revictimize them through repeated interviews and examinations.

Preventing the inadvertent revictimization of an abused child by the judicial and social service systems in their efforts to protect the child is a major goal of this program. As a consequence of a coordinated response, child victims are spared the pain and confusion of multiple interviews by prosecutors, protective service workers and social workers.

This program may not be a panacea for the increasing problem of child abuse. However, it is more than a first step toward addressing the problem. This program has served and will continue to serve as a model for communities that are working to focus attention and efforts on the best interests of the child and non-offending family members.

Funding this program speaks volumes to the House of Representatives' commitment to support a necessary profamily and anticrime initiative. Without question, this program improves the lives of communities, children and nonoffending family members. Communities from Hawaii to Vermont and cities as diverse as Miami and Salt Lake City have established multidisciplinary teams and mobilized professionals to respond to child sexual abuse. In every instance, when the model outlined in the 1992 amendments to the Victims of Child Abuse Act has been incorporated into a community's unique program, that community has seen positive results.

Mr. Chairman, the Children's Advocacy Center Program is an effective response to child abuse. I commend Chairman MOLLOHAN for his leadership efforts. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, in my district in the neighborhoods of Macomb

and Oakland Counties, Byrne program funds in this bill support multi-jurisdictional anticrime task forces to crack down on drug dealers, auto theft rings, juvenile gangs and other criminals who operate across municipal borders.

In April, the Attorney General, Janet Reno, met with local chiefs in my district. She heard firsthand why it is so important to continue full funding for these local anticrime task forces. A number of us battled together to restore full funding. With the help and leadership of the chairman of the subcommittee, this has now been accomplished. Today the House has a chance to make sure that all of our local police departments have the resources they need to put criminals behind bars. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in strong support for this hard-won Byrne grant funding.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Taylor-Wolf amendment.

The guidelines promulgated by the EEOC are irresponsible; they redefine harassment beyond the established legal standard and will place employers in the awkward position of having to disallow religious expression in order to avoid litigious suits by disgruntled employees.

Religious expression has adequate protection under the Constitution and through numerous Supreme Court cases which have sided with the individual's right to the free expression of religion. Individuals have been protected from discrimination long before such guidelines were proposed. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act has provided that protection without these overzealous guidelines for the last 30 years—the Constitution has provided protection for the last 205.

The EEOC's efforts to regulate religious expression, however well intended, must be stopped. The Taylor-Wolf amendment is an important move in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, they are the gangs who fight over turf, and who fuel their drug supplies by killing each other and those whose property they steal so they can buy more drugs. They broke into Nancy Slaughter's Washington, DC apartment looking for money; they took cd's, clothing, \$25 worth of food stamps and a child's piggy bank. Nancy pleaded with the gunmen to spare her children, Denise, 16, Nancy 10, and Dennis, Jr, 3: "if you believe in God, please don't shoot my children, shoot me instead." A gunman replied, "I don't believe in God" before he put a gun to the head of Denise

Slaughter, age 16, and fired once, killing her. Imagine, a child murdered in front of her mother by a gunman looking for money for drugs.

And in Chicago, there is one murder every 10 hours, much of which is caused by the battle for control of lucrative drug territories.

Drugs are killing our children, both by kids using drugs and dying on them, or gangs shooting our kids to get more drugs.

The majority of violent crimes are caused by the influx of drugs into the country. We must stop the drugs. The Justice Department bill that we are debating today provides programs to stop these drugs, and the money for these programs was added back by both parties after the administration proposed to reduce or cut them:

First, I am especially pleased that the Edward Byrne Memorial Block Grant Program received \$804.3 million—a 125 percent increase over last year. This program funds statewide antidrug abuse strategies that support Federal drug priorities, including multijurisdictional task forces such as the SLANT program in northern Illinois.

Second, another tremendous boost is increased funding to hire more Drug Enforcement Agency, FBI and Immigration and Naturalization agents. We can't even wage a skirmish against drugs without these agencies help in stopping illicit drugs from entering this country. I'm pleased that the Appropriations Committee rejected the Clinton administration's request and added money to hire 75 additional DEA agents; 160 new special FBI agents; and 700 INS border patrol agents.

Mr. Chairman, I plead with the Members of this body to pass the Justice bill. The memory of Denise Slaughter commands it. The children of America deserve it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, before I yield the final 30 seconds, I would like to urge support of this bill with the exception of the peacekeeping provision which we will have a provision on later in our consideration of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield our final 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank them for the additional Border Patrol with the Hunter-Moore-Cunningham amendment. Why? There are 16,000 illegal aliens just in California prisons. There are 84,000 aliens nationwide. That costs with the health care, the law enforcement, and education, \$37 billion a year for the U.S. Government. Take that times five and we have got about \$185 billion. We are looking at a way to pay for health care in this country. Take just half of it, \$93 billion, if we used the lowest absolute figure we could. We could go a long

way to pay for health care, education, and the other things.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield our final 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], a distinguished new Member of Congress.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, as a former Michigan State police trooper, I support funding in the bill for the Byrne grant program. These funds will provide for 22 specific prevention programs.

Mr. Chairman, 153 Members of the House signed a letter to the Committee on Appropriations asking that the Byrne grants be funded at no less than the 1994 level.

I appreciate the chairman and his committee approval of that request. I urge my colleagues to support the Byrne grant formula and our Nation's 881 multijurisdictional drug task forces and vote against any amendments which would reduce the Byrne grant formula level.

Mr. Chairman, in summation we have a Federal program that works. We give the Federal money to the States, then the States decide which of the Byrne grant programs to fund. The Federal Government is not putting unfunded Federal mandates, we are not imposing mandates on States. Rather we are giving the States a discretionary pool of funds so they can best decide how to fight crime at the State and local level.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to congratulate members of the committee for their recommendation of \$70 million for the Information Infrastructure Grant Program under the National Telecommunications and Information Administration [NTIA] for demonstration of telecommunications technology applications. A firm investment in the technologies of the future is essential in keeping the United States economically competitive in the world market.

Nowhere is the need for advanced technologies greater than in today's educational system. Most school systems are just beginning to develop and implement new comprehensive educational technology policies. As local and State policies are incorporating the use of technologies such as fiber optic transmission and video and audio CD-ROM disks, teacher training in the use of these technologies is more than ever a primary focus. Boards of education are providing incentives to teachers and administrators to be more creative in their use of educational technologies to prepare their school systems to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

I believe that the creative use of technology in the classroom by students, teachers, businesses and the community will bring limitless opportunities and benefits to our educational system. I commend the committee for including report language, which I requested, which urges NTIA to provide a grant, if warranted, to the Modern Educational Technology Center, Inc. [METEC] located in Rockville, MD to coordinate school-business-community partnerships for the development of new and innovative educational technologies and training methods. I believe that METEC is uniquely po-

sitioned to be a model for the rest of the Nation of parent-school-business partnerships that promote our educational goals and foster economic development.

Again, I reiterate my support for the Appropriations Committee's recommendation of \$70 million for the National Information Infrastructure Grant Program. The additional dollars that the committee has wisely appropriated will enable more communities to have access to the necessary Federal resources so that everyone will have the opportunity to become travelers on the national information infrastructure highway. The dollars we invest today will enable the U.S. to better educate its citizens and remain economically strong.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, but I do wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to one area where we can—and should—achieve some savings.

Over 11 years ago, the Appropriations Committee included the following in its report:

The committee \* \* \* continues to be concerned about possible duplication or competition with private sector efforts \* \* \*. The committee directs ITA to continue to take steps to ensure that private sector efforts for expanding the export markets of U.S. industries are enhanced and that ITA does not duplicate or compete with the private sector in those areas where the private sector can and does offer quality opportunities to U.S. firms. The committee expects ITA to work closely with the private sector, particularly private sector event organizers, and other Government agencies including the Small Business Administration to eliminate duplication and competition with private sector firms in the solicitation of participants for overseas trade shows and in the provision of marketing and exhibit services at such shows.

Mr. Chairman, 11 years later, the Department of Commerce still refuses to allow the private sector to participate in the Paris Air Show through the certification program. A constituent of mine who has extensive experience in this field has, in fact, just recently been denied certification for the Paris Air Show. The result is not only a total lack of cooperation and coordination, but head-to-head competition that undermines the ability of both private firms and the Federal Government to effectively and efficiently serve the needs of U.S. aviation exporters.

Furthermore, I want my colleagues to know that the Commerce Department's aviation trade show activities have cost \$645,349 in the past 4 years when there are private firms who are ready and willing to bear the financial risk involved in many aspects of these air shows. Not only does running the pavilion incur direct expenses, but the Commerce Department actually charges other Federal agencies such as NASA and NOAA for display space adding to the total cost of these shows.

Mr. Chairman, the private sector is quite capable of running the U.S. pavilion at the Paris Air Show, as it does at other air shows around the world. Private sector involvement will not mean a reduction in quality of the pavilion; private companies will still need the Department's certification to perform this task and should still work closely with relevant U.S. Government agencies. Allowing private companies to compete to run the U.S. pavilion would save Federal funds without harming ef-

forts to help promote American exports. It is a step that is long overdue.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the rule. Yesterday, I testified to have a limitation amendment made in order prior to the preferential motion to rise.

My amendment to the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill would have allowed no funds to be made available to carry out the return to Mexico of any Mexican national who is a prisoner convicted of a felony in the United States without a final order of deportation.

Under a 1977 treaty between the United States and Mexico, Mexican nationals convicted of an felony in the United States may be returned to Mexico to complete their sentences if they request it. While this can alleviate some prison overcrowding, unfortunately most transfers are being done on a voluntary departure basis rather than on a formal order of deportation.

There are immigration consequences to this shortcut. Persons who voluntarily depart can keep illegally re-entering the United States without threat of serious penalties. Formal deportation, however, carries the threat of 15-year imprisonment for those who break the law and re-enter.

The re-entry penalty was enacted to be a strong deterrent to criminal aliens who have been deported from our country. There's no use in having a strong deterrent law on the books if we are going to circumvent it by allowing voluntary departure for criminal aliens who should be deported.

Since I cannot offer my amendment before the preferential motion to rise, I am supporting the attempt to defeat the preferential motion to rise by Representatives LIGHTFOOT and LIVINGSTON and urge other Members to do so as well.

If this motion is defeated then I intend to offer my limitation amendment to clarify what the Nation's priorities should be in the handling of these transfers of criminal aliens.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from West Virginia, the subcommittee chairman, for the fine job that he has done in developing this legislation which provides funding for a number of important ocean, coastal, fisheries, and maritime programs.

In support of a key element of the National Shipbuilding Initiative passed by Congress last year to help revitalize U.S. commercial shipbuilding, the bill provide \$25 million for the Title XI Loan Guarantee Program.

I want to thank the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, for working with me to include these funds. Although the amount is less than the request, I look forward to working with Chairman MOLLOHAN to improve upon this figure as the appropriations process continues.

Currently, U.S. shipyards are completely dependent on military ship construction, a rapidly declining market. Absent a revitalization of commercial shipbuilding, U.S. yards face the possibility of permanent closure, endangering our defense industrial base and our ability to meet future defense needs.

The President and Transportation Secretary Pena have proposed a five-step plan to assist U.S. shipyards in their transition from defense production to commercial construction. A vital

part of this plan is adequate funding for the title XI program which now has been expanded to allow U.S. shipbuilders to utilize these loan guarantees for the export market.

Regulations for the expanded program have recently been issued and generated intense interest. By the end of the month the Maritime Administration expects to have received loan guarantee applications for over 1.9 million dollars' worth of ship construction—ships that will be built in U.S. yards. This means jobs for American workers—good paying jobs—and increased revenues for State and local governments and the Federal Government.

Without additional appropriations for this program, MarAd will temporarily have to cease consideration of applications for loan guarantees for vessels to be built in the United States.

In addition to these important maritime provisions, the bill also provides vital funds for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] to begin rebuilding our decimated fisheries and to manage our threatened coastal resources. The bill provides desperately needed increases to improve the scientific basis for fisheries management, to build sustainable fisheries, to rebuild a healthy fishing industry, and to enhance seafood production through aquaculture. In addition, it provides support for the development and implementation of endangered species recovery plans and for the implementation of recent amendments to the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

The bill provides increases for marine sanctuaries, estuarine research reserves, and coastal zone management. As the population increases in our coastal regions, these investments will pay large dividends because they provide recreational opportunities, conserve increasingly threatened marine resources, and promote managed growth in the coastal zone.

This bill provides necessary funding for many national priorities and I urge its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4603

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend our subcommittee's new chairman for his outstanding work in producing a bill that addresses our Nation's law enforcement and economic development needs as well as numerous other responsibilities, under very tight budgetary constraints. I also want to recognize and thank Mr. ROGERS for his exemplary contribution as the subcommittee's ranking minority member. Chairman MOLLOHAN and Mr. ROGERS deserve the appreciation of this House, and this bill deserves its support.

It is a good bill. We had some difficult choices to make, but under our

chairman's direction, we made those choices well. The bill contains a total increase in spending of \$2.8 billion over fiscal year 1994—almost all of which is targeted to fund programs created under the crime bill which is now the subject of a conference committee. This increase notwithstanding, the bill is still \$1.2 billion less than the administration requested and contains a number of specific spending cuts and streamlining measures.

One good example is our broadcasts to Cuba, whose budgets have become increasingly difficult to justify in these tight fiscal times. I am pleased that the subcommittee took the bull by the horns—acting unanimously to end funding for TV Marti and significantly reduce expenditures for Radio Marti. This represents a roughly \$19 million victory for the American taxpayer.

The subcommittee based its decision to pull the plug on TV Marti and rein in spending at Radio Marti on the results of an independent panel report. The panel—created last year as a compromise between supporters and opponents of the program—was instructed to determine whether or not TV Marti is technically sound, cost-effective, and is consistently being received by such a significant Cuban audience as to warrant its continuation. In its March 31 report, the panel confirmed what experts have been telling us all along: the necessary operational conditions do not exist to make TV Marti work because of jamming by the Castro government.

In refusing to continue funding TV Marti, the subcommittee also specifically rejected spending any more money to make broadcasting enhancements to fix the failed program. The panel report proposed attempting to switch TV Marti's signal from a VHF to UHF frequencies. But this costly proposition was promptly and widely criticized by numerous technical experts—including the National Association of Broadcasters and MSTV, a national association of commercial and public television stations—as destined to fail.

Another place the subcommittee pursued ways of making the Government smarter and more discriminate in where and how it spends money is in our operations abroad. The report accompanying the bill contains a provision I authored directing the State Department to prepare a pilot program for co-locating support services for U.S. missions overseas. Such a joint administrative operation already exists in Vienna, where one main center serves the various missions headquartered there, including the United States missions to the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. I expect the benefits of replicating the Vienna model on

a regional level will be increased efficiency and reduced expense in future fiscal years.

Improving operations is also the key goal of critical investments the subcommittee was able to make in supporting a number of Commerce Department programs within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA], the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST], and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration [NTIA]. Many of these initiatives will help revitalize the American economy and improve the environment for generations to come. One such project is NOAA's Health of the Atmosphere initiative, which promises to provide scientific information invaluable to implementation of the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments.

I'm also pleased that we were able to restore funding for the Wind Profiler Demonstration Network—a network which NOAA has called an unqualified success. Given the crippling economic and human costs of unexpected severe weather phenomena, it strikes me as unwise to shut down a system that's providing vital and accurate forecasting information. Were this network to be dismantled, it could also jeopardize our ability to route aircraft more efficiently, improve the safety of NASA launches, and to maintain a competitive edge in profiler technology.

The subcommittee was also able to provide a significant funding increase for NIST's scientific and technical research program, which represents NIST's core research function. This, coupled with an increase in funding for the industrial technology services program, will allow NIST to fund more of the research necessary to improve American industries' global competitiveness.

Funding for NTIA is vital to support the administration's efforts to help develop an information superhighway. NTIA is the lead agency working to make the information superhighway a reality. The subcommittee's support for NTIA will also go a long way to making up for a decade of neglect of public telecommunication facilities.

The subcommittee also made critical investments in some basic programs that matter to every American every day. Answering the call for safer streets, we've even been able to increase funding for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and for organized crime drug enforcement task forces—this means more agents on neighborhood streets.

In particular, the subcommittee has significantly enhanced funding for the Edward Byrne Memorial Formula Grant Program. Byrne grants have proven a valuable resource for State law enforcement programs, such as drug and alcohol treatment and programs to divert youth away from

criminal activities. Under an expanded Byrne Program, which Chairman Mollohan worked with the authorizers to create, funding for States will more than double. For any State that's a big deal. For instance, Colorado received roughly \$5 million in Byrne grants in fiscal year 1994. Under the expanded Byrne Program, Colorado would receive over \$11 million next year. That's a positive step in our fight against crime.

I'm also pleased that we were able to restore funding—\$14.491 million—for the Regional Information Sharing System [RISS]. The information received by State law enforcement agencies from the various RISS databases is immensely useful in tracking criminal activities across State lines.

The bill also includes funding for the National Institute of Corrections [NIC], which is located in Longmont, CO. The NIC is the national center where State correction departments can turn to for information on how to make their operations more efficient and cost effective, and I'm glad we were able to provide the funding that they need to continue their excellent work.

I'd also like to say a little about funding for the Legal Services Corporation [LSC]. The \$415 million we propose is far less than LSC's \$500 million request—and far less than it needs. One of the basic principles of our system of justice is that every American is entitled to a fair hearing in a court of law, and we have an obligation to provide legal representation to those who can't afford it. The poor are entitled competent representation, and this is as important in civil cases as it is in criminal. The LSC is an essential part of the effort to provide this assistance. I support their efforts and hope that we will be able to provide more resources for this valuable program in the future.

Another issue that each year attracts a strong divergence of views is the rising bill for the U.S. share of membership in various international organizations, including the United Nations [U.N.] and its affiliates. Our contributions to U.N. operations—particularly U.N. peacekeeping activities—is an issue of considerable debate within the subcommittee and, for that matter, across the Nation. Beyond controversies over U.S. participation in and financing of U.N. activities, however, is the frightening fact that the demand for peacekeeping operations is growing rapidly. The subcommittee's report includes language I requested which takes note of the need to address this dilemma by addressing a root cause.

Noting that arms sales stimulate arms races, which in turn undermine international security and increase the danger of regional conflicts, the subcommittee's report urges the administration to complete its ongoing review of U.S. policy on conventional arms sales as soon as possible. Further, the

report language encourages the administration to consider initiating negotiations among all major arms supplier governments to agree on a code of conduct based on mutual restraint.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, the bill we present today deals realistically with the fiscal constraints every appropriations subcommittee was faced with in a way that provides the resources we need to continue important law enforcement and economic development programs. I urge its adoption. And, once again, I thank the chairman for his excellent work.

□ 1810

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND RELATED AGENCIES  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS  
JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, and the Missing Children's Assistance Act, as amended, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith, and with the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, as amended, \$94,100,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 1001 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as amended by Public Law 102-534 (106 Stat. 3524), of which \$750,000 of the funds provided under the Missing Children's Program shall be made available as a grant to a national voluntary organization representing Alzheimer patients and families to plan, design, and operate the "Safe Return" Program.

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, for State and Local Narcotics Control and Justice Assistance Improvements, notwithstanding the provisions of section 511 of said Act, \$68,500,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 1001 of title I of said Act, as amended by Public Law 102-534 (106 Stat. 3524), of which: (a) \$50,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of chapter A of subpart 2 of part E of title I of said Act, for discretionary grants under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs; (b) \$12,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of chapter B of subpart 2 of part E of title I of said Act, for Correctional Options Grants; (c) \$6,000,000 shall be available for implementation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Instant Background Check System; and (d) \$500,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of subtitle B of title I of the Anti Car Theft Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-519), notwithstanding the provisions of section 131(b)(2) of said Act, for grants to be used in combating motor vehicle theft: *Provided*, That of the funds made available in fiscal year 1995 under chapter A of subpart 2 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended: (a) \$2,000,000 shall be available for the activities of the District of Columbia Metropolitan

Area Drug Enforcement Task Force; and (b) not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available to make grants or enter contracts to carry out the Denial of Federal Benefits program under the Controlled Substances Act, as amended by the Crime Control Act of 1990 (21 U.S.C. 862): *Provided further*, That funds made available in fiscal year 1995 under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, may be obligated for programs to assist States in the litigation processing of death penalty Federal habeas corpus petitions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN: On page 3, strike everything after line 16 down to and including the word "theft" on line 20, and insert the following: the anti Car Theft Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-519), for grants to be used in combating motor vehicle theft, of which \$200,000 shall be available pursuant to subtitle B of title I of said Act, and of which \$300,000 shall be available pursuant to section 306 of title III of said Act.

Mr. MOLLOHAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, we have had a chance to look at the amendment. We find it in order and agree to it and have no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, for grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance, to be allocated and distributed in accordance with section 506(a) of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3756), notwithstanding the provisions of section 511 of said Act, \$804,280,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out the provisions of—

(1) subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, for grants to States under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs,

(2) section 501 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, as amended (8 U.S.C. 1365), to reimburse States for costs of incarcerating illegal aliens, and

(3) section 106(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1993, Public Law 103-159 (107 Stat. 1536) to upgrade State criminal history records.

JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, including

salaries and expenses in connection therewith to be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Justice Assistance, \$146,500,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 299 of part I of title II and section 506 of title V of said Act, as amended by Public Law 102-586, of which: (a) \$100,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by parts A, B, and C of title II of said Act; (b) \$7,500,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by sections 281 and 282 of part D of title II of said Act for prevention and treatment programs relating to juvenile gangs; (c) \$15,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by section 285 of part E of title II of said Act; (d) \$4,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by part G of title II of said Act for juvenile mentoring programs; and (e) \$20,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by title V of said Act for incentive grants for local delinquency prevention programs.

In addition, for grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as amended, \$11,250,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by sections 214B, 218, and 224 of said Act, of which: (a) \$500,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by section 213 of said Act for regional children's advocacy centers; (b) \$2,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by section 214 of said Act for local children's advocacy centers; (c) \$2,000,000 shall be available for technical assistance and training, as authorized by section 214A of said Act, of which \$1,500,000 is for a grant to the American Prosecutor Research Institute's National Center for Prosecution of Child Abuse, and of which \$500,000 is for a grant to the National Network of Child Advocacy Centers; (d) \$1,000,000 shall be available for training and technical assistance, as authorized by section 217(b)(1) of said Act for a grant to the National Court Appointed Special Advocates program; (e) \$5,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by section 217(b)(2) of said Act to initiate and expand local court appointed special advocate programs; and (f) \$750,000, notwithstanding section 224(b) of said Act, shall be available to develop and distribute model technical assistance and training programs to improve the handling of child abuse and neglect cases, as authorized by section 223(a) of said Act, for a grant to the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

#### COMMUNITY POLICING

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized in H.R. 3355, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, for the Cops on the Beat Program, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith to be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Justice Assistance, \$1,332,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS BENEFITS

For payments authorized by part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796), as amended, such sums as are necessary, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 6093 of public Law 100-690 (102 Stat. 4339-4340), and, in addition, \$2,072,000, to remain available until expended, for payments as authorized by section 1201(b) of said Act.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HAST-

INGS) having assumed the chair, Mr. BROWN of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4603) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and making supplemental appropriations for these departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3355, VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion to instruct conferees on the bill (H.R. 3355) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to allow grants to increase police presence, to expand and improve cooperative efforts between law enforcement agencies and members of the community to address crime and disorder problems, and otherwise to enhance public safety.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MCCOLLUM moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3355 be instructed not to agree to any provision similar to subtitle I, relating to the Local Partnership Act, of to any provision similar to it, of title X of the House amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Majority Member will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate that I will represent the opposition to this motion to instruct conferees.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

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

This motion to instruct conferees of the House on the crime bill that is going on is to not agree to the Local Partnership Act or to anything similar to it based on a need that I believe, and I think, many Members do not set priorities in spending in this crime legislation.

The chairman's mark I have seen is going to spend about \$30 billion of money. A good portion of that money is going to social or prevention programs, some of which are very good and noble, some of which I agree with.

The problem is that only a fraction of what needs to be spent of the total

amount of money there for dealing with prisons and dealing with the real law enforcement issues is put off in the mark as we now see it.

In the House version that passed out to go to conference, over \$10 billion was set aside for so-called prevention programs. Again, some of that is fine. If we had all the money in the world to spend, we would certainly do a lot of these programs. But I think every Member of this body understands that that is not the case.

When the conferees come down to it, they are going to have to make some very tough decisions. I am a conferee, a number of Members on both sides of the aisle are conferees to a conference that has not yet met. It seems to me we need to understand that and set those priorities at least to give some guidance to setting those priorities to our Members of the conference now.

This motion to instruct is an effort to do that. The \$2 billion Local Partnership Act is a grant program for the cities and local communities that does purportedly a number of things. The money might be for education to prevent crime, for substance abuse treatment to prevent crime, for coordination of crime prevention programs funded under this title with other existing Federal program to meet the overall needs of communities that benefit from funds received under this section, of job programs to prevent crime, a pretty broad possibility here.

The bottom line of it is that it just does not make sense to go forward with a \$2 billion program that is basically a jobs program, which is what I see this is being, when we have so many higher priorities, when we have such a high rate of crime and violent crime in this country and a better place to send the money.

There was a very interesting editorial in the June 13 issue of the Wall Street Journal written by Stephen Moore, and I will just quote a little bit from that particular op-ed piece Mr. Moore published.

He said:

Don't look now, but after 18 months in office, Bill Clinton is finally going to get his long-awaited fiscal stimulus bill through Congress. This year the White House and big-city mayors have used an ingenious marketing strategy. They call it a crime bill. In fact, it is a well-kept secret on Capitol Hill that this year's crime bill is the largest urban cash program to come through Congress since Richard Nixon invented revenue sharing.

□ 1820

Mr. Moore goes on in part of his op-ed piece to point out the \$2 billion program that I would wish us to instruct conferees to delete. He says:

Some \$2 billion would be allocated to the Local Partnership Act of LPA which is revenue sharing. The flow of Federal funds to State programs resurrected under another name. In truth it is worse than revenue sharing, because part of the formula for distributing the cash is based on local tax burdens.

The more oppressive the local tax regime the more money the city get from Uncle Sam. This rewards cities for high taxation. For the cities this is a big gift. For the urban lobby, the LPA promises to become Uncle Sam's gift that never stops giving.

And that is exactly what I see that is wrong with this.

The Local Partnership Act with its focus on a community's affluence, unemployment level and rate of taxation should be considered as part of an economic stimulus package, not part of a crime bill. The limited resources of the violent crime reduction trust fund, which will be set up in this crime bill whenever a conference report is issued must not be used for this program. It just does not make sense. The Local Partnership Act contains a quota provision for disadvantaged business enterprises. Not less than 10 percent obligated by the local government must go to small business concerns controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals and women, and historically black colleges and universities and other colleges and universities with a student body that is 20 percent Hispanic Americans or native Americans. Instead of setting quotas in social spending programs, the crime conferees should be concerned with the figures that really matter in the fight against violent crime. According to the FBI Uniform Crime Reports, in 1991, 22,540 people were murdered, 11,175 of those victims were black. In 1992, 21,505 people were murdered, 10,660 of these victims were black. Blacks account for 12.4 percent of the population but were 49.6 percent of the murder victims in 1991 and 1992. These are alarming statistics. Given these facts and the limited resources to fight violent crime in this country, would not those who are apt to be victims of crime want to have the limited resources spent to put these violent criminals behind bars instead of spending it on a new social program which we are talking about in this particular case?

As the gentleman, Mr. Moore, said in his column, especially that is so since the structure of this program is designed strictly for urban areas and skewed to those with the highest tax rates. It just does not make sense. Of all the prevention programs in this particular legislation, this 50-page one in the House version that we sent over to conference, is the one that clearly had the most problems. If we want to take some of the money out of the prevention area, and I certainly think we should, we cannot begin to fund it all, we should instruct the conferees that this is where we want them to look, this is where we want them to take it out and not somewhere else. Again, that is the purpose of this.

The overall chairman's mark that we have seen and again, we do not know what is going to come out of this conference. It was supposed to meet today, I do not know when it is going to meet.

Every passing day is a problem for us. It is one violent crime every 22 seconds, one murder every 22 minutes, one forcible rape every 5 minutes, one aggravated assault every 28 seconds. And yet we cannot seem to get together as conferees and have a conference. It has been postponed a number of times.

But when we do get together on this, the chairman's mark indicates that even if we took this \$2 billion out there would be nearly \$6 billion left in prevention monies in the bill in addition to monies for prisons and so forth. We simply cannot afford to go this route. Beside this is a bad, bad particular program that this motion to instruct would strike or proposes to strike.

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

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

Mr. Speaker and Members, we are here today on yet another motion to instruct conferees by my friend [Mr. McCOLLUM], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who only yesterday offered yet another motion to instruct the House conferees.

Yesterday he insisted that the House revoke the provision that we spend \$13.5 billion for a particular part of the crime bill. Today he comes forward again with yet another motion to instruct conferees, which is setting a new precedent for the use of this parliamentary tool in the House.

Now he says that \$2 billion is an excessive amount in the bill and that it is his intention that in the name of fiscal responsibility that we strike these \$2 billion. Why?

Well, because it is part of the prevention package in the crime bill which is one of the reasons that I supported the crime bill, because we have a balanced crime bill for the first time which deals not only with punishing criminals but creating additional police officers that would be federally funded. For the first time it is looking at the way that we might head off those who might be moving into criminal activities.

So I am here to urge that this motion be rejected because the Local Partnership Act reaffirms our confidence in local government. We are saying that local governments at the city level and at the county level know at least as much about preventing crime as Washington does. So this provision passed by the House, supported by the Committee on the Judiciary would give our most needy urban and rural governments flexible Federal funds so that they could decide after a public hearing how they best prevent crime.

Those who attack the Local Partnership Act at this stage of the game are really attacking their own local governments, they are really saying, we don't think you know how to prevent crime. We don't think the mayors and the police chiefs and the county law officers understand what this particular

problem is. That is precisely why in a very specific prevention package we have the Local Partnership Act. We have determined by formula the way that this money should be going and it employs local self-help by giving more funds to local governments that have imposed high taxes upon themselves. I understand that is under criticism now by my friend. Who else would we want to reward more than those communities who have put a maximum tax upon themselves already. And that is now factored into the formula to determine how this money should be spread. It is a good idea. It is a very important concept.

I would urge that we very quickly, as quickly as possible, vote to keep this program in the crime package and not to give the conferees any further instructions.

As one of the conferees, I have been instructed to death on this bill. We had hearings, we had debate on the floor, we are now being confronted with a series of revisitations to the crime bill, one motion at a time. We have had a couple already. I do not know how many more are coming on.

I too urge that we get the conference under way. I would like at this point to bring to my colleagues' attention a letter received from attorney General Janet Reno, and I would like to quote one paragraph.

The Local Partnership Act is one of the important prevention programs included in the House Crime Bill that make the bill a balanced and common sense approach to fighting crime. The program provides resources to local governments, which are most familiar with local needs, to take necessary steps to fight crime. It is supported by local officials from across the country.

It is important for Congress to include prevention programs like the Local Partnership Act in the Crime Bill.

Sincerely,

JANET RENO.

The text of the complete letter is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, DC, June 23, 1994.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS,  
Chairman, House Government Operations Committee,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONYERS: I am writing to you and Chairman Brooks because I understand that a motion may be offered today which would seek to instruct the House of Representatives' conferees on the Crime Bill to reject the Local Partnership Act—which was included in the Crime Bill that passed the House in April. I urge the House to reject the Motion to Instruct.

The Administration supports passage of the Local Partnership Act as part of a comprehensive Crime Bill which should also include, among other key provisions, a funding mechanism to ensure that the bill's promises will be achieved; assistance to state and local communities to help them put an additional 100,000 police officers on our nation's streets; a ban on assault weapons; assistance to states to build necessary correctional facilities to ensure that violent offenders are incarcerated; tough and certain punishment

for repeat and violent offenders, including the President's "three strikes" proposal and the death penalty for the most heinous offenses; and innovative crime prevention programs that give our young people something to say yes to.

The Local Partnership Act is one of the important prevention programs included in the House Crime Bill that make the bill a balanced and commonsense approach to fighting crime. The program provides resources to local governments, which are most familiar with local needs, to take necessary steps to fight crime. It is supported by local officials from across the country.

It is important for Congress to include prevention programs like the Local Partnership Act in the Crime Bill. I again urge defeat of the Motion to Instruct and prompt passage of the Crime Bill.

Sincerely,

JANET RENO.

□ 1830

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] for yielding. I think he is aware of some concerns that have been expressed from my office to his with regard to the formula used in the Local Partnership Act, and I simply wanted to ask if, if I am correct in that regard, that he is familiar with those concerns, if there is any possibility that we might see a modification of this conference.

Specifically what I am asking about is the way the formula works. The city of Detroit gets about \$29 million, and my city of exactly the same size gets about \$2.3 million. There are a lot of complicated reasons in the formula for that, but the bottom line is it is very difficult for me to defend that kind of a formula when I go back home, and I think perhaps the gentleman or the other authors of the provisions—

Mr. CONYERS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleague that I do not want to go city by city through the House of Representatives this evening, but could we not engage in how the formula is constructed, if we could meet, and how it might be modified, if it can be modified?

Mr. BRYANT. Certainly.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I join in the motion to instruct conferees to remove the Local Partnership Act from the crime bill because the Local Partnership Act, whether one chooses to support it or not support it, is not and has never been a crime prevention program. The Local Partnership Act, as included in

the House passed version of the crime bill, was originally drafted as H.R. 581 by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS]. However that bill, as introduced on January 26, 1993, states 19 findings at the beginning of the bill as to why the Congress should pass the Local Partnership Act. Not one of the 19 findings mentions crime or crime prevention. The 19 findings deal solely with economic stimulation and the disparities of income, income readjustment.

Just to give an example:

Finding No. 2 in the original Local Partnership Act states effective local governments in the services they provide contribute to national economic growth. National economic growth, of course, is a laudable goal for the Congress of the United States, but not in a crime bill.

To give another example:

Finding No. 2 states the disparities and per capita income between cities and their suburbs accelerated in the 1980's, and it goes on in finding No. 12 to state there is a growing discrepancy in the ability of the Nation's local governments to provide these public services for their residents. Hence this weighted formula on how to distribute the Federal funds.

The point is that this bill was drafted for the purpose of economic stimulation and for the purpose of readjusting income to cities. Both of these are worthwhile topics. Both of these ideas deserve their forum, but not in a crime bill, in a crime prevention section, or any other section. To simply change one part of the bill and to say the programs going to be funded are for the purpose of preventing crime does not change the basic idea that the whole purpose of this bill is just to spend money as fast as possible. In fact, finding No. 4 states local governments would spend quickly and productively any additional Federal funds they receive under this act. In other words the whole idea is just to spend money just to jump money into the economy.

Mr. Speaker, a true crime prevention program would not be this broad, would not be this shotgun. It would take the time to analyze in much more specificity what kinds of programs are we taking about, how would they actually prevent crime. This is a substitution of an economic stimulus package that has not passed the House under the name, under the guise and pretense of crime prevention.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY].

Mr. CANADY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the motion to instruct con-

ferrees. The portion of the House crime bill to which this motion is addressed represents a classic example of how to throw money at a problem. The so-called Local Partnership Act does indeed throw money in the general direction of the crime problem, but unfortunately it gives the taxpayers no assurance that the money spent will produce the desired results.

The provisions of the legislation in fact add up to an elaborate revenue sharing program, Mr. Speaker, which may in the absolute discretion of local governments be used to fund a jobs program of some description. Although the funds may be used for other broadly defined purposes related to crime prevention, any recipient government may spend every single penny of the grant funds on a "job program to prevent crime." What kind of jobs programs will that be? How will such jobs programs operate? Who will receive the jobs? There are no answers to those questions in the language of the legislation. The bill simply says "a job program to prevent crime;" that is it.

Mr. Speaker, past experience shows that such an undefined jobs program will, in at least some places, in fact become a patronage program for political cronies. Now a patronage program for political cronies may be what some people want out of this bill, but it is not what the American people want, and it is certainly not something that will do anything to solve the urgent problem of crime in America.

The Members of this House need to pay close attention to this issue. I would suggest that the Members look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, April 25, on page H2662, and they will see 13 lines there which describe the way these funds, the \$2 billion, will be used. There are 13 lines to describe how we will use \$2 billion.

That is ridiculous. This is a program that is out of control. The Members of the House need to focus on this. The legislative language in question here is a perfect formula for abuse and a waste of taxpayers' dollars. We need to put money into programs that have a proven record of success, not throw away money into political patronage programs.

Mr. Speaker, the House should adopt the motion to instruct and send a clear message to the conferees that we do not want to waste the public's money on this ill-conceived program.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear what our colleagues will be voting for if they vote for this motion in this amendment. They will be voting to cut funds that will go to local DARE programs that have kept kids off the street and away from drugs. They will be voting to end Boys and Girls Clubs

that give children in high-crime and high-risk areas an alternative to a life of crime. If our colleagues vote for this motion, they will be voting to take resources out of the hands of local crime control officials in their own district, both Republicans and Democrats who have asked for help in attacking crime at the root by preventing it before it happens. Our colleagues would be voting to take resources from local communities who would use these funds to bring metal detectors into schools to make them safer so kids can learn, to keep schools open later to give children an alternative to the streets and to counsel children to keep them away from drugs and violence.

By voting for this motion today, you will be sending a clear message that Washington knows better than local communities how to fight crime, that Washington bureaucracy knows what works better than local crime officials and that there is nothing Washington can do to help needy rural and urban communities to fight crime. By voting for this motion you will be voting against local police officers, sheriffs, citizens, all of whom support the balanced prevention package that we passed in the crime bill and all of whom want us to vote against this motion.

Mr. Speaker, let us be clear what this amendment is all about. This amendment is nothing but another delaying tactic by those who do not want a crime bill. They just want crime as a political issue.

□ 1840

Now, it is easy for all of us to say we want to help police officers and have our pictures taken with the policemen on the beat. But this motion offers us one simple challenge. What are we going to do to help those police officers fight crime before it happens?

This motion is one more effort to posture on crime. They could not kill the crime bill through the front door, so now they are trying to steal it away through the back door.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I checked, the American people wanted us to do more to prevent crime, not less. They want us to do more to keep kids off the streets, not less.

The crime bill we passed recently is a tough, smart package, that contains an effective balance between punishment and prevention. It focuses on punishment, including billions for the construction of new prisons. It focuses on policing, including resources to put between 50,000 and 100,000 policemen on the beat. And it focuses on prevention, by giving local communities the assistance they need to attack crime before it happens.

It is a smart, effective, balanced bill that passed overwhelmingly, with bipartisan support. And if you vote for this motion, you break that bond of

those 3 trinity points in this bill, that are so important to get this bill through.

Now, if that has not convinced you, you ought to recognize that the money in your State for your local officials to make the local decisions to deal with crime is substantial.

To the gentlemen from Florida who have spoken this evening, they will lose \$90 million, for every city, going to every major city and local community in Florida that needs to fight crime, Miami, Tampa, Clearwater, you name it. Gone, if this passes.

So I ask my colleagues this evening, as late as it may be, to help us get a good crime package by rejecting this amendment. I do not know for the life of me why anybody on this side of the aisle would vote for it. I do not know why you would want to go back to your district and say, "I cut out crime for the DARE Program, I cut out the crime package to help kids with drug abuse program, and I am proud of it. Because I think Washington knows better than my local communities."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the McCollum amendment, and let us get on with the business of our country.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, what the whip just said on the other side of the aisle, I take some issue with. I respect him a great deal. But for one thing, he misrepresents what this motion does. This motion eliminates one program only, the Local Partnership Act. It has nothing to do with the DARE Program or the Byrne grants or the Community Policing Program. It leaves completely intact all the money for the new police we are going to have, and the prosecutors, and rural drug training. In fact, it leaves alone the Model Intensive Acts, the Ounce of Prevention School Programs, the violence against women money, the Yes grants, the prison treatment programs, the gang prevention, even midnight basketball and midnight sports, community youth activity money, youth gang prevention services. Boys and Girls Clubs moneys are not touched by this, police partnership moneys are not, safe low-income housing moneys are not touched, nor are the Olympic Youth Program and youth violence prevention.

All of these are separate titles in the bill. We do not touch at all the moneys for them. All we want to get out and all I am trying to get out of here tonight is a \$2 billion boondoggle in here. A lot of this, local governments would love to have us give anything we give out. They do not know what is in here. But you say give them grant money, they are going to take it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct conferees.

The American people have demanded real action by this body on crime, and they should not be given big spending social programs as an alternative.

The LPA provides \$2 billion of scarce crime fighting resources as a "no questions asked" grant to cities.

Mr. Speaker, the American people rightly recognize that the criminals who prey on the innocent in our society must be held accountable for their actions, not rewarded.

Unfortunately, the crime bill does not reflect this priority.

Nearly \$2 billion of badly needed crime fighting funds are instead dedicated to the Local Partnership Act. Instead of taking the needed steps to stop violent crime in its tracks, the omnibus crime bill reestablishes revenue sharing.

Mr. Speaker, the \$2 billion wasted on the LPA could be used to build 80 new State prisons or to place nearly 40,000 new police officers in our cities streets. Either of these two approaches would have a real impact on crime.

Let me remind this body of the nature of the problem in this country. Every year in this country, nearly 5 million Americans are victims of violent crime. A murder is committed every 21 minutes, a rape, every 5 minutes. Someone's car is stolen every 19 seconds.

The American people expect us to take serious actions to solve this problem. This revenue sharing proposal is not even a close solution. The criminals who prey on the innocent should expect one clear message from this body.

Their violent behavior will not be tolerated.

If they continue to commit these heinous acts they should expect to get caught.

When they get sentenced, they will serve real time.

And if they are repeat offenders they will be sentenced for life.

Handing out cash to fund various State crime prevention programs will not lock up recidivists. Insuring that failed root causes solutions continue won't put more police on the beat.

The LPA is a step in the wrong direction. It is a step in favor of big spending social programs, but it's not even a little step in real crime prevention.

To my colleagues on this side of the aisle, be aware—the American people are watching. They are looking to see who is working to make their streets safer and who is not. We will not be able to get away with saying we tried. We will not be able to say we meant well. We know what works—we know what can make a difference. And we also know what doesn't. If we do not use the opportunity to hold criminals accountable I can assure that the American people will hold us accountable. The American people do not want or need smoke and mirrors, and I say

let us not be a party to ineffective pretensions.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt the sincerity of Members of this side of the aisle, my side of the aisle, who want to eliminate the Local Partnership Act, but I have to tell you I am somewhat surprised with the logic. I am surprised with the logic because for years I have been part of a party that says allow local governments to decide how to deal with crime.

I want the city of Bridgeport in my community in my district to decide how to deal with crime. I want them to have the opportunity to spend their money as they see fit.

Why would we on our side of the aisle decide it is all right to have Federal mandates? Federal mandates are all right, when it is our kind of mandate, but when it is someone else's kind of mandate, we do not want it.

Why on our side of the aisle do we oppose allowing local communities to decide how to spend money when they want to deal with crime?

I do not understand it. What I do understand about this formula is it is targeted. Now, maybe we did not care as much about Los Angeles or New York City in past years because we did not represent them. But we have Republicans who have to run these cities, who need this kind of money to deal with crime.

I think prisons are important, and I vote to spend money for prisons. But I also think it is important to allow local communities to decide how they want to spend money to fight crime.

Bridgeport, CT needs the resources to deal with it. And what I particularly find important about this amendment is, they have tried to focus the money where it is needed, where crime exists.

In the past we have provided local revenue sharing money, and we have given to communities in my district that do not need it, like the Greenwiches of this world, like the Fairfield. They are in my district and I would love my communities to have more money, but they do not need it like Bridgeport needs it.

This formula focuses on urban areas that need the money to fight crime. For the life of me, I hope Republicans and Democrats can agree that once in a while it is nice not to have a large bureaucracy that is going to take some of the money, that this money can become quickly focused to communities so they can spend the monies on programs that meet their needs to fight crime.

I hear about local jobs. As far as I am concerned, the best antidote to fighting crime is a job. The best antidote in my city of Bridgeport this summer to

fight crime is to help young people have a job. That will make a world of difference.

I have a lot of substance abuse in my district. I would like it to go to my local communities so they can use it to fight the crime of drugs.

□ 1850

I would like it to be done without a lot of administrative costs. It seems to me that this is a program that Republicans have been fighting for 4 years. Let local communities decide how to spend money to fight crime.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], our distinguished Republican whip.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask for less time, but the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] asked many good questions on top of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] fine statements that I wanted to take a couple minutes to talk about where we are at.

Let me say, first of all, it is not a problem to mandate, if we pay for it. The Federal Government, when it is paying for something, has every right to say, since we are raising the money from the taxpayers, we have a legitimate right to say what we think ought to be done with the taxpayers' money. I do not blame local officials for calling our offices and saying, please, send me money that I do not have to raise taxes on. Please give me a gift so I can spend it locally. But we have no obligation, with a several hundred billion dollar deficit, to create a brand new port barrel patronage program.

First of all, I would just say that we do not have an obligation to go back to a program which failed, a program in which the Federal Government shipped checks to various cities.

Let me say, I am a little surprised at my good friend from Connecticut, who is usually at the cutting edge of these kind of changes, because if we go and talk to many of the best mayors of the country on both sides of the aisle, if we talk to Mayor Norquist of Milwaukee, who is a Democrat, he will tell us the problem is not money. The problem in the big cities is unionized bureaucracies, work rules that are crazy, regulations that are nuts, red tape that is destructive, waste and inefficiencies and a political system that is not responsive to small business and that kills jobs.

If we look at Guiliani, the Republican mayor of New York, he just cut spending for the first time in two decades. New York City will spend less money under Guiliani, and he worked out a bipartisan deal with the Democrats.

If we talk to King up in Rochester, NY, the county executive, he is cutting spending by applying quality to having

better government. If we talk to Ed Rendell in Philadelphia, he is reforming the system by taking on the employee unions.

If we go out and talk to Dick Riordan and say to him, how did you get the expressway built after the earthquake, years ahead of schedule, he will tell us bluntly, he broke the law. And he counted on no L.A. jury indicting and convicting him, because he was getting them to work on time despite the fact that it was illegal under local law to do what he did, because he applied common sense. And he hired a contractor, and he worked him 7 days a week because it matters.

I would say to my good friend from Connecticut, this not a mandate. This is a question of whether the taxpayers of America, with the \$200 billion deficit, should send \$2 billion to local governments measured by how much they have already raised taxes to hire a larger bureaucracy to have a bigger political machine.

If Members look at number D on page 133, a job program to prevent crime. I know what that is going to translate into. In Washington, DC, a sick city, a city whose government is a travesty, a city which wastes money and ruins the lives of people, it is going to mean more political jobs for more city councilmen to get reelected.

So when Members come to me and say, do you want to fight crime, I will give, as we voted to yesterday, \$13 billion to build prisons to lock up violent criminals, to save the women and children of this country from the kind of predatory behavior we have on our streets. That I am willing to go to my citizens and raise money for. But if they say to me, in the name of fighting crime, will I send a \$2 billion check to cities, many of which are rife with corruption, many of which have destructive bureaucracies, to let the local politicians build a bigger machine with more patronage, my answer is "no".

For this amount of money, we can build 80 prisons to house 40,000 people. I think that is a legitimate use of Federal money. I am prepared to lock up the people who beat their wives. I am prepared to lock up the people who kill others. I am prepared to lock up the drug dealer. I am prepared to pass Federal money for the local purpose of helping every local government in this country. But I am not prepared to give a blank check to the local political machines who hire more politicians. And I do not think we have an obligation to take our taxpayers' money and to take the money of our children by deficit to send it to those local machines.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I am astounded to find out how much corruption exists in the cities of the gentleman who has just spoken in the well. The League of Cities is comprised of mayors of small- and middle-sized

cities whose records of trying to bring back a productive economy, a revitalized economy, to create jobs, to bring law and order, those are the kinds of mayors in cities that have voted in their conference to support this provision. And the National Conference of Mayors, Democratic, Republican, and nonpartisan mayors, have all agreed that this modest program would be something that they could use in a very important and constructive way.

I do not think it is appropriate for us to categorize with one paint brush the corruption that exists in our local cities.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my good friend from Michigan, when he looks at New York Times coverage of corruption in New York City, when he looks at Washington Post coverage of corruption here, he can see some of my references.

I want to make one other point. I expect every mayor in America, if asked the question, would you like the Federal Government to send you a check you can spend, to say, with enormous, warm enthusiasm, "Yes, send me the money."

I do not expect them to somehow say, "Oh, please, don't burden me with these dollars."

So I appreciate that they all want it. I am just not sure that has any reference to public policy. It has the normal reference to any politician eager to get resources from somebody else.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it should be clear to us that we cannot have it both ways. We are providing 100,000 policemen that are federally funded. I did not hear anybody, when we voted for that provision, saying that we did not want to furnish more policemen at the local level because there were Federal funds involved. We did it because it was the right thing to do.

If Members do not like the prevention package, they will not like the Local Partnership Act. But sending the money into the local communities for police is no less logical than sending in prevention programs to be determined by our local leaders.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused by the remarks of my colleague from Georgia with respect to corruption in our big cities. After he just gave an impassioned speech on the floor, in the well of the House, talking about the mayor of New York, what a great job he did, talking about the mayor of Philadelphia, talking about the mayor of Los Angeles, which way is it? Are they corrupt, or are our big cities corrupt, or are they not corrupt?

He gets up in the well, my friend from Georgia, and argues with all his might and passion for a couple of billion dollars for Russia. And when it comes to taking care of crime in our cities right here at home, drug abuse, school programs, and as the gentleman from Connecticut correctly points out, giving people a job, that is not good enough.

I urge all of my colleagues, before they vote on this, particularly on this side of the aisle, to look at what they will be denying our own local officials in our own communities, in our own cities with respect to giving them the ability to fight crime independently.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to confuse the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. My position is very simple. The best mayors in America are working to reform their cities. They are working to shrink the size of their bureaucracies. They are trying to change their regulations and apply common sense.

Many of them will tell Members, and I quoted Mayor Norquist, who said, quite publicly, Democrat from Wisconsin, mayor of Milwaukee, "The money is not the problem."

My point is that money given by us where we raise it from our taxpayers should be for a purpose that our voters understand we have responsibility for and that I think that if we have to choose between paying for a directed purpose such as building prisons, which, as I said, this \$2 billion would build 80 prisons for 40,000 criminals, I can defend that.

□ 1900

What I cannot defend is sending a blank check to local politicians across the country for them to decide how to spend it, Mr. Speaker. I think that is a fairly clear distinction.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor because I think it is important for me to deal with one of the comments made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] as it relates to the city of Los Angeles and Mayor Reardon. Our city is in deep trouble and falling apart. We almost had a police revolt. The mayor came to that city promising that he was going to expand the police department, that he was going to do something about crime, that he was going to put more police officers on the street. Believe me, he has worked at it. He cannot get it done because we do not have the dollars to do it.

Mr. Speaker, if we want officers on the street and in the schools, we need some support. This local partnership program will help us to fight crime.

Please do not try to describe what the mayor is doing in Los Angeles if the gentleman does not know.

Let me tell the Members, as someone who comes from that city, the mayor of that city, Mayor Reardon, needs help. He needs to be able to support his officers, expand the police force, and fight crime.

For all of the Members who have talked about wanting to fight crime, being against what is going on in the cities, they need to support this. Members will not be able to explain to their constituents why they did not support spending some of their money to do what the American people want them to do, and that is fight crime.

We need the money in Los Angeles. I would ask the Members not to instruct the conference committee to delete the local partnership program from the crime bill. It would be a big mistake.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] very much. However, she does misspeak with regard to what this motion does.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is very clear, this motion to instruct does not affect the money for police that is in this bill, or in any conference report at all. There is \$3.45 billion for community policing in the House bill. My motion to instruct conferees has nothing to do with that. There is \$300 million for the police corps. My motion has nothing to do with that. There is \$1.15 billion for Federal law enforcement. My motion to instruct has nothing to do with that.

Mr. Speaker, there is \$33 million for rural law enforcement, and my motion to instruct has nothing to do with that. There is another \$100 million for community prosecutors, so there is roughly \$5.25 billion for community policing and police force in this bill which this does not have anything whatsoever to do with.

In fact, what we are dealing with here is a special entitlement program overlaid on a lot of other things that are in the bill, and some of these things maybe we should not have in the bill, either. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] pointed out a moment ago, it is an entitlement program that we are dealing with here, a new one, a new grant program to the cities. We are in the process of supposedly doing an economic stimulus package with this, and maybe that is something we should do, but not as a part of the crime bill, not in addition to the monies that are already there for all these other things that I read off earlier.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman, does he support the DARE Program?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I do support the DARE Program.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, how does the gentleman think he gets a DARE Program unless he has the resources to do it? We can put the money in the budget for the police force, but unless they have money and resources they cannot.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the DARE Program is not affected by my motion to instruct. The DARE Program comes under the Byrne grant and other programs in this bill not under this particular \$2 billion.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely not correct.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the bottom line of this is, what we do is very narrow. We take out a \$2 billion new revenue sharing program that is based on the cities and communities that have the highest tax rates that are in this country today, to go to that particular group by some formula that is really skewed. It is a crazy program, I think. We are not doing the job of what fighting crime is all about.

Mr. Speaker, our side of the aisle for the most part wants to do what is right. We are not interested in hurting the gentewomen's city any more than we are anyone else. We want to help. However, to add an entitlement program of \$2 billion is not the answer. DARE Programs are fine, more police on the streets are fine, more money for prisons is fine. We happen to be interested in helping the Boy Scouts, too, but this is a program for \$2 billion more in entitlements to the cities that goes basically for a jobs program. That is what it is, pure and simple, and it should not be a part of the crime bill.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would indicate that on this side of the aisle I think we have many Members who want to participate in the debate, but the fact of the matter is we are prepared to close the debate now and go to a vote at the earliest practicable moment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, A, I would like to inquire how much time each side has remaining, and, B, I would ask if I do not have the right to close. I have no other speakers but myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has 9½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has the right to close debate.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, actually I think the distinguished gentleman wanted to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE].

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the position of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE].

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I have sat in my office and watched this debate with great interest. As a person who is not just a Congressperson but a person who pastors a church in an urban community, it always appalls me that our arguments are reduced to trying to separate programs based on what we consider to be preventive and programs that we consider to be necessary, as it relates to trying to solve the problem of crime.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before the Members as a person who started an organization out of my church with the cooperation of two people, me and a secretary. Today I have 790 employees. We have demonstrated that in a community where resources are made available, we can actually create the kind of opportunities that remove people from the necessity of having to become a part of the increasing prison population.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the day will surely come when we understand the goods and services available in many of the communities in this land are not available in these urban communities. I would hope the day would come when we realize that if we make an investment early on in the lives of these young people, we will prevent the necessity for building jails.

Imagine what we are saying tonight. Approximately \$100,000 to build a unit, \$30,000 or \$40,000 to keep a prisoner, and here we are arguing about a small portion of the resources in this bill. If we took those monies and invested them in young people, we would soon discover that we would not have to create the jobs program on the other side of this ledger.

Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing the arguments, "This \$2.5 would be creation of a jobs program." What is more job creative than building jails, creating job opportunities for people, for persons from communities who do not live there to go and be guarded by persons who live in communities outside of

urban America? What is more job creative than creating opportunities for vendor contracts, for laundry, for meat, for bread, and for other food.

Mr. Speaker, this argument is messed up. I would hope we would all stand opposed to this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I just need to respond to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH]. When I came to the Congress, let me tell the Members what my background was: Seven years on a city council with 2 years of serving as a Mayor, and then 10 years in the State Senate.

□ 1910

I have to tell Members that time that I served kept me closer to the people than I am in this body, because I served there every day, I was at home every day, and at that very same time, I taught school, 10, 12 hours of public hearings that we would bash out things in our community that were good for our community, that we needed to hear from our community.

These 13 lines about this particular issue, I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY], the reason there is only 13 lines is because of the fact that we want our local communities to make these decisions through public hearings. They know what is best for their communities and what is going to fight that crime and what kind of programs they need to do.

Mr. Speaker, I just ask for those Members who have never served in local government, please do not bash your local government because they really do a very fine job.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself whatever time I may consume in closing.

To close, I would just like to say a couple of words. I would like to bring us back to the focus of what this motion to instruct is so everybody understands it. It is a motion to instruct crime bill conferees that we would like to strike out the \$2 billion Local Partnership Act and like them to do that when they meet with the Senate in a few days to work out the deal on the crime bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking now about \$2 billion that is in addition to a lot of other things that are in this bill. I have heard a lot of debate tonight about how we need to have things besides prisons and besides some of the money for the police and so on. But a lot of confusion exists out here as to what all is involved. The fact of the matter is that even if we were to not have this \$2 billion program, there

would be at least \$5 billion or \$6 billion in programs for grants to local communities to do all kinds of things involving the youth.

Mr. Speaker, I do not happen to agree with all of those programs that we put into the legislation to begin with, but we would. Actually in the House version which is all we are instructing on, when we take the \$2 billion out, we have still got \$7 billion left. The \$5 or \$6 billion is what the Senate talks about.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote just a couple of thoughts on this. There would still remain in this bill besides the community policing monies and all the money for the police a Model Intensive Prevention Program, \$1.5 billion; an Ounce of Prevention Council Program for \$1.275 billion; a Youth Employment Program of about half a billion; Violence Against Women for about \$700 million; safe schools, about \$300 million; youth violence prevention grants of \$200 million; \$81 million for other youth prevention programs; Midnight Sports of \$50 million; community youth academics, \$50 million; police applicant recruitment, \$30 million; Police Partnerships with Children, \$10 million; Safety in Low-Income Housing, \$10 million; \$7 million for older Americans; Drug Treatment in Prisons, \$450 million; \$1.4 billion in drug courts and treatment; and \$600 million in alternatives to incarceration that are not touched.

Mr. Speaker, I do not happen to agree with all those, but even after we take this \$2 billion new entitlement out that some of those folks on the other side want tonight and have argued so much for, all of that is left in here. The bottom line is we cannot afford to do all this with \$200 billion plus in deficits every year. We need to start somewhere in setting priorities. That is what we are about here to do.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, what this motion to instruct conferees does is simply delete \$2 billion in a new entitlement program that is not needed. We need to spend the money instead on the prisons and on the law enforcement, on the other things in here. We do not need to do it on this. We do not need to have a new economic stimulus program for jobs in a crime bill of \$2 billion in nature.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the McCollum motion to instruct conferees.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this motion to instruct conferees on the crime bill.

The Local Partnership Act, will provide direct formula grant funding to local governments for education and substance abuse programs to prevent crime. We can stand in this Chamber and talk about how to prevent crime on our streets, but it is the local governments that know best how to prevent crime in their own communities.

Congress is committed to enacting a balanced anticrime bill, which contains three es-

sential ingredients, resources for police, punishment, and prevention. Striking the Local Partnership Act from this legislation will severely diminish the resources available for prevention programs. I urge my colleagues to defeat the motion to instruct the conferees to strike the Local Partnership Act from the Crime bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). 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 Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 247, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—143

- |              |              |               |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Allard       | Gilchrist    | Meyers        |
| Archer       | Gillmor      | Mica          |
| Armey        | Gingrich     | Michel        |
| Bachus (AL)  | Goodlatte    | Miller (FL)   |
| Baker (CA)   | Goodling     | Moorhead      |
| Baker (LA)   | Goss         | Myers         |
| Ballenger    | Grams        | Nussle        |
| Barrett (NE) | Greenwood    | Oxley         |
| Bartlett     | Gunderson    | Packard       |
| Barton       | Hancock      | Paxon         |
| Bateman      | Hansen       | Petri         |
| Bereuter     | Hastert      | Porter        |
| Bilirakis    | Hefley       | Portman       |
| Bliley       | Herger       | Pryce (OH)    |
| Boehlt       | Hobson       | Quillen       |
| Boehner      | Hoekstra     | Ravenel       |
| Bonilla      | Huffington   | Regula        |
| Bunning      | Hunter       | Roberts       |
| Burton       | Hutchinson   | Rogers        |
| Callahan     | Inglis       | Rohrabacher   |
| Calvert      | Inhofe       | Roth          |
| Camp         | Istook       | Roukema       |
| Canady       | Johnson (GA) | Royce         |
| Castle       | Johnson, Sam | Santorum      |
| Coble        | Kasich       | Saxton        |
| Collins (GA) | Kim          | Schiff        |
| Combest      | King         | Sensenbrenner |
| Cox          | Kingston     | Shaw          |
| Crane        | Knollenberg  | Shuster       |
| Crapo        | Kolbe        | Skeen         |
| Cunningham   | Kyl          | Smith (MI)    |
| Deal         | Lazio        | Smith (TX)    |
| DeLay        | Levy         | Solomon       |
| Dickey       | Lewis (CA)   | Spence        |
| Doolittle    | Lewis (FL)   | Stearns       |
| Dornan       | Lewis (KY)   | Stump         |
| Dreier       | Lightfoot    | Talent        |
| Duncan       | Linder       | Taylor (NC)   |
| Dunn         | Livingston   | Thomas (CA)   |
| Ehlers       | Lucas        | Thomas (WY)   |
| Emerson      | Manzullo     | Vucanovich    |
| Everett      | McCandless   | Walker        |
| Ewing        | McCollum     | Walsh         |
| Fawell       | McCreery     | Weldon        |
| Fields (TX)  | McDade       | Wolf          |
| Fowler       | McHugh       | Young (FL)    |
| Gallo        | McKeon       | Zimmer        |
| Gekas        | McMillan     |               |

NOES—247

- |              |              |              |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Abercrombie  | Bacchus (FL) | Barrett (WI) |
| Ackerman     | Baessler     | Becerra      |
| Andrews (ME) | Barca        | Bellenson    |
| Andrews (NJ) | Barcia       | Bevill       |
| Andrews (TX) | Barlow       | Bilbray      |

- |              |               |               |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Bishop       | Hefner        | Pelosi        |
| Blackwell    | Hilliard      | Peterson (FL) |
| Blute        | Hinchey       | Peterson (MN) |
| Bonior       | Hoagland      | Pickett       |
| Borski       | Hochbrueckner | Pickle        |
| Boucher      | Hoke          | Pombo         |
| Brewster     | Holden        | Pomeroy       |
| Brooks       | Horn          | Poshard       |
| Browder      | Houghton      | Price (NC)    |
| Brown (CA)   | Hoyer         | Rahall        |
| Brown (FL)   | Hutto         | Ramstad       |
| Brown (OH)   | Inselee       | Rangel        |
| Bryant       | Jacobs        | Reed          |
| Buyer        | Jefferson     | Reynolds      |
| Byrne        | Johnson (CT)  | Richardson    |
| Cantwell     | Johnson (SD)  | Roemer        |
| Cardin       | Johnson, E.B. | Ros-Lehtinen  |
| Carr         | Johnston      | Rose          |
| Chapman      | Kaptur        | Rostenkowski  |
| Clayton      | Kennedy       | Rowland       |
| Clement      | Kennelly      | Roybal-Allard |
| Clinger      | Kildee        | Rush          |
| Clyburn      | Klecza        | Sabo          |
| Coleman      | Klein         | Sanders       |
| Collins (IL) | Klink         | Sangmeister   |
| Condit       | Klug          | Sarpalius     |
| Conyers      | Kopetski      | Sawyer        |
| Cooper       | Kreidler      | Schaefer      |
| Coppersmith  | Lambert       | Schenk        |
| Costello     | Lancaster     | Schroeder     |
| Coyne        | Lantos        | Scott         |
| Cramer       | LaRocco       | Serrano       |
| Danner       | Laughlin      | Sharp         |
| Darden       | Leach         | Shays         |
| De la Garza  | Lehman        | Shepherd      |
| DeFazio      | Levin         | Sisisky       |
| DeLauro      | Lewis (GA)    | Skaggs        |
| Dellums      | Lipinski      | Skilton       |
| Derrick      | Long          | Slaughter     |
| Deutsch      | Lowe          | Smith (IA)    |
| Diaz-Balart  | Mann          | Smith (NJ)    |
| Dicks        | Manton        | Smith (OR)    |
| Dingell      | Margolis-     | Snowe         |
| Dixon        | Mezvinsky     | Spratt        |
| Dooley       | Markey        | Stark         |
| Durbin       | Matsui        | Stenholm      |
| Edwards (CA) | Mazzoli       | Stokes        |
| Edwards (TX) | McCloskey     | Strickland    |
| English      | McDermott     | Stupak        |
| Eshoo        | McHale        | Swett         |
| Evans        | McInnis       | Swift         |
| Farr         | McKinney      | Synar         |
| Fazio        | McNulty       | Tanner        |
| Fields (LA)  | Meehan        | Tauzin        |
| Filner       | Meek          | Taylor (MS)   |
| Fingerhut    | Menendez      | Tejeda        |
| Flake        | Mfume         | Thompson      |
| Foglietta    | Miller (CA)   | Thornton      |
| Ford (TN)    | Mineta        | Thurman       |
| Franks (NJ)  | Minge         | Torkildsen    |
| Frost        | Mink          | Torres        |
| Furse        | Moakley       | Trafcant      |
| Gedjenson    | Molinar       | Tucker        |
| Gephardt     | Mollohan      | Unsoeld       |
| Geren        | Montgomery    | Upton         |
| Gibbons      | Moran         | Valentine     |
| Gilman       | Morella       | Velazquez     |
| Glickman     | Neal (MA)     | Visclosky     |
| Gonzalez     | Neal (NC)     | Waters        |
| Gordon       | Obey          | Watt          |
| Grandy       | Olver         | Waxman        |
| Green        | Ortiz         | Williams      |
| Gutierrez    | Orton         | Wise          |
| Hall (OH)    | Pallone       | Woolsey       |
| Hall (TX)    | Parker        | Wyden         |
| Hamburg      | Pastor        | Wynn          |
| Hamilton     | Payne (NJ)    | Young (AK)    |
| Hastings     | Payne (VA)    |               |

NOT VOTING—44

- |              |           |            |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Applegate    | Kanjorski | Schumer    |
| Bentley      | LaFalce   | Slatery    |
| Berman       | Lloyd     | Studds     |
| Clay         | Machtley  | Sundquist  |
| Collins (MI) | Maloney   | Torricelli |
| Engel        | Martinez  | Towns      |
| Fish         | McCurdy   | Vento      |
| Ford (MI)    | Murphy    | Volkmer    |
| Frank (MA)   | Murtha    | Washington |
| Franks (CT)  | Nadler    | Wheat      |
| Gallegly     | Oberstar  | Whitten    |
| Harman       | Owens     | Wilson     |
| Hayes        | Penny     | Yates      |
| Hughes       | Quinn     | Zeliff     |
| Hyde         | Ridge     |            |

□ 1933

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ELDERS: THE MOST EXPLOSIVE MINE IN THE FIELD

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago in USA Today Richard Benedetto wrote an article that was titled by his paper "Doubts Dog President's Every Move, Every Poll." In the body of the article, which I will submit for the RECORD, Mr. Benedetto says:

Clinton has little wiggle room as he maneuvers the political mine field toward reelection. Among the dangers Clinton faces over the next two-years:

The fate of his health care reform legislation; the results of the 1994 elections—

Holy Haley Barbour, I will read that one again:

the results of the 1994 elections; the long-term performance of the economy; the outcome of the sexual harassment lawsuit filed by Paula Jones, a former Arkansas State worker; hearings on his Whitewater land dealings; his ability to get a handle on foreign affairs.

Here is what he does not need as he negotiates his political minefield, Mr. Speaker. Here is today's paper, and here are dispatches from the culture war front: "Elders Taunts the Religious Right: Joycelyn Elders, Surgeon General, warming to a favorite target, yesterday rips religious conservatives."

The bottom of the front page, "Classifying homosexual couples as families was not what Virginia Governor Allen had in mind during his family values campaign."

Here is something we are going to discuss as soon as the 1-minutes are over: "NEA's Jane Alexander defends bloody performance on AIDS."

The next page, "Elders Lashes Out at the Religious Right."

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that the President went to Georgetown, to a Jesuit university. I went to Loyola University, also a Jesuit school. Through his policies he is taking on the entire Catholic Church and every Protestant and Orthodox person in this country who focuses on religion and goes to church once a week. What the heck is going on here?

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the Wall Street Journal article and the article in USA Today written by Richard Benedetto:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

#### CATHOLIC VOTERS MAY BE PROBLEM FOR CLINTON TEAM

(By Gerald F. Seib)

When it comes to gauging the power of the Pope, the most famous commentary was offered 60 years ago by one Joseph Stalin. When somebody suggested that he encourage Roman Catholicism in the Soviet Union to please the Pope, Uncle Joe replied scornfully: "The Pope! How many divisions has he got?"

Mocking though it was, that very question is again relevant for the Clinton administration. For right now, the White House is locked in a quiet but emotional battle with the Vatican over something that normally produces only deep yawns and glazed-over eyes: a United Nations report.

By itself, this relatively obscure debate doesn't spell serious political trouble for the Clinton team. But the struggle is important, because it suggests that some deeper significant troubles with Catholic voters may be developing for the Clinton administration.

The immediate dispute is over the draft of a U.N. plan for international population control, which is to be approved at a conference in Cairo, Egypt, later this year. Pope John Paul II is deeply unhappy with the draft, which he thinks both encourages abortion and devalues the traditional family. More than that, the pontiff is clearly annoyed at the U.S. for supporting the plan as it takes shape, a point he made directly to President Clinton this month in Rome and in a series of other ways.

This argument alone isn't likely to set the political views of most American Catholics. After all, they don't move in lockstep with their church leadership on political issues.

No, the problem for Mr. Clinton is more subtle. After Mr. Clinton went some distance toward recovering the Catholic vote for Democrats in 1992, the struggle with the Vatican is just the latest addition to a series of issues—abortion, school choice, the very makeup of the administration—that threaten to undermine his bonds with Catholics.

In sheer political terms, this matters because the Catholic vote matters. Catholics—many of them urban, ethnic, working-class voters—traditionally fit most comfortably into the Democratic Party. Through the 1950s and 1960s, Democrats won the Catholic vote in one presidential election after another, sometimes overwhelmingly. That turned around with George McGovern's candidacy in 1972, which turned off many working-class Catholics. By 1984, Republican Ronald Reagan won more than six in 10 Catholic voters.

But in 1992, Bill Clinton began pulling back Reagan Democrats, and he recaptured the Catholic vote. That helped him win the crucial states such as Pennsylvania and New York.

Since then, though, the road has been bumpier. Prominent Catholics grouched that the administration found a top job for a member of every big Democratic constituency except urban, ethnic, Northeastern Catholics. Meanwhile, there was a place for Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders, who has managed to insult Catholics of every stripe with thoughtless criticisms of the Vatican.

There is also the abortion issue, of course, where there is an inescapable rift between the administration's pro-choice policies and Catholic teachings. There also are tensions over school choice, and problems growing out of the president's personal life.

The administration knows it has a problem. Undersecretary of State Timothy

Wirth, who is steering American policy toward the U.N. population conference, is holding a series of private meetings with all American cardinals to find common ground, administration aides say. Last month, Raymond Flynn, the ambassador to the Vatican, sent a letter to church leaders and prominent Catholic laymen, stressing Mr. Clinton's desire for good relations. While Mr. Clinton and the Vatican "do not always agree," he has "always been respectful of the church's position, both publicly and privately," Mr. Flynn wrote.

Certainly there is common ground between President Clinton and Catholics. The president, after all, was educated in a Catholic grade school and attended a Jesuit college, Georgetown University, and therefore knows Catholic sensibilities. And significantly, while sticking to Democratic pro-choice positions, he argues that his goal is to make abortion as rare as possible.

Mr. Clinton has good reason to tend to the Catholic front, for there is a growing political threat on the horizon if he doesn't. As the Religious Right rises in political power, some Republicans are trying to build bridges between its foot soldiers and American Catholics.

And there is one Republican who appears uniquely qualified to do the job. He is William Bennett, the former Education secretary and potential 1996 presidential candidate. He is both a practicing Catholic and a hit with the Religious Right because of his unflinching family values rhetoric. "I've been arguing that Catholics, when they look at the world of politics today and see the Clinton administration and the Christian Coalition, they'd better be clear which side they're on," Mr. Bennett says. "And it's the Christian Coalition side."

[From USA Today, June 9, 1994]

#### DOUBTS DOG PRESIDENT'S EVERY MOVE, EVERY POLL

(By Richard Benedetto)

Jobs are up, inflation's low. And, despite foreign fumbles, the USA is at peace.

By every traditional measure, President Clinton should be riding high in the polls, yet recent surveys find growing disquiet with his presidency.

A USA Today/CNN/Gallup Poll this week finds the electorate less interested in his accomplishments and more concerned about who Clinton might be.

Those doubts have helped keep Clinton's approval ratings low at a time he needs to be building beyond the 43% who elected him in 1992.

The degree to which Clinton is able to ease questions about his character will count as much as legislative achievements as he moves closer to 1996. And it could mean the difference between victory and defeat.

"Bill Clinton seems to have given people cause for specific cynicism," says Rutgers University political scientist Ross Baker: "And no president, given the sort of dispirit abroad in the country, will do well. Bill Clinton just does worse. He has to get his act together" for 1996.

Poll analysis finds many have reservations about his moral leadership, and genuine splits over whether he shares their values and is honest and trustworthy enough for the job.

More specifically: 35%, likely fueled by the continuing charges about financial dealings and extramarital affairs, say Clinton has tended to lower the stature of the presidency.

A third of the nation "strongly disapproves" of Clinton's presidency.

Only one in 10 say they'd "definitely" vote for him in 1996; 32% definitely won't.

Support is deep as well. One out of four say they like Clinton, but those numbers have not grown over the 16 months of his presidency.

About one in five make up a narrow band of undecided, swing voters who most likely will mean the difference between re-election in 1996 or a ticket back to Little Rock.

Duke University presidential scholar James David Barber says Clinton has a communications problem, that he needs to find more ways to talk directly to the American people and seriously explain to them in simple terms what he is trying to achieve, and how much he is accomplishing.

"People see a lot of him but they don't necessarily hear a lot of him," Barber says. "He needs to do weekly, 15-minute talks like Franklin Roosevelt's fireside chats."

Barber says Clinton may not be getting credit for achievements because they're being obscured by so many "troubles" in the country that continue to keep people uneasy: rising crime, rampant poverty, economic displacement, declining education and continued dissatisfaction with government itself.

Clinton has little wiggle room as he maneuvers the political minefield toward re-election. Among the dangers Clinton faces over the next two plus years:

The fate of his health-care reform legislation.

The results of the 1994 elections.

The long-term performance of the economy.

The outcome of a sexual harassment lawsuit filed by Paula Jones a former Arkansas state worker.

Hearings on his Whitewater land dealings. His ability to get a handle on foreign affairs.

"If this was 1996, and it was November, I'd say I was going to vote for him again. But with two years to go, it'll depend on what happens between now and 1996," says Gary Smith, 45, a Bristol, Ind., postal worker, a Republican who voted for Clinton in 1992.

Clinton political adviser Paul Begala insists Clinton has no character problem, just nasty political opponents who keep throwing mud and keep trying to fan the flames of discontent.

"Republicans and the radical right have made a conscious effort to undermine this president in a coordinated strategy," he says.

Everett Ladd of the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research attributes the galvanizing of Clinton detractors to two tenets: They are opposed to big government and have serious reservations about his character.

"It's a confluence of the personal and the political," he says.

White House communications director Mark Gearan generally agrees Clinton has a lot of work ahead but discounts the character issue.

"People will be looking at whether we have maintained faith with our commitment to create jobs, keep the economy going, provide health care and reduce crime," he says.

Indeed, those who support Clinton tend to be measuring him primarily on job performance. They like his willingness to tackle health care, his efforts to shake up the status quo, his hard work, his knowledge of the issues.

"I'm a registered Republican, but I voted for Clinton because I thought the country needed something different," says Smith.

But Clinton detractors appear to be judging him on a far more personal level. They

say he's indecisive, a weak leader, unable to get a grip on foreign policy, a poor example of moral authority, a person who tells people what they want to hear.

"People are kind of iffy about him because they're not sure they can trust him," says Rosio Sanchez, 20, a San Diego college student.

#### A CRISIS WITHOUT A CRISIS

By most standards, President Clinton is not facing a major crisis.

But he can't seem to muster more than 43% of re-election support, the same percentage he got in the 1992 election. And 40% of the electorate appears to be solidly opposed to him.

And when people are asked to rate him on a 10-point scale of whether they like or dislike him, numbers suggest he's in deep trouble:

25% say they like him very much; 19% say they don't like him very much.

It's almost as if he's in a crisis without a crisis.

Indeed, Clinton's like-dislike numbers fall into a range similar to those measured for other presidents facing some of the toughest times in their tenures.

He's slightly lower than Lyndon Johnson in August 1967, when antiwar protests were building, body counts were mounting in Vietnam and the country was splitting. Seven months later Johnson decided not to seek re-election.

He's slightly higher than Richard Nixon in August 1973, when Senate Watergate hearings were causing people to pause from their vacations to watch. A year later, Nixon resigned.

He's a little better than Jimmy Carter in August 1980, when U.S. hostages were being held in Iran and a rescue attempt had failed. Three months later, Carter lost his re-election effort to Ronald Reagan.

And he's about where Ronald Reagan was in June 1982, when the nation, gripped by a recession, was in a sour mood. The economy eventually recovered and Reagan went on to win a second term.

#### VACATING SPECIAL ORDER FOR TODAY

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 5-minute special order granted for today to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] be vacated.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, and under a previous order of the House the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### RUSSIA JOINS PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Western alliance realized an extraordinary achievement of international peace and partnership. Russia, our bitter adversary for more than 40 years of cold war struggle, joined the Partnership for Peace, and pledged to work with us to secure our common goals throughout the world.

Just 5 years ago, the thought that one day we would welcome Russia into the family of NATO would have been unthinkable. The thought that Russia would come to embrace democracy and freedom, and that it would come to pursue so many of our fundamental goals throughout the world, was unimaginable.

In taking this historic step, Russia and the United States are working together to heal the wounds that have divided Europe since the end of the Second World War. We are working together to bring to Eastern Europe the security and the stability that NATO has given Western Europe for nearly half a century.

In the coming weeks, Russia's relations with the West will continue to grow and to strengthen. President Yeltsin will sign an agreement with the European Union that will open European markets to Russian products. President Yeltsin will meet with the G-7 on a broad range of political and economic issues.

I believe that this is the time to reaffirm our commitment to democracy and freedom in Russia—and to reaffirm our determination to help Russia make real the promise of its political and economic reforms.

It's far too easy to take yesterday's progress for granted. But for half of this century, the fear of confrontation with Russia cast a shadow over all of our international relations, and all of our lives. Let's not turn our backs on this progress. Let's not take it for granted. Let's work to ensure that this unprecedented alliance grows even stronger, even closer, in the years and decades to come.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM VOTES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the votes on health care reform which took place in full committee in the Appropriations Committee on June 21, and in the Ways and Means Committee on June 22, 1994:

The following vote was taken on June 21, 1994, in the Appropriations Committee during consideration of the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Bill for FY 1995:

An amendment offered by Mr. Porter to provide an additional \$87.1 million for the Community Health Centers program in order to increase the availability of health for people in underserved areas. Defeated 28 to 15.

#### DEMOCRATS

Mr. Beville, "nay."  
Mr. Carr, not voting.  
Mr. Chapman, not voting.  
Mr. Coleman, "nay."  
Mr. Darden, not voting.  
Ms. DeLauro, "nay."  
Mr. Dicks, "nay."  
Mr. Dixon, "nay."  
Mr. Durbin, "nay."  
Mr. Fazio, "nay."  
Mr. Foglietta, not voting.  
Mr. Hefner, "nay."

Mr. Hoyer, "nay."  
 Miss Kaptur, "nay."  
 Mrs. Lowey, "nay."  
 Mrs. Meek, "nay."  
 Mr. Mollohan, not voting.  
 Mr. Moran, "nay."  
 Mr. Murtha, "nay."  
 Mr. Obey, "nay."  
 Mr. Olver, "nay."  
 Mr. Pastor, "nay."  
 Ms. Pelosi, "nay."  
 Mr. Peterson, "nay."  
 Mr. Price, "nay."  
 Mr. Sabo, "nay."  
 Mr. Serrano, "nay."  
 Mr. Skaggs, "nay."  
 Mr. Smith (IA), "nay."  
 Mr. Stokes, "nay."  
 Mr. Thornton, not voting.  
 Mr. Torres, "nay."  
 Mr. Visclosky, "nay."  
 Mr. Whitten, not voting.  
 Mr. Wilson, not voting.  
 Mr. Yates, "nay."

## REPUBLICANS

Mrs. Bentley, not voting.  
 Mr. Bonilla, "yea."  
 Mr. Callahan, "yea."  
 Mr. DeLay, "yea."  
 Mr. Gallo, not voting.  
 Mr. Hobson, not voting.  
 Mr. Istook, not voting.  
 Mr. Kolbe, "yea."  
 Mr. Lewis (CA), "yea."  
 Mr. Lightfoot, not voting.  
 Mr. Livingston, "yea."  
 Mr. McDade, not voting.  
 Mr. Myers, "yea."  
 Mr. Packard, "yea."  
 Mr. Porter, "yea."  
 Mr. Regula, "yea."  
 Mr. Rogers, "yea."  
 Mr. Skeen, "yea."  
 Mr. Taylor, "yea."  
 Mrs. Vucanovich, not voting.  
 Mr. Walsh, "yea."  
 Mr. Wolf, "yea."  
 Mr. Young (FL), not voting.

The following recorded votes were taken on June 22, 1994, in the Committee on Ways and Means during consideration of Acting Chairman Gibbons' substitute proposal for H.R. 3600, The Health Security Act of 1994:

An amendment by Mr. Santorum striking authority given to the Secretary of Health and Human Services under provisions establishing a new Medicare outpatient prescription drug benefit, to require advance approval for a covered outpatient drug if the Secretary determines the drug is subject to misuse or inappropriate use. The amendment would also strike provisions requiring the Secretary to study the advisability of mandating advanced approval in cases where a more cost-effective therapeutically equivalent drug is available, and to develop and update a list of drugs subject to misuse or inappropriate use, based on evidence of such problems. Defeated 24-14.

## DEMOCRATS

Mr. Gibbons, "nay."  
 Mr. Rostenkowski, "nay."  
 Mr. Pickle, "nay."  
 Mr. Rangel, "nay."  
 Mr. Stark, "nay."  
 Mr. Jacobs, "nay."  
 Mr. Ford (TN), "nay."  
 Mr. Matsui, "nay."  
 Mrs. Kennelly, "nay."  
 Mr. Coyne, "nay."  
 Mr. Andrews (TX), "nay."  
 Mr. Levin, "nay."  
 Mr. Cardin, "nay."

Mr. McDermott, "nay."  
 Mr. Kleczka, "nay."  
 Mr. Lewis (GA), "nay."  
 Mr. Payne (VA), "nay."  
 Mr. Neal (MA), "nay" by proxy.  
 Mr. Hoagland, "nay."  
 Mr. McNulty, "nay."  
 Mr. Kopetski, "nay."  
 Mr. Jefferson, "nay."  
 Mr. Brewster, "nay."  
 Mr. Reynolds, "nay."

## REPUBLICANS

Mr. Archer, "yea."  
 Mr. Crane, "yea."  
 Mr. Thomas (CA), "yea."  
 Mr. Shaw, "yea."  
 Mr. Sundquist, "yea."  
 Mrs. Johnson (CT), "yea."  
 Mr. Bunning, "yea."  
 Mr. Grandy, "yea."  
 Mr. Houghton, "yea."  
 Mr. Herger, "yea" by proxy.  
 Mr. McCrery, "yea."  
 Mr. Hancock, "yea."  
 Mr. Santorum, "yea."  
 Mr. Camp, "yea."

An amendment by Mr. Grandy to include coverage of hearing aids for children in the guaranteed national benefit package. Adopted 20-18.

## DEMOCRATS

Mr. Gibbons, "nay."  
 Mr. Rostenkowski, "nay."  
 Mr. Pickle, "nay."  
 Mr. Rangel, "nay."  
 Mr. Stark, "nay."  
 Mr. Jacobs, "nay" by proxy.  
 Mr. Ford (TN), "yea."  
 Mr. Matsui, "nay."  
 Mrs. Kennelly, "yea."  
 Mr. Coyne, "nay."  
 Mr. Andrews (TX), "nay."  
 Mr. Levin, "nay."  
 Mr. Cardin, "nay."  
 Mr. McDermott, "nay."  
 Mr. Kleczka, "nay."  
 Mr. Lewis (GA), "yea."  
 Mr. Payne (VA), "nay."  
 Mr. Neal (MA), "yea."  
 Mr. Hoagland, "nay."  
 Mr. McNulty, "nay."  
 Mr. Kopetski, "yea."  
 Mr. Jefferson, "nay."  
 Mr. Brewster, "nay."  
 Mr. Reynolds, "yea."

## REPUBLICANS

Mr. Archer, "yea."  
 Mr. Crane, "yea" by proxy.  
 Mr. Thomas (CA), "yea."  
 Mr. Shaw, "yea."  
 Mr. Sundquist, "yea."  
 Mrs. Johnson (CT), "yea."  
 Mr. Bunning, "yea" by proxy.  
 Mr. Grandy, "yea."  
 Mr. Houghton, "yea."  
 Mr. Herger, "yea" by proxy.  
 Mr. McCrery, "yea."  
 Mr. Hancock, "yea."  
 Mr. Santorum, "yea."  
 Mr. Camp, "yea."

An amendment by Mr. Santorum that would activate the sunset provision of the vaccine entitlement program created by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 upon enactment of the underlying bill. Defeated 23-15.

## DEMOCRATS

Mr. Gibbons, "nay."  
 Mr. Rostenkowski, "nay."  
 Mr. Pickle, "nay."  
 Mr. Rangel, "nay."  
 Mr. Stark, "nay."

Mr. Jacobs, "nay."  
 Mr. Ford (TN), "nay."  
 Mr. Matsui, "nay."  
 Mrs. Kennelly, "nay."  
 Mr. Coyne, "nay."  
 Mr. Andrews (TX), "nay."  
 Mr. Levin, "nay."  
 Mr. Cardin, "nay."  
 Mr. McDermott, "nay."  
 Mr. Kleczka, "nay."  
 Mr. Lewis (GA), "nay."  
 Mr. Payne (VA), "nay" by proxy.  
 Mr. Neal (MASS), "nay."  
 Mr. Hoagland, "nay."  
 Mr. McNulty, "nay."  
 Mr. Kopetski, "nay."  
 Mr. Jefferson, "nay."  
 Mr. Brewster, "yea."  
 Mr. Reynolds, "nay."

## REPUBLICANS

Mr. Archer, "yea."  
 Mr. Crane, "yea" by proxy.  
 Mr. Thomas (CA), "yea."  
 Mr. Shaw, "yea."  
 Mr. Sundquist, "yea."  
 Mrs. Johnson (CT), "yea."  
 Mr. Bunning, "yea."  
 Mr. Grandy, "yea" by proxy.  
 Mr. Houghton, "yea" by proxy.  
 Mr. Herger, "yea."  
 Mr. McCrery, "yea."  
 Mr. Hancock, "yea."  
 Mr. Santorum, "yea."  
 Mr. Camp, "yea."

An amendment by Mr. Kleczka providing that private health plans could exclude the coverage of services to terminate pregnancy in the guaranteed national benefit package of the underlying Chairman's mark. Defeated 33-5.

## DEMOCRATS

Mr. Gibbons, "nay."  
 Mr. Rostenkowski, "nay."  
 Mr. Pickle, "nay."  
 Mr. Rangel, "nay."  
 Mr. Stark, "nay."  
 Mr. Jacobs, "nay."  
 Mr. Ford (TN), "nay."  
 Mr. Matsui, "nay."  
 Mrs. Kennelly, "nay."  
 Mr. Coyne, "nay."  
 Mr. Andrews (TX), "nay."  
 Mr. Levin, "nay."  
 Mr. Cardin, "nay."  
 Mr. McDermott, "nay."  
 Mr. Kleczka, "yea."  
 Mr. Lewis (GA), "nay."  
 Mr. Payne (VA), "nay."  
 Mr. Neal (MASS), "yea."  
 Mr. Hoagland, "nay."  
 Mr. McNulty, "nay."  
 Mr. Kopetski, "nay."  
 Mr. Jefferson, "nay."  
 Mr. Brewster, "yea."  
 Mr. Reynolds, "nay."

## REPUBLICANS

Mr. Archer, "nay."  
 Mr. Crane, "nay" by proxy.  
 Mr. Thomas (CA), "nay."  
 Mr. Shaw, "yea."  
 Mr. Sundquist, "nay."  
 Mrs. Johnson (CT), "nay."  
 Mr. Bunning, "nay."  
 Mr. Grandy, "nay."  
 Mr. Houghton, "yea" by proxy.  
 Mr. Herger, "nay."  
 Mr. McCrery, "nay."  
 Mr. Hancock, "nay."  
 Mr. Santorum, "nay."  
 Mr. Camp, "nay."

An amendment by Mr. Bunning that would exempt abortion from coverage of pregnancy-related services in the guaranteed national benefit package, unless a woman suffers from a physical disorder or disease that

would, as certified by a physician, place her in danger of death if the fetus were carried to term; or where the pregnancy was the result of rape or incest. The amendment further provided that it was not to be construed to remove or diminish coverage of any reproductive health service, family planning service, or service for pregnant women otherwise provided for by the underlying bill, except abortion, and clarified that only an Act of Congress could expand the benefit package to include abortion, other than for the exceptions described above. Defeated 23-15.

## DEMOCRATS

Mr. Gibbons, "nay."  
Mr. Rostenkowski, "nay."  
Mr. Pickle, "nay."  
Mr. Rangel, "nay."  
Mr. Stark, "nay" by proxy.  
Mr. Jacobs, "yea."  
Mr. Ford (TN), "nay."  
Mr. Matsui, "nay."  
Mrs. Kennelly, "nay."  
Mr. Coyne, "nay."  
Mr. Andrews (TX), "nay."  
Mr. Levin, "nay."  
Mr. Cardin, "nay."  
Mr. McDermott, "nay."  
Mr. Kleczka, "nay."  
Mr. Lewis (GA), "nay."  
Mr. Payne (VA), "nay."  
Mr. Neal (MASS), "yea."  
Mr. Hoagland, "nay."  
Mr. McNulty, "yea."  
Mr. Kopetski, "nay."  
Mr. Jefferson, "nay."  
Mr. Brewster, "yea."  
Mr. Reynolds, "nay" by proxy.

## REPUBLICANS

Mr. Archer, "yea."  
Mr. Crane, "yea" by proxy.  
Mr. Thomas (CA), "nay."  
Mr. Shaw, "yea."  
Mr. Sundquist, "yea."  
Mrs. Johnson (CT), "nay."  
Mr. Bunning, "yea."  
Mr. Grandy, "yea."  
Mr. Houghton, "nay" by proxy.  
Mr. Herger, "yea."  
Mr. McCrery, "yea."  
Mr. Hancock, "yea."  
Mr. Santorum, "yea."  
Mr. Camp, "yea."

An amendment by Mr. Santorum providing that nothing in the bill shall be construed to conflict with any constitutionally permissible regulation of abortion by a state. Defeated 22-16.

## DEMOCRATS

Mr. Gibbons, "nay."  
Mr. Rostenkowski, "nay" by proxy.  
Mr. Pickle, "nay."  
Mr. Rangel, "nay."  
Mr. Stark, "nay."  
Mr. Jacobs, "yea."  
Mr. Ford (TN), "nay."  
Mr. Matsui, "nay."  
Mrs. Kennelly, "nay."  
Mr. Coyne, "nay."  
Mr. Andrews (TX), "nay."  
Mr. Levin, "nay."  
Mr. Cardin, "nay."  
Mr. McDermott, "nay" by proxy.  
Mr. Kleczka, "nay."  
Mr. Lewis (GA), "nay" by proxy.  
Mr. Payne (VA), "nay."  
Mr. Neal (MASS), "nay."  
Mr. Hoagland, "nay."  
Mr. McNulty, "yea."  
Mr. Kopetski, "nay."  
Mr. Jefferson, "nay."  
Mr. Brewster, "yea."  
Mr. Reynolds, "nay" by proxy.

## REPUBLICANS

Mr. Archer, "yea."  
Mr. Crane, "yea" by proxy.  
Mr. Thomas (CA), "yea."  
Mr. Shaw, "yea."  
Mr. Sundquist, "yea."  
Mrs. Johnson (CT), "nay."  
Mr. Bunning, "yea."  
Mr. Grandy, "yea."  
Mr. Houghton, "yea" by proxy.  
Mr. Herger, "yea."  
Mr. McCrery, "yea."  
Mr. Hancock, "yea."  
Mr. Santorum, "yea."  
Mr. Camp, "yea."

## THE REPUBLICAN PARTY: WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT IS NOT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years, the national media has pushed the line that the Republican Party was or is the party of the rich, the fat cats, the wealthy.

However, so many extremely wealthy people are so liberal that this propaganda is just not effective anymore.

Too many people know that it is false.

So, the new line is that the Republican Party has been taken over by extremists and hatemongers.

The new propaganda of the liberal media is that the Republican party has been taken over by the religious right.

This, too, is false—totally, completely, absolutely false.

The Republican Party has been taken over by people who are fed up by the fact that government, at all levels, takes half of the average person's income.

Our party has been taken over by people who are sickened by the fact that the Federal Government wastes such unbelievable amounts of money.

The Republican Party has been taken over by people who understand that big government helps extremely big business with all of its rules, regulations, and red tape, while it drives small businesses out of existence or forces them to merge.

Our party has been taken over by people who believe in the things that made this Nation great—free enterprise, the private ownership of property, and individual freedom.

The Republican Party is a party today that does not believe that the Federal Government should control, dictate, or dominate everything.

And yes, our party is filled with people who are very concerned about the breakdown of our families, the unsafe, even violent conditions in our inner cities, and the declining quality of our educational system.

The vast majority of Republican, like the vast majority of Americans, believe in prayer in schools. They believe that prayer helps many people and

really hurts no one, and that if the House and Senate can open each day with prayer, why not our schools.

Does this make the Republican Party religious right? Well, listen to what a very prominent woman says about prayer in schools:

... School prayer advocacy, especially in inner cities, is a symptom of people trying to figure every way they can to reinforce people's ability to work together, to live together in families, to have a sense of purpose, a sense of self respect, a sense of regard for others, and how we get along with each other.

These are the words of that well-known member of the religious right—Attorney General Janet Reno.

And as another prominent member of the religious right, says: "It is not just possible that anti-religious bias, masquerading as religious neutrality, is costing us far more than we have been willing to admit."

Those are the words of William Raspberry, the very fine and very liberal columnist for the Washington Post.

The Republican Party has been taken over by people who believe that "our government would be better if policies were more directed by moral values." Those exact words were taken from a recent poll for U.S. News and World Report, which found that 84 percent of the American people hold that exact same belief, while only 9 percent disagree.

Yet at the same time that an overwhelming majority believe that, another liberal Yale professor, Stephen Carter, says in his book, "The Culture of Disbelief." We have pressed the religiously faithful \* \* \* to act as though their faith does not matter."

The Republican Party is filled with people who believe in freedom rather than government and who know that government cannot solve all our problems.

It is filled with people who know that if our Nation is to survive, people will have to realize that they have responsibilities and not just rights.

Our party is filled with people who believe in freedom of speech, rather than political correctness, and who are being criticized simply because they have the courage of their convictions and do not need the national media to tell them how to think.

And yes, our party believes—as do an overwhelming majority—that homosexuality is not a healthy alternative lifestyle and should not be promoted as such to children in elementary school.

Those on the other side, the liberal side of the political spectrum, seem to know they are losing the arguments on the merits, so they are resorting to name calling.

They seem to think that if they say the words "hatemonger" or "religious right," that settles it—they don't need to discuss the merits, or lack thereof, of their positions.

Many people, though, are beginning to see that the real intolerance is coming, not from conservatives, but from the left.

In today's Roll Call newspaper, the very nonpartisan political commentator, Charles Cook, writes this:

\*\*\* Many of the Democratic attacks do come awfully close to religious intolerance, however. I was on a panel discussion earlier this week at a national College Democrats meeting (the next day I did one for the Republican National Committee, and both were for free), and someone on the panel made a passing reference to former Education Secretary William Bennett's recently published "Book of Virtues." I was stunned to hear at least one person in the audience hiss at the mention of the book \*\*\*

\*\*\* I wonder what offended this person about Bennett's anthology. Was it Longfellow's "The Children's Hour" or "The Village Blacksmith"? Was it Martin Luther King, Jr.'s letter from the Birmingham city jail or his famous "I Have a Dream" speech? Maybe it was Lincoln's Gettysburg Address? \*\*\*

\*\*\* I'd bet a dollar to a donut that the hisser hadn't the foggiest idea what was in the book. This is the kind of intolerance that causes many Democrats to be called cultural elitists, and it has put them out of touch with many working- and middle-class voters \*\*\*

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is filled with people who know that most Government programs, no matter how wonderful their title, really help primarily the people who work for the Government and do very little for the intended beneficiaries.

Our party has been taken over by people who believe that they can spend their own money better than the bureaucrats can spend it for them, and who believe Government should have to live within its means just as individuals and families do.

Ours is a party that believes in freedom, hope, and opportunity for all people, and that Government should be of, by, and for the people, not just of, by, and for the bureaucrats.

This is a positive, optimistic message, and one that will appeal to everyone if it is presented to them without the extreme bias of the national media.

As a national advertising campaign used to say, Americans want to succeed, not merely survive. Most Americans, and certainly almost all Republicans, do not want the enforced mediocrity that comes with Government control or domination of peoples' lives.

□ 1940

#### THE FDR MEMORIAL COIN BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANNER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 3270, the FDR commemorative coin bill. Congress mandated the FDR Memorial Commission to raise funds from private sources for construction of

a memorial for President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The FDR commemorative coin can raise as much as \$5 million of private, non-Federal funds for the purpose.

The FDR Memorial is not a new project. Congress created the FDR Memorial Commission in 1955 to plan and construct a memorial to our only 4-term President. The American people feel a deep debt of gratitude to President Roosevelt for his leadership in America's struggle for peace, well-being and human dignity. Because of its unique design, the FDR Memorial is not only a tribute to the life and work of the man, but more importantly, it will serve as a vivid reminder of the Great Depression and our fight for freedom in World War II. As our country commemorates WW II, it is appropriate that we honor the man who was our Commander in Chief during the time Americans fought against tyranny and defended democracy throughout the world.

1995 will mark the 50th anniversary of President Roosevelt's death. The plans for the memorial, which will be located near the Tidal Basin in Washington, DC, has been approved. The ground breaking has taken place. The time is now to raise the funds necessary to continue construction. The FDR commemorative coin gives the American people a wonderful way to support what will certainly be one of our Nation's greatest, most visited memorials.

I urge my colleagues to give the American people an opportunity to personally contribute to the memorial in honor of President Roosevelt. Please support H.R. 3270.

#### RELIGION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, and because there is no designee of the majority leader, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to discuss the important issues relating to the attack on people of faith being carried out by high officials in the Democrat Party. I think we need to address many of these issues, and I have with me colleagues tonight who are prepared to do that, and I would like to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] who has been a leader in addressing this issue of the EEOC guidelines on religion, and I would like to allocate such time as he may wish to share with us to him for his thoughts on that subject.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] for putting together this special order and addressing this subject. I think he has done an outstanding job on many occasions with these special orders in bringing to the public's attention a number of concerns. The one that I am speaking on this evening is the EEOC regulations that were promulgated last October, and made known through a hearing period, and in

effect have been recognized by companies in this country so strongly that many of the private companies have issued regulations dealing with those proposed EEOC regulations. They issued rules for their companies.

Now what would these EEOC rules do? First of all, they would say that in the work place, under the guise of religious harassment, under title 7, that we could not have any mention of religion, either positive or negative, and that is essentially what the company that issued its regulations has said. That would include jewelry, artifacts, potential conversations of employees dealing in this area.

Now this is as much a question of first amendment protection as it is anything else. It is not the necessity to sponsor any religion under any particular name. It is not the necessity to be against any religion under a name. It is to say that the Framers of the Constitution gave us a Bill of Rights and that first amendment protected us in the area of religion. It was not that we wanted a state religion. On the contrary. The Framers of the Constitution had seen that experience before and wanted nothing to do with the state of religion, but they did want religion in the state. And over the 200 years of our history in this country we have recognized that fact.

And here comes today bureaucrats that have devised rules that say, "No, this is wrong. This is something that we cannot tolerate. It will be harassment if you mention any sort of religious activity, invite someone to Sunday school, do something else in the work place. That will be harassment."

Now this could have been stopped. The President with one phone call could have stopped this months ago. The President could have said, "This is wrong. This is something I don't want to see. It seems to be encouraging rather than discouraging, and let's see what the effect is."

Yesterday I met with a group of NASCAR drivers. They said they could have had a truckload if they had had time to put it together. But we had seven or eight come down and point out one of the things that concerns them about the EEOC regulations. They pointed out that each Sunday, since that is the day of the race at the track, they have a minister who has a special service for the drivers. Now they are about to get in about a four by four space of solid metal. It is about 140 degrees on a summer day out there, and they are going around laps between 100 and 200 miles per hour risking their life in a sport they love. If they want to have a special service conducted by a minister on Sunday morning before they start the race, who are we to say that they cannot? Who are we to tell the fans, the hundred thousands or so that are going to be watching that race, "I'm sorry. We can't have that

race because we think there might be some religious harassment going on here in the stadium before the sports race starts?"

The necessity and the reason we have the freedom of a Bill of Rights is to let everyone make up their own mind in these areas, to let everyone have the freedom to do as they please in these areas. The government in my district, people recognize, would mess up a one-car funeral, and yet we are calling on them to devise regulations and tell us how to micromanage our lives in this most sensitive of areas. It is absolutely ridiculous that we are getting to this point.

I had a marine write a letter, an officer in the Marines. He said, first of all, we are going to have to change the Marine motto if this goes on because *semper fidelis* is just part of the motto. The motto is: Always faithful to God and country. Now we will have to remove God obviously because that will not be allowed in our workplace, and the chaplain may not be able to minister either in the battlefield or in the barracks because that is the workplace of those individuals.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a situation where with each step we get more and more ridiculous.

I served on committees with the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] who has put together this special order, and I maintain that the depths of dumb cannot be fathomed in Washington, DC. That does not mean there are not good people here. I served with intelligent people in the House and in the Senate, people whose character is above reproach. But somehow, as we pass legislation and it becomes promulgated into ever finer regulations on the American people, all of us who have human weaknesses and fallacies are going to make the errors, and that is passed on and put on the American people as onerous rules and regulations.

□ 1950

Somehow, that comes about, and we continue to pile these on the American people day after day. We issue between 60,000 and 100,000 pages of regulations in the Federal registry every year. Those are regulations like the EEOC regulations that have to be recognized and obeyed as the law of the land.

One last comment I would like to make, and I know the gentleman from California is a cosponsor of this, and that is we have legislation, our amendment tomorrow, that will deny the EEOC funding to enforce the religious regulations that it has, and I hope that amendment will pass. It will give us a year to go in and change those regulations, abolish those regulations, if the House sees fit, and to correct that problem.

But what about the future? The gentleman has cosponsored with me a

piece of legislation that would require whenever rules and regulations or whenever the bill is passed, and then goes to the appropriate bureaucracy for rules and regulations to be promulgated, they would have to come back to this House to be examined by this House and then approved or disapproved.

We could save the American people an enormous amount of grief and trouble if we would pass that regulation and if we pass that law and keep those regulations from being put on the public until we get a chance to assess them.

I want to tell the gentleman again how much I appreciate him and our colleagues for this program on the family and the threat to the family.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman, who has been a leader in this Congress in fighting for the rights of Americans. The bill you just mentioned is an outstanding piece of legislation that would probably, more than almost any other single piece of legislation that we might enact, do more to impact the average American. Because all of a sudden, the Congress would have to pass judgment before any of these regulations take effect. And there are thousands and thousands of pages of regulations, especially under this President, and it is just devastating.

I would like to ask the gentleman before he goes, because this is such an important issue, do you mean to say that under what the EEOC is doing, that conceivably an employer could be ruled in violation of the regulations for harassment because, for example, he might have a Bible on his bookshelf, or might wear the little pin, you know, the fish pin or maybe a cross, or might allow an employee to have one? Or maybe an employee has religious pictures at his desk, or maybe in the coffee room an employee witnesses to another about his or her faith? Are those the types of things that are conceivably prohibited under these guidelines?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Exactly. Or offers of scripture for someone who lost a family member that could bring some relief, or invites them to a service during the week for some relief. All of that would be prohibited, and the employer could be held liable for harassment in that particular circumstance.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. So what we are really facing is every employer in this country, what do we have, 6 million small businesses, give or take, every employer in this country could be the subject of an official governmental action against him, and have the privilege of paying \$15, \$20, \$50, or \$100,000 in attorney's fees to validate his first amendment rights? Is that what we are talking about?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. That is exactly what we are talking about. I

hope in this body tomorrow we are going to be able to give 1 year's relief. It will not solve the problem. We need to follow with legislation to change or abolish the regulations. But this will say we get a year's relief from the regulations that have already been promulgated, and we will not have to live under them.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. The gentleman has done great work in this area, and we are anticipating a favorable result here in the House tomorrow. I thank the gentleman for taking the time to come down to the floor to explain this very important aspect of the attack on people of faith relative to the actions of the Clinton administration's EEOC.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, we have a number of issues to talk about, and we have here my colleague from the East Bay in California, Mr. BILL BAKER, whom I would like to allocate some time to.

Mr. BAKER of California. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. DOOLITTLE from California. It was a very big surprise to me when I came here to Washington and discovered that the problem was that the religious right was taking over. And here all the time my constituents and I thought that a weak national defense, a \$4 trillion national debt, an arts program that has gone absolutely haywire, goals for education that have no relationship to the future or to science and math and hard subjects, and I learned it is not those things that are a problem, but we are on a witch hunt trying to find whether the religious right has taken over Washington.

Russia has recently undergone real change, and their leaders, JOHN, have said that we need more faith in our country. And they are passing out Bibles in their schools and are teaching their children to respect God, to respect themselves, and to have faith.

Now, this is in a country that formerly was highly alcoholic, people were bored to tears. There was no productivity increase because everyone was working for that nameless, faceless state.

Now that they are individuals again, and now that they have become free, they are talking about how to rebuild their country. And the way to rebuild their country is to rebuild their people. And the way to rebuild the people is to restore faith.

So they have gone back to the Bible and gone back to faith, at the same time the Clinton administration here in Washington is telling people, don't have a show of religious faith. Don't have any religious symbols in the workplace. Don't wear a crucifix or a Star of David. Don't show that you care about anything but the state.

We are repeating the mistakes of the last 70 years. The EEOC now is promulgating regulations for the workplace. I

This is reminiscent of taking over health care. We are having a health care fiasco here where the health care providers are not being asked what can we do to provide increased health care. What we are asking is how can we provide more bureaucracy and government control over health care. So you know whatever comes out of Washington is not going to say how can you get through your doctor's office faster, how can you have a procedure at a hospital cheaper and better.

What they are saying is how can a regional health alliance control what kind of insurance you can have. How can a national health board control how much money is spent on health care. How can we fix pharmaceutical rates and hospital rates so no money will be invested in new plant and equipment and future wonder drugs.

The question here in Washington is over political control. It is not over faith, it is not over producing better quality medical care for the people, it is not even over the citizens themselves and how they can live better by keeping more of their income in their pockets. It is about government control.

So this whole battle is about whether they are going to control your life, JOHN, and your faith.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. So if I understand the gentleman, the gospel of bureaucracy, governmental control, spending by the government, and taxes, is favored under this administration, it would appear. But for people to profess faith or live by the values of the family is apparently disfavored, at least so far as we can tell by the actions of the Clinton Justice Department in supporting the EEOC regulations referenced by Mr. TAYLOR, which pose a threat to every employee in the country, and certainly to every employer, and other examples that we no doubt will cite later on here.

But the gentleman mentioned the health care plan. You know, it is interesting to me, we talk about the attack on people of faith. We have been branded the religious right. You know, it seems to me basically it is just whatever the ultra liberals who run this country don't like, they want to put an ugly name on it. To their way of thinking, what could be uglier than the religious right? What is so bizarre is, of course, look how many good people in this country, Democrats and Republicans, are people of faith. Are they all to be branded by the Democrat leadership religious right, and therefore cast aside?

Mr. POMBO. If the gentleman will yield, you mention the religious right and it has been mentioned in the previous statement by Mr. BAKER about the attack being on our religion. And I think it goes much deeper than that. The attack is not just on religious freedom and the fact that conservative re-

ligious people have decided to become involved politically because they see our country going down the drain. It also stretches out into many other areas. Some of the groups which have been attached to the radical right are groups such as National Taxpayers Union, a taxpayers watchdog group which oversees how every taxpayer's dollars are spent in this Federal bureaucracy.

It also reaches out to groups like Citizens Against Government Waste, who is a watchdog group who watches over wasteful government programs.

□ 2000

Those groups are being called radical right. You know what else is also called radical right? Term limits, U.S. term limits group, which has decided to get involved in educating people across this country about who is in favor of term limits and who is not. That is called radical right.

If you look at the American people, and I have looked at polls, public opinion polls across this country, and you ask them about taxpayers and you ask them about the tax rates that our Federal Government imposes upon its citizens, they are not happy. If you ask them about wasteful government spending, they are not happy. But does that mean that every person who agrees with the National Taxpayers Union or Citizens Against Government Waste is somehow castigated as radical right?

Mr. BAKER of California. They are just trying to paint any group that opposes the Great Society here in Washington as religious right. Imagine, we have two million employees we cannot even figure out when we steal 40 percent of a person's income that we are putting pressure on the family. And what are we spending that money on? Art that is obscene and of questionable value, a military that is now being demoralized because we have changed the standards of who gets in the military and what they can do when they are in the military. We are trying to destroy America from within, and we cannot even find out that overtaxation and overregulation are the cause for most of the people's lack of faith in their government. So is it strange that they turn their faith to a real God and to the Bible.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I consider it to be one of the greatest moral issues in this country today, the destruction of the American family by government through overspending, overregulation and overtaxation which is forcing both parents out into the workplace so they can earn enough money to pay their taxes. And because I believe that and because millions of Americans across the country believe that, we are branded as the dangerous radical right.

Well, I just think people need to understand, we are not talking about a

situation where someone is trying to impose their narrow religious views on everyone in this country. We are talking about fundamental notions in fairness, of what is appropriate for the relationship between the government and the people whom the government is supposed to serve. I think the gentleman from Tracy, from the 11th Congressional District, the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER] have both made excellent points that we need to just stand up and say, wait a minute, folks, do not put some label on us so that you can dismiss the work that we are trying to do.

I think the American people need to understand what we are talking about. This is not an attack that is being waged in order to divert attention. Even in today's Roll Call, a Democrat author named Charles Cook wrote a very interesting article, if I might just presume upon my colleagues to quote this, because Roll Call is a little house liberal democrat newspaper that circulates up on Capitol Hill. And it serves as a vehicle for the Democratic congressional committee and others to use to put out their views.

But even this paper thought they had gone overboard. Let me just quote them. "Clearly, it is an expedient tactic for Democrats to employ," referring to this branding of the religious right or using that term, "particularly as the prospects for health care reform look increasingly grim, as foreign policy developments suggest ineptitude on the part of the Administration"—can you imagine that, with Bill Clinton in the White House and Jimmy Carter helping him out in Korea? This country is in deep trouble. And they do not want you to focus too much on that. I am diverting from the quote. Let us go back.

Ineptitude on the part of the Administration and as the battle ranges with Republicans over Whitewater. In politics, you always need a devil to beat on, and by reminding everyone of the horror show of the 1992 GOP convention in Houston, Democrats can conjure up a very convenient demon.

I thought this thing about the demon was interesting, because I also read in People magazine, June 27, 1994, excerpts from this new book on the chaotic Clinton administration by Bob Woodward, very interesting book. I think it is called "The Agenda." And in this, there is a little reference to this idea of demonization. It is talking about Mrs. Clinton and how she operates. It says, "In an extraordinary White House meeting, she," meaning Mrs. Clinton, "told Clinton's advisors, 'we need to tell a story to sell our plan that has heroes and villains. You need to demonize things to sell something to people.'"

Mr. BAKER of California. Pretty hard to make your doctor a demon.

Could I just interject, after the Senate took one look at the EEOC guidelines, trying to overregulate the workplace and the people who work there, the Senate voted 94 to nothing to throw out the religious harassment guidelines. This is on June 17, 1994. So just very recently, after this was proposed, the Senate said, thank you, but no thank you. I am hoping that this House, Congressman DOOLITTLE, will take the same well-reasoned approach to the overregulation of the workplace by a greedy Congress.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. That is 94 to nothing. I do not know if TED KENNEDY even voted for that, but I presume a lot of established liberal Democrats did.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANNER). Members should refrain from referring to individuals of the other body.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I stand corrected. I will just refer to the liberal Senators who no doubt voted for this.

Still, though, the Clinton Administration has yet to direct its own bureaucrats in the EEOC to withdraw those, even after a 94 to nothing vote. We will have a vote offered by Mr. TAYLOR tomorrow on that and, hopefully, these people in the White House who say we are extreme, maybe they will get the message and will withdraw what I think to everyone but to them clearly is extreme.

Mr. BAKER of California. Let me quote the author of the 94 to nothing amendment, a Democrat named HOWELL HEFLIN who said, "It is a consensus on all sides of the political and religious spectrum that these guidelines as currently worded are seriously flawed at best."

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. I am a little late joining your special order, as I promised I would, because I was watching Crossfire. I would not mention a show in competition with us right here except that it is off the air now, but the guests were Haley Barbour, chairman of the Republican Party, and the distinguished Member from the other side of the aisle who is head of their Congressional Election Campaign Committee, VIC FAZIO. And I was watching VIC, who is a good-natured person, smiling throughout the whole thing, trying to figure out if he really understands the Pandora's box that he has opened here.

Now, you are a Mormon in the time that I have known you. I have known you as a family man, a man of faith who loves his Mormon faith. Some of us on the floor are Catholic. I do not even know the religious affiliation of second, brandnew, shiniest Member.

I usually do not know anybody's religious affiliation until years and years after I have served with them. But I can pick out very quickly, after 6 months of floor voting and debate,

those who are concerned, as you just expressed it, about the destruction of the American family.

I have here the transcript of our friend, VIC FAZIO, at the National Press Club yesterday morning. And it is very revealing.

The press, I am happy to say, really put him up against it with a long Q and A period to try and figure out where he was headed with all this. I think he is going to crash into a stone wall and take his party with him, if they do not follow the advice I gave Vice President AL GORE at the back of the Chamber yesterday, to back off this divisiveness and what I think is clear and simple Christian bashing, much broader than the narrow focus that VIC FAZIO tried to give it on the Crossfire Show tonight.

The Catholic article in yesterday's Wall Street Journal, by Gerald Seed, who is not an ideologue in any way, I was told on the show by Bob Novak, he wrote an article, "Catholic Voters May Be a Problem for the Clinton Team." And I put this article in the RECORD yesterday. It is in the RECORD under all of our chairs today.

I think one of the things that I discussed with Speaker FOLEY yesterday, with DICK GEPHARDT and with Vice President AL GORE is they better understand how broad reaching this attack is.

I said, "Are you going to make a case to me that Pope John Paul the 2d is part of the religious left?"

□ 2010

Or is he even some centrist moderate compromising group when he spoke in very forceful terms with the magisterian, the teaching authority of the Catholic Church behind him on homosexuality, on taking innocent human life in the womb and crushing it, killing it, flatlining it, stopping a heartbeat?

Here is one of the things VIC said, VIC FAZIO said in response to a question, that I think is revealing. The moderator for one questioning period said, "So you would say that in their agenda," the Christian right, "I mean, what would you classify as being radical?"

Mr. FAZIO responds, "Well, I guess I fear the intolerance, as I said earlier, the intolerance of people."

"Specifically," the moderator said, and Mr. FAZIO, "Well, as it comes down to books in the library, magazines and newspapers," and get the next line, "things that relate to people's sexual preference," ah ha, "places in which it is appropriate to express your faith," oh, you mean like praying here in the morning, praying at the Supreme Court, our brothers and sisters in the U.S. Senate opening every one of their days with a prayer?

Then he says, "The ways in which you might do it, express your faith. I certainly think these are kinds of

things that trouble people who believe in the Constitution." You mean like the 56 men who signed the Declaration of Independence and they all lost their fortunes, that wrote their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, and "with a firm reliance in Divine Providence" went right before that?

Then he says, "And those that believe in the separation of church and state, that is a true protection for those of religious faith as well as for those in the country who choose to practice theirs in another way."

Let me just read six titles of articles and then we will discuss.

Bob Novak today, a dynamite column: "Doctor Elders Is Safe," safe from being fired, but Bob Novak writes a great column that this country is not safe from her attacks on Christianity.

Joycelyn Elders, the sex guru general, "Condoms to Nine-Years-Olds," and here is where she is discussing, "We had a girl in Arkansas who at eight gave birth to twins." I wonder if this is really true. I will take her at her word. "We must teach them responsibility and make sure they have the availability of a condom," and that is an uninterrupted sentence.

"Condoms For Eight-Year-Olds," and that column is by my friend, Susan Fields, an excellent column.

Here is from today's newspaper. "Fazio Says Religious Right Is Pushing GOPs To Extreme." Of course, one of the things that everybody is questioning VIC about is, since when are we going to get all this free advice from VIC on how to save our Republican Party? He even talks in this Press Club Q and A period that he things if we are ever going to take the White House back, we have got to follow his advice. I know VIC wants us to take the White House back.

Mr. BAKER of California. Will the gentleman yield? Who won seven of the last seven special elections in 30 percent Republican districts, the last two?

Mr. DORNAN. And they were not always people who were pro-life. The Senator from Georgia got Christian Coalition help. He is pro-choice. So did the very talented Senator from Texas that won.

Mr. BAKER of California. If the gentleman will continue to yield, who won seven of the last seven elections?

Mr. DORNAN. The Republican Party, and not every candidate was alike, and the Christian Coalition weighed in to help people that they did not agree with across the board.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, is the Republican Party the only party where you can have an open discussion on issues like homosexuality and abortion, where both sides are represented?

Mr. DORNAN. A darn good question, I would say to the gentleman, because when you try to get a discussion going like that in some Democrat groups

across this country, you are shot down. There is only one viewpoint that is tolerated, and that viewpoint is pro-sodomy, and 95 percent of the Democratic clubs across this country are aware of this in the debate. You are screamed down. You could not even talk on the Democratic Convention platform, if you were the Governor of one of the biggest States in this Union, and I am talking about a Democratic pro-life hero, Bob Casey, but seven Republicans were put up on the platform at the Democratic Convention who had never done anything to walk a Democratic precinct in their life. They were given a platform and the Governor of Pennsylvania was told, "Get lost."

Mr. POMBO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER of California. I wonder if we could introduce our second newest Member?

Mr. POMBO. Before we do that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] a question. He says that not all the candidates were alike, that they had different viewpoints. What was it that tied all the candidates together? What was the central theme behind all seven of those?

Mr. DORNAN. To use Lee Atwater's big tent frame, one thing that brought all seven of these candidates together, and we have one of them right here with us, so we are going to give him the floor in a second, was the moral issue of passing massive debt on to our children and grandchildren and their children, massive debt. We have got into a bankruptcy type spending in this country that is so bad it is a moral issue. There is one.

Crime was an issue that brought everybody together. The health care issue was discussed in most of these races, because I think every one of them but one, maybe all seven, came after the Hilary task force had weighed in with its 1,364 page report.

Let us ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS] what are the key issue in his campaign and how broad was his support?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from California yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I believe if we actually take into consideration both of the House races, are we not nine for nine in major contests since election day in this country?

Mr. DORNAN. We were talking about big State races; nine for nine.

Mr. LUCAS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think quite clearly, and I suppose I should apologize to my colleagues, because from what I am able to gather and determine, a lot of this, whether you want to call it hysteria or this angle of attack that is now being used, really did not start to

boil up to the top until after my election victory in the Sixth District of Oklahoma, and that of our new colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS]. So obviously we have gotten someone's attention.

Pounding up and down the trail in the Sixth District of Oklahoma, a district that was and is 65 percent Democrat in registration, a district full of very conservative Christian Democrats in both an urban and rural environment, it was a joy for me to run as a candidate who opposed massive tax increases, who supported term limitations, a candidate who did not want to nationalize health care, a candidate who was opposed to further intrusions in our private lives, be it gun control or other things of that nature; a candidate who said up and down the trail that things like our agricultural industry and our energy industry were being ignored by the present administration in favor of short-term social goals.

It was a pleasure campaigning out there because the people of western Oklahoma, of central Oklahoma, responded to me. Certainly I shared those conservative moral values and was never ashamed to say so, but they responded to me.

Mr. Speaker, if there is such a thing as a radical right in western Oklahoma in the Sixth District of Oklahoma, then those are just the common folks who earn a living, who send their children to school, who care about the issues. So what if they happen to go to church on Sunday, happen to be God-fearing people? I am proud of them. I am a pleased person to serve them, to be one of them.

This statement that they are the radical whatever that sent FRANK LUCAS to Congress is just so unbelievable, so totally unbelievable, as to be laughable. I know out there that they know this.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to my colleagues for creating this mass hysteria among the other side in their efforts to lash out and try to put a different spin on things. Quite simply, my constituents, the salt of the earth, good, solid people who are still registered in the other party, are so because they are not ready to admit that they have been gone off and left in the political stream of life.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. He was elected in a district, I believe, that has not had a Republican elected for over 20 years, is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, 19 years.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. OK, 19 years. What is the Democrat registration in your district, I would ask the gentleman?

Mr. LUCAS. Sixty-five percent Democratic. In fact, my home county, until a number of good people reregistered to help me in my primary, it was about 91 percent, 92 percent.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. When the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], head of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, and Mrs. Clinton, the First Lady, are out to "demonize," as the evidence shows that that is what they are out to do, they are basically saying to all the good Democrats, not just the Republicans, to all the Democrats in the gentleman's district in Oklahoma, "You are the religious right and we don't respect you." Is that what your impression is?

Mr. LUCAS. The very people we are speaking of are the folks who are the backbone of my district, and I believe the backbone of this country.

□ 2020

Mr. DOOLITTLE. The overwhelming majority of the people in this country are God-fearing people. I think the statistics are that over half have prayer every week, go to church every week. So imagine the God-fearing people of this country, Republicans and Democrats, independents, all being labeled by the Democratic Party leadership as somehow less than worthy of full dignity because they are "religious right." Shocking, really.

Mr. DORNAN. Let me tell you again, looking at our colleague, VIC FAZIO, in his long appearance at the National Press Club, and let me see if I can try and figure out what he is saying. He is saying, and he said it again on Cross Fire tonight, he would say to the people in the Sixth District of Oklahoma, "Go ahead and practice your faith, go ahead and let your faith give you certain beliefs. But don't bring those beliefs or worries about values to the public marketplace in a voting situation and attempt to influence other people's opinions. If your value system is based on religion, keep your mouth shut. If your value system is just based on the simple law of the jungle that you do not want to be beaten up, so you want brutes put away in prison, well you can base it on that."

I think what is happening here, I said in my 1-minute today, read an article from the USA Today by Richard Benedetto, I am not that familiar with him, but I am starting to read a little of these news coverage stories just in the past month on other things other than religion. He says Clinton faces over the next 2 years, if he has any thoughts of a second term, he says he has "very little wiggle room," as he says it, the fate of his health legislation, the results of the 1994 elections, I guess the long-term performance of the economy, the outcome of a sexual harassment lawsuit filed by Paula Jones, a former Arkansas State worker, hearings in this Chamber and the U.S. Senate on the Whitewater land dealings and his ability to get a credible handle on foreign affairs. I added the word credible. He said get a handle on foreign affairs. Now if he has all of these

worries, what can they come up with to divert, to stop this nine for nine onslaught against them of losing all of these elections? I think somebody without understanding at all, because they are not part of it, they are not part of the fear about the cultural meltdown and the worry about family values in this country, they thought that they could attack a segment of those who encourage voters to get out and vote, and attacked on a TV show Rev. Jerry Falwell, and former Rev. Pat Robertson. He wants to narrow it down to a few, and he does not understand, frankly. Two of my daughters, and I have three, but the two oldest ones who were married first have three kids each. They told me, "Dad, as plain, run-of-the-mill Roman Catholics who go to church every Sunday, we consider ourselves part of the religious right. We are part of that Christian coalition. We think government is making it hard for us to raise our children. We don't want condoms passed out in schools. We do not want value-free courses teaching sex such as straight old biology as though you are talking about animal husbandry." They said, "Don't these people understand they are insulting us?"

I know that there are Reagan Democrats, as they were called by the political pundits all across this country who rejected Bush for economic reasons and are now analyzing the common wheel, what is going on out there in the marketplace, and they are disgusted with the continual assaults upon the family. And they sit back and they say now let me see, was it the conservative philosophy that has caused this, the conservative judges, the conservative lawyers, the conservative district attorneys, the conservative movie producers or financiers, the conservative actors or actresses, the conservative show hosts, the conservative priests, the conservative rabbis, the conservative ministers, was it the conservative politicians who defended pornography down the line the last 30 years until they have turned our Nation into an open sewer in some cities? Who has defended abortion for all 9 months for any reason and told young teenage girls, 13, 14, 15 that they could have an abortion behind their mother's back, and that we as a party will fight to get them Federal money, and tell those who think it is murdering innocent life to just take a walk, we are going to get you Federal funding for this? Who has said the Boy Scouts should take in homosexuals? Who other than Joycelyn Elders?

And there is a column by Novak where he quotes the cardinal of Washington DC's archdiocese, Cardinal Hickey, who says we must now accept that everything that Elders says is Bill Clinton speaking. He now must come forward and admit this is everything that he stands for, or he would not tell a cardinal twice in two letters to back off, that he is going to support Elders.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the Attorney General has determined that we should not have multidistrict prosecution of child pornography. As the gentleman recognizes, child pornography is not a mom and pop industry. It is a large section of the organized crime, and in order to get rid of the Reagan administration attack where it had attacked in several districts at once in district courts, the Attorney General determined that we would not do that any longer.

Also, instead of having standards that disallow children to be involved at all in child pornography, they said the child had to be nude and performing a sex act. It was not just enough that they were in it.

This weakening of the child pornography laws was tossed out of court by a well-reasoned judge as she tried to get a conviction overturned so they could establish these new weaker standards.

My question is do you not believe that the first year and a half of the Clinton administration, with the ridiculous appointments and the weakening of our laws toward the family is reestablishing the Reagan revolution, and these nine victories were because people do have character, they respect family failures, and they are going to get that, they are going to elect Frank Lewis in a 30 percent Republican seat?

Mr. DORNAN. In direct answer to your question I would give names in the White House. When Christians and people of orthodox faith, and I have plenty of orthodox rabbis calling me, writing me, stopping me in the hall. I tell them, "Don't whisper. We're in the majority around here. You wouldn't know it from the news media."

But when you look at appointments like Donna Shalala, Roberta Actenberg, Christine Gibby, Joycelyn Elders, Patsy Thomason, when you look at the trooper 4, the Rosegate law firm 4, money changers in the Arkansas temple 4, that is my name for them, the condom 4, the pro-Hanoi 4, Strobe Talbot, Derek Shear, Sam Brown, and Morton Halperin, when you look at the Fab 4, James Carville, Paul Begala, Mandy Grunwald, and Stan Greenberg, and battered wife Stephanopoulos Christians who are worried about their children, and worried about what's happening in the schools look at this and they say, "Where is our support?"

Novak in his column says where is there one traditional, upstanding Catholic who identifies with Mother Teresa, who agrees with every single bishop in America on life issues, even the liberal and moderate bishops, where are these people?

I want to get the exact words of Cardinal Hickey's spokesman, Monsignor William Lori. And he says, "I'm speaking for Cardinal Hickey.

"One can only really conclude from both Clinton's letters, May 6 and June 3 this month, that Dr. Elders is truly speaking for the administration."

When I got back from Normandy, one of my sons said to me, "Dad, is the press going to have the guts to question the President about what Elders said while he was gone?" and I asked what that was. I did not hear it over there in Europe. Elders told the press that Clinton stopped her somewhere during the month of May and said, "Joycelyn, I'm all for you. I'm backing you up. I love what you're doing. I'm with you all the way."

Then she says yesterday, "I taught your President," she should have at least said hers, ours, she said, "I taught your President an awful lot," and got a standing ovation from about 300 lesbians.

I mean, what is going on here? As I said this morning, why does my pal, VIC FAZIO, who has a nice personality, think he can back up people who are insulting every Christian denomination in this country worthy of the name? I wish we had Ron Lewis here to join with Frank. The way he had been demonized, to use Hillary's word, in the press, I mean I was really looking forward to meeting a Christian bookstore owner from the great State of Kentucky. And here is just another good, hardworking Member who is worried about the country, worried about the massive accumulating debt, worried about the family, worried about his kids and whoever God has put in his care, and you would think by reading some of these columns that Frank here and Ron Lewis was the beginning of some sort of Middle Ages, Dark Ages takeover and crushing of the liberty of this country.

□ 2030

Mr. DORNAN. The crushing and the oppression has been against the American family, not the other way around.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I would like to inquire of the Chair, Mr. Speaker, how many minutes we have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANNER). The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Thirteen minutes. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DORNAN. If the gentleman will yield, do not rush. Because I follow that with 60 minutes. But I want to let the Speaker pro tem make it down to the chowder crabfest down at the White House. I may go down there myself and tell them about our special order, give them an autographed transcript of the RECORD tomorrow. But we have got plenty of time. Let us not rush this.

Mr. BAKER of California. I think it is important to remember that when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS] was sworn in, the first thing he did was sign, not the scriptures, but

the A to Z withdrawal petition to cut government and to balance this budget.

Mr. DORNAN. He did it before he spoke. He started to speak, went around and signed it, very dramatic moment, then came back and then made his introductory, very pleasant, remarks, to this Chamber.

Mr. BAKER of California. Very radical; very radical.

Mr. DORNAN. Let me get the reaction from everybody. My friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], was beating up on my friend Pat Buchanan, and they took a simple verbal slip of Pat Buchanan at the Republican Convention, and VIC used this again, said should we have a religious war in this country, and he starts beating up on one line of Pat Buchanan's at the Republican Convention. Here was Pat's line. Pat said, incorrectly, "We have a religious war in this country." He meant, and he has corrected it and said it ever since, "We have a spiritual war, a cultural war, in this country."

But Clinton went up to Notre Dame, very carefully had priests behind him with the good-looking Roman collars on, and he says, "We do not need a war, one religion against another," and got a standing ovation from the Notre Dame student body that was there. Pat was not calling for Mormon against Presbyterian against Methodist against Catholic against our Jewish brothers. That is not what he was saying at all.

What he was saying is we have a war of values, and do we. So here is Pat today, and let us everybody grab a piece of this.

Buchanan's column starts off by saying, "Bellicose barrage of Christian-bashing." Excuse me, this was last week. You would think that VIC FAZIO's staff would have put this in front of his face and tipped him off he is heading in the wrong direction. Pat starts off: "Are you now or have you ever been a Christian? The way things are going, congressional committees are likely to be asking that question in a few years. What is the Christian-bashing all about? Simple. A struggle for the soul of America is under way, a struggle to determine whose views, whose values, beliefs, and standards will serve as the basis of law, who will determine what is right and wrong in America, and the intensifying assault on the Christian right should be taken as a sign that these folks, the Christians, are gaining ground and winning hearts."

Jump forward to his closing two paragraphs: "If one would sit with these Christian folks and ask what they want for America, one would find that the answer is they simply want America to become again the good country she once was." Now, I think still is. "They want the right to life of unborn, preborn children protected. They want the popular culture to re-

flect the values of patriotism, loyalty, bravery, decency," and it sounds like the Boy Scout oath, does it not? "They want magazines, movies, and TV shows depolluted of raw sex, violence, and filthy language," and I know that Pat wants the marketplace to do that, not us in this Congress, "just as they want rivers and beaches detoxified of raw sewage. They want the schools for which they pay taxes to teach the values in which they believe," the values, by the way, that Alexis de Tocqueville saw in this country in the 1830's. Pat continues, "They want kids to have the same right to pray that they had, not a school-ordained prayer, kids' voluntary prayer from within the student body, and, yes, they do want chastity taught as morally right and traditional marriage taught as the God-ordained and natural norm. Is that so wicked and sinister an agenda?"

And, my colleagues, this very day, the Governor of Hawaii, because he thought his tourism was being threatened, had the guts to sign a law that bans same-sex homosexual lesbian marriage. He signed it. Now, it is probably going to go all the way to the Supreme Court.

Whose values will be reflected in those decisions, the values of the majority of Americans or the values of something that 10, 20, 30 years ago would have been considered bizarre and radical to the extreme, unworthy of public discourse?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. That was the Governor of Hawaii? Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. DORNAN. That is right.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. He is a Democrat, is he not?

Mr. DORNAN. He is a Democrat.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. So the Governor of Hawaii, which has to be one of the Nation's most liberal States if not the most liberal State—

Mr. DORNAN. PATSY MINK told me, by way of helpful help, she said you had better rebuild your party in the State. There is no Republican Party in Hawaii. None.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. So he has just been branded by the Democrat leadership in the White House, basically, as religious right because he has signed something into law that does not agree with their values? Now that is exactly the point we are making, that to brand people religious right simply to "demonize" them, and I believe that was Mrs. Clinton's term in People magazine or, as Mr. Cook explained, that the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and the Democrat leadership is doing.

That is smearing them. That is basically using a personal attack in order to divert attention from the issues.

Let me tell you if supporting the line-item veto like I do, if supporting the balanced-budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution like I do, if supporting

private-property rights like I do, if supporting smaller government, less regulation, tax cuts for families, capital-gains cuts for jobs, strong family values, if supporting love of country and of God like I do, if that is to be deemed religious right, I plead guilty, and so do the vast majority of the people of this country, and it just goes to show you how vastly out of touch the Democrat leadership and the Clinton administration are to think they can get away with this kind of a smear campaign being waged across the national media and think that we are just going to sit back like little puppy dogs and take it and not strike back, because, Mr. Speaker, there are too many good people in this country who care deeply about these things, and they know that this is no kookie, far-right fringe set of values that we are talking about. This is mainstream America. Sadly, mainstream America is not represented very strongly in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. BAKER of California. If the gentleman will yield, may I conclude by suggesting that the Democrat Party has brought us this majority coalition back together again that George Bush let slip through his fingers, and I would like to thank VIC FAZIO and wife of the President for focusing the public's attention on just what is wrong here in Washington, and that majority brought us FRANK LUCAS from Oklahoma, in an overwhelming vote in a special election. FRANK, it is great to have you with us.

Mr. LUCAS. My colleagues have summed up. You are entirely right.

In my district where I, too, read in all the publications in the Washington area about how it was such a great religious right-wing whatever, it flabbergasts me, but those are the same issues I campaigned up and down the trail, balanced-budget amendment, line-item veto, and my opposition to nationalized health care, my opposition to further tax increases, and the people responded, and they responded because they are not the radical Christian right. They are not the radical anything. They are just the average citizens out there who work for a living, who care about this country, who care about the Lord, who want to be able to prosper and to do well and to have Uncle Sam, in whatever guise that it might be, stay out of their life, stay out of their church, stay out of their pocket.

And when I spread that message across the Sixth District of Oklahoma, people responded, no matter what their skin color was or their economic background or which particular church they attended or whatever they did, because it is the views that reflect the good folks of the Sixth District of Oklahoma.

I think obviously in the other eight races they are the views that reflect

this country, and the people who do not share those views had probably better spend more time focusing on why they are out of sync than just simply calling names as a way to cover their deficiencies.

Otherwise what has started with those nine races will continue through the summer and the fall, and we will see a different process here next year, because the people will speak just as they have already spoken nine times.

I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to participate in this discussion before this esteemed group this evening.

Mr. DORNAN. I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], before you yield back your time, can I get in one line here from the Washington Post? I keep referring to yesterday. Actually the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] made this speech Tuesday morning, on June 21. Here is the Washington Post, the liberal paper of record, one of America's three largest newspapers, here in the District of Columbia, a reporter whose political beliefs are unknown to me, which is the sign of a good reporter, Don Balz, and sometimes I like what I am reading when he reports, other times I do not. But he seems like a fair reporter. Here is what he says.

□ 2040

Here is what he says, and he quotes VIC FAZIO directly. "The Republicans accept the religious right and their tactics at their own peril," again here is VIC helping us "For these activists are demanding their rightful seat at the table." Did he mean to say it that way? Why not?, "And that is what the American people fear most." That is what FAZIO said. VIC FAZIO is telling us that the greatest fear Americans have is that religious people are demanding their rightful seat at the table. Then Don Balz goes on to write, "Democrats are worried about major losses in the fall elections and FAZIO's speech indicated that he and other Democrats hope to shift the focus away from public dissatisfaction with incumbents in Congress by raising questions instead about what kind of candidates the Republicans will be offering." Outstanding candidates like FRANK here.

"Although FAZIO lumped a number of groups into what he called the radical right," and by the way that is what he has been saying for 2 days, the radical right, not any religious right. Then he slipped over and over and keeps saying the religious right. The article goes on, "His principal target was the role of religious conservatives in the Republican Party." That is me, that is including my five grown children. It is that entire section of the Catholic faithful that you can call "loyal."

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Nothing wrong with being religious, basically.

Mr. Speaker, let me yield to the gentleman from California in the few minutes we have left.

Mr. POMBO. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the gentleman taking out the time tonight for this special order to talk about what is going on in this country today and what the agenda should be for this country and this government today.

I, like every other Member of this body represent about 575,000 people. In my district my constituents, the people that I live with, my neighbors, my friends, they all have a lot of fears. They have a lot of fears about this country and what is going on today. Their fears are not about the radical right or the religious leaders who have spoken in this country. Their fears are about the runaway deficit, their fears are that taxes seem to increase every year, and they have to work harder, longer hours just to continue on for the standard of living that they have.

The fears that they have are that their children are not going to have the same opportunities that they had; that they are not going to be able to hand their children and grandchildren a better world. That is what they are afraid of. But if we want to work together as a Congress, we need to look at what the real fears are and stop this fearmongering and finger-pointing that is going on right now. I thank the gentleman.

#### DR. ELDERS IS SAFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. TANNER). Under the Speakers's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for 60 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, before the last crab is gone down there, let me try to be fair to you because you enjoyed this inspirational trip to Normandy with me and we got to be good friends. But let me just reemphasize some of the points on Dr. Elders, who seems to have a lock on her job partly, I guess, because of the dumping of Lani Guanier, another lady of African-American descent who had been appointed to something, and then Clinton, her friend from law school at Yale, suddenly discovered her writings, he said, and jerked her appointment.

I did a 1-minute speech today that I titled "In the Minefield, the Electoral Minefield" that Clinton has to go through the next year and a half," that the most explosive mine under the ground is Dr. Elders. She is the one who can blow his lights out.

I have before me again this Bob Novak column from today, and I want to underscore some of the things we missed during the four-way discussion.

Bob Novak writes—and he was terrific on Crossfire tonight, I might add—"President Clinton has rejected requests from the Catholic Archbishop of Washington to disavow Surgeon Gen-

eral Joycelyn Elders' comments about sexuality, signalling that she must be treated with kid gloves no matter how embarrassing her statements." The reason I want to do this, Mr. Speaker, is on the show our distinguished colleague, VIC FAZIO, said he never heard of these letters, this correspondence between the Catholic Cardinal, the Archbishop of Washington, DC, and all the surrounding environs that make up a better-than-your-average diocese and archdiocese. He said he never heard of it. So he is going to hear about it tomorrow with all the dates, because I am going to give him this article tomorrow. We are friends. I will give him the transcript of this colloquy tonight for some speed readings. "Senior Clinton officials," and I continue Novak, "have to follow suit; finessing options that Dr. Elders is apt to offer whenever she testifies before Congress. When she recently said that more Federal funds should be spent on AIDS than on cancer is that the victims are younger. Her superiors rolled their eyes but could not reprimand her."

To quote a high-ranking official "The President feels very strongly about Joycelyn Elders." Hence the reason he has not disowned what she said while he was gone but he backs everything she is saying.

"That's a clue to what's wrong with the Clinton presidency," Novak goes on. "He named as Surgeon General of the United States somebody her own colleagues admit is unqualified and undisciplined. But as an African American woman up from poverty and out of Arkansas, Elders need not worry about her job. Cardinal James Hickey of Washington found that out in a correspondence with Clinton. It began when Hickey learned that the Surgeon General, interviewed by a gay publication," the Advocate, "endorsed homosexual adoptions and called homosexual sex normal and healthy." Novak left out that she said "Particularly for young people."

"On March 21 the Cardinal wrote to the President to take strong exception to Elders' criticism of how religious leaders view human sexuality. Hickey accused the Surgeon General of 'encouraging life style which puts so-called homosexual unions on a partisan with marriage and family and condones homosexual behavior among young people.' He then asked the President 'publicly to disavow' Elders' remarks." He goes on, "That was not an easy letter for Clinton to answer. How to balance gays," homosexuals, "and blacks against traditional Catholics? On May 6, six weeks later," I find that insulting as a run-of-the-mill Catholic, "he replied that he is committed to building a society that promotes tolerance and acceptance of diversity." I guess he still wants to shove homosexuals who are active into places in the military."

Now this is Clinton's words. "Issues such as homosexual marriage 'are left

to the individual states and are not under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government."

"The Cardinal responded May 16," within a few days that "Contrary to the Clinton formulation 'Dr. Elders, as a Federal official, continues to advocate a redefinition of the family.'"

Clinton is a little faster this time, 18 days later he responds with Clinton's June 3 reply. He "recited all his administration had done for the family starting with the Family Leave Act but left the Cardinal unsatisfied. Monsignor William Lori, speaking for Hickey, told this column 'One can only really conclude from both letters' from Mr. Clinton 'that Dr. Elders is truly speaking for the administration.'" I have a feeling that she is speaking for Hillary Rodham Clinton, but I guess it appears she is also speaking for her friend from Arkansas, Bill Clinton.

"In the midst of this correspondence, Elders before the Senate committee May 11 to be asked why the government plans to spend more against the number 9 killer, AIDS, than against number 1 cancer and number 2 heart disease. Her answer was stunning," and I think it is distasteful when talk show hosts kind of mock her accent.

□ 2050

So I will just kind of read this straight. She says:

"We know that AIDS is a ravishing disease in our country that is destroying our bright young people. I feel that if we do not find a vaccine, if we do not find a good drug \* \* \*." By the way, thank God she is not saying "cure." There never will be a cure, not when that little, infinitesimal HIV virus is locked inside those helper T cells. No way are we ever going to get that out. That is beyond science for millions of years. But she wants that vaccine or to find a good drug. How that is going to help Africa, which has no pharmacies, I do not know.

She says, "If we don't, we are going to lose our entire society."

So, there is threat again of heterosexual AIDS transmission whipping through the whole of society, and all of that has been disproven.

Elders continues:

"Most of the people who die with heart disease and cancer are our elderly population, you know, and we will all probably die with something sooner or later."

What? Probably? It is an inevitability, Mr. Speaker. What is she saying? Sometimes her mind just wonders off. How did she get through medical school?

Now what does the Assistant Secretary, her boss, Assistant Secretary for Health, the respected, Bob Novak says, Dr. Philip Lee say? He quotes:

"A lot of things that Joycelyn says I don't agree with, but I still respect her right to say them," blah, blah, blah,

blah. "I don't look at whether this will affect older people or younger people." I myself. "I look at whether this is an area where we can make progress in dealing with disease," unquote Dr. Philip Lee.

Novak continues:

"Elders' high-sounding job is low in the chain of command, subordinate to both Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala and subordinate to Dr. Philip Lee. But they had no part in selecting the Surgeon General and cannot discipline her now. For all of her failings Joycelyn Elders is an appealing, compassionate person whom administration officials, the President included, would prefer to have had concentrate on antismoking and antiteenage pregnancy campaigns. The reality is that Dr. Elders is out of control, and nothing will be done about it, and this tells us much about the presidency."

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today our colleague, BOB MICHEL of Illinois, the Republican leader, was with his 9th Division fighting on the Cotentine Peninsula, the Cherbourg Peninsula. Up on the outskirts of Cherbourg the German defenders were digging in. The U.S. loss of life was tremendous. The British still had not gotten into Caen which we drove through, Mr. Speaker, several times from Deauville going to and from the very moving and thought provoking 50th anniversary commemorations along the beach of Utah, Normandy, Gold, Juneau, Seward. The British took St. Honorine; I wonder if that means St. Honore, the beautiful little city on the coast where Henry V landed.

Meanwhile in the Pacific, which I talked about last night, I put in some material on Saipan in the RECORD last night. It is in today's RECORD. The United States Marines, Japanese troops fought viciously on the slopes of Saipan's Mt. Tapotchau, T-a-p-o-t-c-h-a-u. We all know Omaha Beach, and we all know about Iwo Jima, but a lot of Americans died on Mt. Tapotchau.

Meanwhile, in the Biat caves, an island that most Americans do not know about, let alone young people; in the Biat caves the fighting went on. We had the upper hand, but meanwhile the Japanese troops on the mainland of New Guinea inflicted serious and heavy losses on American forces fighting in the Sarmi, S-a-r-m-i, area 50 years ago, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by asking to put in the RECORD a column from last Sunday's New York Times, June 19, by Maureen Dowd. I never met this reporter. She has called me a couple of times for a brief quote.

She has a column, I guess it is every week, called Dowd, D-o-w-d, Maureen Dowd on Washington. This one she simply calls "Beached," and it brings back some memories of our trip, Mr. Speaker, to Normandy.

It was cold and rainy as the Normandy invasion started, and nothing was going as planned.

As we hit the beaches, Helen Thomas was in the lead, charging off the aircraft carrier George Washington with toothbrush and tape recorder. Sam Donaldson provided air cover in a Chinook helicopter hovering over the English Channel. "General Hillary," as a British paper dubbed her, arrived on the field of battle with her hairdresser, Sylvan, one word.

Never mind destiny. President Clinton has a rendezvous with Wolf Blitzer.

The boys of Point du Hoc scaled their cliff under German fire in bad weather on June 6, 1994, but the boys on the bus never made it to Pointe du Hoc at all on June 6, 1994. The White House press corps missed the President's speech because their helicopters turned back because of bad weather and the backup buses did not leave in time to get to the coast from the landing at Le Havre.

The reporters, stranded at Colleville-sur-Mer, were in a panic. The Clinton lieutenants, who pride themselves on their high-tech virtuosity, said calmly that they would play a tape of the Pointe du Hoc speech. But when they put the tape in and Clinton began to speak, no words came out. "The sound," a White House official explained helpfully, "is coming later by bus."

The fog of war had given way to the fog of White House amateurism. As yuppies retraced the steps of heroes, one thing was certain: Midway into the first term, the Clinton White House has not yet gotten the knack of smoothly moving around hundreds of grouchy journalists, who pay handsomely to be ferried by the Government.

With comic timing worthy of Evelyn Waugh, the White House kept losing people. Tom Brokaw said he was 2 hours late for an interview with the President because Army helicopter pilots delivering him, Sam Donaldson and Harry Smith and CBS to the aircraft carrier, where Clinton was spending the night, got lost and could not find the largest ship in the world. After flying aimlessly over the English channel for 45 minutes, the pilots got low on gas and had to return to the airstrip in Deauville, call the ship for coordinates and start again. (The Navy was vastly amused.)

Another day, the White House marooned 24 reporters and staffers in the misty British countryside for 12 hours, unable to figure out a way to get our group 100 miles from Cambridge to Portsmouth, the next stop on the President's schedule.

I drove it the day before along with my wife and walked in Eisenhower's steps. It is funny that I did not have this problem.

A furious A.P. radio reporter was filing reports on a President he could only see on the telly in the Churchill pub, where the press had been dumped. White House aides paced the Tarmac, scanning the skies for a missing helicopter, and screamed into cellular phones with dying batteries.

I tried to call my boss in Portsmouth to warn him I would miss my deadline, but the instructions on the pay phone were in British. Sipping the Champagne ordered by the Paris March reporter, I fantasized about replacing the corner dart board with the head of one of Clinton's prepubescent press-minders.

Things were no better in Paris. After the state dinner at the Elysee Palace, the photographers were told that there would be a photo opportunity by a bridge, where the

First Couple would stroll "hand in hand" and gaze at the Eiffel Tower at midnight. (Take that, Paula Jones.) \* \* \*

But when the Clintons got out of their limousine near the Pont des Arts, the Bridge of Arts, it was not exactly an intimate moment. They were surrounded by about 40 people—Bill staffers, Hillary staffers, the Secret Service and the French police. Security did not allow the American photographers off the bus, thus stymieing the scheme of the White House advance team to bathe the Clintons' bruised partnership in a little Paris moonlight. After a few confused seconds, the Clintons climbed back into the car and motored off for a tour of the Louvre.

With the exception of the First Lady, a tidy traveler, the Presidential operation has the smell of a dormitory about it, with everyone crashing for exams. Each White House reflects the personality of its leader, and this President, immune to punctuality and discipline, will always have a Pigpen cloud of chaos around him.

What you see traveling with the Clintons is what you already know: He is learning. She is searching. He is learning to be Commander in Chief. She is searching for a personal style, and for a way to blend old rituals with new power.

At the end of the day in Normandy, Bill Clinton walked down to the beach with the veterans of Omaha Beach—Joe Dawson, Walt Ehlers and Robert Slaughter. The tableau was appealing: the young President enjoying the company of the aging heroes. But suddenly the President's aides began tugging the veterans away, mid-conversation, so that Clinton could walk off at sunset down the beach in his dress shoes and have a preplanned meditative moment with the bluffs on one side and the sea dotted with warships on the other.

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, what Maureen Dowd could not know is that major ship in the background, the U.S.S. *San Jacinto*, an Aegis cruiser, was named after George Bush's carrier, the U.S.S. *San Jacinto*, which 50 years ago tonight was launching George Bush, in the morning, Pacific time, against the Mariana Islands. We have the 50th anniversary of Bush's second loss of his airplane, and he lost all of his crew, his other two crew members, coming up, the 50th anniversary, on September 2, a few months from now.

Maureen closes:

"Originally, the White House told photographers they were considering a 'Where have all the flowers gone?' moment, where Clinton and children would throw flowers into the sea." I may barf, Mr. Speaker.

"But they settled on a moment of solitude. The President knew he was supposed to look reflective," as he had done at the Nettuno Cemetery, the Sicily-Italy cemetery south of Anzio.

"He knew he was supposed to look reflective for the three cameras and dozen photographers who joined him," this soulful moment.

"But after looking soulfully out at the ocean for a moment, he seemed at a loss for what to do next, according to a photographer on the scene, who was scared that Clinton was about to

mouth the words, 'What do I do now?' Then spying the stones at his feet left by his advance staff to show him where his camera marks were, the President crouched down and began to arrange the stones into a cross. He gathered more stones to finish the cross, and then bent his head as though in silent prayer."

"The White House aides were ecstatic." These are the prepubescent young aides bumping into one another. "Wasn't it great?" they asked reporters.

Mr. Speaker, I will bet one of them said, "Awesome, dude."

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and tomorrow, June 24, on account of official business.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 3:45 p.m., and tomorrow, June 24, on account of illness.

Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), after 2:30 today, on account of his addressing the West Seneca High School Graduation Ceremony in his congressional district.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today after 6:00 p.m., and for June 24, on account of attending a funeral.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. FISH, for 5 minutes today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HINCHEY) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 5 minutes today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MILLER of California and to include extraneous material notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$2,222.

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

Mr. WALSH.

Ms. SNOWE.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. TALENT.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. STUMP.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. SUNDQUIST.

Mr. SOLOMON in six instances.

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

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. KLEIN in two instances.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas in two instances.

Mr. MANN in four instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. PASTOR.

Mr. DE LA GARZA.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. CHAPMAN.

Mrs. MALONEY in two instances.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. STUDDS.

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

Mr. TANNER.

Mr. POMEROY.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. WAXMAN.

#### SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1357. An act to reaffirm and clarify the Federal relationships of the Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians and the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians as distinct federally recognized Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 2099. An act to establish the Northern Great Plains Rural Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution commemorating June 22, 1994, as the 50th anniversary of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 24. An act to reauthorize the independent counsel law for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 24, 1994, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3417. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request to make available appropriations totaling \$45,550,000 in budget authority for the Departments of Commerce, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, and the Interior, and to designate these amounts as emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 103-276); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3418. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 94-32), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on 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. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. H.R. 4600. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority (Rept. 103-557, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

#### 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. MINGE:

H.R. 4634. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a taxpayer may elect to include in income crop insurance proceeds and disaster payments in the year of the disaster or in the following year, to provide for a technical correction regarding indexation of the threshold applicable to the luxury automobile excise tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 4635. A bill to extend the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLACKWELL,

Mr. BONIOR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GEJDE-SON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HAMBURG, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFINGTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Mr. REYNOLDS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHENK, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 4636. A bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONILLA:

H.R. 4637. A bill to assure compliance with the guarantees of the 5th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution by prohibiting the intentional creation of legislative districts which favor or discriminate against individuals based on the race, color, national origin, or language of voters within such districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H.R. 4638. A bill to consolidate the administration of defense economic conversion activities in the Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4639. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives relating to the closure, realignment, or downsizing of military installations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Maine (for himself and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 4640. A bill to establish a Gulf of Maine Council to promote the economic development and ensure the environmental quality of the Gulf of Maine, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Foreign Affairs, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 4641. A bill to restore the previous tariff treatment accorded to hand-cast string-drawn fishing nets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGLETTA:

H.R. 4642. A bill to provide for the restoration of Washington Square in Philadelphia

and for its inclusion within Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. GRAMS):

H.R. 4643. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide and clarify the authority for certain municipal solid waste flow control arrangements; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H.R. 4644. A bill to amend the Defense Economic Adjustment, Diversification, Conversion, and Stabilization Act of 1990 to give priority in the provision of community economic adjustment assistance to those communities most seriously affected by reductions in defense spending, the completion, cancellation, or termination of defense contracts, or the closure or realignment of military installations; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Public Works and Transportation, Education and Labor, Armed Services, and Small Business.

By Mr. HILLIARD:

H. Con. Res. 258. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the U.S. Congress that the Citizen's Stamp Advisory Committee of the U.S. Postal Service would recommend to the Postmaster General that a postage stamp be issued honoring America's first African-American professional nurse, Mary Eliza Mahoney; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HILLIARD (for himself, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. EVERETT):

H. Con. Res. 259. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the U.S. Congress that the Citizen's Stamp Advisory Committee of the U.S. Postal Service should recommend to the Postmaster General that a postage stamp be issued honoring coach Paul "Bear" Bryant; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZIMMER (for himself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HORN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. FURSE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 463. Resolution requiring that LEGIS and TLS information be made available to the public on the Internet; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. BLILEY):

H. Res. 464. Resolution designating July 12, 1994, as "Public Health Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 84: Mr. BROWDER.

H.R. 417: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 647: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 672: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 795: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. AP-LEGATE, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 1080: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1737: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.R. 1801: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 1955: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 2019: Mr. YATES.

H.R. 2418: Mr. SAWYER and Mr. BISHOP.  
 H.R. 2586: Mr. SKEEN.  
 H.R. 3039: Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. PAXON.  
 H.R. 3407: Mr. UPTON and Mrs. MEEK.  
 H.R. 3486: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. EMERSON.  
 H.R. 3492: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. STUMP, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CANADY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KLEIN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. JEFFERSON.  
 H.R. 3546: Mr. COLEMAN.

H.R. 3634: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 3694: Mr. KYL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. SCHENK, Mrs. THURMAN, and Ms. FURSE.  
 H.R. 3731: Mr. FROST, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. SANDERS.  
 H.R. 3875: Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. LUCAS.  
 H.R. 3978: Mr. CALVERT.  
 H.R. 4028: Mr. FINGERHUT and Mr. ROWLAND.  
 H.R. 4056: Mr. COMBET, Mr. KYL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. WELDON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCURDY, and Ms. FURSE.  
 H.R. 4251: Mr. FISH and Mr. ROSE.  
 H.R. 4257: Mr. FISH.  
 H.R. 4271: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 4353: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.  
 H.R. 4354: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. PARKER.  
 H.R. 4371: Ms. SNOWE and Mr. KASICH.  
 H.R. 4386: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. LEVY.  
 H.R. 4400: Mr. FISH.  
 H.R. 4402: Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. PELOSI, and Ms. SHEPHERD.

H.R. 4413: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
 H.R. 4478: Mr. VENTO, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. KOLBE.  
 H.R. 4479: Mr. VENTO, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. KOLBE.  
 H.R. 4514: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. BLACKWELL.  
 H.R. 4517: Mr. FARR and Mr. FROST.  
 H.R. 4519: Mr. LEVY.  
 H.R. 4527: Mr. MONTGOMERY.  
 H.R. 4589: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 4623: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.  
 H.J. Res. 44: Mr. BALLENGER.  
 H.J. Res. 311: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. SHAW, and Mrs. UNSOELD.  
 H.J. Res. 343: Ms. FURSE and Mr. HUTCHINSON.  
 H.J. Res. 378: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FROST, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. TOWNS.  
 H. Con. Res. 5: Mr. TORRICELLI.  
 H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. ORTON.  
 H. Con. Res. 150: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.  
 H. Con. Res. 255: Mr. YATES, Mr. McHALE, and Mr. RICHARDSON.  
 H. Res. 446: Mr. ALLARD and Ms. MOLINARI.  
 H. Res. 460: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.