

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, July 29, 1994

The House met at 11 a.m.

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

May the spirit of gratefulness and appreciation, of gratitude and thanksgiving, be with us, O God, as we remember people who have blessed us by their concerns for us and all we do. We remember especially those friends whose support and succor is available at any time, whose love and devotion encourages and strengthens, whose respect we cherish and whose good will is a precious gift. As You, O gracious God, have made us one people to dwell together in peace, so unite us with those near and dear as we express the harmony and unity that is Your will for us. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. SCHROEDER 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 with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4602. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 4603. An act 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.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4602) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of the

Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. REID, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GORTON, Mr. HATFIELD, and Mr. BURNS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4603) "An Act 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," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. SASSER, Mr. KERREY, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. GRAMM, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive up to 15 requests on each side for 1-minute speeches.

EQUAL ACCESS FOR ALL TO HEALTH CARE

(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, this is an incredible country where Americans every day are willing to put their lives on the line for other Americans and for their full rights under the Constitution. Unfortunately, today two of those Americans lost their lives in Florida. Two Americans who were escorting women into family planning clinics were shot and killed today. That says to me as we go into this health care debate, we must all stand for the full constitutional rights of women to access to health care. Anything we do that sends any kind of message that women's rights are at all marginal only encourages those people who think they have the right to take

the law into their own hands and shoot those who are out there trying to guarantee this constitutional right for women.

I think universal includes women. It must include women in health care. We must do it for these two Americans who lost their lives today. Anything else would only perpetuate this kind of a terrorizing scene that we have seen much too much of in America.

BANKING COMMITTEE INVESTIGATES WHITEWATER

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

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, last night the Democratic majority on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs demonstrated conclusively to the American people how desperate they are to keep the American people from learning the truth about Whitewater. As I was pursuing a line of questioning of Maggie Williams, the First Lady's Chief of Staff, showing conclusively that either she or Roger Altman, the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, is not telling the truth regarding White House involvement and interference in the Whitewater investigation, Chairman GONZALEZ attempted to gag me and MAXINE WATERS, the gentlewoman from California, interrupted me and told me to shut up.

Mr. Speaker, this, even for the gentlewoman from California, went to a new low. I want her to know as long as I am on that committee and so long as I am in this House, she is not going to tell me to shut up, she is not going to tell the American people to shut up, and I am not going to stop until we get to the root of Whitewater.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has to realize and the Democratic members of that Whitewater committee have to realize they can no longer continue to cover up the truth from the American people. They cannot shout down elected representatives.

I would just say to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], can you imagine the reaction if anyone had told her to shut up, what she would be claiming, the allegations she would be making? There is no double standard in this House. What she did is wrong, and I am going to stay on her until this is over.

☐ 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.

HUMANITARIAN AID MISSIONS COULD AFFECT ADVERSELY THE UNITED STATES MILITARY PRE- PAREDNESS

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Madam Speaker, nothing gives American citizens a greater sense of pride and satisfaction than to see the flag of this great Nation planted in a foreign country and the troops of our Nation providing humanitarian aid and assistance to people who are suffering and people who are starving. We saw it very recently in Kurdistan. We saw it in Somalia. We have seen it in Guantanamo Bay with troops providing help for Haitian refugees, and we are now seeing it in Rwanda.

But, Madam Speaker, it must be said that the U.S. Army is not the Red Cross, and the U.S. Navy is not the Salvation Army. Those are two outstanding and wonderful organizations dedicated to providing succor and aid to people around the world, but they are not military organizations, and our military organizations are not humanitarian organizations.

When as it is stated in today's Washington Post some people at the Pentagon are concerned about the effect of humanitarian aid missions upon our national preparedness and our national defense, we have to take warning. I would say we must keep up the good work, but we cannot let that good work affect adversely our being militarily prepared to defend our Nation.

LISTENING TO HEALTH CARE CONCERNS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, normally over the last few weeks, we have been doing a lot of talking about health care. But maybe we should also make a conscious effort to listen closely and carefully to the people we represent.

On July 25, WFLA radio in Tampa, FL, conducted a listener poll on health care. The results? Of the callers, 90 percent preferred our present system of mostly private medical care. Only 6 percent of those responding liked the Clinton plan and barely 4 percent supported a single-payer, Canadian style system.

This radio poll was not scientific. I make no claim that these numbers represent what everyone in America thinks about health care reform. But neither are these results meaningless. Instead, I believe they are an indication that many people want to rely on the private sector—and not the Government—to provide health care. They

prefer to let what is working now continue to work.

Altogether, there is a tendency for some to view health care reform as a matter of educating the public as to what is good for them. They think "if only they know more, they will go along * * *." I disagree. I think this issue is fundamentally a matter of us learning from them.

□ 1110

INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, what version of the Constitution will Congress endorse today, the Son of Sam version or the mom and dad version? Will it be government by threat, government by fear, or will we get back to government by due process?

I am talking about the Internal Revenue Service, ladies and gentlemen, because when the Internal Revenue Service points a finger and accuses a taxpayer of fraud, you are guilty and you have got to go to court and prove you are innocent. But the Son of Sam, a serial killer, is innocent, and the burden of proof is on the government.

Unbelievable, ladies and gentlemen. It is time to take the Constitution and the Bill of Rights back. Sign Discharge Petition No. 12. A taxpayer in America should get the same constitutional protection that at least a serial killer gets.

Think about it.

DEMOCRATS MEET SECRETLY TO WRITE NEW HEALTH BILL

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, here we go again. After all of the promises of ending gridlock with bipartisan cooperation, the Democrat leadership has spent the past few weeks secretly meeting behind closed doors to work on a new version of the Clinton health care plan. Excluded from the meeting, rank and file Democrats, the press, the public, and above all, Republicans. Were special interest groups there? I do not know. But maybe what is more important than who was at the meeting is what is in the bill.

Who has read it? Who will get a chance to read it? Will we get a chance to read it before we vote, and will our constituents get a chance to review it and give us input before that vote takes place?

Ladies and gentlemen, I am a newcomer to Congress, but this is no way to run a country. I belong to a hopeful and an optimistic bipartisan group of

legislators in this House who want to vote on the Rowland-Bilirakis alternative, which we think is a good health care bill. It targets the needy and it does not give big government more power.

PROVIDING RELIEF FOR INSLAW, INC.

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

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing legislation for the relief of INSLAW, Inc., and William and Nancy Hamilton, the owners of INSLAW. These citizens have been grievously harmed by acts and omissions of our Government for more than a decade. Justice Department officials at the highest levels have taken the Hamiltons' property and used it without compensating them for its use and have thwarted their every attempt to obtain justice.

In 1982, INSLAW won a 3-year, \$10 million contract with the Department of Justice to install case management systems in the U.S. attorneys' offices. The company soon came enmeshed in a series of contract disputes when the Justice Department began withholding increasingly larger amounts of money until INSLAW was forced to file for chapter 11 bankruptcy in 1985. INSLAW survived bankruptcy and emerged from chapter 11 with a loan from the IBM Corp., an INSLAW business partner.

INSLAW filed suit against the Justice Department in U.S. Bankruptcy Court in June 1986. On September 28, 1987, Judge George Bason of the Bankruptcy Court ruled that the Justice Department "took, converted, stole" INSLAW's software "through trickery, fraud and deceit" and thereafter unlawfully attempted to cause INSLAW's liquidation.

In November 1989, senior U.S. District Judge William Bryant of the District of Columbia affirmed the Bankruptcy Court's \$8 million judgment against the Justice Department, ruling that "[t]he cold record adequately supports his findings under any standard of review." The U.S. District Court decision was reversed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in May 1991 on technical jurisdictional grounds. The appeals court ruled that INSLAW has proceeded in the wrong court.

On September 10, 1992, the House Judiciary Committee, completing a 3-year investigation, made the following statement in its report, House Report 102-857, the INSLAW Affair:

* * * the Committee's investigation largely supports the findings of two federal courts that the Department "took, converted, stole" INSLAW's enhanced PROMIS [software] by "trickery, fraud and deceit," and that this misappropriation involved officials

at the highest levels of the Department of Justice.

According to sworn testimony before the committee, high level Justice Department officials conspired to steal the PROMIS software and secretly convert it to use the domestic and foreign intelligence services. The committee noted in its report:

This testimony was provided by individuals who knew that the Justice Department would be inclined to prosecute them for perjury if they lied under oath. No such prosecutions have occurred.

Madam Speaker, we need to move now to refer this matter to the U.S. Court of Federal Claims so that the Hamiltons and INSLAW can get a fair hearing under the congressional reference procedure and finally obtain the justice which has been so long denied.

DEMOCRATS STONE WALL ON WHITEWATER

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, the handling of the Whitewater investigation at the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs has been a travesty. We have watched artificial time limits used to prevent the truth from being pursued. We have watched majority members of the committee tell Republicans to shut up when Republicans were attempting to ask important questions.

The Democrats then have the audacity to come out from behind their stone wall and proclaim that Whitewater is no big deal. "Where is the smoking gun," I heard one Democrat ask on TV this morning. The answer is clear. We suspect that the smoking gun is somewhere behind the Democrats' stone wall.

HEALTH CARE DEBATE IS NOT A GAME

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

Mr. OLVER. Madam Speaker, newspaper headlines across the country treat health care reform as one big game. To the Wall Street Journal, "The stage is set for the health care battle." The New York Times is keeping score. "Clinton wins one on health care." And the Washington Post calls health care "an election issue."

Madam Speaker, our health care debate is not a game. It is about people. It is about people like the couple from a small town in Worcester County, MA, who last week responded to my survey on health reform.

The woman pleads for health insurance that is affordable for everyone, this year, not 10 years from now, and with all employers paying a portion of employees' health care costs.

Madam Speaker, they have put their house up for sale. Her husband is disabled, and they cannot afford to keep their home while paying a COBRA premium of \$461 a month. They had to make a choice: Their home or their health.

Madam Speaker, we are reforming care to save that couple their home.

VETERANS PREFERENCE

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, the administration's rhetoric versus reality gap grows ever wider. Barely a month after reaffirming its support for the Veterans Preference Act, the administration has betrayed our veterans. The Department of Justice has decided to lodge an appeal against an Administrative Board decision upholding the law in a layoff of postal workers.

The Veterans Preference Act of 1944 establishes one of the most fundamental of veterans legal rights by giving wartime and disabled veterans first consideration for certain jobs and preference for retention in reductions in force.

According to an article in the Washington Post yesterday, a spokesman for the American Legion, denounced the decision to appeal as "hypocritical." Other veterans' groups are also outraged.

Madam Speaker, despite attempts to repair the administration's image with veterans and the military, including a stage-managed Presidential trip to Normandy for the 50th anniversary of D-day, Attorney General Janet Reno has shattered any illusions on where the administration really stands.

REPUBLICANS CONTINUE STRATEGY TO DEFEAT HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, yesterday on the floor, I read parts of a strategic memo from the Project for the Republican Future to the Republican leadership in Congress. It is an incredible document that advises Republicans to defeat health care reform—the theory being that health care's defeat will translate to Democratic defeats in November.

It is hard to believe that Republicans would be willing to sacrifice the most important initiative of our time in order to keep Democrats from getting any credit for it. But here it is in black and white, and I quote: "We should send them to the voters empty-handed."

In its zest to win elections, The Project for the Republican Future

seems to have forgotten America's future. They have forgotten the 40 million uninsured; forgotten the 80 million Americans with preexisting conditions; forgotten millions of small businesses who pay 30 to 50 percent more than their larger competitors for health care.

If Republicans are successful in their effort to thwart the public will and defeat health care reform, it will not be Democrats left empty-handed, it will be the American people.

MANDATES ARE A TAX BY ANY OTHER NAME

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Speaker, recent press reports indicate that Democrat leaders are continuing to advocate the idea of an 80:20, employer-employee contribution to fund their as yet unseen health care reform proposal.

They just do not get it. Mandates at 50 percent, 80 percent or even 100 percent are a tax that employers will pass onto their customers and their employees. And those lost dollars that employers cannot realize from someone else will force them to reduce their work forces.

Translation: Bad news for the American economy.

Would it not be ironic if my colleagues, who are in so much of a hurry to throw any sort of health care reform package together, ended up passing a measure that crippled one-seventh of our economy.

Madam Speaker, none of us here want to be remembered for reckless reform measures that polarized our economy, sapped the economy spirit of small business people and stalled the economy back into recession.

We need to accomplish meaningful health care reform that helps all Americans, not just the political objectives of a few select individuals.

Let us slow down the process, and make sure all the numbers and percentages are right. Reform of our health care delivery system does not need haphazard mandates—it needs calm, rational legislation.

□ 1120

TIME TO END THE WHITEWATER HEARINGS

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I want to share with the Members of this House an editorial opinion from one of my district's papers, the Marietta Times in Marietta, OH.

TIME TO END WHITEWATER HEARINGS

The House should devote its energy toward the massive agenda that's on hold while members of the Banking Committee conduct the Whitewater hearings.

What's the point of diverting so much effort from the business of the nation? We've gotten the explanations from the White House and others involved in the ill-fated land deal that occurred before Bill Clinton took office.

While some may have delusions that this is the '90s version of Watergate, it looks like that argument won't hold water. No one has been charged with a crime. It appears there was plenty of bad judgment, though. But it's not worth a full-blown committee hearing and the all-out efforts of the panel's talented staff. Imagine what this group of inquisitors could accomplish if they re-directed their energy to health care or fighting crime.

Madam Speaker, I hope we listen to this commonsense message from the heartland of America, Marietta, OH.

ACCEPT SENATE PROVISION ON VIOLENCE IN THE SCHOOLS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, last night the Senate added an important provision to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act giving local schools broader authority to deal with weapons and violence in the classroom. This amendment is similar to legislation that I have introduced in the House, the Student-Teacher Protection Act.

The amendment by the senior Senator from Washington allows local schools to take necessary disciplinary action against any student who brings a deadly weapon to school or who commits a life-threatening act of violence. Currently, students who are covered under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act—the IDEA—cannot be removed from the classroom for more than 10 days without a court order, regardless of the severity of their offense.

While the overwhelming number of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act students are dedicated learners who deserve our admiration, we have seen an increasing number of cases at the local level of dangerous behavior by a small number of students. This has been a significant concern in several of my local school districts, and I have been pleased to work with the Senator from Washington on this matter.

I urge the House conferees on this bill to accept this important Senate amendment and provide safer schools for all our students and teachers.

UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE WILL STRENGTHEN OUR ECONOMY

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I would be very happy to see some of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle come forward with a proposal that would provide guaranteed universal coverage for all Americans by the year 2000.

We have started off on the other side with complaints there was not a problem; from not having a problem, they attack the process; they talk about the calamity that we are about to create. Let us see what you would do. Give us a proposal on how to cover people with preexisting conditions, how to help people who work for corporations like McDonald's and Pizza Hut that do not insure their employees.

Do not give me your calls of calamity. The same people were here when we passed the budget and said it would ruin the economy. We have created more jobs in the last 16 months than the previous 4 years under a Republican administration. You said calamity would come from Social Security and Medicare. They are the things that hold this country together.

The charges during the Medicare debate are very similar to the charges we hear today. The reality is universal health care will strengthen our economy and move our country forward.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ALLOWING BUSINESSES TO CLAIM NEW EQUIPMENT AND MACHINERY AS BUSINESS EXPENSE

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I think I have some good news. We just received a report from the Tax Action Analysis. It is the tax policy arm of the Institute for Policy Innovation.

According to this study, it would result in almost 3 million new jobs. So in addition to new jobs, it results in added real GDP growth from my bill that I introduced, H.R. 539. It results in increased take-home pay.

Let me just give you a summary of the analysis of this bill that allows business to claim on their tax forms that the new equipment and machinery that they buy can be considered a business expense. First, higher investment would increase capital formation in the United States by \$8.9 trillion. Second, this larger stock of U.S. capital would lead to the creation of 2.7 million new jobs. Third, more capital and labor would yield an extra \$3.5 trillion in gross domestic product between 1995 and the year 2000.

Finally, this greater economic activity would boost long-term annual growth.

Madam Speaker, I elicit my colleagues to cosponsor this bill.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO THE HONORABLE BRUCE VENTO

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my gratitude to our colleague from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], whose considerable work in both housing and community development was critical in helping to draft and gain passage of the recent Housing and Community Development Act of 1995, particularly the provisions creating the Geno Baroni Recognition Awards for outstanding achievements by community-based revitalization groups across our country.

These awards will honor the visionary work of a crusader for the disenfranchised, and in memory of their namesake, will fund and facilitate neighborhood self-help by building upon the existing capacity building program under section 4 of the HUD's Demonstration Act of 1993.

As a defender of ordinary people, Monsignor Baroni passionately believed that real change begins with ordinary people working together at the local level, by working with blacks, ethnics, Hispanics, and people from all walks of life. He urged them to transcend their differences and work together to form coalitions to pursue their common agenda.

Thank you, Congressman VENTO.

FORCE-FEEDING THE CLINTON HEALTH PLAN

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

Mr. ALLARD. Madam Speaker, after reading the Washington Post this morning, it is clear that despite the opposition of the American people, the Democrat leadership intends to force-feed us the Clinton health plan.

Earlier this year, the CBO agreed that the Clinton plan should be completely on-budget. The mandated premiums are taxes, and the massive new entitlements are outlays.

From the start of this debate I have fought to ensure that any health entitlement is subject to budget discipline. With \$200 billion deficits we cannot afford another out-of-control entitlement.

Earlier this year we put an on-budget requirement in the budget resolution, only to have it removed by the Democrat leaders. They will no doubt continue their fight against honest budget treatment. I wonder why?

I will not let this issue be swept under the rug. When ClintonCare comes to the floor I am prepared to offer an on-budget amendment.

The best medicine for America in the health care debate is honesty. Federal mandated premiums are tax increases.

THE TRAGEDY IN PENSACOLA

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

Ms. SCHENK. Madam Speaker, I rise today with mixed emotions ranging from sadness to outrage. At 7:25 this morning in Pensacola, FL, a radical anti-abortion activist shot and killed two men and wounded a woman outside a family planning clinic. The two men were escorts who accompany women entering the clinic; the woman, a clinic employee.

The alleged gunman, Paul Hill of Pensacola, is the director of the radical group "Defense America of Pensacola," a group that advocates the use of force against both clinics and doctors, in other words, a terrorist group.

Madam Speaker, this Congress has passed legislation guaranteeing free and safe access to family planning clinics. We must now prosecute these terrorists to the full extent of the law.

We have made much of the so-called radical right; my colleagues, this is the horrible face of the radical right.

Madam Speaker, I pray for the families of the victims, and I pray that this type of tragedy will not occur again.

SUPPORT THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, today the Congressional Accountability Act is before the Rules Committee. This bill, H.R. 4822, will make certain laws applicable to Congress. I support H.R. 4822, I say to my colleagues, both in letter and in spirit.

But we cannot let H.R. 4822 be the end of our efforts in congressional reform. H.R. 4822 will come before the House the week of the eighth, most likely under suspension. This does not allow us the opportunity to strengthen it further by amending away the perks and privileges of Congress.

While I applaud the efforts of my colleagues, Mr. SHAYS and Mr. SWETT, again I ask for support for my congressional reform bill, H.R. 4444.

My bill brings Congress under laws that H.R. 4822 does not and also does away with the perks and privileges of office that have resulted in the voter revolt brewing across the country.

H.R. 4822 is a needed first step, and I support it. Support H.R. 4444 to finish the journey to total congressional reform.

□ 1130

REDACTED

(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. Madam Speaker, during the first Whitewater hearing, we have heard a lot of complicated terms and legalistic phrases.

One of these terms is redact. What the heck does redact mean?

Well, according to the dictionary definition, it means to make ready for publication, to edit or revise. In connection with the Whitewater investigation, redact takes on an even more interesting definition.

Administration officials certainly did redact documents before giving them to Republicans. Entire pages whited out, 40 page memos, completely blank.

Thus, when it comes to Whitewater, to redact means more than simply editing. It means to keep the truth from the American people.

Madam Speaker, we need less redact and more reassurance that the American people will hear the truth.

CONDUCT AT WHITEWATER COMMITTEE HEARING

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, last evening a Member of this House, PETER KING, had to be gavelled out of order at the Whitewater hearings of the Banking Committee. He had to be gavelled out of order because he badgered a woman who was a witness from the White House, Maggie Williams. I am pleased I was able to come to her defense. Madam Speaker, the day is over when men can badger and intimidate women.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I demand the gentlewoman's words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MEEK of Florida). The gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] must suspend and be seated.

The Clerk will report the words.

Ms. WATERS. —

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will please desist and take her seat.

Ms. WATERS. —

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is about to direct the Sergeant at Arms to present the mace.

□ 1150

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

He had to be gavelled out of order because he badgered a woman who was a witness from the White House, Maggie Williams. I am pleased I was able to come to her defense. Madam Chairwoman, the day is over when men can badger and intimidate women.

The SPEAKER. While in the opinion of the Chair the word "badgering" is not in itself unparliamentary, the Chair believes that the demeanor of the

gentlewoman from California was not in good order in the subsequent period immediately following those words having been uttered.

Accordingly, the Chair rules that without leave of the House, the gentlewoman from California may not proceed for the rest of today. The Chair would ask whether there is objection to the gentlewoman from California receiving the right to proceed in good order.

Mr. SOLOMON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does that mean that all of the words will be taken down subsequent to the point that she was ruled out of order and stricken from the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. None of those words will be in the RECORD, the Chair will state to the gentleman. None of the words will be in the RECORD subsequent to that since she was not recognized.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am a little puzzled by the word "demeanor." I was in the Chamber at the time, and I did see the Chair try to gavel the gentlewoman down, but I can understand why she could not hear, because there were so many people at mikes and I think she was confused by that. So I am a little troubled about that. How can you challenge "demeanor"?

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to advise the gentlewoman from Colorado that it is the opinion of the Chair that the chair at the time was attempting to insist that the gentlewoman from California desist with any further statements and sit down. She did not accord cooperation to the Chair and follow the Chair's instructions. Consequently, it is the find of the Chair that her demeanor at that point in refusing to accept the Chair's instructions was out of order.

The Chair wishes to ask if there is objection to the gentlewoman from California proceeding in good order.

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the Chair is putting the question to the House under unanimous consent of the gentlewoman being able to proceed for the rest of the day?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, so ordered.

There was no objection.

NOW IT'S THE FOREST GUMP PLAN

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, life seems to be imitating art in the health care debate as the Clinton administration's strategy calls to mind this summer's movie blockbusters.

The Clinton plan may be dead, but the Democratic leadership is busy crafting a Forest Gump plan. It's like a box of chocolates, since we do not know what we are going to get.

Meanwhile, the First Lady has boarded the scariest bus trip since the movie "Speed" to sell the as-yet unknown plan.

The public recognizes promises of something for nothing as "true lies." No wonder congressional support for a Government takeover of health care is melting fast. Members who support it will be blown away at the polls this November.

CLINTON HEALTH CARE BILL UNDER A NEW NAME

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that the demise of the Clinton health care bill has been greatly exaggerated. Last week Democrat leaders from the Senate and the House met with President Clinton and declared the Clinton health care bill dead. But we are going to have a new bill.

The new bill happens to have all the same elements of the Clinton health care bill. We are still going to have employer mandates. It is going to cost a lot of people their jobs. It is going to cost those who keep their jobs, and there will be reductions in their wages and reductions in their fringe benefits. We are still going to have global budgets, and it will mean nothing more than rationing.

So I would say to my colleagues that the American people know that the Government is too big and spends too much. Let us not make the Government bigger and keep spending more, while at the same time injuring the health care delivery system that most Americans today find highly acceptable.

ABORTION CLINIC KILLING

(Ms. FURSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a horrible tragedy that has occurred this morning in Pensacola, FL. Two people were shot and killed and another person was injured outside an abortion clinic today, and a well-known abortion protester was arrested.

This is not the first time this kind of violence has occurred. This is a coordinated effort of intimidation and terrorism. Last year David Gunn was shot to death outside a Pensacola abortion clinic, and an Oregon woman is in prison for shooting another abortion doctor. Let us not forget that abortion is legal in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this violence must stop. This Congress has passed and the President has signed into law the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances. This makes it a Federal offense to physically obstruct access to a clinic. I call on my colleagues to set aside their partisan differences and to work to protect doctors' and workers' right to a safe environment and a woman's right to these legal services. We owe the American people no less.

THE PENSACOLA ABORTION KILLINGS

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

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, when I got back to my office this morning after the caucus and heard about the shootings in Pensacola, FL, at the clinic, my heart wept for those victims and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I weep for this country. There is a growing atmosphere of hatred and of violence that this Nation cannot long endure.

Mr. Speaker, we must tell the men and women of our country, we must tell the fathers and mothers and tell the grandmothers and grandfathers that it is time for us to set a better example for the children of this country. It is time for us to break the chain of violence and hate.

Mr. Speaker, hate is not a family value.

□ 1200

TRAGEDY IN PENSACOLA

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who believe strongly in a woman's right to choose, today is our worst nightmare. We have been winning the battles in the courts, but we are at risk of losing the war at the clinics.

This shooting is a direct assault on the rights of all American women. The gunfire in Pensacola is just the latest in a series of attacks against patients, clinics, and doctors. Make no mistake: anti-choice extremists are waging a nationwide war on the right to choose.

In Pensacola they use a gun. Here in Washington they hope to use health care reform. The goals are the same: to take women backward, to marginalize women's health care, to restrict access to reproductive services.

We cannot allow them to succeed.

Health care reform is an historic opportunity to affirm the right to choose by guaranteeing basic health care for all American women. This is an opportunity we cannot afford to lose.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH IMPROVEMENT ACT

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, every day, we take for granted that the water we drink, the food we eat, and the air we breathe are not contaminated; that the food in our local restaurants is safe and that we are protected from communicable and infectious diseases. Yet, as a nation, we spend far less on these and other core public health activities that prevent disease, illness, disability, and injury than any other industrialized nation, and our patterns of morbidity and mortality reflect this. In fact, public health expenditures have decreased by 25 percent relative to national health expenditures over the last decade.

An estimated 70 percent of all health expenditures are attributed to preventable conditions. Yet, we continue to spend far more on costly curative treatment of these conditions than we do on prevention of them. Last year, we spent as much on treatment of preventable motor vehicle accident victims as we did on Medicare; the economic burden of preventable cardiovascular disease was greater than what the U.S. Government collected in corporate tax revenues.

Today, I am introducing the "Public Health Improvement Act." This bill promotes and finances prevention of illness and accidents and promotion of public health through two distinct approaches: it strengthens the capacity of local and state public health departments to carry out core functions, and it expands access to preventive and primary care services for vulnerable and medically underserved communities. This bill invests Federal dollars in the beginning years of life, and focuses on prevention, so that they'll be lives of quality rather than at the end of life, with its focus on the most costly of cures and procedures.

Think how excited we would be over the impact of a new surgical treatment that would correct millions of cases of heart disease; a new drug that would cure an epidemic likely to infect millions of Americans; a new perinatal therapy that would help over thousands of low-birthweight babies survive. But we already have the knowledge to prevent the heart disease; to prevent the epidemic; to prevent the low birthweight baby—that is real health care progress; that is what our public health system has the potential to accomplish, and that is the crux of the Public Health Improvement Act. Expanding access to health insurance will not resolve the major public health problems facing our nation

today, most of which are behavior-related. AIDS, substance and alcohol dependency, cardiovascular disease, accidents, violence, tobacco-related disease, and environmentally induced illnesses are outside the purview of the doctor's office. I urge my colleagues to focus on improving health status and reducing the economic burden of unnecessary illness and disease. I urge you to support the Public Health Improvement Act.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE PETER T. KING, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

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

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York, PETER KING, is a legislator of utmost integrity. He is fair and he is honest, with men and women. He is tough and he is conscientious on issues facing men and women. And he is a credit to all the voters who bring him to this Chamber, today, and especially during the investigation of the Whitewater hearings.

My colleagues, it is not always easy being a woman in today's society, but we can't always use it as an excuse when we are challenged. And we should never use it as an attack, when it could hurt and impugn the integrity and the respect of an individual like Congressman PETER KING.

I stand here in the well as a woman who is very proud to consider him a close friend and, in many ways, someone I seek to follow in the legislative battles that are conducted on the floor.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EMPLOYMENT ENHANCEMENT REFORM ACT OF 1994

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning with my colleagues, JOHN KASICH, JOHN MICA, and 20 of our colleagues to introduce legislation to improve the Federal job training effort.

The Employment Enhancement Reform Act of 1994 will simplify and streamline the flow of Federal job training dollars to the States to better serve unemployed Americans and hasten their reentry into the work force.

The act consolidates over 90 Federal job training programs into one flexible block grant program. States will have one set of job training definitions and regulations to implement, and one funding stream to monitor. The result: More resources devoted to job training services and fewer dollars being wasted on administrative costs.

States will also have the flexibility to target job training funds where they

are needed most and to be creative in providing this training. A single, more efficient job training effort will also reduce the deficit by \$7 billion over 5 years. This legislation will make our job training dollars work better and put people back to work. I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort.

U.S. DEFENSE BEING WEAKENED BY DISPERSAL OF TROOPS ABROAD

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the President's announcement on Rwanda today. First of all, because, to the best of my knowledge, there has been virtually no consultation with the Congress. Second, because we now have, in a Clinton administration which is cutting defense, Americans troops preparing to invade Haiti. We have a blockade or embargo around Haiti which is drawing forces away from drug interdiction to interdicting supplies to Haiti. We have American troops around Iraq. We have Americans now being sent into Rwanda. We have a proposal to send potentially 25,000 Americans to Bosnia as peacekeepers. Finally, we are reinforcing Korea where there is still a grave danger of a crisis which could explode into war.

I just wish that the administration would carefully look at what it is doing to weaken defense while further dispersing Americans across the planet.

I would urge my colleagues to look at what we are doing to airlift. All over the planet, every time you see an American airlifter showing up, we are wearing out the airplanes, we are wearing out the crews, and we are, frankly, exhausting our military. We are engaged in a process of hollowing out, and I think it is very, very dangerous.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The Chair will remind visitors in the gallery that it is contrary to House rules to show any manifestation of support or opposition to the proceedings of the House.

WAIVING PROVISIONS OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946 REQUIRING ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS BY JULY 31

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 495 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 495

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House a concurrent resolution waiving the requirement in section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 that the Congress adjourn sine die not later than July 31 of each year. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may use. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 495 provides for consideration in the House of a concurrent resolution waiving the requirement of section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The rule orders the previous question on the concurrent resolution without intervening motion.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may be wondering what we are doing here. An obscure section of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 established a joint rule of Congress. The joint rule requires that Congress adjourn sine die by July 31 of each year. It takes a concurrent resolution adopted by both Houses each year to authorize continuation of the session past July. The joint rule grants privileged consideration to the necessary concurrent resolution but only in odd-numbered years.

In even-numbered years the concurrent resolution is not privileged, so the normal course is to bring up the matter under unanimous consent. Yesterday there was an objection. That is why we need a rule today.

The requirement to adjourn by July 31 may have made sense in 1946. Back then the fiscal year ended in June and perhaps it was realistic to expect to adjourn before August. But Congress has not adjourned sine die before August in almost 40 years—July 27, 1956, was the most recent time. In fact, we have not adjourned sine die before October in almost 35 years—most recently on September 27, 1961.

Frankly, we ought to repeal section 132. That would eliminate what has become an unnecessary, irrelevant procedure each year. We could continue in session until we are ready to adjourn and then consider an adjournment resolution under the regular order; adjournment resolutions are privileged in the House.

I have tried to delete section 132 for many years. In fact, the House passed legislation I introduced in the 101st Congress but it went nowhere in the Senate. In recent years I tried to accomplish this through an amendment to the legislative branch appropriations bill but certain Members on the

other side of the aisle objected. And I will continue to pursue the means to repeal this obsolete joint rule.

Now what would happen if we don't pass the concurrent resolution authorizing us to stay in session? The only precedent I can find dates back to 1949. Speaker Rayburn, in August 1949, overruled points of order questioning the authority of the House to meet in the absence of a concurrent resolution. The state of war from World War II remained in effect and Speaker Rayburn noted that section 132 allows Congress to continue its session in the event of war.

But legitimate questions might be raised about the validity of the actions of this Congress in session beyond July, in the absence of a concurrent resolution.

I don't want to prolong the debate. It is necessary to pass this rule and pass the concurrent resolution and I urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York for purposes of debate only.

□ 1210

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule not because I think we can realistically adjourn the Congress on July 31 of this year as required by the 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act.

Instead, I oppose this rule to protest the fact that we have not had a comprehensive reform of this Congress since the enactment of that 1946 act.

Nothing more underscores the need for a bold overhaul of this Congress than antiquated provisions such as this which have not been revisited for nearly a half a century. In many respects we are still a mid-20th century Congress attempting to deal with the problems of the 21st century.

Is it any wonder the American people are losing respect for their Congress when they see us nearing the end of a Congress and still trying to devise major legislation on such pressing issues as health care, welfare, crime, and campaign reform?

Mr. Speaker, the authors of the 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act, had the best of intentions when they established the goal of adjourning each session of Congress no later than the end of July of each year.

What they were trying to say was that we should do a better job of getting our work done earlier so that we could return to our districts and constituents for the balance of the year and get back in touch, with their real problems and needs. Only in that way could we return in January refreshed

and better able to truly represent the best interests of our districts and Nation.

There are those who would argue that the day of the citizen legislator are long gone, and that Congress must have full-time, professional politicians working in a full-time Congress. But, when I hear those arguments I am frankly revolted.

To me that is running up the white flag on democracy and selling-out the people we represent. And don't think for a minute that our constituents haven't noticed this shift in the nature of their Congress. That is precisely why the people are so disgusted with us and are threatening to kick so many incumbents out of office this November.

They are not impressed with full-time, professional politicians or full-time Congresses. They want Representatives who are truly a representative cross-section of the citizenry so that they will have a truly representative government.

And to have that, they know that we must return to our districts more often and really listen to what is concerning them and how they think we can better represent them in making the laws they must live under.

Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, of which I was privileged to be a member, was very sensitive to these concerns and very sensitive to the declining public support for this institution.

The final report of the House members of the joint committee issued last December pointed out that the joint committee was created back in 1992 because, and I quote, "the issues facing Congress had changed greatly in the last 50 years while the internal structure had not."

And the report goes on,

Members were increasingly frustrated with the process. And the public's usual skeptical attitude toward Congress plunged toward cynicism and major discontent as reflected in public disapproval ratings which hit an all-time high of 77 percent in the summer of 1992.

That's when the joint committee was created—in the summer of 1992. And yet, here we are in the summer of 1994, with public disapproval ratings still running high. We've done nothing to reverse that dangerous attitude. The recommendations of the Joint Committee to reform this institution continue to languish in various committees of this House—some 6 months after they were introduced in bill form last February.

Today, the Rules Committee is taking one piece out of that reform bill in a futile attempt to demonstrate movement. Yet all it demonstrates is the truth of my prediction that the leadership is embarked on a 3-D strategy to kill comprehensive reform—divide, dilute, and delay.

How can we go back to our districts and face the voters when we have sat on our hands month, after month, after month and done nothing to modernize this institution and make it run better? Do you really think they will be bought-off with a few crumbs that won't do one thing to improve the operation of this Congress?

Mr. Speaker, I suspect this House would come much closer to meeting the July 31 adjournment date we are waiving by the resolution if we made a few major changes we have recommended.

I am talking about changes that would require that we organize each House and its committees earlier and report bills and pass major legislation by midyear instead of the year's end; changes to reduce the number of overlapping committees and subcommittees and staff and Member assignments; to outlaw ghost voting in committees and one-third and rolling quorums.

In short, I am talking about changes to make this a more deliberative, responsive, accountable and representative institution. Nobody says that democracy can ever be made perfectly efficient. It is inherently inefficient.

But we have made it even more inefficient by our huge congressional bureaucracy and internal turf fights that have tied things in knots around here.

Some 12 House committees alone have been working on a single health care bill—over half the House committees. Is it any wonder we do not yet have a coherent and workable health care bill on the floor of this House?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this resolution as a protest against the abject failure of the House Democrat leadership to even permit a vote on a comprehensive congressional reform plan that will solve the problems that keep us here for months on end with little to show for it.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. Goss], a very valuable member of the Committee on Rules who has worked on congressional reform.

□ 1220

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules from New York, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear that we are being asked here to waive a requirement to adjourn sine die by the appointed date of July 31. That is a relatively straightforward issue and clearly we are going to have to do that. But in the process of the remarks the gentleman from New York has made, it is very clear that it sounds like we

need to make some changes, because times have changed and our workload has changed and we need to have a good opportunity and a good forum to deliberate that change. What made sense back in 1946 may or may not make sense today. But I think the gentleman from New York is right in saying that comprehensive reform has been blocked by the Democratic leadership. The efforts of the Joint Committee on Reform are not going forward in a bipartisan way, the way they were intended or the way we expected. The Democratic leadership has intervened and said, "No, we are going to trifurcate it, bifurcate it, divide it up and chop it." And because of this we are never going to get anywhere. It is going to end up looking like chopped liver and it is not going to do the job when we get through.

I think I am like most Americans when I say I am a little skeptical of the promises of Democratic leadership to say, "Well, we're going to get the comprehensive reform." About 77 percent of Americans do not think that Democratic leadership is committed to comprehensive reform and this is one more example that they really are not.

I want to talk about another type of reform, and another matter that has come upon us. It is sort of ironic that yesterday was the 79th anniversary of the invasion of Haiti. And to celebrate that fact, Haitians demonstrated in front of the American Embassy yesterday and, I understand, into the morning hours of today. So here we are talking about when we are going to adjourn this House at some point this summer. At the same time, the White House is again talking about invading Haiti—Seventy-nine years, four generations later—I think the United States would have learned by now. They do not like American invasions in Haiti and such a move will not accomplish anything right now. So here we are with the White House talking about another invasion of Haiti.

It turns out, Mr. Speaker, that most Americans do not want to invade Haiti. It turns out actually that most Members of this House apparently do not want to invade Haiti, and I do not think I want to invade Haiti. I agree with those people. I think it is a very bad idea. But I certainly think it is a very, very poor idea that there would be any type of military action in Haiti taken out at a time when the Congress was not in session. I believe that it is the responsibility of Members of both bodies to be available for deliberation, consultation, advice, consent and a vote when we talk about using our men and women in uniform and putting them in harm's way. There has to be a justification for that and that is part of our say-so and that is what the people of this country have elected us to talk about.

So I am going to urge that we do not adjourn without some type of provision

for calling us back in session should there be some type of a military intervention by United States military in Haiti.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the distinguished chief deputy whip, and a member of the Congressional Task Force Reform Committee.

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

We have a problem. The problem is that Congress is broke and we ought to fix it. Much of what is broke in the Congress is right here in this book, in the rule book. There is a lot of things that we ought to change simply because they no longer work. The gentleman from Massachusetts in his speech on this particular rule was absolutely right. It do not think anybody believes that Congress can get its work done by July 31 anymore. So this is something we would have to do. The problem is that we never get a chance to do it. Why? Because much of the rest of what is broke in Congress, the Democrats in Congress do not want to consider. They do not want to consider revising the committee structures. They do not want to consider getting rid of the rule that says that people can vote in committee without actually being there. They do not want to do any of these things. We put together a committee that a lot of us worked hard on, the Hamilton-Dreier committee. A lot of us worked hard to come up with a set of reform proposals. And guess what? It is bleeding to death in the Committee on Rules. We may get out one little piece of it sometime next week. But the rest of the proposal is dying because we are not getting the stuff done that we should get done. We are not fixing what is broke. It is high time that we understand that this particular item that we have before us is not isolated. This is one more example of the fact that we simply have to make this institution work better. We are not going to do that in my view, because I think when we get to September and October, we will find that we just do not have time to take up this very controversial idea of reforming the House. So we will end up having not done anything to reform the process once again. That is disturbing. It brings us to the ludicrous kind of thing that we have today where we have to come to the floor on the question of waiver.

What did we want to do last night? They wanted to do this by unanimous consent last night so that they did not have to go through this kind of embarrassment and have this actually discussed on the House floor. We ought to be discussing this kind of thing because this is exactly what middle-class America has decided is wrong with this Government and with this Congress.

Middle-class America has decided the Government is too big and spends too much and they know that one of the reasons why that is a problem is right here in the U.S. Congress and we will not clean up our act. It is high time we clean it up. If we are going to help the American people get back the dream that they think they have lost a while back, it is going to have to happen because we clean up our act here and we are not prepared to do that yet.

This particular bill ought to be passed, we ought to be able to go ahead with our work. But for Pete's sake, if anything describes the fact that this place is broke and we ought to fix it, it is what we are doing here right now.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Chester, OH [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], chairman of the Committee on Rules, said it all when he introduced the resolution that he brought to the floor that we are debating now.

This is the 1946 Congressional Reorganization Act that we are trying to waive the rule that we should adjourn by July 31. But let us go back to the 1946 Congressional Reorganization Act. That is the last time there was serious reorganization of the way this body does its work. The committee system has not changed. The rules have not changed much.

Can you imagine any business in America, any other organization in America that has the same operating structure they had in 1946? The same management structure they had in 1946? Operated under the same procedure since 1946? That is what we have in Congress today.

Many of us have been pushing for real reform of this institution. Why? Because the American people keep saying, "Congress, go this way." The American people look up and see Congress going this way and they cannot understand why.

Part of it is because the leaders in this institution have tremendous control over what happens. They use and abuse the rules of this House every day to literally control the outcome of what this Congress produces. That is not what the American people want and it certainly is not what the Founders of our country wanted.

In this effort to reform Congress, the Speaker decided he would move a reform bill last October and promised us we would have a reform week. It did not come. They said, well, we will do it in November of 1993. It came and went as well. And earlier this year after repeated attempts at trying to bring reform to the floor, we were told, well, by Easter we will do it. Well, Easter has

come and gone and we are still waiting for reform of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, the time for action is now. The system that we have in Congress is fatally flawed. It is not allowing the American people's will to come to this floor. So I say to my colleagues, I understand the need for the resolution today, but the question is, when are we going to have real reform of this institution?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], another member of the joint committee who served and made every meeting that we held over that whole year period.

□ 1230

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this Legislative Reorganization Act that we are now being asked to waive, that is the adjournment by July 31 in even years, brings to my mind how ludicrous the whole situation of congressional reform is here in the House of Representatives.

A year and a half ago the committee I was pleased to be a member of, the only freshman member of, began a series of 6 months of meetings on congressional reforms. It is now brought to my mind that we have not done a complete reform of the House rules since 1946.

I think the folks in my district, the Eighth District of Washington State, will not be surprised to hear that yet again reform has been put on the back burner, yet again we are told that we may have a chance to consider some of the reforms that we determined were absolutely necessary to this House during our hearings last year, that we were stonewalled from presenting by December 31, which had been the intent of the resolution that put our reorganization committee together. This Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 tells me that it has been a heck of a long time since we have taken an in-depth look at the rules of the House of Representatives. Still in the United States Congress there are no open meeting laws. My Congressional Sunshine Act is one that would be put before the House if we were able to consider in toto our reform package. It would require that all meetings and conferences that are held here in the House of Representatives be open to the press or to the people who pay for that system. Right now we can hold closed meetings by a simple majority vote of a committee, and the folks who pay for this process are kept out of meetings as serious as the Ways and Means Committee where they write tax policy that the people are forced to pay for.

There is no delineation between debate on the floor or in committee meetings. We often have a conflict in whether we are on the floor or whether we are in committees.

I would say that this is an issue that the Democrat and Republican freshmen agree on. We should set aside a time for deliberative debate on the floor of the House versus what goes on in our committee meetings. As it is, now we are racing back and forth on three or four critical things we must be doing at one time so that we have to choose the most important when we should be able to offer all our time and our services. It could be done through a computer scheduling system, not a difficult deal, but it shows the arcaneness of the rules around here.

Lastly, there has been no reform of the committee system. We must do this. It takes far too long for important issues to the public to come before committees.

Mr. Speaker, I have hope that eventually we will be able to consider our reform package, even if it is only after the beginning of next year's session when we expect to welcome 30 new Republican freshmen onto the floor of this House who will be finding a coalition for reform waiting for them.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER], who is a member of the Committee on Rules and who was cochairman of the Joint Committee to Reform this Congress.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Glen Falls for yielding the time, and appreciate not only his leadership on the Rules Committee, but also the time and effort he put into that 1-year committee, the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress that had 37 hearings, 243 witnesses, Members of Congress, former members, outside groups who came before us saying that the important thing for the U.S. Congress to do is to bring about the reforms which the American people believe are important, and what I continue to believe a majority of this House and our colleagues in the Senate would like to see happen.

What we are doing now is debating whether or not we should move this date, a time in the 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act. Frankly, it underscores the need to reform the place, because it has been virtually half a century since a bipartisan, bicameral, equal number of Republicans, equal number of Democrats committee has been put together to do this.

My colleagues on the joint committee have talked about some of the changes that the American people want so that this institution can become more accountable to them and more deliberative, including things like eliminating proxy voting. Chairman MOAKLEY is here, and he knows very well we do not have proxy voting up in the Committee on Rules, and I praise him for maintaining the fact that we do not have proxy voting there. But, unfortunately, other committees in the

House have proxy voting, and we have case after case where it is really abused. I consider it an abuse when Members' votes are cast and they do not have any idea what those votes are. That happens on a regular basis in committees other than the Rules Committee and the Appropriations Committee and I guess the Ethics Committee and the Veterans' Affairs Committee. But most all of the other committees in the House use proxy voting, and frankly, most all of the other committees abuse proxy voting.

The American people have to show up for work. I think Members of Congress should show up for the votes that they cast. The argument given as to why they do not go is very simple, "Gosh, I've three markups going on at the same time."

We will have an opportunity if we could bring about this reform of Congress package, a chance to deal with that. There are 266 committees and subcommittees in the House and Senate. It seems to me that might just be a couple too many for the 535 of us.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have a chance to bring about reform of the committees structure. I know it is difficult. I know we have to deal with personalities in doing that, and I know that it is an uphill battle. But if we are going to truly become more accountable and more deliberative, the way the Founders envisioned it, and the way the American people want us to be, it is essential that we proceed with that reform package under a generous rule which allows for us to consider these different ideas.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to what we are doing here because it underscores the fact that the change of the reform committees needs to be moved forward immediately. I hope very much, I would say to my distinguished chairman, Mr. MOAKLEY, that we can move H.R. 3801 to the House before we adjourn for the August break. I know that different arrangements have been made indicating that we will have the package brought up sometime before we adjourn for the election.

Unfortunately, as I listen to that strong commitment that has been made, I am reminded of commitments that I had that this would be done before the end of calendar year 1993, and when that date slipped I was promised it would take place early in the spring of 1994, then late in the spring of 1994, then early in the summer of 1994, and now we are approaching the end of the summer and we are being promised that this will be brought up in the fall before we adjourn for elections.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is a real mistake for us to be doing it this way. This is a wrong way for us to be doing this. We should be keeping H.R. 3801 intact. We should not be allowing this divide and conquer strategy to be

utilized to perpetuate the status quo, which unfortunately is exactly what happened.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule, and I thank my friend for yielding the time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Peoria, IL. [Mr. MICHEL], our distinguished Republican leader who is going to be retiring this year, and who is going to be sorely missed.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist the opportunity to make some appropriate, what I think would be appropriate comments at this juncture. A number of years ago when I was a freshman Member, there used to be an elderly gentleman from Illinois, Noah Mason, who used to sit right in the aisle on that second row there, and that was his reserved seat. He was a former school teacher and served on the Ways and Means Committee.

In those early days, whenever we got to July 31, he used to rise in his chair and say,

Mr. Speaker, I want to serve notice on the House that this is July 31st. Under the Reorganization Act of 1946 we ought to be going home. So I just want to let you all know, I'm leaving tonight and spending the rest of the year with my constituents.

That is the way it ought to be, 7 months here and 5 months back home with the folks.

I will tell colleagues, Noah Mason would be a hero to the American people now, especially those Americans who might prefer to put off some of the legislative proposals that are currently before the House. According to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the House is supposed to adjourn sine die this Sunday.

□ 1240

Now, let me give you the direct quote: "Section 132(a). Unless otherwise provided by the Congress, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than July 31 of each year."

As we all know, Congress will not adjourn today, even though, according to the latest polls, most Americans wish we would go home, listen to their fears and concerns, and do a better job representing their interests.

As it stands now, the Congress will continue to work in August, September, and October, passing laws, spending money, and enacting mandates.

It is altogether fitting that today the majority waive one of the reform provisions of the Legislative Reform Reorganization Act of 1946, as the Democratic leadership ponders how to sink the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress' reform recommendations.

The Democratic majority cannot abide by old reforms, so it is no wonder they would rather not enact some new ones.

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

It is Friday, and I know Members are trying to get home and do what we have been talking about, talk to the people back home so that they will have an understanding of what they should be doing here. So I will not delay the House. I am not going to ask for a recorded vote. I will shout "no" on the resolution.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 495, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 275) waiving the requirement of section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 that the Congress adjourn sine die not later than July 31 of each year, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 275

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 132(a)(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 198), the House of Representatives and the Senate shall not adjourn for a period in excess of three days, or adjourn sine die, until both Houses of Congress have adopted a concurrent resolution providing either for an adjournment (in excess of three days) to a day certain or for adjournment sine die.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4801, SMALL BUSINESS REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENT ACT OF 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 494 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 494

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4801) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be

dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committee on Small Business now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the bill modified by the amendments recommended by the Committee on Small Business now printed in the bill and by the additional amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. No other amendment shall be in order except those printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to my dear friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 494 is a rule that provides for the consideration of H.R. 4801, the Small Business Reauthorization and Amendment Act. The resolution provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Small Business Committee. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. The substitute consists of the bill as modified by the Small Business Committee amendments now printed in the bill and other amendments printed in part 1 of the report to

accompany the rule. The substitute shall be considered as read.

The rule makes in order no other amendments except those printed in part 2 of the report to accompany the rule, to be considered in the order and manner specified in the report, with debate time also specified in the report. The amendments are not subject to amendment, are considered as read, and are not subject to a demand for a division of the question. All points of order are waived against the amendments in the report. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4801 provides authorizations for fiscal years 1995 to 1997 for programs administered by the Small Business Administration, the primary Federal agency with the mission to administer programs that provide assistance to small businesses. A major function of SBA is to make capital available for those small businesses which cannot normally secure financing in the private sector. The bill authorizes \$175 million in direct loans, \$12.32 billion in loan and debenture guarantees and \$1.8 billion surety bond guarantees for fiscal year 1995.

The bill makes improvements in the Microloan Program which provides loans averaging \$10,000 per borrower. The bill would delete limitations on the number of intermediaries or lenders per State under the program, delete the dollar limitation on these intermediaries and direct equitable allocation of program funds between urban and rural areas.

The bill improves loans for export purposes by allowing lines of credit without the current 3-year repayment requirement. The bill also provides up to a 90-percent guarantee on large export loans by allowing guarantees of standby letters of credit and by allowing larger portions of SBA loans to be used for working capital purposes.

The bill establishes an Accredited Lenders Program for Certified Development Companies. These lenders would receive priority in the processing of their loan applications. The bill establishes the Premier Lenders Program for Certified Development Companies under which participants would be able to approve SBA guaranteed loans of behalf of the SBA directly.

The bill provides assistance in the development of women-owned businesses by establishing an Office of Women's Business Ownership at SBA and by establishing an Interagency Committee on Women's Business Enterprise.

The bill also establishes a 3-year pilot program to provide procurement opportunities for businesses with 10 employees or less and requires SBA to prepare a report to Congress on the impact of all Federal regulatory and tax requirements upon small businesses. Finally, the bill authorizes SBA to provide training on new manufacturing

practices to small businesses to assist them in carrying out Federal contracts for the production of manufacturing components.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 484 is a fair rule that will expedite consideration of this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

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

□ 1250

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

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

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I rise in strong opposition to this restrictive rule. The rule makes in order several amendments which may improve the bill. However, the bill does not address the palpable fear in most of the small business community that the Clinton administration and its allies in the Congress are about to ram an outrageous employer mandate down our throats.

The rule before us denies Mr. ROHRBACHER of California the opportunity to offer his amendment providing that no amounts in this bill may be used to provide financial or other assistance to illegal aliens.

Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration was established to look after the interests of small business in Washington. It was not created to be a regulatory agency but rather an ombudsman for the backbone of American business, and that is small business in America.

Similarly, in the legislative branch the Small Business Committee role is one of an advocate, not a regulator. Why then, Mr. Speaker, is the SBA, the Small Business Administration, promoting positions detrimental to the small businesses which they are charged to represent?

As we speak, Democrat leaders and a handful of committee chairmen are meeting behind closed doors to draft a health care reform bill that they hope to bring to the floor before the August district work period, before any American has a chance to look at it outside of the beltway here.

The plan advocated by the President and under consideration by the Democrats would reportedly require employers to pay up to 80 percent of the cost of health insurance for their employees, and everybody knows this is an outright job killer. Two million jobs, probably.

As its contribution to this debate, the Small Business Administration has produced documents favoring the Clinton-style Government-controlled health care plan. This is the SBA, the advocate of small business.

I believe this is contrary to the mission of that agency.

The gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] over here has offered an excellent

amendment to deal with the untenable position that small businesses have been put in by the Clinton-controlled Small Business Administration. His amendment—and I wish Members back in their offices would listen to this—his amendment would simply state the sense of Congress that health care employer mandates may adversely affect the ability of many small businesses to remain in business in order to meet their obligations under the programs authorized by this act.

Small businesses in America create 75 percent of all the new jobs every single year, annually, in this country. If that goes through, instead of creating 75 percent new jobs, one small business creating 2 new jobs, that small business is going to lay off 1 or 2. That is how you get the 2 million, which raises the deficit by \$40 billion every time the unemployment rate goes up 1 percent. You trigger in social programs that the city, county, town, village, State, and Federal level of \$40 billion for each 1 percent. The amendment that he would offer would further state that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this act shall be used by the SBA to promote the inclusion of employer mandates in any national health care reform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this germane amendment designed to address the terror that exists in small businesses today about the Democrats' health care reform was denied upstairs in the Committee on Rules; perfectly germane amendment, but it is not going to be allowed to be debated and voted on on this floor.

The ranking Republican on the Small Business Committee, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], sitting to my right, pointed out in the Committee on Rules yesterday that Small Business Committee bills usually come to the floor under suspension of the rules or under an open rule. In my 16 years here I have never seen a Small Business bill come to this floor under any kind of rule other than an open rule, which means Mr. KIM would have been able to offer his amendment and so would the rest of us.

This restrictive rule is an unprecedented procedure for a committee that usually has bipartisan support, and that is a shame.

The action of the Rules Committee in denying the Kim amendment makes it clear that small businesses do not have a seat at the drafting table for Democrats drafting a proposal here today.

Consider the lengths to which the Rules Committee went to make sure this amendment never hit the floor. Amendments were first required to be submitted to the committee in advance. That is unprecedented, never happened before in a small business bill.

Ten were submitted, five Democrats and four Republicans. That certainly

was not a flood of amendments, as this is a relatively bipartisan bill. The bill itself is not a bad bill, it is a pretty good bill.

The Rules Committee could have made in order all of those amendments and under the House's light floor schedule this week—you know, we wrapped up business yesterday at 1:30, last night about 6—all amendments could have been debated and voted on in a reasonable amount of time.

But instead the Rules Committee resorted to power politics as usual.

The Democrat leadership blocked Mr. KIM's amendment on employer mandates precisely because they knew the bill would pass overwhelmingly on both sides of the aisle, a majority of Democrats voting for it, certainly all of the Republicans voting for it. Yet the Democrat leadership blocked it from being voted on on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents have asked how were such poor health care reform proposals developed? In the legislative and executive branches, the common thread has been secrecy and strong-arm tactics.

The First Lady's health care task force, now disbanded, is in deep legal trouble. As you recall, it was myself and a few others that got the hidden task force members out of the White House and gave it to the Wall Street Journal.

Earlier this week a Federal judge ordered the President's senior health adviser, including the First Lady, to stand trial on civil charges for producing a health care plan in absolute secrecy and possibly in violation of Federal sunshine laws.

It should be no surprise then that a poor executive process would lead to a poor legislative program.

Members are greatly concerned that when a health care bill eventually reaches this floor, they will not be given a separate vote on issues of em-

ployer mandates. The mandate will be included in an enormous omnibus package, and there may be 2 or 3 substitutes but there will not be 1 vote up or down on employer mandates. I would bet the kitchen sink that that is what happens.

If Members think that the Committee on Rules, the strong arm of the Democratic leadership, will allow that separate vote, boy, they sure have got another think coming.

Mr. Speaker, for those of you who have heard complaints in your town meetings back in your districts about brutal Government-imposed mandates, here is your chance to express the will of the Congress right here today. Make no mistake about it, a vote for the previous question on this rule we are debating right here is a vote for employer mandates on small business owners across this country. So do not try to weasel out; if you come over here when I ask for a vote on the previous question and you vote "yes" on that previous question, you are voting to jam down the throats of small business an 80 percent payroll tax on top of small businesses in this country and you are going to be held accountable for it.

So when the vote comes up, ladies and gentlemen, you vote "no" on that previous question and stand up for small business, just like the gentleman from New York just stood up.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit the following material to be printed in the RECORD:

The following are the recorded votes taken in the House Rules Committee on July 28, 1994 on H.R. 4801, the Small Business Reauthorization and Amendment Act of 1994. These votes are relevant to the debate on the rule providing for consideration of the bill, H. Res. 494 (House Report 103-627).

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE RULES COMMITTEE ON AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSED RULE ON H.R. 4801, SMALL BUSINESS REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENT ACT OF 1994, THURSDAY, JULY 28, 1994

Open Rule—This amendment to the proposed rule provides for one-hour of general

debate and an open amendment process. (Vote: Defeated 4-7). Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Frost, Wheat.

Kim (CA)—Sense of Congress that employer mandates would be destructive to small businesses and that the SBA should not use any funds authorized in the bill to promote the inclusion of employer mandates in health care reform legislation. (Vote: Defeated 4-6). Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Bonior, Hall, Slaughter. Not Voting: Frost, Wheat, Gordon.

Rohrabacher (CA)—Provides that no amounts provided in this Act may be used to provide financial or other assistance to illegal aliens. (Vote: Defeated 5-6). Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss, Beilenson. Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Frost, Bonior, Wheat.

Adoption of Rule—(Adopted 7-4). Yeas—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Nays—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Not Voting: Frost, Wheat.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH-103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted ¹	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent ²	Number	Percent ³
95th (1977-78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979-80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981-82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983-84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985-86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987-88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989-90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991-92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993-94)	81	21	26	60	74

¹Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

²Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

³Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rule, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th-102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Cong., through July 29, 1994.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D-5; R-25)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ: 246-176. A: 259-164. (Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: National Voter Registration Act	19 (D-1; R-18)	1 (D-0; R-1)	PQ: 248-171. A: 249-170. (Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D-2; R-5)	0 (D-0; R-0)	PQ: 243-172. A: 237-178. (Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D-1; R-8)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ: 248-166. A: 243-163. (Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: N35 Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D-4; R-9)	8 (D-3; R-5)	PQ: 247-170. A: 248-170. (Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental Appropriations	37 (D-8; R-29)	1 (not submitted) (D-1; R-0)	A: 240-185. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D-2; R-12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D-2; R-2)	PQ: 250-172. A: 251-172. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 138, Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20 (D-8; R-12)	9 (D-4; R-5)	PQ: 252-164. A: 247-169. (Mar. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 147, Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase Public debt limit	6 (D-1; R-5)	0 (D-0; R-0)	PQ: 244-168. A: 242-170. (Apr. 1, 1993).
H. Res. 149, Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993	8 (D-1; R-7)	3 (D-1; R-2)	A: 212-208. (Apr. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 164, May 4, 1993	O	H.R. 820: Nate Competitiveness Act	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 5, 1993).
H. Res. 171, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 20, 1993).
H. Res. 172, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act	NA	NA	A: 308-0. (May 24, 1993).
H. Res. 173, May 18, 1993	MC	S.J. Res. 45: United States forces in Somalia	6 (D-1; R-5)	6 (D-1; R-5)	A: Voice Vote (May 20, 1993).
H. Res. 183, May 25, 1993	O	H.R. 2244: 2d supplemental appropriations	NA	NA	A: 251-174. (May 26, 1993).
H. Res. 186, May 27, 1993	MC	H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget reconciliation	51 (D-19; R-32)	8 (D-7; R-1)	PQ: 252-178. A: 236-194. (May 27, 1993).
H. Res. 192, June 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 2348: Legislative branch appropriations	50 (D-6; R-44)	6 (D-3; R-3)	PQ: 240-177. A: 226-185. (June 10, 1993).
H. Res. 193, June 10, 1993	O	H.R. 2200: NASA authorization	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote (June 14, 1993).
H. Res. 195, June 14, 1993	MC	H.R. 5: Striker replacement	7 (D-4; R-3)	2 (D-1; R-1)	A: 244-176. (June 15, 1993).
H. Res. 197, June 15, 1993	MO	H.R. 2333: State Department, H.R. 2404: Foreign aid	53 (D-20; R-33)	27 (D-12; R-15)	A: 294-129. (June 16, 1993).
H. Res. 199, June 16, 1993	C	H.R. 1876: Ext. of "Fast Track"	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote (June 22, 1993).
H. Res. 200, June 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 2295: Foreign operations appropriations	33	5 (D-1; R-4)	A: 263-160. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 201, June 17, 1993	O	H.R. 2403: Treasury-postal appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 203, June 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2445: Energy and Water appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote (June 23, 1993).
H. Res. 206, June 23, 1993	O	H.R. 2150: Coast Guard authorization	NA	NA	A: 401-0. (July 30, 1993).
H. Res. 217, July 14, 1993	MO	H.R. 2010: National Service Trust Act	NA	NA	A: 261-164. (July 21, 1993).
H. Res. 220, July 21, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	14 (D-8; R-6)	2 (D-2; R-0)	PQ: 245-178. F: 205-216. (July 22, 1993).
H. Res. 226, July 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	15 (D-8; R-7)	2 (D-2; R-0)	A: 224-205. (July 27, 1993).
H. Res. 229, July 28, 1993	MO	H.R. 2330: Intelligence Authority Act, fiscal year 1994	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Aug. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 230, July 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1964: Maritime Administration authority	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (July 29, 1993).
H. Res. 246, Aug. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authority	149 (D-109; R-40)		A: 246-172. (Sept. 8, 1993).

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.—Continued

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 248, Sept. 9, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National defense authorization			PQ: 237-169. A: 234-169. (Sept. 13, 1993).
H. Res. 250, Sept. 13, 1993	MC	H.R. 1340: RTC Completion Act	12 (D-3, R-9)	1 (D-1, R-0)	A: 213-191-1. (Sept. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 254, Sept. 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authorization		91 (D-67, R-24)	A: 241-182. (Sept. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 262, Sept. 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1845: National Biological Survey Act	NA	NA	A: 238-188. (10/06/93).
H. Res. 264, Sept. 28, 1993	MC	H.R. 2351: Arts, humanities, museums	7 (D-0, R-7)	3 (D-0, R-3)	PQ: 240-185. A: 225-195. (Oct. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 265, Sept. 29, 1993	MC	H.R. 3167: Unemployment compensation amendments	3 (D-1, R-2)	2 (D-1, R-1)	A: 239-150. (Oct. 15, 1993).
H. Res. 269, Oct. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2739: Aviation infrastructure investment	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 7, 1993).
H. Res. 273, Oct. 12, 1993	MC	H.R. 3167: Unemployment compensation amendments	3 (D-1, R-2)	2 (D-1, R-1)	PQ: 235-187. F: 149-254. (Oct. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 274, Oct. 12, 1993	MC	H.R. 1804: Goals 2000 Educate America Act	15 (D-7, R-7; 1-1)	10 (D-7, R-3)	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 13, 1993).
H. Res. 282, Oct. 20, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 281: Continuing appropriations through Oct. 28, 1993	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 21, 1993).
H. Res. 286, Oct. 27, 1993	O	H.R. 334: Lumber Recognition Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 287, Oct. 27, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 283: Continuing appropriations resolution	1 (D-0, R-0)	0	A: 252-170. (Oct. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 289, Oct. 28, 1993	O	H.R. 2151: Maritime Security Act of 1993	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Nov. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 293, Nov. 4, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 170: Troop withdrawal Somalia	N/A	N/A	A: 390-8. (Nov. 8, 1993).
H. Res. 299, Nov. 8, 1993	MO	H.R. 1036: Employee Retirement Act-1993	2 (D-1, R-1)	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Nov. 9, 1993).
H. Res. 302, Nov. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 1025: Brady handgun bill	17 (D-6, R-11)	4 (D-1, R-3)	A: 238-182. (Nov. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 303, Nov. 9, 1993	O	H.R. 322: Mineral exploration	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Nov. 16, 1993).
H. Res. 304, Nov. 9, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 288: Further CR, FY 1994	N/A	N/A	
H. Res. 312, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 3425: EPA Cabinet Status	27 (D-8, R-19)	9 (D-1, R-8)	F: 191-227. (Feb. 2, 1994).
H. Res. 313, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 796: Freedom Access to Clinics	15 (D-9, R-6)	4 (D-1, R-3)	A: 233-192. (Nov. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 314, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 3351: Alt Methods Young Offenders	21 (D-7, R-14)	6 (D-3, R-3)	A: 238-179. (Nov. 19, 1993).
H. Res. 316, Nov. 19, 1993	C	H.R. 51: D.C. statehood bill	1 (D-1, R-0)	N/A	A: 252-172. (Nov. 20, 1993).
H. Res. 319, Nov. 20, 1993	MC	H.R. 3: Campaign Finance Reform	35 (D-6, R-29)	1 (D-0, R-1)	A: 220-207. (Nov. 21, 1993).
H. Res. 320, Nov. 20, 1993	MC	H.R. 3400: Reinventing Government	34 (D-15, R-19)	3 (D-3, R-0)	A: 247-183. (Nov. 22, 1993).
H. Res. 326, Feb. 2, 1994	MC	H.R. 3759: Emergency Supplemental Appropriations	14 (D-8, R-5; 1-1)	5 (D-3, R-2)	PQ: 244-168. A: 342-65. (Feb. 3, 1994).
H. Res. 352, Feb. 8, 1994	MC	H.R. 811: Independent Counsel Act	27 (D-8, R-19)	10 (D-4, R-6)	PQ: 249-174. A: 242-174. (Feb. 9, 1994).
H. Res. 357, Feb. 9, 1994	MC	H.R. 3345: Federal Workforce Restructuring	3 (D-2, R-1)	2 (D-2, R-0)	A: WV (Feb. 10, 1994).
H. Res. 366, Feb. 23, 1994	MO	H.R. 6: Improving America's Schools	NA	NA	A: WV (Feb. 24, 1994).
H. Res. 384, Mar. 9, 1994	MC	H. Con. Res. 218: Budget Resolution FY 1995-99	14 (D-5, R-9)	5 (D-3, R-2)	A: 245-171. (Mar. 10, 1994).
H. Res. 401, Apr. 12, 1994	MO	H.R. 4092: Violent Crime Control	180 (D-98, R-82)	68 (D-47, R-21)	A: 244-176. (Apr. 13, 1994).
H. Res. 410, Apr. 21, 1994	MO	H.R. 3221: Iraqi Claims Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Apr. 28, 1994).
H. Res. 414, Apr. 28, 1994	O	H.R. 3254: NSF Auth. Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (May 3, 1994).
H. Res. 416, May 4, 1994	C	H.R. 4296: Assault Weapons Ban Act	7 (D-5, R-2)	0 (D-0, R-0)	A: 220-209. (May 5, 1994).
H. Res. 420, May 5, 1994	O	H.R. 2442: EDA Reauthorization	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (May 10, 1994).
H. Res. 422, May 11, 1994	MO	H.R. 518: California Desert Protection	N/A	N/A	PQ: 245-172. A: 248-165. (May 17, 1994).
H. Res. 423, May 11, 1994	O	H.R. 2473: Montana Wilderness Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (May 12, 1994).
H. Res. 428, May 17, 1994	MO	H.R. 2108: Black Lung Benefits Act	4 (D-1, R-3)	N/A	A: WV (May 19, 1994).
H. Res. 429, May 17, 1994	MO	H.R. 4301: Defense Auth., FY 1995	173 (D-115, R-58)		A: 359-49. (May 18, 1994).
H. Res. 431, May 20, 1994	MO	H.R. 4301: Defense Auth., FY 1995		100 (D-80, R-20)	A: Voice Vote. (May 23, 1994).
H. Res. 440, May 24, 1994	MC	H.R. 4385: Natl Hiway System Designation	16 (D-10, R-6)	5 (D-5, R-0)	A: Voice Vote. (May 25, 1994).
H. Res. 443, May 25, 1994	MC	H.R. 4426: For. Ops. Approps, FY 1995	39 (D-11, R-28)	8 (D-3, R-5)	PQ: 233-191. A: 244-181. (May 25, 1994).
H. Res. 444, May 25, 1994	MC	H.R. 4454: Leg Branch Approp, FY 1995	43 (D-10, R-33)	12 (D-8, R-4)	A: 249-177. (May 26, 1994).
H. Res. 447, June 8, 1994	O	H.R. 4539: Treasury/Postal Approps 1995	N/A	N/A	A: 236-177. (June 9, 1994).
H. Res. 467, June 28, 1994	MC	H.R. 4600: Expedited Rescissions Act	N/A	N/A	PQ: 240-185. A: Voice Vote. (July 14, 1994).
H. Res. 468, June 28, 1994	MO	H.R. 4299: Intelligence Auth., FY 1995	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (July 19, 1994).
H. Res. 474, July 12, 1994	MO	H.R. 3937: Export Admin. Act of 1994	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (July 14, 1994).
H. Res. 475, July 12, 1994	O	H.R. 1188: Anti. Redlining in Ins.	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (July 20, 1994).
H. Res. 482, July 20, 1994	O	H.R. 3838: Housing & Comm. Dev. Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (July 21, 1994).
H. Res. 483, July 20, 1994	O	H.R. 3870: Environ. Tech. Act of 1994	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (July 26, 1994).
H. Res. 484, July 20, 1994	MC	H.R. 4604: Budget Control Act of 1994	3 (D-2, R-1)	3 (D-2, R-1)	PQ: 245-180. A: Voice Vote. (July 21, 1994).
H. Res. 491, July 27, 1994	O	H.R. 2448: Radon Disclosure Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (July 28, 1994).
H. Res. 492, July 27, 1994	O	S. 208: NPS Concession Policy	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (July 28, 1994).
H. Res. 494, July 28, 1994	MC	H.R. 4801: SBA Reauth & Amdmts. Act	10 (D-5, R-5)	6 (D-4, R-2)	

Note.—Code: C-Closed, MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE], chairman of the committee.

Mr. LAFALCE. I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I admire tremendously the histrionic ability of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. He has done a great job of emoting it.

The only difficulty is that this is the Small Business Administration Reauthorization Act, it is not the health care bill. The problem is that some Members have wanted to take what has been a totally nonpartisan effort over the years, the reauthorization of the SBA Programs, and make it into a political contest over what should or should not be in the health care bill.

I think you can have some debate on the rule, but I think that debate on the rule should be when the health care bill comes up. At least all the remarks of the gentleman up to now, virtually all of them, have been in connection with health care issues.

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

Mr. LAFALCE. I surely do.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you know, nobody would like to make it more bipartisan than me. If we had been given an open rule, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] has brought to this floor many times during his career—and he has been here a couple of years longer than I have—he has never brought a rule to this floor that has been restrictive.

□ 1300

This is a germane amendment. It is an amendment that would be allowed under normal rulings of the house. Let me read it to my colleagues:

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this act shall be used by the Small Business Administration to promote the inclusion of employer mandates.

I mean what is wrong with that? I mean it is germane according to the Parliamentarian sitting over there. I ask, "Why can't we have a debate on that and vote on it?"

Mr. LAFALCE. First of all, that was not the original amendment that was offered. The original amendment that was offered was a sense of Congress resolution with respect to certain health care issues.

Mr. SOLOMON. That is part of it, too. I did not read the first part of it. I just read the—

Mr. LAFALCE. All right; so that is part of it also—

Mr. SOLOMON. And it is germane.

Mr. LAFALCE. No, it is not germane. That belongs to the health care bill, and that is what we should be debating on.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say I had the privilege of serving my first years in the Congress as a member of the Committee on Small Business, and we have regularly seen this bill come up under an open amendment process.

Now the distinguished committee chairman has just said that the Kim amendment is nongermane, when, in fact, it has been ruled germane by the Parliamentarian. It is determined that, as we focus on small business issues and the impact that the Small Business Administration has on that segment of our economy which creates jobs, that possibly we ought to look at this issue rather than letting the Democrat leadership simply say, because

we are afraid of having a vote on the House floor on employer mandates, we are not going to be allowed to deal with that until we face the health care bill.

I think it is wrong, I think it is wrong, I think we should have that opportunity to do it, and this previous-question battle is the one chance we will have to vote on employer mandates, and I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE], my friend, for having yielded to me.

Mr. LAFALCE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the point is this is the SBA reauthorization bill. The issues they are concerned about, employer mandate, are appropriately considered in the debate on health care. We hope to take the health care bill up sometime between, say, August 9 and August 12. I hope we will be able to do that. At that time their arguments on the rule with respect to employer mandates on small business would be most applicable. We will join issue on that time. Now we are talking about the 7A Loan Guarantee Program. Now we are talking about the SBIC Program, et cetera.

In fact, of all the amendments that are being offered by the minority, I am going to be accepting them on the one chief issue in controversy in committee which precluded a unanimous vote of the committee, the SBIC Program. I have come into a compromise. I have entered into a compromise with the ranking minority member. It is that some spirit that has enabled me to come to the floor year after year after year with an open rule. That spirit though has been violated because of the intensity of the debate on health care and an attempt to inject the health care debate into this reauthorization.

So, Mr. Speaker, for that reason I am going to conclude my remarks and hope we can go to a vote.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that I just went up and took this amendment up to the Chair to see whether or not we had some misunderstanding here about the germaneness of this amendment.

This amendment is an entirely germane amendment. There is absolutely nothing in this amendment that is not germane. It is an amendment that is entirely in order because it goes only to the subject matter of the Small Business Administration. It talks only about Small Business Administration funds.

So, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that there was something out of order about this amendment is to suggest something which just is not the case.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, as the gentleman knows, we have been told that there are not going to be open amendments to any health care bill that comes on the floor. At best there might be a Democrat based text proposal, maybe a Republican substitute. But there is not going to be allowed individual amendments on employer mandates like this. That is why we need a vote today.

Mr. Speaker, it is germane; we ought to be voting on it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for that, and I mean he is absolutely correct, and what disturbs me here is the fact that we are getting an argument that somehow this was a procedural problem when in fact it was absolutely something where the Committee on Rules has made a specific determination they do not want this issue on the floor. This is something they do not want discussed on the floor, and so, therefore, we ought not allow it.

This is not a case of process, procedure or anything else. This is just a case of keeping off the floor a debate that they do not want to have to go through, and that is Congress acting at its worst because they simply, they simply, are keeping the membership from having a discussion on something which, under any other circumstances, would be entirely germane.

Mr. Speaker, that is using the power of the Committee on Rules in exactly the wrong way.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I simply would like to underscore once again:

Is it true we would anticipate a restrictive rule on health care, and so this may be the only vote that the full membership will have on the issue of employer mandates? Am I correct in assuming that?

Mr. WALKER. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is absolutely correct—

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

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman would not yield to me, but I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE].

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the amendment that is presently in my hand that was given to me, that is being discussed today, is not the amendment that was filed, to be offered. The amendment that was filed to be offered was strictly a sense of Congress—

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. LAFALCE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Let us be very reasonable. As the gentleman knows, when Members prefile amendments, as is required under this situation, if there is an amendment that is not germane because of some technicality, the Members are allowed, on the gentleman's side and ours, quite often to modify it to make it germane.

We spent hours down here working with the Parliamentarian to get the germane amendment. The Committee on Rules refused to let him offer it.

Mr. LAFALCE. This did not enter into my hands, nor did I ever see it, until approximately 60 seconds ago. Before that time we were talking about a filed amendment that was absolutely nongermane, and again the point is the gentleman wants to have a debate on health care issues in connection with the SBA reauthorization bill, which should sail through this House probably, by unanimous vote. It is unfortunate that we are politicizing something that in my entire tenure as chairman of this committee has not been politicized up until now.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] be allowed to sit in for me for a few minutes and control the time on our side.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Overland Park, KS [Mrs. MEYERS], the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. H.R. 4801, the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendment Act of 1994 is basically a noncontroversial and important piece of legislation. There were only a handful of amendments filed with the Committee on Rules, most of which were acceptable to the majority and the minority. Historically the legislative proposals that are crafted in the Committee on Small Business have strong bipartisan support, and these same proposals generally come to the House floor under an open rule or suspension of the rules. There is simply no reason for H.R. 4801 to be brought to the floor with anything less than open rule.

Two Republican Members, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] who serves on our committee and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], filed amendments with the Committee on Rules that were not made in order. These were the only amendments not made in order. Presumably they were not made in order because the chairman of our committee found the amendment unnecessary,

or opposes the amendment, or because the Committee on Rules did not want the issue to be discussed on the floor. However I would say that the issue of mandates for small business is the most important small business issue that is concerning small business today or that will be before the Congress this year involving small business.

□ 1310

Mr. Speaker, to say that it is not germane or that somehow it has absolutely no place to be considered in this authorization bill is, I think, just incorrect.

Mr. Speaker, I may not support all of the amendments that were filed with the Rules Committee or that would be offered to H.R. 4801 under an open rule, but I support the right of any Member to offer an amendment. The Small Business Committee must regularly work together on a bipartisan basis for the protection and promotion of small business. Arbitrarily limiting the amendments that can be offered on small business legislation is in absolute opposition to that principle.

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that anything less than an open rule was requested for H.R. 4801, and that the Rules Committee saw fit to grant this closed rule. This sets a negative new precedent for Small Business Committee legislation, and I urge the House to reject this closed rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the chairman of the Rules Committee whether there are any speakers on the other side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY].

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, no, the speakers on this side will reserve their time on the employer mandate issue for the bill that should be on the floor at the time, the health care bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to talk about the impact of employer mandates on the small business sector of the economy, I yield 5 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Diamond Bar, CA [Mr. KIM], the author of the very important amendment which we hope will be made in order when we defeat the previous question.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule.

I came here as a freshman, as a former businessman, thinking that I would have an opportunity, a genuine opportunity, to help the small businesses of this Nation. However, yesterday I found out that this is not necessarily the case. I was absolutely shocked.

Yesterday I offered an amendment which was simple and straightforward. My amendment expresses the sense of

Congress that employer mandates would be detrimental to small businesses and prohibits the SBA, a government agency which is supposed to act as an advocate for small business, from spending taxpayer dollars to promote employer mandates. I offered my amendment yesterday because the SBA has spent nearly \$100,000 last year alone to make a slick brochure telling every small business owner that employer mandates is good for them.

The reason behind my amendment is simple. Employer mandates would be bad for small business. Every credible study predicts that employer mandates will cost substantial job losses. Even the economic adviser of the President himself predicted that over 600,000 jobs would be eliminated as a result of employer mandates. Every study shows that there would be huge job losses if employer mandates are implemented.

We do not have to rely on academic studies to understand why employer mandates would be a bad idea. All we have to do is listen to any small business owner and any small business employee in the Nation.

Over the last 2 months the White House has sponsored seven different small business conferences attended by owners of small businesses and employees of small businesses in seven different States. In six out of seven of those State conferences small business owners voted unanimously to reject employer mandates.

My point is simple. Employer mandates is a bad idea, one that small business owners overwhelmingly reject, and they are frightened that the SBA, which is supposed to be an advocate for small business, should be spending its own budget money going around the country telling small business owners that employer mandates would be good for them.

That is why I offered my amendment to prohibit the SBA from spending taxpayer dollars to promote a policy which would be detrimental to the very small businesses it is supposed to represent.

However, the Rules Committee decided yesterday to reject my amendment and prohibited me from even offering it on the floor. Even the Parliamentarian said this is a germane amendment.

Why was this done? Why was it rejected? They said we should not be debating the health care reform issue on the small business bill. They argued that my amendment was not appropriate at this time. Well, I may be new in town, but this is an old game. The House is supposed to debate issues, and that is what the fight on this rule is all about. If we cannot debate the activities of the Small Business Administration now, when can we debate them?

All I am saying is that the SBA should not spend the funds authorized to be appropriated by the Small Busi-

ness Reauthorization Act to promote employer mandates which would really eventually hurt small businesses themselves. I do not understand why we should not be allowed to debate this issue today. How can we debate the issue later at the time Congress is considering the health care issue? Should I offer my amendment at that time, saying that the SBA should not spend money any more at the time of the health care debate?

I will bet that if I offered my amendment on the health care bill, the Rules Committee would tell me that my amendment is out of order because it is not appropriate to debate SBA issues while considering a health care bill.

This is exactly the kind of blatant hypocrisy I came here to fight.

In case my colleagues are wondering, let me tell them the real reason why they do not want to have a vote on this amendment. They are terrified. They are terrified that this body might vote to reject this job-killing proposal. In fact, they are so terrified that they will not even let a perfectly germane amendment come to the floor for debate.

Mr. Speaker, shame on us. This is why the American people are so angry and frustrated at the Congress. For this reason I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule so we can have a fair and honest debate on my amendment. I think we owe it to the owners and employees of the small businesses of this Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY].

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time at the present time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very simple vote that is coming before us. It is on the previous question. If Members are in favor of employer mandates, they will vote yes on the previous question. If they are opposed to employer mandates, they will vote no on the previous question.

I have just had a discussion with the distinguished ranking Member of the Committee on Small Business, my friend, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], who has told me that the single most important small business issue this year is employer mandates in the health care area.

It seems to me I have heard that many requests have been made throughout this year to have the Small Business Committee hold some hearings on the impact of employer mandates, the No. 1 issue for small businesses, on the small business community. I am told that hearings are scheduled now for August 4. It seems to me quite frankly that that is a little late in the game since the issue of health care has been debated throughout really the last year and a half.

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

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Committee has had a number of hearings on health care.

We have had representatives from the small business community testify on health care, such as the NFIB, such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and such as the National Association of Manufacturers, and they were certainly allowed to discuss it, and the issue—

Mr. DREIER. Mr. speaker, I would like to take back my time.

Mr. LAFALCE. We have had witnesses testify on the issue—

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I take back my time.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is out of order. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I take back my time, and I would like to inquire of my friend, the gentleman from New York, the distinguished committee chairman, have the hearings the Small Business Committee held been focused on the issue of employer mandates and their impact on small business?

Mr. LAFALCE. That certainly has been one of the primary issues that the Small Business Committee has covered in testimony before the committee.

Mr. DREIER. So there have been hearings on the employer mandate issue?

Mr. LAFALCE. Yes, and they will testify—

Mr. DREIER. If this is the case, I am sorry, I will say to my friend, the distinguished chairman of the committee. If hearings have been held by the Small Business Committee specifically targeted at the issue of employer mandates, then I regret what I said—

Mr. LAFALCE. The issue was—

Mr. DREIER. No, Mr. Speaker, I was asking whether employer mandates was the issue—

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WALKER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time, and I yield to the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, my friend, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have had some hearings on the impact of mandates in Hawaii, and I think most people would agree that the experience there would not be exactly applicable to the entire United States.

Mr. DREIER. No, everyone has concluded that.

□ 1320

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Also in that same hearing, we heard about the experience in Cleveland where a great many employers have banded together on health insurance. But that is not mandated, of course. That was just a hearing on how it affected those in Cleveland.

I do not think that we have had a hearing on the impact of mandates on small business in this country.

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield further to the distinguished chairman of the committee to respond to the ranking member.

Mr. LAFALCE. If I can refresh the recollection of the distinguished minority ranking member, I recall a representative from the Small Business Legislative Council, a representative from the National Federation of Independent Business, a representative from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, a representative from the National Association of Manufacturers, et cetera, et cetera, testifying on the issue of health care, and including as a principal part of their testimony, as a principal part of the question and answer that ensued, the impact of an employer mandate on small business.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the issue we faced here, I guess there has been some talk in the Committee on Small Business and the General Economy about the issue of employer mandates. It sounds to me as if there was not a specific hearing held to discuss the issue of employer mandates. I guess since it is the number one issue that is concerning the small business community, it has been raised.

Well, that is the reason we are having this previous question battle right here. The fact of the matter is the Committee on Rules denied this new Member of the House, who has come fresh from the business community as a small businessman to serve here, the right to even offer his amendment that would deal with the issue of employer mandates.

I think it is an extraordinarily unfair treatment of a new Member, and I am going to urge defeat of the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to another Member whose amendment was denied. I offered it myself up in the Committee on Rules, and they said it was already covered in the bill. But frankly the amendment, my friends, would go further in dealing with a very important issue.

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, another reason to oppose this rule is the fact I was denied my attempt to offer an amendment that would strengthen the language in this bill and make it absolutely clear that no

money in this bill would be used to provide benefits to illegal aliens. The language in the bill, there is current language in the bill, but it is not adequate to do the job. If there was agreement on the issue that no benefits should be extended to illegal aliens, I should have been at least provided an opportunity to present an amendment that would make that absolutely clear.

Over and over and over again we hear on the floor that, oh, we are all in agreement; money should not be wasted on giving benefits to illegal aliens.

We have limited resources. We do not even have the resources to provide these benefits for our own people. We all agree with you, DANA. We should not be providing benefits to illegal aliens. But then again, every time I try to propose an amendment like this, I am knocked out of the ballpark by the fact that I cannot even propose an amendment that makes it clear in the language of the bill that the benefits should not be going to illegal aliens.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time to say what I was explained to by the majority up in the Committee on Rules, they said this issue is already dealt with in the bill. But, quite frankly, as we looked at it, it was not strong enough to deal with that very serious problem we have. And the Rohrabacher amendment is just one of the reasons we should vote against this rule.

But the fact of the matter is our previous question battle is over a very important small business issue. The number one small business issue that we have out there today is are we going to support in this House the imposition of employer mandates on the small business sector of our economy. The gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] says that we should not.

If you support the idea of ensuring that employer mandates are not imposed on the small business sector, we have one choice today, and that is to vote no on the previous question.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5(b)(1) of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 169, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 364]

YEAS—215

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Olver
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Ortiz
Andrews (ME)	Hamburg	Orton
Andrews (NJ)	Harman	Pallone
Andrews (TX)	Hastings	Parker
Applegate	Hayes	Pastor
Baesler	Hefner	Payne (NJ)
Barca	Hilliard	Payne (VA)
Barlow	Hinchev	Pelosi
Barrett (WI)	Hoagland	Peterson (FL)
Bellenson	Hochbrueckner	Pickett
Berman	Holden	Pomeroy
Beverly	Hoyer	Poshard
Bilbray	Hughes	Price (NC)
Bishop	Jefferson	Rahall
Blackwell	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Bonior	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Borski	Johnson, E.B.	Richardson
Boucher	Johnston	Rose
Brewster	Kanjorski	Rostenkowski
Browder	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Brown (CA)	Kennedy	Rush
Brown (FL)	Kennelly	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Kildee	Sanders
Bryant	Klecza	Sangmeister
Byrne	Klein	Sarpallus
Cantwell	Klink	Sawyer
Cardin	Kopetski	Schenk
Chapman	Kreidler	Schroeder
Clayton	LaFalce	Schumer
Clyburn	Lambert	Scott
Coleman	Lantos	Serrano
Collins (IL)	LaRocco	Sharp
Conyers	Lehman	Shepherd
Coppersmith	Levin	Siskys
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Coyne	Lipinski	Skelton
Cramer	Long	Slaughter
Danner	Lowey	Spratt
Darden	Maloney	Stenholm
de la Garza	Mann	Stokes
Deal	Manton	Strickland
DeFazio	Margolles-	Studds
DeLauro	Mezvinsky	Stupak
Dellums	Markey	Sweet
Derrick	Martinez	Swift
Deutsch	Matsul	Tanner
Dicks	Mazzoli	Taylor (MS)
Dingell	McCloskey	Tejeda
Dixon	McCurdy	Thompson
Dooley	McDermott	Thurman
Durbin	McHale	Torres
Edwards (CA)	McKinney	Torricelli
Edwards (TX)	McNulty	Trafficant
Engel	Meehan	Tucker
English	Meek	Unsoeld
Eshoo	Menendez	Valentine
Evans	Mfume	Velazquez
Farr	Miller (CA)	Vento
Fazio	Mineta	Visclosky
Fields (LA)	Minge	Volkmer
Filner	Mink	Waters
Fingerhut	Moakley	Watt
Foglietta	Mollohan	Waxman
Ford (MI)	Montgomery	Whitten
Frank (MA)	Moran	Williams
Frost	Murtha	Wilson
Furse	Nadler	Wise
Gejdenson	Neal (MA)	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Neal (NC)	Wyden
Gordon	Oberstar	Wynn
Green	Obey	Yates

NAYS—169

Allard	Bonilla	Cunningham
Archer	Bunning	DeLay
Army	Burton	Diaz-Balart
Bachus (AL)	Buyer	Doolittle
Baker (CA)	Callahan	Dornan
Baker (LA)	Calvert	Dreier
Ballenger	Camp	Duncan
Barcia	Canady	Dunn
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Ehlers
Bartlett	Clinger	Emerson
Barton	Coble	Everett
Bateman	Collins (GA)	Ewing
Bentley	Combest	Fawell
Bereuter	Condit	Fields (TX)
Bilirakis	Cooper	Fish
Bliley	Cox	Fowler
Blute	Crane	Franks (CT)
Boehert	Crapo	Franks (NJ)

Gekas	Leach	Ros-Lehtinen
Gilchrest	Levy	Roth
Gillmor	Lewis (CA)	Roukema
Gilman	Lewis (FL)	Royce
Gingrich	Lewis (KY)	Santorum
Goodlatte	Lightfoot	Saxton
Gooding	Linder	Schaefer
Goss	Lucas	Schiff
Grams	Machtley	Sensenbrenner
Greenwood	Manzullo	Shays
Gunderson	McCandless	Shuster
Hall (TX)	McCollum	Skeen
Hamilton	McCrery	Smith (MD)
Hancock	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Hastert	McInnis	Smith (OR)
Hefley	Meyers	Smith (TX)
Herger	Michel	Snowe
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Solomon
Hoekstra	Mollinari	Spence
Hoke	Moorhead	Stearns
Horn	Morella	Stump
Huffington	Myers	Talent
Hunter	Nussle	Tauzin
Hutchinson	Oxley	Taylor (NC)
Hyde	Packard	Thomas (CA)
Inglis	Paxon	Thomas (WY)
Istook	Penny	Torkildsen
Jacobs	Peterson (MN)	Upton
Johnson (CT)	Petri	Vucanovich
Johnson, Sam	Pombo	Walker
Kasich	Porter	Walsh
Kim	Portman	Weldon
King	Pryce (OH)	Wolf
Kingston	Quinn	Young (AK)
Klug	Ramstad	Young (FL)
Knollenberg	Regula	Zeliff
Kolbe	Roberts	Zimmer
Lancaster	Rogers	
Lazio	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—50

Bacchus (FL)	Grandy	Quillen
Becerra	Hansen	Ravenel
Boehner	Houghton	Reynolds
Brooks	Hutto	Ridge
Carr	Inhofe	Roemer
Clay	Inslee	Rowland
Clement	Kyl	Shaw
Collins (MI)	Laughlin	Slatery
Dickey	Livingston	Smith (IA)
Flake	Lloyd	Stark
Ford (TN)	McDade	Sundquist
Gallely	McKeon	Synar
Gallo	McMillan	Thornton
Gephardt	Mica	Towns
Geran	Murphy	Washington
Gibbons	Owens	Wheat
Glickman	Pickle	

□ 1346

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Becerra for, with Mr. McKeon against. Mr. Synar for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Ms. PELOSI changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SOLOMON was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in speaking is to ascertain the schedule for the rest of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the pending vote on the rule which I will ask for will be the last vote of the day, depending on the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], and I would yield to him to confirm that.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, if we have a recorded vote on the final pas-

sage of the rule, which we expect to have, that will be the last recorded vote of the week.

Mr. SOLOMON. For today?

Mr. DERRICK. The gentleman is right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 161, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

AYES—221

Abercrombie	Foglietta	McNulty
Ackerman	Ford (MI)	Meehan
Andrews (ME)	Frank (MA)	Meek
Andrews (NJ)	Frost	Menendez
Andrews (TX)	Furse	Mfume
Applegate	Gejdenson	Miller (CA)
Baesler	Gephardt	Mineta
Barca	Gibbons	Minge
Barcia	Gonzalez	Mink
Barlow	Gordon	Moakley
Barrett (WI)	Green	Mollohan
Bellenson	Gutierrez	Montgomery
Berman	Hall (OH)	Moran
Beverly	Hamburg	Murtha
Bilbray	Hamilton	Nadler
Bishop	Harman	Neal (MA)
Blackwell	Hastings	Neal (NC)
Bonior	Hefner	Oberstar
Borski	Hilliard	Obey
Boucher	Hinchev	Olver
Brewster	Hoagland	Ortiz
Brooks	Hochbrueckner	Orton
Browder	Holden	Pallone
Brown (CA)	Hoyer	Parker
Brown (FL)	Hughes	Pastor
Brown (OH)	Jacobs	Payne (NJ)
Bryant	Jefferson	Payne (VA)
Byrne	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Penny
Cardin	Johnson, E.B.	Peterson (FL)
Chapman	Johnston	Peterson (MN)
Clayton	Kanjorski	Pickett
Clyburn	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Coleman	Kennedy	Poshard
Collins (IL)	Kennelly	Price (NC)
Conyers	Kildee	Rahall
Coppersmith	Klecza	Rangel
Costello	Klein	Reed
Coyne	Klink	Richardson
Cramer	Kopetski	Rose
Danner	Kreidler	Rostenkowski
Darden	LaFalce	Roybal-Allard
de la Garza	Lambert	Rush
Deal	Lancaster	Sabo
DeFazio	Lantos	Sanders
DeLauro	LaRocco	Sangmeister
Dellums	Lehman	Sarpallus
Derrick	Levin	Sawyer
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Schenk
Dicks	Lipinski	Schumer
Dingell	Long	Scott
Dixon	Lowey	Serrano
Dooley	Maloney	Sharp
Durbin	Mann	Shepherd
Edwards (CA)	Manton	Siskys
Edwards (TX)	Margolles-	Skaggs
Engel	Mezvinsky	Skelton
English	Markey	Slaughter
Eshoo	Martinez	Spratt
Evans	Matsul	Stark
Farr	Mazzoli	Stenholm
Fazio	McCloskey	Stokes
Fields (LA)	McCurdy	Strickland
Filner	McHale	Studds
Fingerhut	McKinney	Stupak

Swett	Tucker	Waxman
Swift	Unsoeld	Whitten
Tanner	Valentine	Williams
Tejeda	Velazquez	Wilson
Thompson	Vento	Wise
Thurman	Visclosky	Woolsey
Torres	Volkmer	Wyden
Torrice	Waters	Wynn
Trafcant	Watt	Yates

NOES—161

Allard	Gillmor	Moorhead
Archer	Gilman	Morella
Army	Gingrich	Myers
Bachus (AL)	Goodlatte	Nussle
Baker (CA)	Goodling	Oxley
Baker (LA)	Goss	Packard
Ballenger	Grams	Paxon
Barrett (NE)	Greenwood	Petri
Bartlett	Gunderson	Pombo
Barton	Hall (TX)	Porter
Bentley	Hancock	Portman
Bereuter	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Hayes	Quinn
Billey	Hefley	Ramstad
Blute	Heger	Regula
Boehlert	Hobson	Roberts
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Rogers
Bunning	Hoke	Rohrabacher
Burton	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Huffington	Roukema
Callahan	Hunter	Royce
Calvert	Hutchinson	Santorum
Camp	Hyde	Schaefer
Canady	Inglis	Schiff
Castle	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Clinger	Johnson (CT)	Shays
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Kasich	Skeen
Combest	Kim	Smith (MI)
Condit	King	Smith (NJ)
Cooper	Kingston	Smith (OR)
Cox	Klug	Smith (TX)
Crane	Knollenberg	Snowe
Crapo	Kolbe	Solomon
Cunningham	Lazio	Spence
DeLay	Leach	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Levy	Stump
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Talent
Dorman	Lewis (FL)	Tauzin
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (MS)
Duncan	Lightfoot	Taylor (NC)
Dunn	Linder	Thomas (CA)
Ehlers	Lucas	Torkildsen
Emerson	Machtley	Upton
Everett	Manzullo	Vucanovich
Ewing	McCandless	Walker
Fawell	McCollum	Walsh
Fields (TX)	McCrery	Weldon
Fish	McHugh	Wolf
Fowler	McInnis	Young (AK)
Franks (CT)	Meyers	Young (FL)
Franks (NJ)	Michel	Zeliff
Gekas	Miller (FL)	Zimmer
Gilchrest	Molinari	

NOT VOTING—52

Bacchus (FL)	Hutto	Ridge
Bateman	Inhofe	Roemer
Becerra	Inslee	Roth
Boehner	Kyl	Rowland
Carr	Laughlin	Saxton
Clay	Livingston	Schroeder
Clement	Lloyd	Shaw
Collins (MI)	McDade	Slattery
Dickey	McDermott	Smith (IA)
Flake	McKeon	Sundquist
Ford (TN)	McMillan	Synar
Galleghy	Mica	Thomas (WY)
Gallo	Murphy	Thornton
Geren	Owens	Towns
Glickman	Pickle	Washington
Grandy	Quillen	Wheat
Hansen	Ravenel	
Houghton	Reynolds	

□ 1417

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Becerra for, with Mr. McKeon against.
Mr. Synar for, with Mr. Quillen against.

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the votes on rollcalls Nos. 364 and 365, due to the birth of my son, Matthew Bennett Roemer, on July 29, 1994. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcalls Nos. 364 and 365.

LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

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

Mr. MICHEL. I requested this time in order to proceed and inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for the balance of this day and the program for next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, obviously there will be no more votes today.

On Monday the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning business. Then the House will meet at noon. We will consider 11 bills on suspension, and they are listed on the sheet. I think the gentleman can see the different bills that will be presented on that day.

H.R. 4768, Veterans' Education and Training Act;

H.R. 4776, Veterans' Employment Act of 1994;

H.R. 4724, Veterans' Housing Amendments of 1994;

S. 725, Traumatic Brain Injury Act;

H.R. 4535, Unlisted Trading Privileges Act;

H.R. 2826, providing for an investigation of the whereabouts of the United States citizens who have been missing from Cyprus since 1974;

Senate Joint Resolution 195 to designate August 1, 1994, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day";

H.R. 1690, to authorize certain elements of the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project;

H.R. 4448, to amend the act establishing Lowell National Historical Park;

H.R. 3898, to establish the New Bedford Whaling National Historical Park in New Bedford, MA;

H.R. 4158, to establish the Lower East Side Tenement Museum National Historical Site.

Mr. Speaker, there will be votes starting at about 5 p.m., on Monday, and I suspect that we will have votes until about 8 p.m. There could be a number of votes.

H.R. 4506, a motion to go to conference on energy and water appropriations for fiscal year 1995. There would

be a motion to instruct on that, I am told.

H.R. 4453, military construction appropriations, fiscal year 1995 conference report, and obviously any suspensions that will require votes after having been debated during the day.

On Tuesday, August 2, and the balance of the week: The House will meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday on morning business, then at noon on Tuesday. Then we have a private calendar.

The House meets at 10 a.m. Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday.

We will be taking up the Maritime Administration authorization subject to a rule, H.R. 4003; also Little Traverse Bay Bands of Ottawa Indians and Little Band of Odawa Indians Act, subject to a rule, Senate 1357; S. 1066, restoring Federal services to the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians; the Omnibus Crime Control Act, subject to a rule; the Federal Crop Insurance Reform Act, a subject to a rule; Export Administration Act, complete consideration; provide for the management of the Presidio, subject to a rule; foreign operations appropriations for fiscal 1995, conference report; Social Security Administrative Reform Act of 1994 conference report, subject to a rule; community development financial institutions/interstate bank branching conference report, subject to a rule; Congressional Accountability Act, subject to a rule; regarding China MFN, subject to a rule. Conference reports may be brought up at any time. Any further program will be announced later.

I would also say to the gentleman that when we are finished, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules will be making an announcement regarding requirements for the filing of bills and alternative bills on the health care legislation next week.

□ 1420

Mr. MICHEL. Might I first inquire: The gentleman made mention of delay of the votes on suspensions and the regular legislative business on Monday, probably beginning at about 5 p.m. and going on for several hours conceivably.

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. That suggests a question relative to the rest of the week on the time frame. There is a certain traditional thing that takes place on Tuesday evening around here. Does that mean we would adjourn by a certain time on Tuesday or—and then, of course, Wednesday, Thursday, and whatever we have to—

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman would yield, on Tuesday we not only have the annual baseball game, we also have a number of States that have primaries. So we are going to try to arrange for as few of votes as we can possibly engineer on that day, and we will be quitting in time for the annual baseball game.

Mr. MICHEL. And then would Members be on notice to spend some late nights, Wednesday, Thursday?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman made mention of the chairman of the Committee on Rules making an announcement. Would it be appropriate for this leader to ask the majority leader several questions pertinent to what we might consider to be an announcement?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I would be happy to do that when the distinguished chairman makes the announcement. I will be available here, and we will try to answer any questions.

Mr. MICHEL. I think we probably ought to because obviously there will be some observations and comments we would like to make at the time to buttress and assure the Members how the program, as we envisioned it at least preliminarily, would unfold and Members' rights being protected in that process, and I would be happy to yield at this juncture unless the gentleman wants to request his own time.

Mr. DERRICK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is the intent of the leadership of the House to bring the health care bill to the floor the second week in August. Obviously health care reform is a matter of immense scope and complexity. People want to know the details of the various proposals which will be presented to the House for a vote.

We have been asked by Members on both sides of the aisle to make the text of these measures available to the membership for scrutiny and advanced consideration on the floor. That is the only fair and wise policy.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, we are asking Members who have alternate health care bills which they would like considered during the upcoming health care debate to submit those proposals to the House, proposals to the House Committee on Rules, by 6 p.m. on Wednesday, August 3. The committee offices are in H-312 in the Capitol.

Let me just make a couple of points here: First, the committee is asking for legislative language to be submitted by the deadline, not a description of the major concepts. Second, at this time the committee is not asking for single-issue amendments, but entire substitutes to be filed by the August 3 deadline.

I want to thank my colleagues for their cooperation in this effort to make available in advance the text of competing bills.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Might I inquire then of the majority leader if those groups or entities that have something to offer in the field of health care in the form of a substitute or entire proposition, as distinguished

from individual line item amendments, be prepared to present those to the committee by 6 p.m. on Wednesday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. And the gentleman did make mention earlier, in our earlier conversation, of the possibility of refinements to those propositions on the following day, Thursday. Is that a possibility?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, there will be further time for that.

Mr. MICHEL. I want to yield to my distinguished friend from Illinois who has done so much work on our side in helping to craft a bipartisan proposition here, but we are up against the gun when it comes to the facilities of the legislative counsel because we are talking about lengthy measures, very technical in language, and to make certain that we have—we are really writing what we think we have, we are at some disadvantage with the limited staff of legislative counsel. Maybe I might yield at this juncture to more clearly refine that inquiry to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding that I might inquire.

One of our problems in trying to draft language is there are other enterprises going on at the same time on the other side of the aisle and other places dealing with health care that have consumed a great deal of time and resources of the legislative counsels. It has been very difficult to get somebody to draft that language or go over language that is drafted. I would hope that, if we present all propositions to the Committee on Rules by 6 p.m. on Wednesday, that all groups that are trying to draft legislation to present propositions to the Congress for consideration have the opportunity, equal opportunities, to get their propositions drafted.

Mr. DERRICK. That, I am sure, will be provided.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, we obviously want to have these bills done. The only thing we cannot ensure is that, if there are other groups other than a bipartisan group or the Republican group that wants to offer something, and overtax unduly, or kind of unreasonably, the legislative counsel, we are going to have to deal with that problem, and we ought to stay in close communication and find out where we are day by day so that we can try to hit this goal.

We will work with the other side in every way that we can.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments by the distinguished majority leader. I think we need to keep in contact day by day. Obviously there are very limited resources and a huge job to do for all those people that are concerned, and we want to be able to get that language

in a timely basis, but on the other hand, if we get it in at the very—if we are pushed to the end of the line, then all of a sudden we are pushed to a situation where we cannot present that language in legislative form, which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has mentioned, and we do not want to be in that situation.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and let me pursue, if I might, a little bit further with the majority leader.

If everything goes according to plan with the propositions that will be presented to the Committee on Rules by 6 p.m. on Wednesday, with possible refinements on Thursday, when would the Committee on Rules actually then be meeting on the crafting or making a determination with respect to the rule under which we would consider one or more of these propositions? I assume it will be the following week when we will really come to grips with it, and I would also then remind the distinguished majority leader of our earlier conversations throughout the year of how we would hope to leave by our recess date of, say, August 12 and whether or not this comports and can be accommodated within that time frame.

Would the gentleman make an observation on that?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman would yield, we are trying to get to the Committee on Rules sometime the week after next, in the early part, and try to get to this bill as quickly as we can. It probably will be a number of days, a few days, under consideration on the floor, and we are going to do everything we can to meet our schedule. But obviously we cannot give Members a specific time of a specific day that we are going to be finished at this point. There is no way to do that.

Mr. MICHEL. I can appreciate that, and I suspect, after the measures have been formally introduced on Wednesday, and refinements by Thursday, by Thursday and Friday, and morning hour, Members will be talking about the proposals. It would not be a formal debate, but certainly it is no secret that during morning hour Members are free to make whatever comments they might wish to make, and I frankly think it would be good if they were pretty much concentrated in that field because that is what we are all leading up to, is trying to come to some agreement and finalize, before we do have a recess, this biggest and most important of all measures to come before this session, and I am happy to yield.

□ 1430

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman would yield further, I would hope we have a debate starting early, with different groups that have bills exposing those bills to the public in morning hour and in special orders. We could even begin some back and forth and

give and take in those periods. We will obviously have a full debate on the floor. It may even be that Members will not have so many committee meetings in that period and can sit on the floor and listen to the debate. Hopefully this will be a high moment for the House of Representatives as we go through this very important legislation.

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to hear the distinguished majority leader express it in that form and fashion.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, if I might address a question or inquiry to the Committee on Rules, clearly we have an extraordinary circumstance here.

As I understand it, the Committee on Rules anticipates having bills filed with it by Wednesday of next week, and that the Committee on Rules would expect these bills to be in legislative language, which we understand could be a problem with drafting, and perhaps we could expect that to be overcome. The Committee on Rules obviously is then willing to entertain two or more different bills, if anybody can get them drafted and get them in.

Mr. DERRICK. The deadline on Wednesday applied to substitutes. You will be able to perfect them at least the next day.

Mr. ARMEY. In addition to that, in the ordinary course of conducting the Nation's business, the Members at large would have a bill that has been reported out of committee, and in that report a clear understanding of the chapter and verse details of the bill, and much time to prepare amendments to be offered to the floor if accepted by the Committee on Rules.

In this case I understand we have a bill that will be introduced to the Committee on Rules by the majority leader on behalf of himself and the President, the Clinton-Gephardt bill, as it were, which no one will have seen until it gets to the Committee on Rules. How then would I, as a Member of Congress that might seek to amend that bill, be accommodated by the Committee on Rules in my effort to make the request to make amendments to that bill with respect to such things as mandated benefits, defined benefits packages, taxes, or any of the things that might be of interest to my middle income American taxpaying citizens back home?

I am sure that there must be some way that I can approach the Committee on Rules with a request, given that I cannot see the language from which to draw my amendment in technically acceptable form until after it is reported out by the Committee on Rules. Is there some way I can make an amendment on the floor, a request for such a thing?

Mr. DERRICK. We ask that you have all substitutes, including the majority leader's substitute, before the Commit-

tee on Rules by 6 o'clock on Wednesday. There will be plenty of time for a look at the substitutes, there will be plenty of time to perfect them with amendments, and we will probably take up the rule on the eighth, I would imagine, but the first of the following week. I think that is going to give everyone ample time.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, is the gentleman saying I am being assured that I can look at the bill that is submitted, because I have only a rough outline of the bill right now by Mr. GEPHARDT, and have time where I could make, as an individual Member, not a substitute bill, but an effort to amend that particular bill?

Mr. DERRICK. Yes.

Mr. ARMEY. I have the gentleman's assurance I will have that opportunity to make that request?

Mr. DERRICK. You do.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate that, and I am sure that that assurance is extended to all the Members of the body.

Mr. DERRICK. It is.

Mr. ARMEY. In light of our special relationship, I do think we need to clarify that.

Mr. DERRICK. It is.

Mr. MICHEL. I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding. I have had a couple of Members come up to me since our conversation and say they are either working on a Republican bill, or others that they have been bumped from the drafting process. It is really important, again, to the distinguished majority leader, that we have the ability to get bills drafted, and that we not be bumped from that procedure and lineup. So I am looking forward to working with the gentleman on that. If you have a comment, I would appreciate it.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman would yield, we are more than willing to do that on a day-by-day basis. My only admonition is if there are three Republican bills and five bipartisan bills, and we are expecting to get all of those drafted by next Wednesday, we are going to have problems. If, however, there is one Republican bill and one bipartisan bill, and that is essentially what we are talking about, then I think it is feasible to get through this.

Mr. HASTERT. I will offer to the distinguished majority leader that we will work to make sure that we have those priorities in place, but look forward to working with you on that issue.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

If the gentleman will further yield, I wish to announce that Chairman LAFALCE has decided to not go forward with the small business reauthorization bill tonight on general debate and other matters without votes. That will

be rescheduled for next week, likely Tuesday.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 1994

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

NOTIFICATION REGARDING FILING OF AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 4822, THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNT- ABILITY ACT

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is to notify Members of the House of the Rules Committee's plans regarding H.R. 4822, the Congressional Accountability Act. The committee is planning to meet the week of August 1, 1994, to take testimony and grant a rule on the bill.

In order to assure timely consideration of the bill on the floor, the Rules Committee is considering a rule that may limit the offering of amendments.

Any Member who is contemplating an amendment to H.R. 4822 should submit, to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol, 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation of the amendment no later than 5 p.m., on Tuesday, August 2.

The Rules Committee is contemplating making in order as base text the bill as amended by the Committees on House Administration and Rules. That text will be available in the House Administration and Rules Committee offices, as well as in the legislative counsel office, after 2 p.m. today.

We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in this effort to be fair and orderly in granting a rule for H.R. 4822.

□ 1440

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REED). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of February 11, 1994, June 10, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is said that those who ignore history are destined to repeat it. And it is perhaps curious to note that yesterday was the anniversary date of the 79th invasion of Haiti by American Forces back in 1915. Anybody who studies that particular misadventure would surely hope that we are not going to repeat that 79 years later.

So, Mr. Speaker, my advice to those who are advocating an invasion of Haiti today, as those at the White House are, I suggest to them that they go back and read some history.

Our Marines were in Haiti for 19 years; almost a full generation. During that time, they did little to promote democracy in that country that was enduring.

Yes, it is true that the American taxpayers in those 19 years contributed many dollars to the infrastructure of Haiti. Unfortunately, those infrastructure improvements have long since gone to seed. About all that remains of that 19-year occupation of that friendly neighboring country, Haiti, just to the south of Florida, is the ill-will toward the American military that was inspired by that occupation resulting from the invasion by the Marines in 1915.

I see no justification to repeat that at this time. There is no threat to the United States of America from Haiti. The Haitian Navy is incapable of going to sea, literally incapable of going to sea. They have no boats that float. They have no airplanes that fly. They are not going anywhere. They are on an island in the middle of the Caribbean. What are we talking about invading them for?

I know that those who follow the issue closely understand that the issue is domestic politics. That is not a sufficient reason to risk the lives of our men and women in uniform in this country. Heaven forbid we ever do that.

It is interesting that at this time the administration is standing on its head, bending over backward, jumping through hoops, whatever you want to say, to get the approval of the U.N. Security Council to invade Haiti. But they are not asking Congress. They are not asking the Congress of the United States, which is filled with people who represent Americans, people who come from all over this country, stay in communication with their constituents, and try and represent the will in a representative form of government

here. And the people in America do not want to invade Haiti either. Any poll you take a look at shows somewhere between two out of three and five out of six Americans saying, do not invade Haiti. It is a bad idea. There is no reason to do that.

So there apparently is no support in this country. The administration at the White House is willfully voiding the opinion of Congress, apparently it is willfully avoiding the American public. There is no congressional support that I am aware of to invade Haiti. Thank heavens.

It is interesting that there is not much hemispheric support either. The traditional four friends of Haiti, that would be the United States, Canada, France, and Venezuela, Canada, and France do not want to invade Haiti either. So it is a little hard to understand where this initiative to invade Haiti is coming from.

We know it is the White House. It is very hard to understand why. We apparently understand that President Aristide, who is the duly and popularly elected President by apparently two out of three votes, about 67 percent, and I was there. It was a very enthusiastic election, and he is the rightful President of that country. But even he has not committed to go back to Haiti in the event there were an invasion. So that makes it even more puzzling that there should be an invasion.

On top of all this, there are some duly-elected leaders in Haiti today. Members of Congress down there. They call it parliament, their chamber of deputies and their senate. There is about 48 of them who have written us letters up here and said, come on down. Let us talk and negotiate a settlement to the Haitian problem. We would like not to be invaded. We believe we can talk to you folks in Congress and work out a solution to this problem.

And do you know what? We have not responded. We have not responded to that invitation. The administration has simply said that they do not wish at this time to negotiate. They are only talking about invading unless things go exactly their way.

That, to me, means we are missing a great opportunity to find a peaceful solution, responding to the invitation of these 48 democratically elected members of their chamber of deputies and senate.

This was the tract that Lawrence Pezullo, who was previously the Special Assistant to the President on Haitian Affairs, was trying to follow. As you recall, Mr. Pezullo got in some trouble by being politically incorrect in pursuing this policy and he is now fired.

I believe we need to respond to this invasion. I understand my time has run. I hope that those who are interested in this subject are listening closely and will convey the same mes-

sage: There is no need to invade Haiti; do not invade Haiti.

MERIDIAN, MS, AIR NATIONAL GUARD UNIT CITED FOR ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE TOTAL FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. Malcolm Armstrong, commander of the 21st Air Force, visited the 186th Air Refueling Group in Meridian, MS, on July 24 and expressed his appreciation for the role this Air National Guard unit is playing in our "Total Force" policy that incorporates active duty, National Guard and Reserve units side by side to help us maintain a strong national defense.

His visit came while the 186th was undergoing a Quality Air Force Assessment [QAF]/Aircrew Standardization and Evaluation Visit [ASEV] inspection. He and Col. Alan Bridging from headquarters, Air Mobility Command, commented on the accomplishments of the 186th. I wanted to share their remarks with my colleagues.

Following are the comments of General Armstrong:

I'm delighted to have the opportunity to come down and accept a debrief of this quality. It is particularly gratifying for a unit that has been through the kind of turbulence that you've been through in the last couple of years with all of the construction on your part of the airfield here. But, I love to see dirt flying, because once we finally get the dust settled, you'll have some better, more effective and more efficient facilities to work out of. So, that's one of those inconveniences that we're all pleased to grit our teeth and carry on through with.

And, of course, it is particularly gratifying to me to come to a Guard unit or a Reserve unit, in this case a Guard unit, that upholds the standards of appearance and professionalism that you've established. Sometimes we lose a little bit of that in some of our units . . . and not always in a Guard or Reserve unit either, by the way. But it is particularly gratifying to come and see that. General Wallace, I want to take my hat off to you and your folks, and certainly Colonel Feinstein because that is clearly a direct reflection of the attitude of leadership in an organization. It tells me that, when the chips are down, you folks having been hardened with yourselves over and over on professionalism, will in fact get the job done no matter what the pressure is that is there, I mean, if you've been watching TV lately, there's plenty of pressure out there for us. We are getting into Rwanda big time right now. We're shipping off some more airplane loads of people from McGuire this morning, some last night, some the night before, going in there. We are tanking in and out of there a lot. We've set up a tanker task force at Moran; and you may get your chance. I don't think this is going to be over very quickly. Perhaps the intense portion of the airlift will be over quickly, because hopefully, if we can just get a lot of water in there we can begin to save some lives. But its going to take an awful long time for those people to get themselves redistributed and to go back and harvest their crops and get themselves properly fed and back to some semblance of health.

And the U.S. and its allies are going to be involved in that, and we should be involved in that. So you may very well get a chance at that.

But my message to you is; it is clear to me, and I compliment you for it, that you folks are hard on yourselves. You're hard-nosed about taking a professional approach to every single aspect of your military mission, and you're proud of it, and you want to make sure you look like it as well as act like it, and you've done a fine job of that, and I really appreciate that. I'm pleased to see that this is the best . . . we don't give reports; or report grades, but this report is the best report that I've read to date on any unit; United States Air Force, or Air National Guard, or U.S. Air Force Reserve.

In addition to General Armstrong's strong endorsement of the unit, Col. Alan J. Briding, representing headquarters, Air Mobility Command, had the following comments regarding the 186th Air Refueling Group:

The group was very proactive in its conversion from RF-4's to KC-135R's and made the transition well ahead of schedule. Twenty-first Air Force ASEV results depict an exceptionally well-prepared aircrew force. Morale appears to be excellent. Pride in past achievements and determination to become the benchmark tanker unit in the command flow from the top and permeate throughout the group. Every indication the QAFA team looked at suggests that the 186 ARG will maintain its superior operational performance record.

Available performance indicators, the health of key processes, and the SORTS program all indicate that the 186 ARG is an exceptional unit and is fully capable of accomplishing its assigned missions.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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 Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 25 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

SANCTIONS AGAINST THE PEOPLE'S LIBERATION ARMY

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want the Members, if any who are still around in town listening, but people to know that next week we are going to bring up the Pelosi bill which deals with putting sanctions against the People's Liberation Army. Now, people say, who is, what is the People's Liberation Army?

They are the ones that killed thousands of people in Beijing during Tiananmen Square. They are the ones, every American citizen should know it, who are flooding in this Nation assault weapons which are killing American men, American women, and American children. Did you know, I ask my colleagues, that the People's Liberation Army which rolled over the young men in Tiananmen Square and has been responsible for so many barbaric things,

barbaric to Americans who fought in the Korean War. Do you remember the oppressiveness of the People's Liberation Army in the Korean war? Think back.

If you have anyone in your family who fought in the Korean war, the People's Liberation Army were the barbarians of North Korea. If you have anybody in your family that fought in Vietnam or know anybody that fought in Vietnam, many of the weapons coming in that killed Americans came from the People's Liberation Army.

If you are young and you are just recent, then many of the weapons that Saddam Hussein, from Iraq, used to kill American men and women came from the People's Liberation Army of China.

You say, what does that have to do with this? Well, next week we are going to have a sanctions bill which will prohibit goods coming in to the United States that are made by the People's Liberation Army.

Now, I think most Americans know, but just to state for the record again, let me just tell you what. I was there several years ago and we visited this prison, Beijing prison number one. These prisoners, there were 40 Tiananmen Square prisoners working in this prison. They were making slave labor goods, knocking out textile workers throughout the United States and in South Carolina and North Carolina and Georgia and Virginia and every other place, with slave labor goods coming in and competing with American products. And they pay them nothing. Slave labor.

I should also say for the record that I am a free trader. I have never voted for a protectionist bill since I have been in Congress. Not once. I was a strong supporter of NAFTA, strong supporter of good trade. I think trade makes a difference. But in China's case, we want to sanction not all of China but the People's Liberation Army.

This man here represents the thousands that are in Chinese gulags. I think most Members know, but just to reiterate it again, that the Chinese government has arrested Catholic bishops. You would not think they would arrest Catholic bishops, priests and ministers, and they have leveled Tibet.

□ 1450

In Tibet, the Buddhist monks and those of the Buddhist faith have been persecuted. One of our colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman CHRIS SMITH, went to China this year, took Holy Communion from Bishop Su, a Catholic bishop. Several days after CHRIS SMITH took holy communion, they arrested Bishop Su.

What I want to bring this debate back on is next week, we should clearly support the bill that sanctions, that goes against the People's Liberation

Army that was involved in the Korean war and responsible for the deaths of a lot of Americans in Korea. Do you want to be with the People's Liberation Army? No. Responsible for the same thing in Vietnam. Responsible for sending weapons.

Right now as we now speak, the People's Liberation Army and China are pumping weapons into Southern Sudan where they are killing black Christians and they are killing them because they are Christians. The same army we are going to get to vote next week, do you want to give them special trade benefits to knock out American textile workers and shoe workers and toy manufacturers, or do you want to sanction?

Let me say a word to those on my side of the aisle. As a Republican Member, I think we have so much to be proud of, that we are the party of Lincoln. We are the party of great compassion and interest with regard to human rights. I would not want to see my party, I would not want to see the Republican party lose its soul. "Want is to profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his soul?" We read in the Bible. I would not want my party, I would not want the other party, but I particularly would not want the Republican party to lose its soul by siding with the bandits, the bandits and the barbarians of Beijing that control the People's Liberation Army. We are going to get a chance next week. The Catholic Conference supports this bill, the Pelosi bill. Fundamentals, evangelicals around this country support the bill.

I will tell you, the Christians that we meet with in China certainly support the bill. The human rights interests in this country support the bill. The Chinese dissidents in this country who have families back there support the bill. The AFL-CIO supports this bill. The clothing workers support this bill. Organized labor supports this bill. This bill ought to pass.

To those on the Republican side, I just think we have to be careful. I know sometimes you want to be with business and, say, a business lobbyist comes in. But this business is a moral issue. It is for the heart and soul of the Republican party. It would be like in the time of the Civil War of Lincoln then selling out and not taking a stand with regard to slavery. It would be like a situation whereby we know what was right and we then decided to kind of close our eyes to the bishops that are still in jail, to the human rights dissidents that are still in jail, to the ministers that are still in jail, to the Buddhist monks that are still in jail, to those that are being tortured every day. Now, a bigger issue is the overall MFN. We are also going to vote on a bill, a bill of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], God bless him, it is a wonderful bill which I am going to

speak for and support, which would take away MFN from all the goods coming into China. I think that is the appropriate way to go. I am going to support it. But Members can vote yes on that or vote no. But we come down to the basic sanctioning, punishing the People's Liberation Army. Clearly the right vote I believe is a vote for the Pelosi bill, which will do that.

In closing, there are two final points. Some people say, "Well, I'm for human rights, but sanctions, well, they just don't work."

"I'm for human rights, Congressman WOLF, but sanctions, they just don't work."

You can tell Scharansky, who is now living in Israel, who used the support when we took MFN away from the Soviet Union, you tell Scharansky that sanctions do not work. You tell Sakharov that sanctions do not work. We would laugh at you today if he were here to say that sanctions do not work. You tell the Romanians in Romania, Father Calciu who got out of prison after being in prison for 19 years, 19 years, and we used MFN to get him out. You tell Father Calciu that sanctions do not work. Look Father Calciu in the eye and say, "Father, I know you have been in there for 19 years, but it wasn't the sanctions that got you out," and Father Calciu will tell you:

Young man, young lady, it was the sanctions that got me out. It was the prayers to the good Lord and it was the sanctions that got me out.

Lastly, tell Nelson Mandela that sanctions do not work. Tell him that they did not work. I listened to white South Africans and black South Africans interviewed on a National Public Radio show several months ago. "I was opposed to sanctions," this one South African said, "I was opposed to sanctions, but I was wrong. It made a difference."

Tell Nelson Mandela that sanctions did not work. I am going to develop this theme all next week, but in closing, I will cover one last point.

Many of the arguments used against the bill to take away MFN from the People's Liberation Army, to sanction this corrupt group that everyone agrees, we have unanimity that they are bad, this group, there is this powerful argument that I have found that was offered during World War II and before World War II with Nazi Germany. Would we today be saying, would any Member have the temerity, the courage or the stupidity to come and say that we should not put sanctions on the Nazi army, on the SS?

Of course they would say that, clearly. We have documents to show that during 1933 and 1934 and 1935, Cordell Hull and others said, "No, let's not upset the Nazis, let's not speak out on this issue." That somehow if we speak out on this issue, we will upset the Germans. My God, if there is one mis-

take we made and we have made many in this country, the United States should have been speaking out boldly in 1933 and 1934 and 1935 and 1936 and 1937 and 1938. We are the leader of the world. We are the leader of the free world because of our military strength. We can thank Ronald Reagan for that and I think we can thank George Bush for that and we can thank many preceding Presidents for that.

The reason that we also are number one in the world is because we lead not only with power, with raw power of might and missiles, we lead with power of example, the power of example. America is a great country because of that. The Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson, from my State: We hold these truths, truths, to be self-evident. That all men are created equal.

It does not say all American men and women. It says all men, Chinese men. All men, Chinese women. All men are endowed, are endowed, endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I think we are going to be faced with a tremendous moral dilemma next week. There are going to be some who want to and let me just stipulate for the record, they are good men and women on both sides of the aisle, on both sides of this issue, all truth and honesty does not rest with one side, and I will stipulate there are good people and good arguments on the other side, but when it comes to the People's Liberation Army, we are going to have to decide, do we want to vote in support of more assault weapons and guns that they sell, and you know they are laughing at us. I bet the People's Liberation Army leadership is just laughing at us. And do you know, I guess the American people know, I think the Congress knows, that the People's Liberation Army has offices here in the United States? They do industrial espionage and military espionage against our Government, but they are laughing at us. We are going to have to decide, do we stand with the Catholic bishops of China. Do we stand with the protestant ministers of China? Do we stand with the peasants that meet in house churches so they can worship Christ? People that when you ask them of anything about the Government, they say, I do not want to get involved in politics, I just want to worship Christ. I want to be in my house church. I just want to worship in freedom, who will literally do anything for a Bible. Do we want to stand with the people who will do anything for a Bible, who want to worship Jesus Christ in their house or do we want to stand with the People's Liberation Army? Do we want to stand with the People's Liberation Army that gave weapons to Saddam Hussein that killed American soldiers or do we want to stand with those against? Do

we want to stand with the People's Liberation Army that is aiding the terrorists around the world and putting arms into southern Sudan whereby they are killing these black Christians who have no food, no weapons, nothing? Or do we want to stand with the Catholic bishops who support this bill?

□ 1500

I think history sometimes repeats itself, and sometimes each generation has to learn a lesson. But I just wondered what the debates would have been like in 1993 or 1934 if we had gone back and had the same circumstances. I would hope looking back that we would have said that Adolf Hitler was evil. I would have hoped that we would have sanctioned the Nazi army and the SS. I would have hoped that we would have done it, and I would hope that we will do the same thing next week when this Congress has an opportunity to come and to vote on whether or not you should stand with those of Amnesty International, the Catholic Bishops, the persecuted, the Dalai Lama from Tibet, the Buddhist monks, those people who are fighting for human rights in Belize, the people who want to keep these Chinese assault weapons out, who want to stop the intelligence and foreign espionage by the People's Liberation Army, or do you want to help stand with the people who want to appease the People's Liberation Army. It would be my prayer and hope that as we develop this issue through the weeks that the Congress will stand for human rights.

I want to add several things. There have been a number of Chinese who have been arrested since the President delinked MFN. As Members know, we used to have MFN, and every year we would say to the Chinese Government, "If you have not made improvement in your human rights, we are going to take away MFN."

President Clinton delinked it. He took it away, and since that time the conditions for the Christians, the non-Christians, the Buddhists, all people, human rights in China have gotten worse.

Second, it was somewhat amusing because they said that President Clinton said, and I can remember President Clinton criticizing President Bush so much during the campaign, and if we recall, he criticized Bush on Haiti and now he has flip-flopped five different times on Haiti. I do not know what his policy is. But he criticized President Bush on Bosnia, and now he has been on every side of that issue in Bosnia. He criticized President Bush on the arms embargo and said that he would lift the arms embargo during the campaign. He said he wanted to lift the arms embargo and criticized President Bush in some very dramatic statements. Now he had done a 180-degree turn, and flip-flopped, and do you know

what he got for it? Several weeks after Clinton delinked MFN, the President of the United States, President Clinton, tried to call the President of China and the President of China would not even take his telephone call, would not even take his telephone call.

So we are going to have an opportunity hopefully to reverse that policy, not again on all of the human rights or on all of the MFN. We will be dealing next week solely with the Pelosi bill that deals solely with the People's Liberation Army that justifiably we know have done all of these bad things, and government-run industry in China.

I would like to add one additional thing so that Members will know it. We now have conclusive proof that in China they have what they call an organ sale program. When they kill religious dissidents and people in prison, they shoot them, and when they fall down the doctors are there, and they operate, and they take their kidneys out, they take their corneas out and things like that, and then they sell them. This is the type of group that we are dealing with.

Our opposition would argue that the Declaration of Independence says, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Americans are created equal." But our Founding Fathers had a more noble vision of American values.

Our opposition would conduct a foreign policy that says, "Pull up the ladder, I'm aboard." But our Founding Fathers held deeper principles than protecting the almighty dollar when that same dollar strengthens regimes which oppress their own people.

And this debate is really about people. People who are suffering persecution, imprisonment, and even death for the sake of their faith or political beliefs. People like Bishop Su, a Catholic leader in China imprisoned for 15 years and beaten so hard with a board that the board was left in splinters.

People like Father Calciu, imprisoned under the brutal Romanian Dictator Ceausescu for more than 20 years—rearrested one Easter after delivering a powerful series of Lenten sermons on freedom. The leverage of most-favored-nation status for Romania led to Father Calciu's release and eventually led to the downfall of Ceausescu.

And people like Wei Jingsheng. Wei is China's most prominent democracy advocate whom you will remember as the prisoner released just months before the end of his 15-year sentence in a public relations ploy by Beijing to gain the Olympics. During his 6 months outside of prison, Wei spoke out boldly for human rights, writing op. eds. for the New York Times and daring to meet with Assistant Secretary of State John Shattuck in February. In the face of Beijing's renewed repression against democracy activists, Wei openly told Western reporters that the United States must keep its word and revoke MFN without true progress on human rights. "If you retreat, you lose," he said. For his courage, he was rearrested on April 1 and his whereabouts remain unknown.

The people like Wei who have the most to lose were urging the United States to remain

firm before President Clinton's MFN decision. They, like those of us supporting either partial or full MFN revocation today, believed that the time to change U.S. foreign policy is after we have kept our word, not before. They told me repeatedly that their brothers and sisters suffering in China were depending on us. They wondered out loud in my office why we are tempted to ally ourselves with China's past instead of China's future. A prominent Chinese democracy leader told me he strongly believes that upon Deng's impending death, the student and worker-led democratic movement will ally with a large segment of the military to usher democracy into China. He marveled that Chinese leaders are investing their significant sums in the West—foreseeing the changes to come—while American corporations are seeking billion-dollar contracts supporting a political system that may be about to change drastically.

In Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, and, most recently South Africa, United States trade leverage eventually worked—bringing down repressive Governments, encouraging the oppressed, and emboldening the future leaders of those countries in their struggles for democracy.

Ask South Africa's Nelson Mandela, Poland's Lech Walesa, or the Czech Republic's Vaclav Havel—all former prisoners turned Presidents—whether they appreciated the pressure of United States trade leverage on their oppressive Governments.

In particular, I'd love to hear Nelson Mandela's response to the other side's argument that the United States must not forgo profits to advance the cause of freedom. Of course, you'd have trouble reaching him right now. He has the burden of crafting his own foreign policy, precisely because we stayed the course in South Africa.

But, at our deepest gut level, we must ask ourselves as a nation if trade at any price is worth more to us than our American values? What's at stake here is the credibility of our moral leadership on the world stage.

The height of American hypocrisy is to preach our cherished values of freedom of religion and speech, while we prize the lost dollar over the lost life.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. INSLEE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CLEMENT (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), after 2 p.m. today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EVERETT in two instances.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. SOLOMON.

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

Mr. GLICKMAN.

Mr. HOYER in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. REED.

Mr. DE LA GARZA.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. ZELIFF.

Mr. WHEAT.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

Mr. ROSE.

Ms. ESHOO.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 1, 1994, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3584. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Department of the Army, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3585. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Department of the Army, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3586. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-289, "District of Columbia Workers' Compensation Act of 1979 Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3587. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of D.C. Act 10-290, "Retired Police Officer Redeployment Salary Limit Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3588. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-291, "District of Columbia Taxicab Commission Establishment Act of 1985 Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3589. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-292, "Compensation Merit Personnel Reemployed Annuitant Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3590. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-293, "National Voter Registration Act Conforming Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3591. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-294, "Policemen and Firemen's Retirement Relief Board Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3592. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-295, "Lie Detector Tests for Pre-Employment Investigations Temporary Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3593. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-296, "Rental Housing Conversion and Sale Act of 1980 Reenactment and Amendment Temporary Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3594. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-301, "District of Columbia Association Attraction and Retention Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3595. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-302, "Technical Amendments Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3596. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by David George Newton, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Yemen, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3597. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of Justification for Presidential Determination (94-34) regarding the drawdown of defense articles and services from the stocks of DOD for emergency military assistance to the Dominican Republic, pursuant to Public Law 101-513, section 547(a) (104 Stat. 2019); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3598. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on Federally funded international exchange programs and training activities of the U.S. Government, pursuant to Public Law 101-236, section 229(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3599. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the transfer of property to the Republic of Panama under the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3784(b); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3600. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide, in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, for the repeal of advisory committees no longer carrying out the purposes for which they were established; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Agriculture, Natural Resources, Armed Services, Science, Space, and Technology, Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, and Public Works and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GIBBONS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4003. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to revitalize the U.S.-flag merchant marine, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-544, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of California: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 4008. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for fiscal years 1994 and 1995, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-583, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GIBBONS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3396. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide security for workers, to improve pension plan funding, to limit growth in insurance exposure, to protect the single-employer plan termination insurance program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-632, 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. ISTOOK (for himself, Mr. HORN, Mr. CANADY, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. LEVY, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. MCHALE):

H.R. 4857. A bill to make small business concerns eligible to participate in the health benefits program under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Post Office and Civil Service, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. FIELDS of Texas):

H.R. 4858. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Investment Company Act of 1940 to promote capital formation for small businesses and others through exempted offerings under the Securities Act and through investment pools that are excepted or exempted from regulation under the In-

vestment Company Act of 1940 and through business development companies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 4859. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide congressional authorization of State control over transportation and disposal of municipal solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FROST, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. TORRES):

H.R. 4860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the collection of taxes of U.S. persons moving production abroad and foreign persons doing business in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELIFF (for himself, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MICA, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COX, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. GEKAS):

H.R. 4861. A bill to provide for the consolidation of Federal employment assistance programs, to provide increased notice of the availability of the earned income tax credit, and to repeal the temporary FUTA surtax; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Veterans' Affairs, Ways and Means, and Agriculture.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to proclaim August 9, 1994 as "Smokey Bear's 50th Anniversary"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H. Con. Res. 275. Concurrent resolution waiving the requirement in section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 that the Congress adjourn sine die not later than July 31 of each year; considered and agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 4862. A bill for the relief of Inslaw, Inc., a Delaware Corporation, and William A. Hamilton and Nancy Hamilton, individually; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAUZIN:

H.R. 4863. A bill to authorize the sale and re-registration of certain vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 25: Mr. SYNAR.
 H.R. 50: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 147: Mr. CANADY.
 H.R. 174: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 214: Mr. CANADY, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. COPPERSMITH.
 H.R. 229: Mr. BARLOW.
 H.R. 441: Ms. SCHENK.
 H.R. 566: Mr. LIVINGSTON.
 H.R. 657: Mr. DORNAN.
 H.R. 799: Mr. SANTORUM.
 H.R. 957: Mr. VENTO.
 H.R. 961: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 1080: Mr. COMBEST.
 H.R. 1110: Mrs. BENTLEY and Mr. BLUTE.
 H.R. 1171: Mr. HILLIARD.
 H.R. 1286: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. KLINK, and Ms. SCHENK.
 H.R. 1322: Mr. ROGERS.
 H.R. 1483: Mr. ROEMER.
 H.R. 1500: Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. KLUG.
 H.R. 1518: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. ZIMMER.
 H.R. 1604: Mr. KYL.
 H.R. 1607: Ms. SCHENK.
 H.R. 1887: Mr. ROEMER.
 H.R. 2014: Mr. ROEMER.
 H.R. 2019: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 2092: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. HOAGLAND.
 H.R. 2227: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 2512: Mr. CRANE.
 H.R. 2680: Mr. ZIMMER.
 H.R. 3128: Mr. ROEMER.
 H.R. 3163: Mr. KLUG, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HAMILTON, and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.
 H.R. 3270: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. SKEEN.
 H.R. 3457: Mr. ROEMER.
 H.R. 3523: Ms. SCHENK and Mr. ORTIZ.
 H.R. 3560: Mr. SCHAEFER.
 H.R. 3712: Mr. SKELTON.
 H.R. 3716: Mr. KYL.
 H.R. 3814: Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 3913: Mr. SCHAEFER.
 H.R. 3951: Ms. DANNER, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. COMBEST.
 H.R. 3958: Mr. ZIMMER.
 H.R. 3967: Mr. MCHALE.
 H.R. 4040: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 4088: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 4091: Mr. JEFFERSON and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 4138: Mr. ROGERS.
 H.R. 4162: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. DEUTSCH.
 H.R. 4198: Mr. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 4230: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 4386: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mrs. BYRNE.
 H.R. 4411: Mr. SCOTT.
 H.R. 4413: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 4421: Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 4517: Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 4684: Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 4699: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.
 H.R. 4702: Mr. MCDADE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. LEVY.
 H.R. 4739: Ms. LOWEY and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
 H.R. 4767: Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 4805: Mr. GLICKMAN.
 H.R. 4831: Mr. SAXTON.
 H.J. Res. 1: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.
 H.J. Res. 287: Mr. FISH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEVY, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. GILMAN.
 H.J. Res. 337: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ROWLAND, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GINGRICH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BLUTE, and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.
 H. Con. Res. 166: Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. MCCANDLESS.
 H. Con. Res. 223: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H. Con. Res. 246: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. FARR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. WATT.

H. Con. Res. 249: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. KING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FROST, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Con. Res. 256: Mr. GREENWOOD.
 H. Con. Res. 270: Mr. SMITH of OREGON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H. Res. 266: Mr. CANADY.
 H. Res. 389: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SHARP, Mr. YATES, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WATT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. KASICH, and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H. Res. 430: Mr. DEUTSCH.
 H. Res. 472: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. UPTON.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 12 by Mr. TRAFICANT on the bill H.R. 3261: Jim Bunning and Charlie Rose.

Petition 17 by Mr. SHAW on House Resolution 386: Michael Huffington.

Petition 18 by Mr. HASTERT on House Resolution 402: Thomas H. Andrews.

Petition 19 by Mr. EWING on House Resolution 415: Don Sundquist.

Petition 22 by Mr. INHOFE on House Resolution 409: J. Dennis Hastert.