

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 13, 1994

The House met at 2 p.m.
The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray using the words of Psalm 103:

Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless His holy name!

Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits.

Who forgives all your iniquity, who heals all your diseases,

Who redeems your life from the Pit, who crowns you with steadfast love and mercy,

Who satisfies you with good as long as you live so that your youth is renewed like the eagle's. 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.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 261, nays 153, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—261

Abercrombie	Borski	Collins (IL)
Ackerman	Boucher	Collins (MI)
Andrews (ME)	Brewster	Combust
Andrews (NJ)	Brooks	Condit
Andrews (TX)	Browder	Conyers
Applegate	Brown (FL)	Cooper
Baesler	Brown (OH)	Coppersmith
Barca	Bryant	Costello
Barcia	Byrne	Coyne
Barlow	Cantwell	Cramer
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	Darden
Bateman	Carr	de la Garza
Becerra	Chapman	Deal
Beilenson	Clayton	DeFazio
Berman	Clement	DeLauro
Bevill	Clinger	Dellums
Bilbray	Clyburn	Derrick
Bishop	Coleman	Deutsch
Bonior	Collins (GA)	Dicks

Dingell	LaFalce
Dixon	Lambert
Dooley	Lancaster
Durbin	Lantos
Edwards (CA)	LaRocco
Edwards (TX)	Laughlin
Engel	Lehman
English	Levin
Eshoo	Lewis (GA)
Evans	Lipinski
Everett	Lloyd
Farr	Long
Fazio	Lowey
Flelds (LA)	Maloney
Filner	Mann
Fingerhut	Manton
Foglietta	Margolies-
Ford (MI)	Mezvinsky
Ford (TN)	Markey
Frank (MA)	Martinez
Frost	Matsui
Furse	Mazzoli
Cejdenson	McCloskey
Gephardt	McCrery
Geren	McCurdy
Gibbons	McDermott
Gillmor	McHale
Gilman	McInnis
Gonzalez	McKinney
Gordon	McNulty
Green	Meehan
Greenwood	Meek
Gutierrez	Menendez
Hall (OH)	Mfume
Hall (TX)	Miller (CA)
Hamburg	Miller (FL)
Hamilton	Mineta
Harman	Minge
Hastings	Mink
Hayes	Moakley
Hefner	Mollohan
Hilliard	Montgomery
Hinchey	Moran
Hoagland	Murtha
Hochbrueckner	Myers
Holden	Nadler
Houghton	Neal (MA)
Hoyer	Oberstar
Hughes	Obey
Hutto	Oliver
Hyde	Ortiz
Inglis	Orton
Inslee	Owens
Jefferson	Pallone
Johnson (CT)	Parker
Johnson (GA)	Pastor
Johnson (SD)	Payne (NJ)
Johnson, E. B.	Payne (VA)
Johnston	Pelosi
Kanjorski	Penny
Kaptur	Peterson (FL)
Kasich	Peterson (MN)
Kennedy	Pickett
Kennelly	Pickle
Kildee	Pombo
Kiecicka	Pomeroy
Klein	Poshard
Klink	Price (NC)
Kopetski	Rahall

NAYS—153

Allard	Bliley	Clay
Archer	Blute	Coble
Armey	Boehler	Cox
Bachus (AL)	Boehner	Crane
Baker (CA)	Bonilla	Crapo
Baker (LA)	Bunning	Cunningham
Ballenger	Burton	DeLay
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Diaz-Balart
Bartlett	Callahan	Dickey
Barton	Calvert	Doolittle
Bentley	Camp	Dornan
Bereuter	Canady	Dreier
Bilirakis	Castle	Duncan

Rangel	Dunn	Knollenberg	Roberts
Reed	Ehlers	Kolbe	Rogers
Reynolds	Emerson	Kreidler	Rohrabacher
Richardson	Ewing	Kyl	Ros-Lehtinen
Roemer	Fawell	Lazio	Roth
Rose	Fields (TX)	Leach	Royce
Rostenkowski	Fowler	Levy	Saxton
Rowland	Franks (CT)	Lewis (CA)	Schaefer
Roybal-Allard	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (FL)	Schiff
Rush	Gallegly	Lightfoot	Schroeder
Sabo	Gekas	Linder	Sensenbrenner
Sanders	Gilchrest	Livingston	Shaw
Sangmeister	Gingrich	Machtley	Shays
Santorum	Goodlatte	Manzullo	Shuster
Sarpalius	Goodling	McCandless	Skeen
Sawyer	Goss	McCollum	Smith (MI)
Schenk	Grams	McDade	Smith (NJ)
Schumer	Gunderson	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Scott	Hancock	Meyers	Snowe
Serrano	Hansen	Mica	Solomon
Sharp	Hastert	Molinari	Spence
Shepherd	Hefley	Moorhead	Stearns
Sisisky	Heger	Morella	Stump
Skaggs	Hobson	Murphy	Sundquist
Skelton	Hoekstra	Nussle	Talent
Slattery	Hoke	Oxley	Taylor (MS)
Slaughter	Horn	Packard	Taylor (NC)
Smith (IA)	Huffington	Paxon	Thomas (CA)
Spratt	Hunter	Petri	Torkildsen
Stark	Hutchinson	Porter	Upton
Stenholm	Inhofe	Portman	Vucanovich
Stokes	Istook	Pryce (OH)	Walker
Strickland	Jacobs	Quillen	Walsh
Studds	Johnson, Sam	Quinn	Weldon
Stupak	Kim	Ramstad	Wolf
Swett	King	Ravenel	Young (FL)
Swift	Kingston	Regula	Zeliff
Synar	Klug	Ridge	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—18

Bacchus (FL)	Gallo	Neal (NC)
Blackwell	Glickman	Roukema
Brown (CA)	Grandy	Smith (OR)
Danner	McHugh	Washington
Fish	McMillan	Williams
Flake	Michel	Wilson

□ 1423

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. MEEHAN 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. 1134. An act to provide for the transfer of certain public lands located in Clear Creek

□ 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.

County, Colorado, to the United States Forest Service, the State of Colorado, and certain local governments in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2947. An act to amend the Commemorative Works Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 859. An act to reduce the restrictions on lands conveyed by deed under the Act of June 8, 1926.

S. 1586. An act to establish the New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park in the State of Louisiana; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 636) "An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit individuals to have freedom of access to certain medical clinics and facilities, and for other purposes," and agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. SIMON, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. COATS, and Mr. HATCH, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE IRENE BAILEY BAKER

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and great sorrow that I rise to inform the House that our esteemed former colleague, Irene Bailey Baker, passed away on Saturday, April 2, 1994, at the age of 92. Mrs. Baker succeeded her husband, Howard H. Baker, Sr., as a Member of this body upon his untimely death and served out the remainder of his term from March 10, 1964, to January 3, 1965.

In her public and private life, Mrs. Baker carried on the proud family tradition of representing the people and their best interests. I had the distinct privilege and honor of serving alongside Howard Baker, Sr., until his death, alongside Mrs. Baker, and at the same time as their son Howard Baker, Jr., during his 18 years in the Senate, and as Senator Baker's father-in-law, Senator Everett Dirksen, a giant leader in that body.

Edith Irene Bailey was born on November 17, 1901, in the hills on Sevier County, TN, and was educated there. She began her public service at age 17 as an employee in the local court system where her father was a judge. In 1935 she married Howard Baker, a local attorney general and widower, and stood by his side steadfastly as he made several unsuccessful attempts to run for public office before his ultimate success. They had two wonderful daughters together, and she also took his son, Howard, Jr., to raise as her

own. The values and determination that she helped instill in her stepson became evident as he later grew to be one of the most distinguished U.S. Senators in the history of that body, and served as its Republican leader from 1977 to 1985, afterward serving as White House Chief of Staff at a most difficult time under President Reagan.

Although there are only 12 of us remaining in the House who served alongside Mrs. Baker, we cannot forget the effort and tireless devotion she brought to her congressional duties. Her service on the Committee on Government Operations was exemplary. She constantly gave her all to represent the interests and meet the needs of her constituents and her State. Mrs. Baker and I worked closely together in the House during my first term, not only as a friend but as a legislator on the floor of the House as well. She also was a proud standard bearer of the principles of the Republican Party, which she loved and of which she was national committeewoman for Tennessee from 1960 to 1964.

After her departure from the House of Representatives in 1965, Mrs. Baker put her skills and her extraordinary compassion to good use as the director of public welfare for the city of Knoxville from 1965 to 1971, and thus continued her public service in helping the neediest Tennesseans and showing through her example that no obstacle is insurmountable. After her retirement, she lived a long and full life at her east Tennessee home and was devoted to her extensive family and her numerous friends. Her passion for her community was legendary, and she remained active and outgoing up until the day she was taken from us. She was laid to her final rest on April 4 beside her husband at Sherwood Memorial Gardens in Knoxville, TN.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Baker is survived by Senator Baker, her two daughters, Mary Baker Stuart and Beverly Baker Patestides, six grandchildren, and numerous great-grandchildren and nieces and nephews. She was a wonderful wife, mother, grandmother, great-grandmother, Member of Congress, and community leader, and a dear friend. I know that all my colleagues and all of the people of Tennessee join me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to the entire family in their time of sorrow, which I am certain we all share.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Second Congressional District, the Honorable JOHN DUNCAN, JR.

□ 1430

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of Tennessee's most distinguished and respected citizens, Mrs. Irene Baker, who passed away last weekend at the age of 92.

Although she may have been best known as the wife of the late Congress-

man Howard Baker, Sr., and the stepmother of former Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker Jr., Irene Baker was a dedicated public servant and community leader in her own right. Throughout her life, she devoted a tremendous amount of time and energy to serving the people of east Tennessee, and her many contributions to the State will not soon be forgotten.

Mrs. Baker got an early start in politics, working in the Sevier County court clerk's office and the Chancery Court office as a teenager in the 1920's. After marrying Howard Baker, Sr., in 1935, she served as Republican National Committeewoman for Tennessee for 4 years, from 1960-64.

Following her husband's death in 1964, Mrs. Baker was elected to serve the remaining 9 months of his term in the House of Representatives, where she upheld his legacy of dedicated service to the citizens of the Second District. At the conclusion of that term, Mrs. Baker became the city of Knoxville's welfare director, a position she held until 1971.

In each of these endeavors, Irene Baker was a credit not only to herself and her family, but to her State and the people that she served. I know I speak for all east Tennesseans in saluting her distinguished service and in offering my sincerest condolences to the entire Baker family.

Mr. Speaker, I will attach to my remarks an article concerning Mrs. Baker and her life that ran in the Knoxville News Sentinel following her death.

GRAVESIDE SERVICES TODAY AT 2:30 P.M. FOR
IRENE BAKER

Graveside services and burial for Irene Baker, widow of Howard Baker Sr., will be held at 2:30 p.m. today at Sherwood Memorial Gardens.

Memorials may be made to the Knoxville Zoological Gardens or the American Heart Association and friends may call 12:30 to 2 p.m. today at Mann's Heritage Chapel, 6200 Kingston Pike.

Baker, 92, had a massive heart attack while dining with friends Saturday at the Dinner Bell Restaurant in Loudon County and was pronounced dead at Fort Sanders Loudon Medical Center.

She was a native of Sevierville who became familiar with politics as a teenager, holding a job in the Sevier County court clerk's office and the Chancery Court office during the 1920s.

She was Republican national committeewoman for Tennessee from 1960 to 1964 and married Howard Baker Sr. in 1935.

After her husband's death in 1964, Mrs. Baker won a special election to serve the remaining nine months of his term in Congress. She was noted as a "common-sense Republican" who favored a sound economy and individual freedom.

After leaving Congress, Mrs. Baker was welfare director for the city of Knoxville from 1965 until 1971.

She was the stepmother of Howard Baker Jr., who represented Tennessee in the U.S. Senate and was former President Ronald Reagan's chief of staff.

Survivors include: Howard H. Baker Jr., Huntsville, Tenn.; Mary Baker Stuart,

Abingdon, Va.; Beverly Baker Patestides, New York City; six grandchildren, seven great-grandchildren, two nieces and three nephews.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Chattanooga, TN, the Honorable MARILYN LLOYD.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the people of Tennessee and the Nation suffered a great loss last week with the passing of Mrs. Irene Bailey Baker on April 2.

Mrs. Baker, a native of Sevier County in east Tennessee, is perhaps best known as the wife of Rep. Howard Baker and the mother of Senator Howard Baker, Jr.

But Mrs. Baker also led a unique career in public service herself. At age 17, she began her career in the Sevier County court system. Mrs. Baker then married and devoted herself to her family, and their call to serve the people of east Tennessee. She later served as a Member of this body after her husband's untimely death. After serving out the remainder of her husband's term, Mrs. Baker returned to her home in east Tennessee to serve as director of public welfare for the city of Knoxville.

Mrs. Baker touched many people through her role as a public servant and as a caring, compassionate person. I know that my colleagues join me in extending their deepest sympathy to the Baker family in their time of sorrow.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Honorable DON SUNDQUIST from the Seventh Congressional District.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues from Tennessee, Mr. QUILLEN and Mr. DUNCAN, in saluting the life and service of the late Irene Bailey Baker.

In her brief service in this House in 1964 and 1965, she represented the people of Tennessee with diligence and dignity, as her husband, Howard Baker Senior, did before her.

Mr. QUILLEN has recounted Mrs. Baker's exemplary public service in Congress, for the city of Knoxville, and for the people of Tennessee.

I came to know her through my long friendship with her stepson, Howard Baker Junior. Howard has often credited her example and encouragement for his own interest in public service, which of course, carried him to the positions of Senate majority leader and White House chief of staff.

Mrs. Baker was a kind and gracious woman, a person of genuine warmth, delightful company, and a true example of a life well and fully lived.

This House is richer for her service, however brief. And the State of Tennessee is richer for her life and example. I offer my condolences to her children and grandchildren, and trust that they will be comforted by the knowledge her legacy lives on in the hearts of those who knew her.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, JOHN TANNER.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to the memory of Mrs. Irene Baker.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late honorable gentlewoman from Tennessee, Mrs. Irene Bailey Baker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask the Members and those in the Gallery to rise in a moment of silence in memory of the late honorable Mrs. Irene Bailey Baker.

(A moment of silence was observed in honor of Mrs. Baker.)

QUESTIONING YASIR ARAFAT'S COMMITMENT TO PEACE

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the terrorist bombing in Hadera, Israel, which killed six innocent civilians at a bus station, coupled with the suicide bomb attack against innocent Israeli citizens last week in Afula, which killed seven people, showed that extremists are still trying to derail the peace process.

While Yasir Arafat, the Chairman of the PLO, has sent a letter to President Clinton condemning the terrorist attacks in an oblique way, I think much more ought to be forthcoming from Mr. Arafat. There ought to be an unequivocal and unmistakable condemnation of the specific massacres, the way Israeli Prime Minister Rabin condemned the Hebron tragedy.

Mr. Arafat's silence in this regard really questions whether he wants peace or whether he can deliver peace. The PLO covenants remain in place, still calling for the destruction of Israel, even though he promised to remove them.

Mr. Speaker, extremists on both sides must not be allowed to defer or deter the peace process, but we must be reassured that Yasir Arafat is committed to peace. His remarks leave us questioning it.

DEMOCRATS THROW A SCREWBALL THIS BASEBALL SEASON

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the 1994 baseball season is hardly a week old and already the best screwball pitch of the year has been thrown in baseball stadiums across the country. The Democrat Party's National Campaign Committee has staged a demonstration of what they believe to be tax equity, arguing that the President's 1993 tax increase only affects 1 percent of the American people. Once again, the Democrat National Campaign Committee has demonstrated that it cannot be trusted with either words or numbers, and now our national pastime of baseball.

□ 1440

Mr. Speaker, they forgot to mention all of us across the board in the country paying higher taxes on gasoline. They forgot to mention the truck driver stuck in Omaha, NE, who cannot deduct his lunch while he is out on the road. They forgot to mention the millions of senior citizens who will pay higher income taxes under their bill.

Mr. Speaker, what they thought they were doing was hitting a home run for increased taxes. And what they did was hit a foul ball into left field. And, Mr. Speaker, even the Democrat cannot steal home on a foul ball.

NURTURING THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN FAMILY

(Miss COLLINS of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, The African-American family is challenged today on every front:

Nearly 44 percent of all African-American children are poor.

Over two-thirds of all African-American children live with a single mother.

The number of African-Americans in their twenties who had completed college dropped 6 percent in the last decade.

I am introducing five family bills today. My bills would provide job training in high unemployment areas; create mentoring and other community responsibility programs; and support parenting training for foster and at-risk families.

Government cannot create families or hold them together. But we can provide important supports for family life and provide hope and opportunity. These bills are a good first step to restoring the health—and hope—of the African-American family.

CLINTON TAX UNDERPAYMENT

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the other night Jay Leno, commenting on the \$14,000 underpayment in the Clinton's taxes observed "when the President does it, it's a discovery. When you do it, it's a felony."

In this morning's Washington Post the liberal columnist, Richard Cohen wrote:

There is a floor staring, stammering and juvenile quality to the way the Clintons reluctantly 'fess up. Whatever Whitewater and related matters might eventually be about—maybe nothing—it is now about candor. The Clintons—not the press and not some right-wing Daddy Warbucks—have made it that. Maybe they think that since the truth and their preferred political image do not conform, it's okay to monkey with the former to match the latter.

The least the Clinton's could do is answer questions frankly:

If they had done that from the beginning, Whitewater would be about an obscure land deal and not about the character of the first family.

CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

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

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is safe to say that each and every one of us in the U.S. House of Representatives is supportive of programs that provide our young people with learning opportunities.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to spotlight an organization that has for the last 8 years, provided students an opportunity to study leadership and Government in this Nation's Capital. The Congressional Youth Leadership Council is an educational organization dedicated to fostering and inspiring young people to achieve their full leadership potential. Through the Council's initiatives over the past 3 years, the participation of under-represented minorities at the conferences has increased from 6 percent to over 13 percent.

The scholarship fund which was implemented in January of this year is designed to assist financially and traditionally disadvantaged or physically challenged youth who wish to participate in the NYLC. The Congressional Youth Leadership Council is earmarking nearly \$100,000 annually for scholarships based on students' scholastic merit, leadership achievements, financial need, and other factors. Over 30 percent of students currently attending the NYLC have secured part or all of their tuition through local sponsorship.

With the addition of the scholarship program, the Council has truly taken a lead in the education community. Now, more than ever before, students who need the assistance and deserve the opportunity to showcase their potential,

will be able to participate in the National Young Leaders Conference—an experience that could redirect their lives toward a more positive future and brighter tomorrow.

THE CRIME BILL NEEDS TRUTH IN LEGISLATING AS MUCH AS IN SENTENCING

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, crime has become the most important issue to Americans today.

The Democratic majority has told us that we will debate a tough anticrime package this afternoon to help ease their concerns.

However, the truth is that anything considered remotely tough has been thrown out.

The American people need to know what the Democratic majority will not allow on the House floor for real debate, much less an honest vote—without a phony king of the hill procedure which chokes off democracy in this House.

An amendment to limit the endless appeal process for prisoners on death row, making it more effective.

Pre-trial detention, to keep two-time felons off the street while they are awaiting trial.

A truth-in-sentencing requirement at the State level to make sure that felons are serving at least 85 percent of their sentences.

A meaningful "three strikes and you're out," with no loopholes to let criminals escape life sentences because of technicalities.

A vote on the exclusionary rule which would provide a good faith exception standard to permit evidence to be introduced in court.

Mr. Speaker, the arrogance of the Democratic majority has cost this legislation the teeth it needed to protect our citizens.

And as crime continues to escalate, it is inevitable that Congress will have to return here, to the scene of the crime, where we failed to do what the American people expected us to do in the first place.

CHAPMAN TRUTH IN SENTENCING AMENDMENT

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, America needs truth in sentencing. I could not agree more with the previous speaker. And during the debate on the crime bill we will have an opportunity to vote on that.

I have offered an amendment which the Rules Committee has made in order

which will give the House of Representatives an opportunity to vote on an amendment that meets the President's definition of being tough and smart in dealing with violent crime in America. My amendment will incentivize the States to pass legislation that will in fact stop the revolving door of the prison for violent criminals and will guarantee that if you do the crime you will do the time.

The Chapman amendment will, with grants, allow the construction of additional prison space that will be needed when we target the 6 percent of the felons that are committing 70 percent of violent crimes, which is what truth in sentencing will do.

I hope Members will examine my amendment and I think it will be a good addition to the House crime bill. And I look forward to the debate, Mr. Speaker, and hope that the Chapman truth in sentencing amendment is a part of the final product.

BIG GOVERNMENT—MORE TAXES

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is the week where most Americans have to finish off their taxes because day after tomorrow is the final deadline to pay Federal income tax.

It is a good time to look at your W-2 form and see how much is being deducted from your hard-earned dollars and decide just how big do you want Government to be. It is a good time to ask the question: How much should we be paying of what we earn to Federal taxes?

Let us just look at a little bit of the history of this country. In 1900 we paid 9 percent of our take-home dollars in tax. In 1930 it went up to 12 percent.

Guess what it is today? Today if you are an average American you are paying 41 cents out of every dollar that you make in taxes to the State, local and Federal Government.

This growth in government spending at all levels has changed the family budget dramatically. To keep taxes down we have to stop asking Government to solve more and more of our problems. The solution is for us to decide we can do without more Government, to decide we are better off spending our own hard-earned income rather than letting Congress decide how they are going to spend it for us.

To keep taxes and spending down, we have to start asking Government for less and assume a greater responsibility for ourselves and our family and our community.

□ 1450

CRIME BILL ADDRESSES WHAT AMERICANS WANT

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people want a tough crime bill to catch criminals, ensure their prosecution, and guarantee substantial and commensurate sentencing for their crimes. This crime bill delivers what they want.

But Americans do not want simple vengeance. They want tough anti-crime measures so that their communities might return to peace and order. They want a crime bill that addresses their entire social climate.

This bill does just that. It bolsters the rights of crime victims. It strengthens penalties for violence against women and children. It provides for programs to track child abusers. It toughens penalties for hate crimes. It cracks down on drunk drivers. And perhaps most importantly, it funds the hiring of 50,000 new officers specifically for community policing programs.

Crimes of all types have eroded the quality of daily life in our Nation. This crime bill aims to reverse that erosion. It is tough, it is smart and it aims to strengthen our communities.

VOTE DOWN THE RULE ON THE CRIME BILL

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker is a member of the Committee on Rules, and had he been present yesterday, he would know that the rule coming before this body today is a crime in itself because it denies 45 Democrats on that side of the aisle, 45 Republicans on this side of the aisle the right to carry out their constitutional obligation to represent their people back home.

They are being denied the right to offer amendments. Members like myself are being denied the right to offer an amendment that would reinstate in this bill mandatory minimum sentencing for convicted drug felons who cart in tons of cocaine and give it to our children. This bill takes out that minimum sentencing. We are not going to have the right to even debate that and vote on it.

The President of the United States stood on the Capitol steps yesterday and said my amendment is a frivolous amendment? Well, I suppose, coming from him you could understand that.

This rule predetermines how this bill is going to come out before we even vote on it. It is going to wipe out the death penalty.

We ought to vote down this rule. Let us go back upstairs and let every Member of this body participate in the legislative process. You owe it to your constituents.

SUPPORT THE BEILENSON AMENDMENT TO THE CRIME BILL

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

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Speaker, the House will consider an amendment to the crime bill by Congressman BEILENSON of Los Angeles, mandating that the Federal Government incarcerate undocumented criminal aliens, or reimburse States and local communities for doing so. This amendment is critical for States such as California, Florida and others and it deserves our support.

The State of California estimates that the cost of incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens next year will be \$393 million, money that otherwise could be spent on police, prosecutors, and prison space.

Immigration is a Federal issue and the incarceration of undocumented criminal aliens is a Federal responsibility. California does not set immigration policy. My area, San Diego County, does not supervise the Border Patrol. And yet, States and local communities pay the price when efforts to secure our borders fail.

For far too long, Washington has reneged on its obligation to States such as California and the States suffer the consequences. I urge my colleagues to take responsibility for what truly is a Federal problem and pass the Beilenson amendment.

DEATH FOR THOSE WHO COMMIT TREASON

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, there is one crime which is so scurrilous in nature, that when it comes to light, the majority of Americans are united in their anger and utter disdain.

The crime to which I refer is treason. Such acts of treachery cannot be equaled with respect to the long-term and damaging effects they have on our country's national security. When such an act results in the death of an agent acting on behalf of the United States, such a betrayal becomes even more heinous.

Because I believe so strongly in bringing those individuals to justice when they commit such acts, I am proud to be a cosponsor and supporter of Congressman BOB DORNAN'S "death penalty for espionage." Sadly, we have recently learned of such a case. I am, of course, referring to Aldrich Ames and his wife.

To borrow a line from Robert Brown-ing's "The Lost Leader":

"Just for a handful of silver he left us,
Just for a riband to stick in his coat."

Mr. Speaker, I think those lines really sum it up. We must impose the max-

imum punishment under law and in certain cases of espionage such as the Ames case, we must impose the death penalty as a proper and just sentence.

FEDERAL CRIME INITIATIVES

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to consider this week H.R. 4092, the Violent Crime Control Act. I would like to express my support for this bill and encourage my colleagues to support this bill as well. In my home State of Texas our prisons are at peak capacity and our local county governments are forced to bear the cost of incarcerating criminals that the State cannot find room for.

H.R. 4092 would not only provide the funds needed to build additional prisons, it will move us in the right direction in crime control. This bill contains the "three strikes and you're out" provision, components of the Violence Against Women Act, as well as grants to State and local governments to develop innovative programs to deal with juvenile offenders. These programs could include boot camps, weekend incarceration, or community service for young offenders.

In Houston, we have reduced our crime rate by increasing the number of police. President Clinton has used this example as a model for his plan to put 50,000 new police on the streets through a Federal grant system for community policing.

We need only pick up a newspaper or turn on the local television news to be reminded of our crime problem. Our citizens are scared to walk the streets and often fear answering the doorbell without carrying a gun. We must do better at controlling this problem and H.R. 4092 is a good start. One of our local television stations in Houston has a special called "City under Siege" which highlights the crime problem. Our Nation is under siege as well and it is time to enact a crime control package that responds to the violence that plagues this Nation.

MORE TALK THAN LISTENING

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, folks back home seem to feel the President is doing more talking than listening about health care reform. Here is what one southwest Florida senior citizen had to say.

Without exception all of my friends are vigorously opposed to any new bureaucracy that would make the decisions on doctor-patient relations, on who will get care and who

will not and the taxes to be imposed to pay for the inevitable foulups, paper, paper, and more paper. They are fed up with * * * Government meddling in their lives and the use of tax money that permits the Clintons, Cabinet members, and the overbearing, bloated White House staff to fly around the country selling Clinton's plan. If it must be sold, it is dangerous.

It's pretty clear, Mr. President. Older Americans are interested in real health care, not costly sales pitches.

COMMUNITY-BASED POLICING

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, to restore sanity and security to the streets of America, I strongly support a tough and fair anticrime package that offers a balance between punishment and prevention and attacks the root causes of crime.

But today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to sing the praises of Albany, GA, its police department, and the city administrators for their commitment to a community-based policing program that began just a few months ago. The city of Albany was given a grant to begin a community-based policing pilot program. Their work has gone so well the Justice Department invited them all to Washington this week.

On Monday, 14 newly-hired officers and the public officials from Albany met with Attorney General Reno to discuss the positive aspects of community-based policing.

The officers spoke openly and enthusiastically about the merits of their community-based policing effort.

Communities outside the pilot area are now asking when they will be served by community-based policing.

With this crime bill before us today, we can provide the other areas of Albany and the rest of America's crime-plagued communities the reinvigorating initiative of community-based policing that has proven successful in Albany, GA.

Monday afternoon, Albany Police Lt. Earnest Williams said to President Clinton, that they are working with the community because they have dreams of seeing it become a safe, clean, quiet, and drug-free place in which to live again.

He humbly and sincerely implored us to pass an anticrime bill that includes the expansion of community-based policing.

Today, I ask as his messenger, I urge all of my colleagues to pass a fair and tough crime bill that provides community-based policing for any community in America that needs it.

CONTROVERSY FEARED WITH POTENTIAL NOMINATION OF DREW DAYS AS SUPREME COURT JUSTICE

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

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, if President Clinton nominates Solicitor General Drew Days for the U.S. Supreme Court, I can guarantee you that he will be in for a rough ride and some very tough scrutiny.

Americans will want to know why Mr. Days—acting on behalf of President Clinton—had intervened on behalf of a convicted pedophile, a man who had been duly arrested, charged, and convicted on Federal charges of possessing child pornography.

Americans will want to know why Mr. Days continues to seek a significant weakening, or gutting, of the Child Protection Act. Pat Trueman, former Chief of the Justice Department's Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, has noted that "if the Days interpretation had been in effect during the Reagan and Bush administrations, much if not most of the child pornography cases prosecuted by the Justice Department could not have been brought."

Americans want to know why Mr. Days has turned aside the clear, unambiguous intent of Congress—recently reaffirmed in a unanimous vote in the Senate. (The House will shortly vote on this.) And 234 Members from both sides of the aisle have filed an amicus brief against the administration's indefensible position.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that Americans will want to know why, why, why Mr. Days coddles and protects exploiters and abusers of children, rather than our kids. If nominated for the High Court, Americans are forewarned that Mr. Days' sympathies are with the kiddie porn industry and not with the victims of this pernicious form of child abuse: our young children.

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT MUST BE PART OF DEBATES ON CRIME, HEALTH CARE AND WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to debate how to reform the Federal Government's approach to crime, health care, and welfare, I think we should consider the findings of a study on children just completed by the Carnegie Corp. of New York.

What does early childhood development have to do with crime, health care, and welfare? According to the Carnegie study, everything. What hap-

pens in the first 3 years of childhood has a decisive impact on intellectual development and social adjustment through adolescence and adulthood.

Children who are abused, children who do not get adequate medical care, children who are simply neglected are children who fail in life. Their growing numbers threaten to undermine our economic competitiveness and destroy our social fabric, while condemning millions to a lifetime of disfunction and underachievement.

Most of the debate over crime, health care, and welfare reform has so far mentioned children only in passing, if at all. But if we are serious about addressing these issues, we are going to have to talk about children. This means Head Start, family leave, and access to affordable health and child care. It also means cutting current consumption so we can afford to invest in the future, our children.

TOO LITTLE FOR TOO MUCH AND TOO MUCH FOR TOO LITTLE

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, there are two notable events in American politics this week.

First, the House will consider the crime bill. The House version is a thoroughly underwhelming response to the most important problem facing America.

In its present form, it will not do enough to curb violent crime; it will not really put repeat offenders in jail longer, and it will not clear away the obstacles to swift and certain justice.

In short, it's a limited response to an unlimited problem.

The second event occurs on Friday, April 15. That is when the American people will be forced to pay for President Clinton's tax increase. If anything, tax day is a cruel reminder of President Clinton's long list of broken promises.

So that is what we've got this week—the crime bill and the Clinton bill. One does too little for too much, the other gets too much for too little.

SIGN DISCHARGE PETITION NO. 12

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the IRS said that David and Millie Evans of Colorado owed \$40,000. Then the IRS said that the Evanses owed \$100,000.

Now the Evanses say the IRS never told them what the exact amount of money was they said they owed, and they would not even talk to the Evanses.

And then the IRS went to court, and in less than 45 minutes a jury of their

peers said the Evanses were not guilty, not guilty, not guilty.

And the IRS appealed it and said:

The judge misdirected the jury because the judge told the jury the IRS had the burden of proof, and there should be a new trial because Congress' law says the taxpayers have the burden of proof.

They went back to court, and the Evanses were convicted.

My colleagues, Congress should be ashamed. If a murderer is innocent until proven guilty, I ask, "Why aren't our constituents treated the same way?"

H.R. 3261, Mr. Speaker, says the taxpayer is innocent until proven guilty, and I want my colleagues' help and say, "If you're so inclined, sign discharge petition No. 12."

Think about it.

TODAY'S CRIME BILL DOES NOTHING TO SOLVE OKLAHOMA'S PROBLEMS

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, we have a serious crime problem in my district. Tulsa, OK, and the surrounding areas have problems with gangs, drugs and a host of other things. Let me give you a few examples.

Nathan Vann, 19, was driving down Frankfort Avenue at about 4:30 in the afternoon when two bullets struck the windshield of his car. One bullet went through the car, striking Vann's hair, causing him to lose control of his automobile and crash into a nearby home.

Beverly Turner, her husband, and her mother-in-law were returning from church when they were approached by someone trying to steal the women's purses. When the thief grabbed at her mother-in-law's purse and ran, Beverly and her husband chased the thief and pinned him to the ground until the police arrived.

A 13-year-old was shot in the leg as he walked down the street in his neighborhood one evening. Witnesses told police that they heard several shots and then saw a red sports car leave the area. The shooting appeared to be gang-related.

Thankfully, I can say that none of these individuals were fatally wounded. But, who is to say that someone else, on another day, that is in the wrong place at the wrong time, will not lose their life and become another statistic.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of society do we live in where people cannot drive down the street without having bullets fly through their car windows and where children cannot walk down the street of their neighborhoods safely? My district is by no means unique. All across the country my colleagues have crime problems, all ranging from purse

snatching thefts to gang and drug related shootings.

Mr. Speaker, we will be considering the crime bill on the floor today. Unfortunately, the crime bill we are considering is a fake crime bill that does not solve the problems in Tulsa, OK. The crime bill we are considering today has several defects. First, \$8 billion goes to a variety of society-style programs including one to increase the self-esteem of young criminals and fund midnight basketball leagues; second, one part of the bill reduces the penalty for drug crimes, possibly leading to the release of as many as 16,000 criminals; third, another part of the bill allows convicted killers to file for appeal after appeal after appeal and avoid the death penalty all together; fourth, 88 percent of the money is discretionary—going wherever the President needs to build political support at the time; and fifth, this crime bill is not funded. There is nothing in the language that provides a mechanism to pay for these programs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join me in taking a closer look at this crime bill we are debating today. Let us not pass the first thing that comes along. Let us pass a bill that is tough on criminals, and will help Tulsa and all Americans.

CRIME STATISTICS—STATE OF OKLAHOMA AND TULSA¹

1 murder every 42 hours.
1 rape every 5½ hours.
1 robbery every 2 hours.
1 aggravated assault every 36 minutes.
1 burglary every 12 minutes.
1 auto theft every 31 minutes.
There is a reported violent crime every 26 minutes.

15 is the average age for rape victims in Tulsa.

Over 25,000 women are raped annually in Tulsa—only about 200 are reported—one out of five rapists are captured and punished.

Over 4,000 burglaries in Oklahoma each month.

Robberies are up in last 4 years.
Aggravated assault up in last 2 years. 54 percent of those were committed with a weapon.

Oklahoma is 4 percent higher than the national average in the use of a firearm in violent crimes.

(The above figures are in the 1992 year end figures—the latest available.)

In the first 6 months of 1993, Oklahoma had an increase in murder by 21.8 percent, assault by 9.3 percent and in general violent crimes by 3.7 percent.

There was a 31-percent increase in rape in the last 2 years.

(The above two figures are from the first 6 month outlook report for 1993—by OSBI.)

Since 1983 there has been a 93-percent increase in murder and manslaughter.

(This is a national figure. Not Oklahoma specific.)

EVERY AMERICAN SHOULD BE GUARANTEED ADEQUATE HEALTH CARE

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, we all welcome a constructive debate on health care reform.

Yet misinformation about the various health plans, particularly the President's, are being generated by opponents of health care reform to confuse and even scare the public.

For example, those who oppose coverage for all Americans tell us that the uninsured are either young, or unemployed, or between jobs.

Yet less than 20 percent of the uninsured are young people. And 28 percent are in poverty. The rest are average working adults.

Mr. Speaker, every American should be guaranteed adequate health care. Period.

And if the morality of this issue does not move one, it should be viewed as a pocketbook issue—we all pay for the uninsured in one way or another, especially in higher insurance premiums.

Mr. Speaker, health care is a serious issue and deserves serious debate. Clouding the issue can only retain the status quo and gridlock.

I urge my colleagues to take the high road. Ignore the misinformation offered by those who want to obstruct the hope of the people, and that is coverage for everyone with a guarantee that no one will take it away from them.

INTRODUCTION OF THE VIETNAM CODE OF CONDUCT ACT

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the 251st anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. Speaker, in 1943 President Roosevelt dedicated one of the world's most beautiful memorials across the pond from where we are now, and inside the ring below the marble canopy are the stirring words that ring through history: "Eternal vigilance against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Mr. Speaker, that tyranny still exists in the Communist nation of Vietnam, and that is why I want to treat Vietnam the way we treated South Africa when the evil of apartheid was in full force, the way this House voted to treat China last year. I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in a bill that, although lifting the embargo on Vietnam was a bad idea, that battle being behind us, it is time to look ahead with a similar set of principles, like the Sullivan principles that we applied to South Africa.

Under my bill, Mr. Speaker, American nationals involved in business would be asked to, among other things, insist that those who served in the Vi-

¹ Source: Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation.

etnamese military government, as well as those who worked for, or assisted, the United States Government, are not discriminated against, and there are four other key points I do not have the time to go over, but I ask they be in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, and I call this the Vietnam Code of Conduct Act for our United States businessmen to follow as they make, sometimes, 30 pieces of silver.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues to join me in efforts to enlist American businesses in the fight for human rights in Vietnam.

Lifting the trade embargo on Vietnam was a bad decision. Yet, that battle is now behind us. It is time to look ahead.

Tomorrow I will be introducing legislation, the Vietnam Code of Conduct Act, that will establish a set of voluntary principles for Americans doing business in Vietnam. This idea had its genesis in the Sullivan principles that were applied by American companies doing business in South Africa during the darkest days of apartheid. And almost identical to a bill on China that passed in this Chamber last year. I am simply applying the same concept to Vietnam.

Under my bill, American nationals involved in business projects will be asked to:

Insist that those who served in the South Vietnamese military or government, as well as those who worked for or assisted the United States Government, are not discriminated against in hiring or any other terms of employment.

Ensure that harassment of any kind or political indoctrination programs will not be tolerated on the premises.

Prohibit any military or Communist cadre presence on the premises.

Promote the free exchange of ideas and information.

Help us, the United States Government, push for a full accounting of all American MIA's from the Vietnam conflict.

To really effect change in Communist Vietnam will require the efforts of both our United States Government and our United States businesses.

So I urge all my colleagues to join me as an original cosponsor of the Vietnam Code of Conduct Act.

THE PLO HAS YET TO CONDEMN RECENT ATTACKS ON INNOCENT PEOPLE

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, this morning six people were killed, and dozens injured, including several children, when a bomb planted by an Islamic fundamentalist group, Hamas, exploded in the back of a crowded bus in Hadera, Israel.

Last week a suicide car bomb, also a member of Hamas, bombed a bus in Afula, Israel.

This is part of that bus, from 1,000 feet away. This is part of that bus, from 1,000 feet away. And this was used

to clean up some of the remains of those who had blown more than 1,000 feet from where the bus was exploded.

It has been more than 1 week since these incidents, the first incident, occurred. The PLO and Chairman Arafat have yet to condemn these types of attacks on innocents.

There is a letter circulating by Members of Congress to Chairman Arafat demanding, requesting, that, if we have a peace process, killing of innocent lives by any party is unacceptable. That is something that must occur if we are going to see peace in that region of the world.

□ 1510

THE ENHANCED ACCESS TO SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994

(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, the failure of the child support enforcement system in this country is nothing short of a national disgrace.

A parent seeking support confronts a dizzying array of legal rules and procedures—which can suddenly change when one parent or the child is moved to another State. As a result of these uncertainties, children who are entitled to receive support are suffering needlessly.

To address this problem, I am introducing the Enhanced Access to Support Enforcement Act of 1994. My bill will require each State to grant full faith and credit to the child support judgments issued by the courts of other States.

While not removing the courts or lawyers from the child support system, this measure will limit drawn-out litigation and relitigation of claims. It will help promote simplicity and fairness in a system which is now anything but simple or fair.

Mr. Speaker, by spending less money on litigation, more can be spent on the children who need and deserve financial support from their parents. I therefore urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

LONG OVERDUE CRIME BILL

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

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, returning from Wisconsin I can tell you that combatting violent crime is on people's minds.

This crime bill is long overdue, and I am pleased that this week we will begin work on crafting a bill that will help local crime-fighting efforts.

A few examples of the many effective provisions in the bill include: 50,000

new police officers to expand successful community policing efforts; invoking the "three strikes and you're out" rule for violent repeat offenders to keep criminals dangerous to society behind bars; and new efforts to work with youthful offenders and to develop alternative punishments and prevention programs designed to ease the crunch on prison space and rehabilitate young people before they become career criminals.

Mr. Speaker, our constituents are telling us to find solutions to the crime problems plaguing our communities. My hope is that this crime bill will be one more giant step in the right direction.

CALL FOR A TOUGHER CRIME BILL

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, 435 out of 435 Members of Congress seem to agree that Americans need a tough crime bill. But is the pending legislation tough? We know this: It does not allow pretrial detention. It does not have truth in sentencing. It increases the number of appeals for death row inmates; and it has a very watered-down "three strikes and you're out" provision. What is so good about "three strikes and you're out"? Why should a violent criminal get three strikes, and let us quit using the word "strikes" and talk about what is the heart of the matter, and, that is, victims.

Why should a violent criminal get three victims? It is absurd. We need to do what we should do the first time and lock him or her up and not give them an opportunity for a second or third victim.

Remember, also, Mr. Speaker, we are only talking about the people who he is caught hurting.

Mr. Speaker, "three strikes and you're out" is the most overblown discussion in this crime bill and I think we should amend this bill, make it much tougher than it is now, and I support an open rule, not the closed rule we have.

PLIGHT OF THE HAITIAN REFUGEES

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I went to TransAfrica headquarters where its executive director, Randall Robinson, began a hunger strike until discriminatory and summary interdiction of Haitians fleeing the most repressive regime in the Western Hemisphere is ended.

A thoughtful if committed leader, Randall has pursued this course only

after all else has failed. Our Government's timid response to the Governors Island accord has emboldened the neo-Duvalier and former Tonton Macoutes forces. The best evidence that the fleeing Haitians are legitimate refugees is that their boats stopped coming when Aristide was elected and started up again only after he was deposed. The way to end the flight of terrorized refugees is to support the first democratically elected leader in Haiti in 200 years.

Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, four of us led by Randall Robinson entered the South African Embassy and set in motion protests that helped produce the South African elections scheduled for this month. This time Randall begins his protest alone. We can join him by passing H.R. 4114 to stop the return of Haitians to torture and death and to make the Governors Island accords law.

A CALL FOR THE PLO TO DEMONSTRATE ITS COMMITMENT

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, after the tragic killings in Hebron a few weeks ago, the political leadership of Israel, including Prime Minister Rabin, publicly and specifically condemned the tragedy and urged that it not derail the peace process.

Now, on the eve of Israeli Independence Day, we witness the gruesome bombings at Hadera and Afula, attacks that are part of the retaliation promised by Hamas, but we do not hear condemnation by key Arab leaders. Specifically, PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat has not spoken out against these killings.

Mr. Speaker, if the peace process is to succeed, it is critical that the PLO leadership demonstrate its commitment at a minimum by clearly and unequivocally condemning specific acts of violence such as that which occurred at Hadera and Afula.

LUPUS LEGISLATION

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

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again I am asking my colleagues to join me in the fight against lupus by cosponsoring H.R. 2420. The bill authorizes increased research into the causes and treatment of this widespread but enigmatic disease.

Doctors estimate that there are about 500,000 Americans known to be suffering from lupus. It is estimated that another 500,000 have not been diagnosed. Known cases of lupus outnumber those of leukemia, muscular dystrophy, or multiple sclerosis.

While lupus affects both men and women, 9 out of 10 people struck with lupus are women. The disease has its most significant impact on young women during the childbearing ages of 15 to 45.

All ethnic backgrounds are stricken with lupus, but it attacks African-American, Hispanic, and some Asian and native American women three times more frequently than white women.

Within those ethnic groups hardest hit, rarely is there a person who has not been directly or indirectly affected by a friend, relative, or loved one who is suffering from lupus.

Perhaps the most discouraging aspect of lupus for the sufferer is the fact that there is no cure.

Lupus organizations throughout the country have endorsed H.R. 2402. Many of them, from districts throughout the country, have contacted my colleagues.

Let us not turn away. Let each of us assure the 1 million who now suffer that we will not choose to neglect their cry for help.

Mr. Chairman, I hope it will be the pleasure of each of my colleagues to join me in this fight against lupus by cosponsoring H.R. 2420.

□ 1520

STUDENT AND BUSINESS PARTNERSHIP FOR CREDIT ACT OF 1994

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, teenagers throughout the United States are dropping out of school. At a crime forum I held in New Mexico, parents expressed their fear that more and more teenagers are joining gangs and are not interested in getting a good education. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, to answer our constituents by giving students a reason to want to stay in school and off the streets. I rise today to introduce the Student and Business Partnership for Credit Act of 1994.

This bill gives community businesses a tax credit if they participate in an educational program. The educational program gives a high school junior or senior the chance to work with a local business in return for academic credit. In turn, the business must closely supervise the student.

Mr. Speaker, students who are tempted to drop out of school may be persuaded to stay in school if they are permitted to receive real work experience. These students will stay in school, work with businesses, and say no to gangs. Businesses will receive a tax credit that they desperately deserve. I urge my colleagues to support our students and to support the Stu-

dent and Business Partnership for Credit Act of 1994.

PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PROGRAM COSTING JOBS

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern that the President's economic program, and in particular the tax increases that were incumbent to that economic program, are beginning to undermine the long-term economy in this country. The question is what are the signs of that?

The majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], gave us a formula for making that determination here some years ago. And I see him on the floor, and maybe he would explain the formula during my time.

What the gentleman pointed out was that if you take another \$10.2 billion in trade deficits, that translates into the loss of another 250,000 good jobs for American workers, and signals a growing weakness in our economy. He said that back in 1989.

I would simply point out to the House that last year we had \$40 billion in trade deficits. That means that the Clinton economic program lost us over one million jobs, and translated into a growing weakness in the economy. So far this year we have had over \$10 billion in trade deficits, and that translates into a loss of another 250,000 good jobs and signals a growing weakness in our economy.

The formula, it seems to me, is one that Americans need to understand, that as we hear all of these rosy predictions out of the White House about what is going on in the economy, the underlying problems in the economy are very apparent, and are very, very well described by the Gephardt formula.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE SAM B. HALL, JR.

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to have served in this body with Sam B. Hall, Jr., the former Member from the city of Marshall, TX. Sam, after serving in this body, was elevated to the position of a Federal judge and served in the Eastern District of the Federal court system in Texas, until, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, his death on this past Saturday.

Sam and I sat side-by-side on the Committee on the Judiciary for a number of years. Sam and Madeline, his wonderful bride and now widow, and Helen and I, have been friends for a long time and shared many a convivial moment and many a nice meal.

NAYS—1

McInnis

NOT VOTING—14

Bacchus (FL)	Grandy	Roukema
Blackwell	Hunter	Skelton
Fish	Johnson, Sam	Smith (OR)
Flake	McCloskey	Washington
Gallo	Peterson (FL)	

□ 1548

Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. HOEKSTRA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So, (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCINNIS. I intended to vote "yes" on H.R. 3770, but inadvertently voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the additional motions to suspend the rules and on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

GREAT FALLS PRESERVATION AND REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3498, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3498, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 288, nays 130, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—288

Abercrombie	Bilbray	Camp
Ackerman	Bishop	Cantwell
Andrews (ME)	Blute	Cardin
Andrews (NJ)	Boehrlert	Carr
Andrews (TX)	Bonior	Chapman
Applegate	Borski	Clay
Baesler	Boucher	Clayton
Baker (LA)	Brewster	Clement
Barcia	Brooks	Clyburn
Barlow	Browder	Coleman
Barrett (WI)	Brown (CA)	Collins (IL)
Bateman	Brown (FL)	Collins (MI)
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Conyers
Beilenson	Bryant	Cooper
Berman	Byrne	Coppersmith
Bevill	Calvert	Costello

Coyne	Kildee	Rahall
Cramer	Kleczka	Rangel
Danner	Klein	Reed
Darden	Klink	Regula
de la Garza	Kolbe	Reynolds
Deal	Kopetski	Richardson
DeFazio	Kreidler	Ridge
DeLauro	Kyl	Roemer
Dellums	LaFalce	Rogers
Derrick	Lambert	Rose
Deutsch	Lancaster	Rostenkowski
Diaz-Balart	Lantos	Rowland
Dicks	LaRocco	Royal-Allard
Dingell	Laughlin	Rush
Dixon	Lazio	Sabo
Dooley	Leach	Sanders
Durbin	Leahman	Sangmeister
Edwards (CA)	Levin	Sarpalius
Edwards (TX)	Lewis (CA)	Sawyer
Ehlers	Lewis (GA)	Saxton
Emerson	Lightfoot	Schenk
Engel	Lipinski	Schiff
English	Lloyd	Schumer
Eshoo	Long	Scott
Evans	Lowe	Serrano
Farr	Maloney	Sharp
Fazio	Mann	Shays
Fields (LA)	Manton	Shepherd
Flner	Margolies-	Sisisky
Fingerhut	Mezvinsky	Skaggs
Foglietta	Markey	Skeen
Ford (MI)	Martinez	Slattery
Ford (TN)	Matsui	Slaughter
Frank (MA)	Mazzei	Smith (IA)
Franks (CT)	McCollum	Smith (NJ)
Franks (NJ)	McCrery	Spratt
Frost	McCurdy	Stark
Furse	McDade	Stokes
Gejdenson	McDermott	Strickland
Gephardt	McHale	Studds
Geren	McKinney	Stupak
Gibbons	McNulty	Swett
Gillmor	Meehan	Swift
Gilman	Meek	Synar
Gingrich	Menendez	Talent
Glickman	Mfume	Tanner
Gonzalez	Miller (CA)	Tejeda
Gordon	Mineta	Thompson
Green	Minge	Thornton
Greenwood	Mink	Thurman
Gunderson	Moakley	Torres
Gutierrez	Molinar	Torricelli
Hall (OH)	Mollohan	Towns
Hamburg	Montgomery	Trafficant
Hamilton	Moran	Tucker
Harman	Morella	Unsoeld
Hastings	Murphy	Upton
Hayes	Murtha	Valentine
Hefner	Myers	Velazquez
Hilliard	Nadler	Vento
Hinchey	Neal (MA)	Visclosky
Hoagland	Neal (NC)	Volkmer
Hobson	Oberstar	Walsh
Hochbrueckner	Obey	Waters
Holden	Olver	Watt
Horn	Ortiz	Waxman
Houghton	Orton	Weldon
Hoyer	Owens	Wheat
Hughes	Pallone	Whitten
Hutto	Parker	Williams
Hyde	Pastor	Wilson
Inslie	Payne (NJ)	Wise
Jefferson	Payne (VA)	Wolf
Johnson (CT)	Pelosi	Woolsey
Johnson (GA)	Pickett	Wyden
Johnson (SD)	Pickle	Wynn
Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy	Yates
Johnston	Poshard	Young (AK)
Kanjorski	Price (NC)	Zimmer
Kennedy	Quillen	
Kennelly	Quinn	

NAYS—130

Allard	Bilirakis	Collins (GA)
Archer	Bliley	Combest
Armey	Boehner	Condit
Bachus (AL)	Bonilla	Cox
Baker (CA)	Bunning	Crane
Ballenger	Burton	Crapo
Barca	Buyer	Cunningham
Barrett (NE)	Callahan	DeLay
Bartlett	Canady	Dickey
Barton	Castle	Doolittle
Bentley	Clinger	Dreier
Bereuter	Coble	

Duncan	Kingston	Roberts
Dunn	Klug	Rohrabacher
Everett	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Ewing	Levy	Roth
Fawell	Lewis (FL)	Royce
Fields (TX)	Linder	Santorum
Fowler	Livingston	Schaefer
Gallegly	Machtley	Schroeder
Gekas	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Gilchrest	McCandless	Shaw
Goodlatte	McHugh	Shuster
Goodling	McInnis	Smith (MI)
Goss	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Grams	McMillan	Snowe
Hall (TX)	Meyers	Solomon
Hancock	Mica	Spence
Hansen	Michel	Stearns
Hastert	Miller (FL)	Stenholm
Hefley	Moorhead	Stump
Herger	Nussle	Sundquist
Hoekstra	Oxley	Tauzin
Hoke	Packard	Taylor (MS)
Huffington	Paxon	Taylor (NC)
Hunter	Penny	Thomas (CA)
Hutchinson	Peterson (MN)	Thomas (WY)
Inglis	Petri	Torkildsen
Inhofe	Pombo	Vucanovich
Istook	Porter	Walker
Jacobs	Portman	Young (FL)
Kasich	Pryce (OH)	Zeliff
Kim	Ramstad	
King	Ravenel	

NOT VOTING—14

Bacchus (FL)	Grandy	Roukema
Blackwell	Johnson, Sam	Skelton
Fish	Kaptur	Smith (OR)
Flake	McCloskey	Washington
Gallo	Peterson (FL)	

□ 1559

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Kaptur and Mrs. Roukema for, with Mr. Smith of Oregon against.

Messrs. DREIER, PACKARD, KIM, CUNNINGHAM, HUNTER, and TAYLOR of Mississippi changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds have voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

WHEELING NATIONAL HERITAGE ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2843, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2843, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 264, nays 154, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—264

Abercrombie	Andrews (NJ)	Applegate
Ackerman	Andrews (TX)	Baesler

Velázquez	Watt	Wise
Vento	Waxman	Woolsey
Visclosky	Weldon	Wyden
Volkmer	Wheat	Wynn
Walker	Whitten	Yates
Walsh	Williams	Young (FL)
Waters	Wilson	

NAYS—136

Allard	Gallegly	Nussle
Applegate	Geren	Orton
Archer	Glichrest	Oxley
Armey	Goodlatte	Packard
Bachus (AL)	Goodling	Paxon
Baker (CA)	Goss	Penny
Baker (LA)	Grams	Peterson (MN)
Ballenger	Greenwood	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Hancock	Pombo
Bartlett	Hansen	Porter
Barton	Hastert	Portman
Bentley	Hefley	Poshard
Bereuter	Heger	Pryce (OH)
Blute	Hoke	Ramstad
Boehner	Holden	Ravenel
Bonilla	Hunter	Roberts
Bunning	Hutchinson	Rogers
Burton	Hutto	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Hyde	Roth
Callahan	Inhofe	Rowland
Calvert	Istook	Sangmeister
Canady	Kim	Sarpalius
Castle	King	Saxton
Clinger	Kingston	Schaefer
Coble	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Knollenberg	Shaw
Combest	Kolbe	Shays
Condit	Levy	Shuster
Costello	Lewis (CA)	Smith (MI)
Cox	Lewis (FL)	Smith (TX)
Crane	Lipinski	Stearns
Crapo	Livingston	Stenholm
Cunningham	Manzullo	Stump
Danner	McCandless	Swett
Deal	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	McCrery	Thomas (CA)
Dooley	McHale	Thomas (WY)
Doolittle	McInnis	Torkildsen
Dornan	McKeon	Valentine
Dreier	McMillan	Vucanovich
Dunn	Meyers	Wolf
Emerson	Michel	Young (AK)
Everett	Miller (FL)	Zeliff
Ewing	Moorhead	Zimmer
Fawell	Morella	
Fields (TX)	Myers	

NOT VOTING—13

Bacchus (FL)	Grandy	Skelton
Blackwell	Johnson, Sam	Smith (OR)
Fish	Peterson (FL)	Washington
Foglietta	Roukema	
Gallo	Schumer	

□ 1619

Mr. WALSH and Mr. POMEROY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, while I attended a funeral for Millicent Boyd, the wife of my close and dear friend and POW Gen. Chuck Boyd, I unavoidably missed four votes held in 5 minute succession.

Had I been present, I would have voted yea on H.R. 3770, the Edward Schwartz Court-house; nay on H.R. 3498, the Great Falls Preservation Act; nay on H.R. 2843, the Wheeling National Heritage Act; and nay on S. 2004, the College Loan Default Exemption Extension.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in order to attend a funeral, I missed four votes on April 13. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall votes 99, 100, and 102; "no" on 101.

□ 1620

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4092, VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 401 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 401

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4092) to control and prevent crime. No further general debate shall be in order. The bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Except as provided in section 2 of this resolution, no amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment printed in the report may be offered only in the order printed, 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. If more than one of the following amendments printed in part 1 of the report relating to habeas corpus is adopted, only the last to be adopted shall be considered as finally adopted and reported to the House: by Representative Hyde of Illinois; and by Representative Derrick of South Carolina.

Sec. 2. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules or germane modifications of any such amendment. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read (except that modifications shall be reported), shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. For the purpose of inclusion in such amendments en bloc, an amendment printed in the form of a motion to strike may be modified to the form of a germane perfecting amendment to the text originally proposed to be stricken. All points of order against such amendments en bloc are waived. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 3. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by this resolution. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes.

SEC. 4. 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 finally adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to commit.

SEC. 5. After passage of H.R. 4092, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 3355, with a Senate amendment thereto, and to consider the Senate amendment in the House. It shall be in order to move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment inserting the text of H.R. 4092 as passed by the House in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate. All points of order against that motion are waived. If the motion is adopted, then it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendments to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3355 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 401 provides for further consideration of H.R. 4092, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the report to accompany the rule. The amendments shall be considered in the order and manner specified in the report and shall be considered as read. The amendments are not subject to amendment, except as specified in the report, and are not subject to a demand for a division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report.

The rule provides that if more than one of the following amendments relating to the subject of habeas corpus is adopted, only the last adopted will be reported to the House: the amendment by Representative HYDE of Illinois and the amendment by Representative DERRICK of South Carolina.

Under the rule, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee may at any time offer amendments en bloc consisting of the amendments printed in part 2 of the report with germane modifications.

The amendments en bloc are debatable for 10 minutes and are not subject to amendment nor a demand for a division of the question. All points of order are waived against the amendments en bloc. The original proponents of the amendments are permitted to submit statements for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole is permitted to postpone consideration of a request for a recorded vote and to reduce to 5 minutes the time for voting after the first of a series of votes. The rule provides one motion to recommit.

Finally, if the House passes H.R. 4092, the rule provides for a hook up with a companion, H.R. 3355, with a Senate amendment. The rule makes it in order to take H.R. 3355 with the Senate amendment from the Speaker's table and to consider the Senate amendment in the House. The rule makes it in order a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment inserting, in lieu of the proposed Senate matter, the text of H.R. 4092 as passed by the House. All points of order are waived against the motion. If the motion is adopted, the rule makes in order a motion that the House insist on its amendments to the Senate amendment and request a conference.

Mr. Speaker, today crime is no longer a problem faced only by big cities. Fear of crime is prevalent in communities both large and small throughout our Nation. In my district, crime terrorizes what was once peaceful and safe. The rule before us today will allow the House to further consider H.R. 4092, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act.

Mr. Speaker, in the State of the Union Address, the President urged Congress to set aside partisan differences and to pass a strong, smart, tough crime bill. In response to this call, the House has before it today a far-reaching bill that does exactly that.

H.R. 4092 will help our Nation to move toward a future free from crime and violence through a commitment of resources unprecedented in the history of the House of Representatives.

The bill authorizes over \$15 billion in funding to address the crime problem on a number of different fronts. The bill provides \$3.45 billion in Federal grants that will place 50,000 more cops on the beat and provides \$3 billion to assure adequate prison space and help States to build new prisons for the incarceration of violent repeat offenders.

The bill also focuses on crime prevention and authorizes \$7 billion for community programs intended to prevent crime and targets \$525 million for programs providing employment opportunities for young adults in areas with high-crime and high-unemployment rates. The bill authorizes \$100 million

to reduce gang activities and the use of illegal drugs by juveniles and authorizes \$20 million for programs in which law enforcement and child and family services agencies work together to deal with incidents of violence involving juveniles and children. The bill authorizes \$7 million to prevent crime against older Americans.

H.R. 4092 sends a message to criminals through stiffer penalties that crime does not pay. The bill expands the Federal death penalty by more than 60 offenses, including drive-by shooting, the murder of a police officer, drug trafficking, and kidnapping. The bill incorporates the "three strikes and you're out" legislation and mandates life imprisonment for a conviction of a Federal violent felony if the defendant previously was convicted of two serious Federal or State drug offenses or violent offenses with a potential sentence of 10 years. It also provides that juveniles 13 years or older could be tried as adults for certain violent Federal crimes.

The bill overhauls the rules for death row inmates who have exhausted the State appeals process by allowing one Federal appeal within 1 year of the final State decision. This will end the abuse of the appeals system which allows death row inmates to file seemingly endless appeals. The bill also requires States to provide defendants with competent lawyers to help ensure that criminals will not be let out of jail due to a technicality or mistake made by the trial court.

The bill further includes the use of "bootcamps" for youthful first-time offenders. The bill provides \$200 million for States to develop new programs to ensure the punishment of youthful offenders, who might otherwise be placed on probation. These grants can be used for alternative punishment such as bootcamps which would teach troubled youngsters the value of hard work and instill discipline.

Finally, H.R. 4092 also addresses the problem of violence against women and provides grants to State and local governments for programs to reduce violence against women and punishes those who commit crimes against women. The bill establishes new Federal crimes of interstate domestic violence, stalking, and establishes a National Task Force on Violence Against Women.

Mr. Speaker, far too many of us no longer feel safe in our own neighborhoods. Violent crime is on the rise across our Nation and the time has come to take back our cities and streets from the criminals and to ensure all Americans the freedom to live and work in safety.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 401 is a fair rule that provides for further consideration of this wide-reaching crime bill. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

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

□ 1630

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as you might expect, I rise in opposition to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, in Singapore they cane you for vandalizing cars. In America, the voters should cane the Committee on Rules for vandalizing the legislative process.

By unfairly imprisoning a number of good perfecting Republican amendments, the Democratic majority has weakened what could have been a very tough crime bill. By using the king-of-the-hill procedure, the Committee on Rules allows weak, liberal amendments to impersonate tough anticrime amendments.

In almost every section of this bill, we see a tough Republican amendment that is destined to be weakened by a following Democratic amendment. From death penalty procedures to truth in sentencing, the Committee on Rules has copped a plea and gotten away with impersonating an anticrime crusade.

Ironically, the other body was allowed to reflect the people's will. They passed a tough crime bill that addresses everyday concerns. Here in the people's House, the people's will may be subverted, unless we defeat this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen accounts in the press indicating that we Republicans are bent on obstructing this process through diversionary tactics and delaying tactics, and all the rest. I will tell you, when you are in the minority and you have to fight for time and an opportunity to open up the process, we have to use all the mechanisms that are at our command.

I would hope, and we have admonished our Members, that as we go through this process, whether it be in consideration of the rule or consideration of the bill, that those on our side who have served with such distinction on the Committee on the Judiciary, who have significant amendments to offer, know the subject well, in and out, in their 5 minutes of time try to clearly and precisely differentiate what we are proposing versus what the other side is proposing. And there is a difference, a meaningful difference, not in the name of obstruction, but simply by way of eventually giving the American people the kind of product they have been demanding.

So I would hope as this debate unfolds that there will be clear attention given to those clean lines of demarcation on what these very complicated amendments mean. It takes the attention of the House, the complete attention of the House, to discern those differences.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a no vote on this rule, that we might come up with one that would certainly open up the process and provide the opportunity to express the people's will.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, it may be instructive to remember a little recent history. When the cry and hue went out for an "instant crime bill" a few months ago, the other body responded by bypassing the relevant subcommittees and full committee and proceeding willy-nilly to the floor. The 960-page product of rushing to legislative judgment without the benefit of careful committee deliberation is now laid out clearly for all to see. Moreover, the procedural pattern for considering that bill was to allow all nature of amendments—however frivolous—into the debate and, not surprisingly, into the final result.

Well, this committee and this body chose a different way to proceed. Our committee spent difficult yet productive time in having numerous hearings, developing draft after draft of provisions to better achieve the goals of punishment and prevention with the least burdensome results on the Federal and State governments involved. This effort culminated in H.R. 4092, a combination of 24 separate bills which either passed the House last fall or were reported by the Judiciary Committee last month.

□ 1640

The committee reports on this body of work constitute a stack about that deep, about 2 inches. These are the committee reports on every single one of the bills included within this 4092, despite what the Members might have heard from misinformed individuals.

There have been some who have decried this deliberative process—who have claimed that we should act without deliberation and now would want to endlessly debate amendments for the next 2 or 3 months. Perhaps—also in their thinking—is the idea that such a process will permit this bill to fall by its own weight.

I reject that approach. And I believe the Rules Committee has been eminently fair and eminently prudent in laying out the procedure and the amendments made in order. Major amendments in every plank of the bill have been made in order—death penalty, death penalty procedures, new prisons, habeas corpus, and "three strikes you're out." The noncontroversial amendments—numbering 31 in all—will be gathered together in the form of an en bloc amendment which I intend to offer today. They were not chosen based on party affiliation or

identity of the sponsor but rather were based on the subject matter addressed. The en bloc amendment will be followed by some 30 to 35 other substantive amendments addressing diverse aspects of the bill.

It is time to move forward. The committee has done its job and subcommittee Chairmen EDWARDS, HUGHES, and SCHUMER should be commended, together with subcommittee Ranking Members HYDE, MOORHEAD, and SENBRENNER.

For those who had a 20-point agenda, of which only 15 points were achieved by the rule, I am sorry, but we cannot accommodate 20-point agendas from 435 Members, from the left and the right, from Democrats and Republicans. I personally believe the omnibus legislation before Members will set a prototype for how to fashion crime legislation into the next century by breaking through the rigid mold that has characterized crime efforts of the past two decades. It is hardnosed about punishment, yet forward-looking in seeking to prevent a whole new generation of young people from going down the wrong road. We can do no less.

The rule is a good one; vote for it and let us get on with the business of passing the best crime bill to come down the pike in many years.

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

Mr. Speaker, Americans are fed up with criminals and crime. They want tougher crime laws, better enforcement, and more consistent, meaningful punishment. Most know that the Federal Government cannot solve this problem on its own, State and local enforcement and court actions play a major role. But many issues are Federal; regrettably, not all those issues are covered in the bill before us, despite this timely opportunity to include them.

Crucial proposals to improve this bill and make America safer were shut out by the Rules Committee majority—20 of them on tie votes. We heard from more than 100 members on 180 different amendments in a bipartisan good faith effort to make this bill better. Skeptics and White House spin doctors suggest that those of us seeking broader debate are trying to block passage of a crime bill. Wrong. We want a crime bill—a good crime bill. We are not being obstructionist—we are trying to be deliberative. I agree that we should proceed with dispatch which we are, but I vehemently disagree with the President's irresponsible statement that amendments proposed to this bill—by Democrats and Republicans—are, in his words, "frivolous or political." He seems to harbor some type of a conviction that any proposal differing from his own personal view is "frivolous" and "political." I refer to his personal view—because we still do not have his bill. There is no Clinton crime bill.

But one way or other, we will pass a crime bill within the next few weeks. I hope it will be with broad bipartisan support but the question is, will it be a bill that fulfills the challenge of fighting crime? Or will it be a missed opportunity to do the right thing? This is not about which party scores quick political points. This is not about another White House photo opportunity. This is about making America's streets, schools, communities, and homes safe once again. I am urging a "no" vote on this rule, but I do not ask a party-line vote. Crime is not a partisan matter. I urge a "no" vote because a better rule will give us a better bill to deliver to the President and to the American people. The President has put us on notice that he will sign the crime bill "in less than a minute". That being the case shouldn't we take the extra time here on the Hill to get it right. Unintended negative consequences are so often the legacy of short circuiting the full deliberative legislative process.

Vote "no".

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD information on rollcall votes in the Committee on Rules on amendments to the proposed rule on H.R. 4092:

ROLL CALL VOTES IN RULES COMMITTEE ON AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSED RULE ON H.R. 4092 THE VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994

Open Rule: This amendment to the proposed rule provides for a two-hour, open rule for the consideration of H.R. 4092, The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

Vote (Defeated 4-6): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Bellenson, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Wheat.

Modified King-of-Hill: Strike existing king-of-hill language where it appears and substitute language providing that, "if more than one amendment is adopted, the amendment adopted receiving the most favorable votes shall be considered as finally adopted and reported back to the House."

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Bellenson, Frost, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Wheat.

6. Sensenbrenner: Strike Subtitle I of Title X—Local Partnership Act.

Vote (Defeated 4-6): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Bellenson, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Wheat.

170. McCollum: Transfers half the funding for Title X (Crime Prevention and Community Justice) to Title VI, Violent Repeat Offender Incarceration.

Vote (Defeated 4-7): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Bellenson, Frost, Hall, Wheat, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior.

171. McCollum: Bars exclusion in Federal proceedings of evidence obtained in circumstances justifying an objectively reasonable belief that a search and seizure was in conformity with the fourth amendment.

Vote (Defeated 3-7): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier; Nays—Moakley, Bellenson, Frost, Hall, Wheat, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Goss.

172. McCollum: Amends Title III and makes serious violent assault felonies against victims either less than 18 years old or 64 years old or older punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment twice that authorized without regard to this section.

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

180. McCollum: Amends Title V, Mandatory Life Imprisonment for Persons Convicted of Certain Felonies, to provide mandatory prison terms for use, possession or carrying of a firearm or destructive device during a serious violent felony or serious drug trafficking offense for which the person may be prosecuted in a court of any state.

Vote (Defeated 4-6): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Wheat.

160. Smith (TX): Establishes a Criminal Alien Tracking Center to help identify, incarcerate and deport criminal aliens; requires registration of aliens on criminal probation or parole; increases funding for INS investigators; establishes expedited deportation procedures for certain criminal aliens; expands definition of "aggravated" felony to include trafficking in explosives, child pornography, spying and other specified activities; increases penalties for failure to depart or reentering after final order to depart; provides wiretap authority for a line smuggling investigations; and increases criminal penalties for passport and visa document fraud.

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

177. Gingrich: Creates violent crime reduction trust fund financed with reductions in federal employees (similar to Senate language); requires that 90% of the funds be used for prison construction grants to states that have enacted truth-in-sentencing laws.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Beilenson, Wheat, Gordon.

42. Zimmer: Doubles the maximum imprisonment and fine for any offense if the adult offender (over 18 years old) uses a child to commit the crime or to assist in avoiding apprehension. After a previous conviction for this offense, the maximum imprisonment and fine are tripled.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Beilenson, Wheat, Gordon.

134. Hutchinson: Provides penalties for the following offenses when committed within a federal jurisdiction: the intentional homicide, voluntary manslaughter, involuntary manslaughter, assault or aggravated assault of a child before birth.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Beilenson, Wheat, Gordon.

24. Burton: Provides the death penalty or life imprisonment without parole, probation or suspension for trafficking in those drugs specified in the amendment by amounts specified in the amendment.

26. Burton: Sense of Congress that criminal background checks should be performed for all prospective employees or volunteers of state-license or tax-funded organizations that interact with children.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Frost,

Bonior, Hall, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Beilenson, Wheat, Gordon.

25. Burton: Provides death penalty for murders committed during a sexual assault.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Beilenson, Wheat, Gordon.

82. Canady/Geren: Requires states applying for grants under the Violent Repeat Offender Incarceration Act to include in their application to the AG assurances that they have established a system to prosecute juveniles who are 14 years or older and charged with violent crimes as adults. Requires states to keep records of these crimes for use in future proceedings.

Vote (Defeated 4-6): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Beilenson, Gordon.

9. Castle: Restricts the sale and donation of excess firearms owned or held by federal agencies and codifies GSA regulations restricting such transactions.

Vote (Defeated 4-6): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Beilenson, Gordon.

15. Clinger: Expands Title III—which increases penalties for assaulting children—to include the elderly.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat. Not Voting: Derrick, Beilenson, Gordon, Slaughter.

2. Cunningham: Exempts current and former law enforcement officers from state laws that prohibit the carrying of concealed firearms.

Vote (Defeated 4-6): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat. Not Voting: Derrick, Gordon, Slaughter.

14. Doolittle: Denies federal benefits, including social security and welfare payments, to individuals convicted of crimes of violence.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat. Not Voting: Derrick, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter.

65. Doolittle: Provides the punishment of life imprisonment after three violent felony convictions. Does not require that the convictions arise from separate episodes.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat. Not Voting: Derrick, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter.

46. Dorman: Adds the requirement of a "profit-seeking purpose" to the definition of "pattern of racketeering activity" under RICO Act.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat. Not Voting: Derrick, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter.

136. Dunn/Deal: Encourages states to establish registration and tracking procedures and community notification with respect to released sexually violent predators, including convicted stalkers.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Bonior, Wheat. Not Voting: Derrick, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter.

86. Franks (NJ): Creates new title, "Penalties for Repeat Sex Offenders", to increase penalties for repeat sex offenders. Makes second offenses punishable by not less than five years and not more than three times the maximum sentence otherwise applicable. A third offense would be punishable by mandatory life imprisonment.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Bonior, Wheat. Not Voting: Derrick, Frost, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter.

87. Franks (NJ): Requires federal prisoners to obtain General Equivalency Degree (GED) before being eligible for early release from prison.

Vote (Adopted Voice Vote).

140. Gekas: Clarifies loophole in drive-by murder provision by including defendants who immediately exit and remain close to a motor vehicle.

Vote (Defeated 3-4): Yeas—Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Wheat. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter, Solomon.

137. Goodling: Increases penalties for individuals possessing a firearm while committing a misdemeanor drug crime (such as simple possession), and makes it unlawful for anyone using a firearm during a misdemeanor drug crime to possess a firearm for 5 years conviction.

83. Goodling: Strikes Title X, subtitle J, the Youth Employment and Skills Crime Prevention Program in its entirety, as it is duplicative of programs for disadvantaged youth under Title II-C of the Job Training Partnership Act, and the Youth Fair Chance Program established under Title IV, Part H of the Job Training Partnership Act.

Vote (Defeated 3-4): Yeas—Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Wheat. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter, Solomon.

152. Hefley: Makes grants conditional upon a state or multi-state compact having a policy that calls for and assures that those who have been convicted of a violent felony serve at least 85% of their sentence.

153. Hefley: Amends Title 18, U.S. Code to cap "satisfactory behavior" time credit for prisoners at 36 days. Currently, the cap is 54 days each year.

154. Hefley: Prohibits payment of Social Security or veterans' benefits to those confined by court order in connection with verdicts of "not guilty by reason of insanity" or similar verdicts.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Wheat.

45. Klug: Prohibits possession of a firearm at or near a day care center or a community center.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Wheat.

71. Kyl: Provides for pretrial detention in serious sex offense cases; increases penalties for repeat sex offenders, repeat child abusers, and for drug distribution to pregnant women; increases sentencing guidelines for sex offenses; requires HIV testing for defendants in federal sex offense case; authorizes courts to enforce restitution orders by suspending federal benefits for offenders who refuse to comply with restitution obligations; protects the victim's right to impartial jury by equalizing the number of peremptory challenges accorded the defense and the prosecution in felony cases; allows for evidence of similar crimes in sex offense cases; and provides for right of victim to fair treatment in legal proceedings.

Vote (Defeated 3-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Wheat, Goss.

38. Levy: Penalizes those who transport firearms across state lines or international

borders with the knowledge they will be used to kill, injure or intimidate; provides life in prison or death penalty if weapon is actually used in a violent crimes.

Vote (Defeated 3-4): Yeas—Solomon, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Wheat, Quillen.

88. Manzullo: Designates police and fire chaplains as public safety officers thereby making them eligible for federal death and injury benefits.

Vote (Adopted Voice Vote).

169. McCollum: Strikes half the funding authorized for Title X, Crime Prevention and Community Justice.

Vote (Defeated 3-4): Yeas—Solomon, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Gordon, Quillen.

166. McCollum: Amends Title VI—Violent Repeat Offender Incarceration, increases the funding authorization from \$600 million to \$1.485 billion for each of the fiscal years 1994-1998.

Vote (Defeated 3-4): Yeas—Solomon, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Gordon, Quillen.

91. Molinari: Provides for death and disability benefits for retired public safety officers who die or are permanently injured and totally disabled as a result of injuries while responding to a fire, rescue, or police emergency.

Vote (Defeated 3-4): Yeas—Solomon, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Gordon, Quillen.

92. Molinari: Changes Federal Rules of Evidence by providing for the admissibility of evidence of similar crimes in sexual assault cases and child molestation cases.

Vote (Defeated 3-4): Yeas—Solomon, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Gordon, Quillen.

5. Oxley: Requires criminals convicted of federal crimes to make restitution to their victims.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Gordon.

29. Packard: Gives federal law enforcement officials access to legalization immigration files for the purpose of a criminal investigation.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Gordon.

178. Pryce: Requires Federal Bureau of Prisons to prevent prisoners from strength-training or improving their fighting ability and to remove all equipment designed for those purposes.

Vote (Adopted Voice Vote).

21. Quinn: Requires a federal permit for all purchases of explosives and requires a photograph and a set of fingerprints to accompany the application.

Vote (Defeated Voice Vote).

141. Schiff: Extends U.S. jurisdiction to crimes committed overseas by civilian employees of the military or their dependents if those acts would be federal crimes if committed in the U.S.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Frost, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon.

142. Schiff: Adds the commission of robbery as qualifying for one of the first two strikes under the three strikes provision.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Frost, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon.

143. Schiff: Adds "Battery while armed with a deadly weapon or resulting in serious bodily injury" to the list of specified violent felonies under the bill.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Frost, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon.

144. Schiff: Changes the mandatory life imprisonment for persons convicted of certain felonies from "three strikes" to "two strikes."

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Frost, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon.

146. Schiff: Adds to the three strikes provisions—mandatory life for the conviction of two serial violent felonies.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Frost, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon.

95. Smith (MI): Alters requirements for federal grants to correctional facilities for diversion programs.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Frost, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon.

50. Solomon: Expresses the Sense of Congress that no federal department or agency should study or finance research involving the legalization of drugs.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Frost, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon.

51. Solomon: Strikes title II of the bill, maintaining current sentencing for those involved in serious drug offenses.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Bonior, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Hall, Gordon.

75. Stearns: Creates a new title, "Carrying of Concealed Handguns", to allow, notwithstanding any provision of the state law, the carrying of a concealed weapon if the individual is 21 years of age, has no felony convictions or history of mental illness, and has completed successfully a handgun safety course offered by the State.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Bonior, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Hall, Gordon.

122 Stearns: Expresses Sense of Congress that the Constitution provides all citizens the right to keep and bear arms.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Bonior, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Hall, Gordon.

84. Vucanovich: Allows and grants made under subsection (b) of Section 2001 to be used for programs, projects and other activities to provide for overtime costs, training, the purchase and maintenance of vehicles and equipment, technology and civilian support staff.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Bonior, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Hall, Gordon.

113. Weldon: Provides state and local authorities \$30 million in matching funds from the Crime Prevention Trust Fund for gun buy-back programs.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Bonior,

Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Hall, Gordon.

128. Wolf: Provides for pilot programs, conducted by the Federal Prison Industries (FPI), to test the feasibility of teaming private U.S. firms with FPI to produce goods currently made offshore to the meet the need for increased employment of federal prisoners.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Bonior, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Hall, Gordon.

40. Zimmer: Requires mandatory minimum five-year prison term for unlawful possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, a fugitive from justice, a drug addict or illegal drug user, or one who transfers or receives stolen firearms, without possibility of parole, suspended or concurrent sentence. Doubles penalties for certain violations of firearms law and increases penalties for use or possession of a firearm in the commission of a violent crime or drug trafficking.

Vote (Defeated 4-4): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Beilenson, Bonior, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Hall, Gordon.

41. Zimmer: Limits remedies available in district court for a successful challenge to the constitutionality of conditions of confinement, specifically denying the court jurisdiction to impose population ceilings, adjust release dates, or prohibit use of tents or prefabricated housing structures. Requires consent decrees regarding conditions of confinement also to provide only narrowly tailored relief.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Bonior, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Frost, Hall, Gordon.

55. DeLauro: Authorizes special grants to states that enact laws to revoke the driver's license of anyone who brings a handgun into an elementary or secondary school zone, that the revocation is immediate and automatic upon receipt of notification from a principal or equivalent official, and that the revocation is for five years on the first offense and ten years for each further offense.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Bonior, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Frost, Hall, Gordon.

8. Harman: Denies felons convicted of violent drug-related crimes the right to appeal to BATF for the right to own firearms.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Gordon.

123. Orton: Creates a new category of federal prosecution against "child abuse and endangerment: for inflicting serious physical injury on a minor or permitting another to inflict such injury on a minor under one's care or custody.

Vote (Defeated 4-6): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Frost, Gordon.

12. Reynolds: Adds a new title that bans 175 specifically named semi-automatic weapons.

Vote (Defeated 4-6): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Frost, Gordon.

17. Traficant: Requires the Federal Bureau of Prisons to give 30 days prior notice to all interested parties who were instrumental in convicting a federal prisoner that he or she is being released.

18. Traficant: Allows a sentencing judge the flexibility to give non-violent offenders

alternatives to imprisonment. Provides that non-violent offenders must pay to have their photos in local newspapers.

20. Trafficant: Provides penalties of not more than \$100,000 to anyone who intentionally affixes a fraudulent "Made in America" label to any product that is purchased with funds authorized under H.R. 4092.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Gordon.

78. Waters: Creates new title, "Voting Rights for Former Offenders", to provide that the voting rights of a U.S. citizen, who otherwise is qualified to vote in any election for federal office, shall not be denied or abridged because he or she has committed a criminal offense.

Vote (Defeated 4-5): Yeas—Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Beilenson, Bonior, Hall, Slaughter. Not Voting: Derrick, Frost, Wheat, Gordon.

Adoption of Rule—

Vote (Adopted 6-4): Yeas—Moakley, Beilenson, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter; Nays—Solomon Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Not Voting: Derrick, Frost, Gordon.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH-103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted ¹	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Per-cent ²	Number	Per-cent 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

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH-103D CONG.—Continued

Congress (years)	Total rules granted ¹	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Per-cent ²	Number	Per-cent ³
103d (1993-94)	59	12	20	47	80

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 Apr. 12, 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. 206: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D-1; R-8)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ. 248-166. A. 249-163. (Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH 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: Hate Competitiveness Act	NA	NA	A. Voice Vote. (May 5, 1993).
H. Res. 171, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 873: Galatin 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. 234-129. (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 (D-11; R-22)	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. (June 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	MC	H.R. 2401: National Defense authority	149 (D-109; R-40)	NA	A. 246-172. (Sept. 8, 1993).
H. Res. 248, Sept. 9, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National defense authorization	NA	NA	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	NA	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	NA	NA	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	NA	NA	A. Voice Vote. (Oct. 21, 1993).
H. Res. 286, Oct. 27, 1993	O	H.R. 334: Lumbee Recognition Act	NA	NA	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	NA	NA	A. Voice Vote. (Nov. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 293, Nov. 4, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 170: Troop withdrawal Somalia	NA	NA	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)	NA	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	NA	NA	A. Voice Vote. (Nov. 16, 1993).
H. Res. 304, Nov. 9, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 288: Further CR, FY 1994	NA	NA	NA
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-3; R-6)	4 (D-1; R-3)	A. 233-192. (Nov. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 314, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 3351: All 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)	NA	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: Reinvesting Government	34 (D-15; R-19)	3 (D-3; R-0)	A. 247-183. (Nov. 22, 1993).
H. Res. 335, 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. W (Feb. 10, 1994).
H. Res. 366, Feb. 23, 1994	MO	H. Con. Res. 6: Improving America's Schools	NA	NA	A. W (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)	NA

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

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin with a profound remark: Two plus two equals four. In other words, there is a logical and rational process called cause and effect. In terms of Newtonian physics,

that means that every action causes an equal and opposite reaction.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, there are reasons why things happen, as controversial as that statement may be.

A farmer neglects to tend and care for his fields—it is likely that the crop will fail.

A company neglects to invest in research and development—it is likely that the company will not be profitable.

In a similar way, Mr. Speaker, a society which neglects, which oppresses and which disdains a very significant part of its population—which leaves them hungry, impoverished, unemployed, uneducated, and utterly without hope, will, through cause and effect, create a population which is bitter, which is angry, which is violent, and a society which is crime-ridden. This is the case in America, and it is the case in countries throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, how do we talk about the very serious crime problem in America without mentioning that we have the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world, by far, with 22 percent of our children in poverty and 5 million who are hungry today? Do the Members think maybe that might have some relationship to crime? How do we talk about crime when this Congress is prepared, this year, to spend 11 times more for the military than for education; when 21 percent of our kids drop out of high school; when a recent study told us that twice as many young workers now earn poverty wages as 10 years ago; when the gap between the rich and the poor is wider, and when the rate of poverty continues to grow? Do the members think that might have some relationship to crime?

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that clearly, there are some people in our society who are horribly violent, who are deeply sick and sociopathic, and clearly these people must be put behind bars in order to protect society from them. But it is also my view that through the neglect of our Government and through a grossly irrational set of priorities, we are dooming tens of millions of young people to a future of bitterness, misery, hopelessness, drugs, crime, and violence.

□ 1650

And Mr. Speaker, all the jails in the world, and we already imprison more people per capita than any other country, and all of the executions in the world, will not make that situation right. We can either educate or electrocute. We can create meaningful jobs, rebuilding our society, or we can build more jails.

Mr. Speaker, let us create a society of hope and compassion, not one of hate and vengeance.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the previous speaker that yes, two plus two equals four.

Fact: Why are liberals for this bill and why are conservatives against it? No question about it, this bill in its present form coddles criminals and makes it tough on law enforcement officials.

Mr. Speaker, the frustration caused by the arrogant Democrat leadership around here would be almost unbearable to me, who has been here for 16 years, were it not for the fact that elections are less than 6 months down the road, and boy, are things going to change.

Mr. Speaker, 104 Members took the time to draft and submit and to testify on some 180 amendments before our Committee on Rules on this crime bill. We took 12 hours of testimony from these 104 Members. In addition, yesterday we put in another 4 hours up in the Rules Committee just marking up this rule.

Now 46 Republicans on this side and 45 Democrats on that side are being denied their constitutional rights, your constitutional rights to represent the 600,000 people back home. That is 25 percent of this body being shut out of the legislative process, 45 Democrats and 46 Republicans who are the victims of this drive-by procedural mugging. That is right, Members are being mugged.

This rule denying your amendments is almost identical to the gag rule the Democrat leadership tried to foist on us just before recess 2 weeks ago when we voiced our strong opposition on this floor and the press was here watching it. The Democrats pulled the bill. Why? And then Majority Leader GEPHARDT convened a meeting the next day with me, and with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], our Republican whip, and with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], our leader on this bill. And we sat down and we talked about it. We came away from that meeting with a clear impression that a much fairer and a much more bipartisan rule so that you 45 Democrats could be recognized would come out of that Rules Committee. And we were told that we would be engaged in a meeting during this 2-week process.

I canceled a trip to Korea on a trade mission to try to bring jobs to my district because of a pending meeting that we could sit down and negotiate a fair rule. No meeting ever took place, and this restrictive rule guaranteeing the outcome before a single vote is taken is being jammed down our throats today.

And Mr. Speaker, to add insult to injury, the President of the United States of America had the audacity on Monday to use the Justice Department auditorium steps as a TV studio to make a partisan attack on this crime issue. He said we should not waste our time with frivolous or political amendments.

That is an insult to every Member of this body. I for one deeply resent the

President attempting to dictate to this Congress what amendments are and are not appropriate on this floor.

Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that this is the same President who has not even bothered to send his own crime bill to this Congress 15 months later. And yet he has the gall to tell us how to write our crime bill. And keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that he dares to charge us, the Republicans, with delay when we introduced our tough crime bill 8 months ago in August, and it is still languishing someplace. Nobody can find it.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of frivolous and political amendments are the Republicans being denied? The Smith of Texas amendment establishes a criminal alien tracking center. Is that frivolous? Is that nongermane? The Gingrich violent crime trust fund to fund more prisons, is that political? The President of the United States asked for that, and it is not in this bill, and we cannot offer the amendment. Is that political, Mr. President, wherever you are?

Is the McCollum amendment to shift more money from prevention programs to building more prisons, is that frivolous, Mr. President? Of course not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair will advise the gentleman that he may not address the President directly, and the Chair would call that to the attention of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for calling that to my attention. I seem to have forgotten it.

Is this Solomon-Hayes bipartisan amendment to restore current minimum sentencing, and listen to this, America, for serious drug offenders, sentences which are stricken by the bill, is that frivolous? I guess it is if Members think recent dramatic increases in drug trafficking, drug abuse and drug-related crimes is frivolous. My constituents do not think so.

Neither do the kids over in Baltimore who were just caught in the fifth grade selling cocaine.

Who sold it to them? They ought to go to jail with a minimum sentence, and we are repealing it in this bill. And I cannot offer the amendment to stop it.

Mr. Speaker, the people are mad as hell about the rising crime rate, and they want to get tough on crime. They want to lock up these violent repeat offenders, and they want to throw away the keys. I do not want to let them out as this bill would do.

Mr. Speaker, by denying the Members their right to offer these amendments that would make the crime bill tough on criminals and helpful to law enforcement, the liberal Democrat leadership is guaranteeing that the final bill will be a watered-down cop-out that makes it easier on criminals and harder for law enforcement to ap-

prehend and convict these murderers who take the lives of law-abiding citizens. And they are often your daughters and your wives and mine too. And they let them go free. And that is wrong, and this bill is going to do nothing to stop it.

You ought to be ashamed of yourselves.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and commend the Rules Committee for this excellent rule, which has been crafted under the most difficult of circumstances.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank President Clinton for restoring the Byrne Memorial Fund Formula grants, which fund some State and local law enforcement programs.

In northwest Indiana, the Byrne Memorial Formula grants fund the activities of the Lake County Drug Task Force, which on the afternoon of Tuesday, August 17, 1993, raided a home in Dyer, IN, and seized 176 pounds of cocaine with an estimated street value of \$15 million.

On February 20, the Drug Task Force working in conjunction with other local and Federal law enforcement agencies seized 3,100 pounds of marijuana in Michigan.

The Clinton administration's action will make it possible for successful programs like the Lake County Drug Task Force to continue to compete for Federal dollars to get drugs off of our streets and put criminals behind bars.

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

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I recommended that this House adopt legislation that would criminalize the interstate transportation of firearms by persons knowing that the firearms would be used unlawfully. As the crime bill approached the House floor, I proposed that my firearms measure be incorporated into it through an amendment that the Rules Committee is now refusing to allow.

I became interested in this subject after a lone gunman shot up a commuter train in my district. When the shooting stopped six Long Islanders were dead, many more were injured. The firearm used in the crime was purchased legally in California by an angry young man who waited 15 days to purchase the weapon as the law of California requires.

The Brady bill was not in effect when this gun was purchased. Had it been, it would have made no difference.

To my many friends who supported the Brady bill, let's admit today that despite its passage, there will be cases—like the Long Island Railroad massacre—in which handguns

fall into the wrong hands. And it is our obligation to punish those who use firearms in violent crimes. So why won't we do that?

Mr. Speaker, it is a Federal crime to transport explosives across State lines for the purpose of using them illegally. An alleged criminal in upstate New York faces the death penalty under Federal law because people died when they opened letter bombs that he made using explosives purchased in Kentucky. Why should we treat firearms differently?

In fact, Mr. Speaker, you can spend a year in jail under our law for illegally transporting dentures in interstate commerce.

Think about that. If you and I left here today, bound for New York—one of us with illegally made false teeth in his pocket and the other with a gun—and the one with the gun used it in a homicide in New York—the guy with the false teeth would have committed a Federal crime but the murderer would not.

This is madness. Defeat the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], who has been instrumental in this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill that we have before us today, make no mistake about it, is a bill that if it passes in its present form would end the death penalty in the United States. According to the prosecutors with whom I have spoken, and I have spoken with a number, it is their opinion that it is highly improbable that after this bill became law we would ever have another death penalty carried out in the 36 or 37 States where the death penalty is currently available.

This bill has other deficiencies, but none is more glaring than that. I will leave it to others to explain the details of it, but it is fairly straightforward that you find in the habeas corpus provisions where there are statements in this bill, as it is now written, which would reverse the Supreme Court decision that says that once somebody has gone on Death Row, and a new Supreme Court ruling comes down on some technical matter not related to their original trial, but on a criminal law matter, they may not go into Federal court and seek to have their death penalty reviewed. However, if this bill became law, that decision of the Supreme Court would be reversed. We would have the months of delay every time there is a new Supreme Court ruling on a criminal technical procedural matter as each Death Row inmate went back into court and sought to have his matter reviewed.

□ 1700

As a practical matter, the death penalties of this country would come to a grinding halt.

The same thing is true with respect to the death penalty when it comes to the so-called Racial Justice Act, where

an inference of discrimination is built in that prosecutors would have a very difficult time overcoming, an inference of discrimination on the basis of statistics where you say in a given jurisdiction a certain number of those in minorities, racial minorities, are getting more death penalties than whites are getting in a district as related to the total population of the minority to the white population in that jurisdiction.

Those kinds of roadblocks, those kinds of back-door problems are very severe in this bill. The bill, therefore, is a bad bill. It is a bill that is going backwards instead of forwards in solving the problems we have with crime in this Nation, if you look at it from that perspective. It is one of the reasons we are so concerned on our side of the aisle when we are not allowed to offer amendments that would do things to improve this bill.

Yes, we will have amendments to address those two particular problems on the floor, and I hope my colleagues take them out of this bill and erase them so we will have a bill at least that is not harmful, although it certainly is a bill that, without the amendments that we are being denied by the Committee on Rules, will not be wholly adequate.

Secondly, there are no teeth in the prison grant program in this bill. The No. 1 problem facing this Nation in crime is the revolving door. Most of the crimes that are a concern to the American people are violent repeat offenders who commit State crimes. Six percent of all criminals commit about 70 to 80 percent of all violent crimes in this country and are serving an average of less than one-third of their sentences.

If we are going to provide money and, yes, we should provide money for prisons, for States to build more prisons to house these violent criminals, then we should provide some eligibility requirements to insure that the States are going to change their laws to guarantee that those who commit violent crimes and are repeat violent offenders serve at least 85 percent of their sentences instead of getting out after serving only a fraction.

We need to put deterrence back into our criminal laws again. Law enforcement officials tell all of us regularly that criminals do talk to each other, and there is a message system out there. Right now they factor in the minimum amount of jail time they expect to serve as the cost or price of doing business.

Until we put the message of deterrence back into our criminal system and put swiftness and certainty of punishment into that system and incarcerate those who commit these violent crimes for a long period of time and throw away the keys, those 6 percent of the criminals, and take them off the streets and more or less permanently, we cannot solve the violent-crime crisis in this country.

What is also wrong with this bill is the fact that the priorities are wrong. There are about \$8 billion for prevention of root causes of money being spent in one title of this bill, the fairly diverse shotgun approach that is out there supposedly solving the underlying cause of crime.

The problem we have with this bill, the underlying bill, in this regard is very simple: All of us believe that we ought to be getting at root causes at some point, but we have a problem like somebody who has been run over by a truck, and you have a paramedic come on and he has got big crush injuries, his arm is cut off, he is bleeding to death. The paramedic's first problem is to stop the fellow from bleeding to death and apply a tourniquet.

Our first problem is to take the violent criminals off the streets. Root causes? Yes, we should be addressing them. When you only put \$3 billion toward prisons and you put \$8 billion toward root causes, we have the cart before the horse, and it is very wrong.

We were not allowed amendments in this bill today for changing the exclusionary rule to overcome the technical problems of allowing evidence in search-and-seizure cases. We do not have an opportunity to offer the amendment that would address the criminal alien problem. Twenty-five percent of the criminals in this country in prisons today are aliens.

We have not been allowed to offer an amendment that would double the sentences of those who commit crimes against children under 18 and those over 64, or to double the time in jail for somebody who commits a crime against a child, and we do not have the money for trust funds.

There are lots of things that are not in the bill. The bill is inadequate, but it is also a bad bill. As I said earlier, if this bill passes, we will never have another death penalty carried out in this country. We need to correct that. We need to defeat this rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1994. This is a bill that has been a long time in the making. And it is a bill that helps answer the fears and concerns of people all over this country—fears that crime is out of control and that our communities are no longer our own.

In my district, I hear those fears expressed every day and I see the harsh reality behind them. I talk to students—one of whom told her teacher she could not take a test. Why? Because that morning on the way to school she had seen someone shot in the head. Another student in my district was recently shot and wounded and a third was arrested for a shooting

that took place at a mall in my hometown. Parents, seniors, children—they have all come to me worried about the safety of those they love and are asking us to take action. And that is what this bill will do.

Compared with the previous crime-related measures that Congress has considered, this crime bill distinguishes itself in several ways: It represents the largest commitment the Federal Government has ever pledged to the crime problem; it addresses the needs of victims; and it strikes an appropriate balance between punishment and prevention.

This bill contains tough new punishments to deter crime and put habitual criminals away. It will put repeat violent offenders away for life upon conviction of a third offense; it will expand the list of Federal offenses for which the death penalty can be imposed; and it will allow for the prosecution of young offenders in Federal court as adults for certain serious, violent offenses.

I am particularly pleased that the bill puts such a strong emphasis on youth crime prevention, authorizing funding to assist at-risk youth with after-school treatment and recreation programs in our most crime-ridden cities. It also addresses one of the most tragic of violent crimes—domestic violence.

In addition, it also recognizes the importance of coordinating the efforts of law enforcement and social service organizations who are dealing with the special problems associated with children and violence, by authorizing the Police Partnership Act.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot wait any longer. We are familiar with the startling national statistics on crime. We know that every 2 minutes someone in the United States is shot. We know that every 17 seconds a violent crime—a murder, rape, robbery, or assault—is reported. And we know—some of us firsthand—that almost a third of all families in America have had someone victimized by crime.

In Connecticut, gun-related deaths among 15- to 19-year-olds now exceed all disease-related deaths combined. Last weekend in my hometown of New Haven, three people were shot and one killed in gun-related incidences—including one drive-by shooting. Elderly people in my district talk about being repeatedly robbed and assaulted in their own homes—the list of victims goes on and on.

We must take action now. We must deliver a meaningful crime bill to the American people to restore their hope and to help bring peace to our communities. I urge my colleagues to support the rule on the Omnibus Crime Control Act and pass this landmark legislation.

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

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, when the Chinese freighter, the *Golden Venture* ran aground off the coast of New York last June, it alerted the Nation to the evil reality of human smuggling and slave trade.

Subsequent hearings by the Congressional Human Rights Caucus detailed the network of Chinese gangs in New York who amass great fortunes by trafficking in human cargo. Just last week, the press reported that these New York gangs are now smuggling Chinese nationals into this country through Virginia.

These gang lords amass great fortunes by charging \$30,000 per immigrant—or \$6 to \$9 million per ship—and then enslaving their human cargoes in lives of narcotics, gambling, and prostitution.

Despite the best efforts of Federal and local law enforcement officials, we are not winning the war against these gangs because, very simply, our laws are incredibly weak. The average sentence for slave trading is 18 months; the maximum fine is \$5,000—not a bad cost of doing business when the profit is up to \$9 million per cargo.

Last July, I introduced the Alien Smuggling Prosecution Act, cosponsored by Congressman KENNEDY, to extend the RICO statute to human smuggling and give the Government the weapons to break the backs of these slave trade gangs. If RICO applies to the smuggling of tobacco, it should certainly apply to the smuggling of human beings.

Mr. SMITH included my bill in his crime package which was rejected by the Rules Committee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. SMITH's legislation deserves full debate and I urge, therefore, that the rule be defeated.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 6, 1994]

CHINA "HOSTAGE" SHIP GIVES FEDS THE SLIP—183 SMUGGLED INTO GRIP OF RUTHLESS NEW YORK GANG

(By Larry Celona and Murray Weiss)

A freighter with 183 Chinese nationals hidden in its hull has slipped into U.S. waters and delivered its human cargo into the arms of violent New York gangs. The Post has learned.

Heavily armed members of the Fuk Ching gang reportedly shepherded the smuggled immigrants from the boat into trucks with commando-like precision and drove them to "safehouses" in New York City and Baltimore, law-enforcement sources said.

Investigators believe the Fuk Ching is holding the immigrants hostage and demanding a smuggling fee of \$30,000 per person—or \$6 million—from their relatives, the sources said.

The sources said the FBI has joined the investigation. The agency has had success in probing the Fuk Ching, which is based in Chinatown and was responsible for the sensational *Golden Venture* operation last June.

In that case, six immigrants died in choppy Jamaica Bay when a freighter carrying 298 aliens from China's Fujian province ran aground off Queens.

The tragedy brought to light the magnitude of the Chinese smuggling trade here—and how the Fuk Ching gang ruthlessly makes millions of dollars by keeping their "hostages" in cramped safehouses in Brooklyn and Queens.

According to the sources, the freighter in the latest case left mainland China four

months ago—originating from the Fujian province—with its human cargo hidden in squalid conditions.

There were conflicting accounts about whether any federal law-enforcement agency had been tracking the latest ship to slip into the country.

After making its 11,000-mile trek, the freighter docked in Virginia 10 to 14 days ago, rather than risk making its way to New York.

Sources said the 183 aliens were met by machine gun-toting Fuk Ching gang members, who herded them into rented trucks.

Several trucks were driven to Baltimore, where there is a large Chinese population.

The FBI believes the rest were brought to Brooklyn and Queens, where they have been frantically telephoning relatives in the United States and China to raise money to buy their freedom.

The Fuk Ching gang is known for keeping its captives chained, freed only to work minimum 14-hour days in restaurants controlled by the gang.

Nineteen Fuk Ching members—including gang leader Ah Kay—were arrested in connection with the Golden Venture tragedy.

Since then, authorities said, the gang has increasingly used ports in Virginia as docking points for its smuggling.

While drug smugglers face terms of life behind bars, those convicted of smuggling people into the country face only five years in prison.

Spokesmen for the FBI and the Immigration and Naturalization Service declined comment.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], chairman of the Republican Policy Committee and the senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, and my dear colleagues, it is a delight to appear in combat, with a small "C," with my friend from South Carolina, the father of the October Surprise excursion which only cost us \$3.5 million, and I will say to the gentleman and produced zilch, and I will say that the gentleman, when he gets his head in a direction, he proceeds that way wherever it leads, and he has done a similar benefit to the community in introducing a new habeas corpus provision 2 days before we got to the floor for our big half-hour debate on crime this year.

We talked about education for a month, but we got a half-hour on this side to debate crime, out of the largesse of the Democrats' heart, and I appreciate that.

But my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, who is skilled in many fields, although he does not serve on the Committee on the Judiciary, introduced his own habeas corpus bill, without hearings, without consideration by the attorneys general of the States' attorneys of this country, and it is the "king of the hill" provision that will override my amendment when we do get to that.

Now, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], who is, as I say, a very skilled legal mind, talks about his habeas corpus proviso at-

tenuating, shortening the endless hearings that consume habeas corpus appeals. What he does not tell you about is that even under his amendment under this bill that the Democrats bring forward that is tough on crime, when a man is accused of murder and cannot afford a lawyer under this bill, the defense bar, not the court, must appoint not one but two criminal lawyers who are very skilled in criminal law and in the handling of psychiatric testimony.

□ 1710

In other words, they have got to pick an Alan Dershowitz and Lawrence Tribe or, if they are busy at the time, then they get Jerry Spence and Melvin Belli.

Until those appointments are made and are functional, the statute of limitations stops. It could go on for years and years and years. The social spending that is near and dear to the hearts of the Democrats makes up the bulk of this bill, something like \$6.9 billion, and for prison space, crumbs.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the prior speaker that although my amendment was not before the Committee on the Judiciary, a good lawyer is always available.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the rule, but I believe, as we did with the education bill, that every Member's idea should have been brought to the floor and debated and all amendments should have been made in order.

But we are about to expand police in our country, and that is needed. But I think we would be better off by having a few more parents.

We are going to build more jails, but I think we would be better off with more parents.

We have more probation officers; we would be better off with more parents.

We are going to have more courts and more judges, and I think America would be better off with more parents.

Ladies and gentlemen, America is not safe. It is very simple; a crime bill is not enough. We have got to change the tax laws and the trade laws, and we need more parents and more jobs, and we are not getting them.

But I want to talk about this crime bill with some specificity. In China they have a new consumer protection law: If you are a worker and you manufacture a faulty product, you can get a life sentence. That is certainly excessive. They now have a law that deals with fraud; a president of a company in China pulled off an illegal scheme on a bank of \$300,000, and he was executed. Certainly, that is excessive.

Now, we talked about the caning in Singapore. Caning is a whipping across the buttocks. It is bloody; it is painful.

That was for spray-painting automobiles.

In America, if you spray-paint an automobile, in most cities you would get a lecture and a fine.

Now, I am not saying that we should be caning people, but anyone in Singapore who spray-paints an automobile or commits vandalism gets caned, and here is all I know: There is very little crime in China and there is very little, if any, crime in Singapore.

In America, it is Dodge City.

We have gone overboard coddling murderers, rapists, and the rights of those creeps, while we are seeing tombstones pop up like mushrooms.

I am going to have a tough vote this year, a tough vote on that Hyde amendment, because I think HENRY HYDE's intentions are right. There are going to be some tough votes in this House. But I will say this, that I am glad the Committee on Rules put in the fraudulent-label law. I think it is time for companies who import products and put American labels on them, it is time for them to get hit in the pocketbook. I am concerned about jobs and I am concerned about families.

I think we should change the Tax Code, change the trade laws, keep families together, create jobs, and it will do more about crime in this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], a distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. The crux of this bill is about \$8 billion of social spending, and this rule does not allow a debate, it does not allow an amendment, does not allow anything to touch that \$8 billion.

Programs are funded in this bill to increase the self-esteem of the young criminals and to fund midnight basketball recreation programs. There are some of us who think that that money would be better spent on building more prison space for those who are convicted by a jury of their peers.

But, furthermore, the legislation that this rule protects does not allow for funding of these programs. So, instead of the \$8 billion being funny money, it is phony money, because it is an unfunded authorization bill and the amendment that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] proposed to set up a trust fund to pay for this was not made in order by the Committee on Rules.

Much is said about hiring 50,000 cops on the beat; but looking at the text of the legislation, the cities and municipalities do not even have to use the money to hire more police officers. They can use it for any other municipal function, including welfare and education.

So it is misdirected money.

But finally, even if this bill does provide money and it is used for law en-

forcement, the money will run out in 3 years. So, communities will be put in an unpleasant catch-22 situation of either having to lay off the cops on the beat 3 years from now or putting the cost of those cops directly on the real estate tax rolls.

That is a fraud. We should not be doing things like this in the name of fighting crime. We should be backing up our rhetoric with money and there is no money in this bill.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Intellectual Property and Judicial Administration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HUGHES. You know, Mr. Speaker, here we go again with another crime bill. And we start off once again by an acrimonious debate over the fact that a lot of Members did not have their amendments made in order. I understand that. We have as much consternation on the Democratic side as the Republican side over that. And I regret that that is the case, because there are too many important issues that we need to debate to be sidetracked by that particular debate.

But what really troubles me is not that; what troubles me most is that there are so many Members on this side of the aisle who are friends of mine, who do not want a crime bill, they want the issue. They want the issue in November.

That is sad, that is a sad commentary, because the crime problem is too serious to be a political football. But that is what it has become. This is a good bill. It does not have all the provisions that I would like in it.

To a lot of Members, the 50 death penalties in there are not enough, they would like to have 50 more. And as the chairman of our full committee has indicated, we could not accommodate some Members but I have always believed in capital punishment and I believe we should reserve it for the most egregious of offenses. And I say to my colleague from Illinois that I understand his concern about those provisions dealing with habeas corpus. We have had this debate for a long time. But his support of the Powell Commission, which would set up two standards in this country for attorneys, one for the rich and one for the poor, is something that I could not accept and I suspect that most of this country could not accept.

Under the Powell Commission recommendation, if in fact you will not accept the reforms of habeas corpus—and we do have to reform habeas corpus because it is in shambles and it is disgraceful that we have so many bites of the apple. I mean they keep going up, back and forth, for 15, 16, 17 years, rehashing, in many instances, nothing new. That is an abuse of the system.

We do need to reform it. But when we do, it seems to me we need to preserve a system that will in fact reach those situations where we have potentially innocent defendants. And the Derrick amendment would create a 1-year statute of limitations and it would provide competent counsel.

I say to my colleagues that one of the problems we have in the criminal justice system with capital cases is during that 15-year period of time, 50 percent of the capital cases in this country are thrown out because of incompetent counsel. That is not saving taxpayers' money, that is not good criminal justice.

My colleagues on this side of the aisle would create a dual system of justice in this country, exactly what we do not need. It is a good bill. It does not have everything that I would want in it, but I think it is probably one of the best comprehensive bills we have reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary in many a year, and I am proud to support it, and I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

□ 1720

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], who is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge a "no" vote on this rule. I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] that crime is an important issue for the country. It is probably the most important issue for our people right now. I have to say that I do not share his confidence that the Clinton administration has really a top priority of getting tough on crime. I know that has been the rhetoric, but I would point to the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the administration recommended in the Department of Justice budget for the next fiscal year a reduction in the number of employees employed in the criminal division and a reduction of the number of criminal prosecutors out in the U.S. attorneys offices. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, they recommended an increase in the number of antitrust personnel at the Department of Justice. Now I have nothing against the antitrust division, but I would point out that, when President Clinton gave the State of the Union Address, he did not say the American people were afraid of being mugged by a bunch of antitrust violators.

Mr. Speaker, what this rule comes down to right now is what is the importance of a bill that will address, or that hopes to address, the most important issue before the American people, which is crime?

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] very correctly, in my opinion,

cited H.R. 6, an education policy bill which we had on the floor of the House of Representatives for a number of weeks in which we had an open rule, which means, of course, that any Member could offer an amendment whenever they wished. I ask, "Isn't the fight against crime at least equal to our education policy?" I would suggest that it is even more important because we cannot educate our children, we cannot be more productive in the workplace if we are not safe to send our children to school in safety, to go to work in safety and to even be in our homes in safety.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of this rule and in place of it a rule that will respect the request of dozens of Democrats and dozens of Republicans who seek to offer amendments to this bill to debate it to its fullest extent to produce a truly concrete and effective bill against crime.

I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for having yielded this time to me.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOAGLAND].

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly urge passage of this comprehensive crime bill as soon as possible. Violence is on the rise across this country and the battle against it will take nothing short of a historic response from this Congress.

Imagine, if my colleagues will, a country where more than 23,000 people died violent deaths in 1992. Imagine a country where gunfire is a daily occurrence in many neighborhoods and where it is not safe to walk to the grocery store or run some other simple errand after dark. Imagine a nation where a woman is raped every 47 seconds and where gunfire could soon overtake car accidents as one of the leading causes of death of young people. That country is not Bosnia, or Somalia—that country is the United States of America.

In eastern Nebraska, we have seen an alarming rise in the number of violent crimes. Just last month, a 94-year-old woman was brutally attacked and robbed as she walked home from the neighborhood drug store in an area that one would normally consider safe. What are we coming too?

One of the most troubling things about rising violence is that the character of crime is changing. First, younger and younger kids are committing violent crimes. Over the past decade the number of juveniles arrested for murder increased 142 percent. Second, juvenile criminals commit crimes that are often more impulsive and random. Random violence heightens our sense of vulnerability. Third, the widespread availability of handguns is allowing violent criminals to strike with increasing ferocity.

This crime bill will help give communities like Omaha the tools we need to fight crime and get violent criminals off the streets. Let us pass it quickly.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chief deputy whip of the minority party, the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for having yielded this time to me, and the debate about this rule comes down to a question of why not allow amendments to be debated on the House floor? The answer to that is clear. The reason why we are not having amendments debated on the House floor is because of the internal politics of the Democratic caucus.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats cannot allow certain amendments to come to the floor or they will lose people within their own caucus for final passage of this bill, and so what they have done is they have gone inside themselves and they have produced a rule that ensures that tough amendments cannot come to the floor. What they want to be able to do is talk tough and act weak.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, what we have on this floor is a lot of tough talk and one of the weakest bills that one could possibly imagine. This is a bill that will make thugs and thieves very happy. Why will it make thugs and thieves very happy? Because it does not just preserve the status quo. That it does is actually weakens present law. It ensures that we will probably never be able to carry out death penalty provisions. It ensures that more technicalities will be in the law for people to get off. Yet it simply ensures that thugs and thieves across this country will find in the Federal law more respite than they have in the past.

What is it that our middle class citizens have been saying? What has the middle class citizenry across the country been saying about crime? I say to my colleagues:

"If you're walking across a parking lot late at night in a shopping center, and you're afraid, most of middle class America is not saying, 'What that thug that I think may come at me needs is a little more welfare,' and yet what the Democrats have on the floor today is a bill that expand welfare to criminals. If you're walking downtown, and you see a glass window being broken, most of middle class America doesn't say, 'What that thief needs is a good midnight basketball league.' Most of middle class America says at that point, 'It's time to get those guys and put them behind bars to stay.' If you're locked behind the door of your apartment or your house afraid to come out at night, and you're a middle class citizen, you're not saying, 'What that thug needs out there in the night, wants and needs, is a new social worker.'"

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that what middle class America wants is thieves

behind bars. They want to get career criminals off the streets. They want violent young thugs in our society treated as adult criminals. They want us to begin to do the things that are necessary to clean up crime in the country.

We need to consider a serious crime bill on this floor that has tough language in it. The Democrats in their committees cannot produce that kind of bill. They will not even allow us to try to produce that kind of bill with votes on the House floor because it does not fit their internal political situation.

That is the shame of where we are in the Congress today. Legitimate amendments that allow middle class Americans to get what they want in a crime bill simply will not be allowed to be debated on the floor here this afternoon.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we can defeat this rule and come back with a bill that will allow middle class America to have the tough crime bill it wants.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I have been listening to the kinds of conversation that I heard from our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], for 19 omnibus crime bills. "Make 'em tougher and tougher."

Mr. Speaker, here is what the gentleman calls a weak crime bill. It has 66 death penalties; count them.

I rise here merely to support this rule, Mr. Speaker, even though it has got too much punishment in it and not enough prevention, a novel idea to those who are trying to sound tough and get reelected, but I want to quote a letter from the Conference of Mayors sent to me by Mayor Dennis Archer in Detroit from Mayor Wellington E. Webb in Denver and Mayor Sharpe James in New Jersey, and it talks about the Racial Justice Act which may be eviscerated if we are not diligent on this floor in the coming week. Here is what they say:

We believe that both supporters and opponents of the death penalty will agree that these racial disparities in the imposition of the death penalty deny African-Americans equal protection under the 14th Amendment in the Constitution. The Racial Justice Act specifies a procedure for defendants to offer evidence.

And I hope that that is carefully supported by Members of both sides of the aisle.

The letter in its entirety is as follows:

CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER,
Denver, CO, March 31, 1994.

Hon. KWEISI MFUME,
Chairman, Congressional Black Caucus, 2419
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We write in support of H.R. 4092, the Violent Crime Control and

Law Enforcement Act of 1994, the Crime Bill that is currently before the House.

We are very concerned about violent crime, and feel that there is an urgent need for a multifaceted strategy to combat it. We are pleased with President Clinton's advocacy of federal funding to put 100,000 more police on our streets, a federal ban on assault weapons, and federal funding for constructive intervention for young offenders. This has alerted the entire nation to the need for bold new partnerships involving all levels of government and citizens to rebuild communities and families.

We wish to support your efforts to blend the need for certain and severe punishment for today's most serious offenders with the need for compassion and community-building to provide potential offenders with alternatives, opportunity, and hope.

Accordingly, there are several provisions in this bill which we believe to be critical to achieving some measure of parity between punishment and prevention by addressing the root causes of crime alongside of the need to sound tough.

First of all, we strongly support the \$6.8 billion in crime prevention measures contained in Title X of H.R. 4092. For the first time in the history of omnibus crime bills, there is an opportunity to include a comprehensive legislative package directed at preventing crime in our communities from which our cities will greatly benefit.

Second, we strongly support the inclusion of the Racial Justice Act in H.R. 4092. The Racial Justice Act is a crucial civil rights measure which would help eliminate racial considerations from improperly influencing the decision to impose the death penalty.

Study after study has documented racial bias resulting from abuse of prosecutorial discretion in charging, plea bargaining and sentencing. In Georgia, for instance, a study showed that African Americans who kill white people received the death penalty 16.7 percent of the time while whites who kill whites are sentenced to die only 4.2 percent of the time. Seven of nine people executed in the Middle Judicial District of Georgia were black, and 71 percent of those executed in Alabama were black.

We believe that both supporters and opponents of the death penalty will agree that these racial disparities deny African Americans "equal protection" under the Fourteenth Amendment. The Racial Justice Act specifies a procedure for defendants to offer evidence in court, including statistical evidence, in support of their claim of racial bias in death penalty decisionmaking. Given that the Crime Bill includes 66 new death penalty crimes, it is critical that the Racial Justice Act be included at this time.

We understand that efforts will be made during the debate of the House of Representatives in April to delete, or seriously modify, both the Prevention Package (Title X) and the Racial Justice Act (Title IX). We urge you to oppose these efforts so that H.R. 4092 can be passed quickly, thereby enabling the Senate and House conference to promptly complete Congressional consideration of significant crime legislation.

Sincerely,

WELLINGTON E. WEBB,
Mayor, Denver, CO,
Chair, U.S. Conference of
Mayors Task Force on Violence.

SHARPE JAMES,
Mayor, Newark, NJ.

DENNIS ARCHER,
Mayor, Detroit, MI.

□ 1730

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

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

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

This past Christmas, four bombs exploded in western New York killing five people.

The individuals responsible for these heinous acts were able to purchase these explosives because of a loophole in Federal explosives law, a loophole that allows anyone to walk in and purchase explosives with any valid ID. A loophole that could be closed today by an amendment I have to offer. But sadly, that's not going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment is supported by the Institute of Makers of Explosives, National Rifle Association, and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. The amendment is based on legislation I had already introduced which bipartisan support. My amendment would require a Federal permit for certain explosives transactions and require a photograph and fingerprints to be taken when applying for a Federal permit.

I offered my amendment and testified before the Rules Committee. However, my amendment was not made in order.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is not controversial. What it does is save lives. Why can't we have a vote on my amendment?

My New York colleague, the distinguished gentleman, Mrs. SLAUGHTER, a member of the Rules Committee, has her own explosives amendment, but it is different from mine. I have no objections to her amendment and I plan to vote for it. However, her amendment does not close the loophole that allowed this terrible tragedy in western New York. There were over 47,000 transactions in 1993 that used this loophole, involving 693 million pounds of explosives.

How many of these transactions are another tragedy waiting to happen—and where will they happen? How many more people must be killed or hurt?

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule. This was a horrible tragedy in my district—and it could happen in any one of yours. Vote for your constituents today and defeat the rule—or—vote for more business and usual in Washington. The choice is yours.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4092 OFFERED BY MR. QUINN OF NEW YORK

At the end insert the following:

TITLE —EXPLOSIVES

SEC. . CONTROL OF RESTRICTED EXPLOSIVES.

(a) PROHIBITION AGAINST THE DISTRIBUTION OR RECEIPT OF RESTRICTED EXPLOSIVES WITHOUT A FEDERAL PERMIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 842 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting "that are not restricted explosives" after "explosive materials" the 2nd place such term appears; and

(II) by striking "or" after the semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

"(B) to distribute restricted explosives to any person other than a licensee or permittee; or"; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), by inserting "that are not restricted explosives" after "explosive materials"; and

(B) in subsection (b)(3), by inserting "if the explosive materials are not restricted explosives," before "a resident".

(2) RESTRICTED EXPLOSIVES DEFINED.—Section 841 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(o) 'Restricted explosive' means high explosives, blasting agents, detonators, and more than 50 pounds of black powder."

(b) REQUIREMENT THAT APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL EXPLOSIVES LICENSE OR PERMIT INCLUDE A PHOTOGRAPH AND SET OF FINGERPRINTS OF THE APPLICANT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 843(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the 1st sentence by inserting "shall include the applicant's photograph and set of fingerprints, which shall be taken and transmitted to the Secretary by the chief law enforcement officer of the applicant's place of residence, and" before "shall be".

(2) CHIEF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER DEFINED.—Section 841 of such title, as amended by subsection (a)(2) of this section, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(p) 'Chief law enforcement officer' means the chief of police, the sheriff, or an equivalent officer or the designee of any such individual."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to conduct engaged in after the 180-day period that begins with the date of the enactment of this Act.

INSTITUTE OF MAKERS OF EXPLOSIVES,
Washington, DC, March 18, 1994.

Hon. JACK QUINN,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUINN: Reference is made to your letter dated March 17, 1994 requesting comments on legislation you propose to introduce that would: (a) prohibit the distribution or receipt of "restricted explosives" without a federal permit, and; (b) require federal permit applications to include photograph and fingerprints.

As discussed during meetings with your staff, IME has recognized the need to strengthening existing federal regulations for many years. The loophole in current regulations that allowed the purchase of the explosives used in a wave of bombings in your district during late December 1993 needs to be eliminated and the permit application process for individuals needs to be strengthened.

Your proposed legislation addresses both issues and the Institute of Makers of Explosives therefore supports the legislation you will introduce next week.

It has been a pleasure working with your office. I have been particularly impressed with the time and effort Earl Whipple and Beth Meyers have devoted to this issue which allowed IME to voice its positions. Be assured IME is prepared to discuss matters involving commercial explosives at any time.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK P. SMITH, Jr.,
President.

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION,
OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, March 22, 1994.

Hon. JACK QUINN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thank you for your letter of March 18, 1994 requesting

my comments on your draft legislation entitled "Restricted Explosives Control Act of 1994".

I appreciated having the opportunity of working with your Legislative Director, Earl Whipple, in addressing the concerns that the National Rifle Association had with the original bill as introduced. I am pleased that the new draft has resolved our concerns.

Again, I appreciate having had the opportunity to work with your staff on an issue of particular importance to you and your congressional district.

Sincerely,

SUSAN LAMSON,
Director, Federal Affairs.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to another very distinguished Member, the gentleman from greater San Dimas, Claremont, CA, [Mr. DREIER] the well-known, hard-charging reformer and a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Sanibel, FL, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it comes as no surprise that I rise in strong opposition to this rule, for more than a few reasons.

As we all know, the desire to bring about a tough crime bill is what everyone says we want. But if we end up getting this rule, and if we end up passing the crime bill that is before us, we will be getting a crime bill that is weaker than the status quo. So the choice is a very simple one. Do we want a tough crime bill that is actually going to demonstrate more concern for the victim than the criminal, or do we want a crime packet that is going to demonstrate more concern for the criminal than the victim? That is really the choice we have here.

Any Member who chooses to vote in support of this rule is voting to deny an opportunity for what President Clinton calls frivolous amendments, but let me tell the Members what a couple of those amendments are. Anyone who votes for this rule is voting to deny the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], an opportunity to offer his amendment which would specifically track and target criminals who are illegal immigrants. That is a major problem in my State of California, in the State of Florida, and, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] said, even in the State of New York.

If we vote in support of this rule, we are voting to deny the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] his right to offer an amendment to put \$4 billion into increasing the number of prisons instead of using that money to float questionable crime prevention programs.

If we vote in favor of this rule, we are voting to deny the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] an opportunity to offer what the President described as a frivolous amendment, although I think it is something other than that, an amendment to increase penalties for violent sex offenders; and Mr. MCCOLLUM's amendment that would address the issue of those who prey upon children and senior citizens.

If we vote for this rule, we are voting against the opportunity of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] to offer his amendment which would deny Federal welfare benefits to convicted violent criminals.

If we vote in favor of this rule, we are voting against the opportunity for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] to offer his amendment which would close a loophole in the law covering drive-by shootings which now allow those to step out of their car, and get in a shooting, and then jump back in and speed away. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] simply wants to close that loophole, and this rule does not allow that.

Unfortunately, this rule is very unfair. It is going to, in fact, strengthen the criminal's status in this country, and we need to do everything we possibly can to defeat the rule and bring about a tough crime package.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to close on our side.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on our side to the minority whip, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], to close debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding time to me.

Let me just say that I was doing some reading recently about a safer America, and I ran across a fascinating story.

In 1933, there was an effort to assassinate President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the assassin missed and he killed Mayor Cermak of Chicago who was standing next to the President. The assassin was arrested; there were eye witnesses. The assassin was tried, and less than 35 days after the assassination, the assassin was given the death penalty and he was executed so that people in America who had seen the horror of Mayor Cermak being killed could remember, 35 days later, why the man was being executed.

Mr. Speaker, in Georgia 2 weeks ago, we had a man executed for a terrible murder, a man executed after a long period of appeals. That murder occurred 16 years ago. Sixteen years. It took 192 times as long, 19,200 percent more time, because of all the appeals the criminal defense lawyers have built into the system over the years. What I find sad about this rule is that the Democratic machine after 40 years is still protecting the criminal defense lawyers. For 40 years the Democrats have run the House, it has gotten harder and harder to have an effective death penalty, for 40 years.

The Democrat machine came in again; they refused to make amendments in order; they refused to give

people a fair chance at creating a tough bill; they drafted the bill in the Committee on the Judiciary in favor of criminal defense lawyers. It is the first time I have ever heard where they, the Democrats, are now going to require the States to hire two, two criminal lawyers for every death penalty, two, in order to make sure that everything is done to protect the person convicted of murder.

So let me just say, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote against the machine, vote against this rule. Vote "no."

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, we are at a historic moment here today. For the first time, Congress is making crime fighting a top priority. We have a real consensus on both sides of the aisle that a major crime bill is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is overdue. We have let crime and lawlessness fester to the point where a frustrated public is ready to endorse the brutal caning in Singapore.

This bill is balanced. It has tough measures, like "three strikes and you're out" and money to build prisons to ensure that violent criminals are put behind bars.

Mr. Speaker, it also has the most ambitious and comprehensive crime prevention programs in history. Tough sentences and prison cells are very important, but not enough. We also have to help young people at the crossroads to choose honest and productive lives rather than gangs and crime.

More important, the bill will put 50,000 more police officers on the street doing community policing. Beat cops both punish and prevent.

The long and short, Mr. Speaker, is we are deluged in this Nation anywhere we go with crime and the concomitant fear. We can argue the procedural points. We can debate and debate and debate. The public is saying, "Stop all that and do something." This bill finally does.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has expired.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 2 minutes to close debate.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, we can talk about this rule as not being fair, but there were 107 amendments that were not made in order. Five of them were bipartisan, 53 of them were Democrats, and 49 of them were Republican amendments. This is a very fair rule and it deals with what the American people want to deal with—the crime issue.

Mr. Speaker, the example that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH]

gave, my amendment will take care of that, because what it says is that you see these people that are on death row for years and years and years and years, and their sentence is never carried out. My amendment says: One year, they have one petition, and it must be done by a capable attorney.

"Three strikes and you're out." Three violent crimes and the criminal is in there for the rest of his life. I cannot understand what is going on in this country. I see these people standing up here talking about crime. Yet they are not willing to do away with assault weapons. They are not willing to do away with those guns that are used to mow down people, those guns that are killing people in this country.

Every day I hear people stand up and talk about crime. They are concerned about crime, but they are not willing to go for a 5-day waiting period to have a handgun. I hear people stand up here and say they are concerned about crime, but they are not willing to fight the lobbies who are for guns in this country and are fueling many of the campaigns in this country. So it really does not make a whole lot of sense.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It deals with what the American people want to deal with. The rule is fair, and I ask that the Members support the rule.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will finally begin debate on anticrime legislation. President Clinton and House Democrats have been talking tough on crime. However, H.R. 4092, the crime legislation being championed by the House Democrat leadership, is weak on substance and strong on misdirected spending programs.

As currently drafted, H.R. 4092 will do little to strengthen our criminal justice system—crime will not go down and the law-abiding citizens of Arizona and the rest of the Nation will be robbed of the opportunity to reclaim their streets and communities from criminals.

Members should have the opportunity to vote for tough criminal justice reforms, but the Democrat-controlled House Rules Committee has twice refused to allow floor consideration of amendments to strengthen our criminal justice system. In his radio address this weekend, President Clinton called these necessary amendments frivolous. This, from a President who has not drafted a single line of the crime bill we are debating today.

I was the author of one of these supposedly frivolous amendments, rejected by the Rules Committee on a straight party-line vote, 3 to 4. My amendment, which includes most of the provisions of the Sexual Assault Prevention Act introduced last year by Representative SUSAN MOLINARI and I, would significantly expand and toughen sexual violence laws and increase the rights of the victims of these crimes. As drafted, H.R. 4092 will not bring about these needed changes.

My amendment would, among other provisions: Double the maximum penalty for recidivists convicted of sexual assaults; require HIV testing of accused sex offenders (results inadmissible at trial); provide for pretrial detention

of the accused; suspend Federal benefits to offenders who refuse to comply with restitution obligations; protect victims from abuse in legal proceedings; and, make admissible at trial evidence of similar crimes of the accused.

Allowing for evidence of similar crimes of the accused at trial is particularly important. It would go a long way toward neutralizing the psychological damage a rape victim often experiences going through the judicial process. It is common in rape and child molestation cases that the victim is too traumatized, intimidated or humiliated to file a complaint and go through the full procedure of a criminal prosecution. However, the victims in such cases are often willing to bear the burden of testifying when they find out that the person who marred their lives has also victimized others.

As the cochair of the Republican Policy Committee Task Force on Women's Issues, I have held a number of hearings dealing with sexual violence. At those hearings, witnesses testified that the most important thing we can do to protect and empower citizens from sexual and domestic violence is by restructuring our criminal justice system, including increasing penalties for offenders.

Paul McNulty, former director of policy at the Department of Justice, said at one of the hearings,

Given what we know about the recidivist nature of sex offenders, you might think that the criminal justice system does all that it can to keep them in prison. Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the truth. The majority of those who are arrested for rape are not sentenced to prison. Only 33 percent of all such arrestees go to prison. For those who are sent to prison, only a fraction of their sentences are actually served. * * * It is, therefore, quite clear that the most effective way to prevent sexual assault is to punish violent criminals by removing them from the streets. * * * That is why we strongly endorse H.R. 688 * * * (the Kyl bill). * * * As former Attorney General William Barr stated last year when discussing this bill, 'It brings criminals to justice and justice to victims.'

My sexual assault amendment is an extremely important component of our efforts to combat crime, particularly violence against women and children. The Congress should have the opportunity to pass the Sexual Assault Prevention Act in its entirety as part of comprehensive crime legislation. The Democrat-controlled House Rules Committee has made this impossible. For this, and a myriad of other reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule to H.R. 4092.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule which we are considering today. I do so because Congress, which should be the greatest forum for debate in the world, is shutting out the voices of millions of Americans.

The House Democratic leadership, with passage of this rule, is not only shutting out the voices of 91 Congressmen who wanted to offer amendments, but the millions of constituents which are represented by them. Almost a quarter of this entire body is being gagged and ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to amendments which would increase minimum mandatory sentences for criminals, including those that use or possess firearms in the commission of

the crime. I'm referring to transferring half of the \$8 million that the crime bill authorizes for social programs, termed crime prevention, to the violent repeat offender title.

Nor does this rule allow for this Congress to resolve the serious problems which have resulted from the fact that 25 percent of our prison population consists of illegal aliens.

Even more pertinent, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that an amendment which would establish the violent crime reduction trust fund, which would ensure that the programs which we enact in this bill are properly financed without raising taxes or cutting other programs, is not considered germane by this rule.

We have all heard the cries from the American public. We, as Congress, are here to serve as their voice. The true fraud being committed today, is not being done by the hundreds of thousands of criminals, but right here by this rule. I urge my fellow Members to oppose this rule.

□ 1740

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 176, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—244

Abercrombie	Condit	Furse
Ackerman	Conyers	Gejdenson
Andrews (ME)	Coppersmith	Gephardt
Andrews (TX)	Costello	Geren
Applegate	Coyne	Gibbons
Baesler	Cramer	Glickman
Barca	Danner	Gonzalez
Barcia	Darden	Gordon
Barlow	de la Garza	Green
Barrett (WI)	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Becerra	DeLauro	Hall (OH)
Bellenson	Dellums	Hall (TX)
Berman	Derrick	Hamburg
Bevill	Deutsch	Hamilton
Bilbray	Dicks	Harman
Bishop	Dingell	Hastings
Bonior	Dixon	Hefner
Borski	Dooley	Hilliard
Boucher	Durbin	Hinchev
Brewster	Edwards (CA)	Hoagland
Brooks	Edwards (TX)	Hochbrueckner
Browder	Engel	Holden
Brown (CA)	English	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Hughes
Brown (OH)	Evans	Hutto
Bryant	Farr	Inslie
Cantwell	Fazio	Jacobs
Cardin	Fields (LA)	Jefferson
Carr	Filner	Johnson (GA)
Chapman	Fingerhut	Johnson (SD)
Clay	Flake	Johnson, E. B.
Clayton	Foglietta	Johnston
Clement	Ford (MI)	Kanjorski
Clyburn	Ford (TN)	Kaptur
Coleman	Frank (MA)	Kennedy
Collins (MI)	Frost	Kennelly

Kildee	Murtha	Sisisky
Kiecaska	Nadler	Skaggs
Klein	Neal (MA)	Skelton
Klink	Neal (NC)	Slattery
Kopetski	Oberstar	Slaughter
Kreidler	Obey	Smith (IA)
LaFalce	Oliver	Spratt
Lambert	Ortiz	Stark
Lancaster	Owens	Stenholm
Lantos	Pallone	Stokes
LaRocco	Parker	Strickland
Laughlin	Fastor	Studds
Lehman	Payne (NJ)	Stupak
Levin	Payne (VA)	Swett
Lewis (GA)	Pelosi	Swift
Lipinski	Penny	Synar
Lloyd	Peterson (FL)	Tauzin
Long	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (MS)
Lowey	Pickett	Tejeda
Maloney	Pickle	Thompson
Mann	Pomeroy	Thornton
Manton	Poshard	Thurman
Margolies-	Price (NC)	Torres
Mezvinsky	Rahall	Torricelli
Markey	Rangel	Towns
Martinez	Reed	Trafficant
Matsui	Reynolds	Tucker
Mazzoli	Richardson	Unsoeld
McCloskey	Roemer	Valentine
McDermott	Rose	Velázquez
McHale	Rostenkowski	Vento
McKinney	Rowland	Visclosky
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Volkmer
Meehan	Rush	Washington
Meek	Sabo	Waters
Menendez	Sanders	Watt
Mfume	Sangmeister	Waxman
Miller (CA)	Sarpaluis	Wheat
Mineta	Sawyer	Whitten
Minge	Schenk	Williams
Mink	Schroeder	Wise
Moakley	Schumer	Woolsey
Mollohan	Scott	Wyden
Montgomery	Serrano	Wynn
Moran	Sharp	Yates
Murphy	Shepherd	

NAYS—176

Allard	Ehlers	Kolbe
Archer	Emerson	Kyl
Armey	Everett	Lazio
Bachus (AL)	Ewing	Leach
Baker (CA)	Fawell	Levy
Baker (LA)	Fields (TX)	Lewis (CA)
Ballenger	Fowler	Lewis (FL)
Barrett (NE)	Franks (CT)	Lightfoot
Bartlett	Franks (NJ)	Linder
Barton	Galleghy	Livingston
Bateman	Gekas	Machtley
Bentley	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Bereuter	Gillmor	McCollum
Bilirakis	Gilman	McCrary
Bliley	Gingrich	McDade
Blute	Goodlatte	McHugh
Boehliert	Goodling	McInnis
Boehner	Goss	McKeon
Bonilla	Grams	McMillan
Bunning	Greenwood	Meyers
Burton	Gunderson	Mica
Buyer	Hancock	Michel
Byrne	Hansen	Miller (FL)
Callahan	Hastert	Molinari
Calvert	Hayes	Moorhead
Camp	Hefley	Morella
Canady	Heger	Myers
Castle	Hobson	Nussle
Clinger	Hoekstra	Orton
Coble	Hoke	Oxley
Collins (GA)	Horn	Packard
Collins (IL)	Houghton	Paxon
Combest	Huffington	Petri
Cooper	Hunter	Pombo
Cox	Hutchinson	Porter
Crane	Hyde	Portman
Crapo	Inglis	Pryce (OH)
Cunningham	Inhofe	Quillen
Deal	Istook	Quinn
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Ramstad
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Ravenel
Dickey	Kasich	Regula
Doollittle	Kim	Ridge
Dornan	King	Roberts
Dreier	Kingston	Rogers
Duncan	Klug	Rohrabacher
Dunn	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen

Roth	Smith (NJ)	Torkildsen
Royce	Smith (TX)	Upton
Santorum	Snowe	Vucanovich
Saxton	Solomon	Walker
Schaefer	Spence	Walsh
Schiff	Stearns	Weldon
Sensenbrenner	Stump	Wolf
Shaw	Sundquist	Young (AK)
Shays	Talent	Young (FL)
Shuster	Taylor (NC)	Zeliff
Skeen	Thomas (CA)	Zimmer
Smith (MI)	Thomas (WY)	

NOT VOTING—12

Andrews (NJ)	Gallo	Roukema
Bacchus (FL)	Grandy	Smith (OR)
Blackwell	McCandless	Tanner
Fish	McCurdy	Wilson

□ 1801

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Bacchus of Florida for, with Mrs. Roukema 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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, due to urgent family business, I was absent from the House on April 13, and was unable to cast the following votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall 98, approving the Journal: "nay."
 Rollcall 99, to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3770, Edward J. Schwartz Courthouse: "yea."

Rollcall 100, to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3498, Great Falls Historic District: "yea."

Rollcall 101, to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2843, Wheeling National Heritage Area: "nay."

Rollcall 102, to suspend the rules and pass S. 2004, Exempting historically black colleges: "nay."

Rollcall 103, to agreeing to House Resolution 401, rule for consideration of H.R. 4092: "nay."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 401, the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JAMES H. BILBRAY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JAMES H. BILBRAY, Member of Congress:

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to inform you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House, that I was served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina.

After consultation with the General Counsel, it was determined that compliance was consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. BILBRAY,
Member of Congress.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 965, CHILD SAFETY PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 965) to provide for toy safety and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Messrs. TOWNS, MOORHEAD, and STEARNS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, for consideration of sections 201-03, 205 and 206 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MINETA, OBERSTAR, RAHALL, SHUSTER, and PETRI.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2659, ORGAN AND BONE MARROW TRANSPLANTATION AMENDMENTS OF 1993

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2659) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs relating to the transplantation of organs and of bone marrow, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DINGELL, WAXMAN, WASHINGTON, MOORHEAD, and BLILEY.

There was no objection.

DEFICIENCIES IN CHILD CARE PROGRAMS

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, a Carnegie Foundation report has just been released which documents the tragic vulnerabilities and problems of the Nation's most vulnerable citizens—its infants and toddlers. That report, subject to intense discussion here in Washington, DC, the last several days, rightly focuses on very serious deficiencies in child care programs. Additionally, however, its condemnation of inadequate parenting by parents who are ill-prepared for parental responsibility must also be highlighted.

We as a nation and this Congress must recognize that the huge number and rate of increase in illegitimate births, especially with so many children and teenagers having children, is the largest contributing factor for the tragedy among America's children. Mr. Speaker, it is time to boldly remind the bleeding heart liberals in this Congress, whose hearts are in the right place, but who apparently lack common sense or resolve, that their unwillingness to move forward on effective and yet humane changes in our welfare system contributes mightily to the problems of our Nation's infants and children. Currently our welfare system encourages illegitimate births with all the attendant problems. These problems are only magnified as these children, suffering from neglect and abuse, themselves become adults on our welfare rolls, populate our prisons, suffer the physical and mental problems from inadequate childhood nutrition, and, all too frequently, perpetuate another generational cycle of child neglect.

Yet the leadership in this Congress and the party that controls this Congress can't manage to give welfare reform a sufficient priority to pass effective legislation this year. That's outrageous, and people in this country know that the excuses being offered for the lack of action on welfare reform ring hollow. Many Republicans and Democrats in this Congress want to act to reform our welfare system, and are willing to vote for the substantial upfront costs for job training and child care benefits if they are coupled with effective, no-nonsense, work-incentive welfare reform.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of America's youngest children, it is well past time for this Congress to enact meaningful welfare reform—with or without

any leadership from the White House—for we are still waiting for that long-promised Clinton welfare reform plan.

Mr. Speaker, this Member invites the attention of his colleagues to the following editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of April 13, 1994:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Apr. 13, 1994]

IT'S SAD TO TRUST BUREAUCRATS OVER FAMILIES

Another voice has joined the chorus of alarm about America's next generation. The Carnegie Corporation, a philanthropic organization, came out with a report on the problems facing the nation's youth.

Carnegie's list of concerns is similar to many others—illegitimate births, teen-age pregnancies, abuse, divorce and poverty, which is often a consequence of other problems.

More than 25 percent of babies are born to unmarried women, the study noted. About every minute, an American adolescent gives birth. One in three victims of physical abuse is a baby. Almost 25 percent of infants and toddlers live in poverty households. Children in single-parent households are more likely to have behavioral and emotional problems than those in two-parent households.

Millions of youngsters are so deprived of loving supervision, intellectual stimulation and proper health care that their development as healthy and well-adjusted adults is in question, the report said.

Carnegie demonstrated a depressingly familiar point: Defining the problem is relatively easy, while proposing a solution that makes sense at all levels is difficult. Carnegie's answer is programs—everything from government-provided "quality child care" to parent education and a vastly expanded federal system of preschools. Unfortunately, programs have been tried. The problem has grown worse in recent years even as the availability of subsidized child care and Head Start, among many other parent-substitute programs, has increased dramatically.

As the welfare state has become more generous, many people have displayed less responsibility in the decisions they make, the mates they select, the children they create, the expectations they have of what the world owes them. They become more dependent on outside solutions, reaching less into themselves.

Yes, far too many kids are growing up without a blessing their parents and grandparents took for granted: two married parents who built a stable life together for themselves and their children. Too many youngsters are growing up intellectually impaired because their teen-aged parent, barely out of childhood herself, doesn't know how to or simply can't afford to provide a secure, stable home in which a child can get a healthy start.

But surely the best solution isn't to create more dependence on government. Generations of parents, relying on instinct and tradition, have equipped their young for success, often with the help of extended family and of neighborhood, tribal, religious or social institutions. What a sad thing it would be to surrender to the idea that the human species has lost its ability to care for its young. What a sad thing to reach the point where bureaucrats would be trusted to carry out the responsibilities that once belonged to families.

THE CRIME BILL

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow as we begin the very important debate on a very important bill in Congress, there is an amendment that I plan to support and I urge my colleagues to support, and that is the one offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM]. His amendment actually has different components to it, but I wanted to touch on just a few of them.

One of them is that it gives States Federal funds if they adopt truth-in-sentencing laws, and part of the truth-in-sentencing requirement is that violent criminals serve at least 85 percent of their sentence. What truth-in-sentencing laws are all about is they are trying to get to this revolving door problem we are having in prisons right now. Currently the average criminal only serves 37 percent of the time that he or she is sentenced for, and under the McCollum amendment States that adopt truth-in-sentencing laws would have to require that the criminals serve 85 percent of their time.

If we think in terms of bringing us down to a human element, I have a constituent right now who had a daughter who was raped, very tragic. She was at home. She was watching her infant child at the time, 10 o'clock in the morning, and the rapist broke into her house, threatened to hurt or possibly kill the baby unless the mama cooperated. Well she did cooperate.

Fortunately, I guess, he was caught. Unfortunately, before he was caught he had raped somebody else.

The average rapist, according to some statistics, is sentenced for 8 years and serves only 3. That rapist is then back on the streets and will be back on the streets. How would my colleagues like to be the mother, how would they like to be the father, how would they like to be the grandparents or the child?

□ 1810

This is what we are talking about. We are talking about violent criminals going back on the street. We are also debating this three strikes and you are out. There are no strikes. We are talking victims. What we are saying is three victims and then you go to jail for a long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is if we on the very first offense have truth in sentencing, the likelihood of these criminals being back out on the street to commit violent crimes has greatly been reduced, because we are protected from them, because they are isolated from us, safely behind bars.

Now, another component of the McCollum amendments is to allow the victims or the victims' families to

make a statement at the time of sentencing. I think that is important, because what we are talking about, what we are becoming is a nation of victims, and we need to know what it is like to come home and find out your loved one will never be home because he or she was murdered.

Or what does a rape do to a family situation? We had in the neighborhood that I live in several years ago, or, excuse me, a town that I represent, a newlywed couple, and actually they had not gotten married, they were engaged. They were picking out furniture and rearranging their new apartment, and the woman was at home alone, and she thought the moving men were coming in, and it turned out a rapist came in. A rapist came in and raped her right there 2 weeks before her wedding day.

Would it not be fair to give her and her family and people like that in those situations an opportunity to make a statement at the time of sentencing? Can we not bring the element of victim's rights into the formula?

Because we in Congress often, so often, debate compassion, and I heard one speaker today talk about the moral side of an issue. Well, let us go all the way. If we are going to be compassionate, if we are going to worry about the moral side, let us give the victims an opportunity to make a statement.

I think because of that, Mr. Speaker, the McCollum amendments are certainly proper, and they make the crime bill a better bill, which is what we want to do.

I think that it is important that we as a Congress work on crime in a bipartisan fashion. As I sat here and I listened to the debates over the last 8 hours, everybody wants to have a tough crime bill, everybody, 435 Members of both parties, of all philosophies, of all sections of the country.

That being the case, let us give these amendments a full hearing, a good debate tomorrow, and then let us put aside partisan labels and vote for amendments based on the substance and not on the party or the author.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FISH (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today and the balance of the week, on account of recuperation due to recent surgery.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, 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 Mr. PORTMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. CASTLE.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. BONILLA.

Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. DORNAN.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. REED.

Ms. NORTON in two instances.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. CONDIT.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.

Mr. SWETT.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. LANCASTER.

Mr. HALL of Texas.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. RUSH.

Mr. HUTTO.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. KOPETSKI.

Mr. DICKS.

Mr. BORSKI.

Mr. TEJEDA.

Mr. MORAN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 859. An act to reduce the restrictions on lands conveyed by deed under the Act of June 8, 1926; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 1586. An act to establish the New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park in the

State of Louisiana; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1206. An act to redesignate the Federal building located at 380 Trapelo Road in Waltham, Massachusetts, as the "Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center."

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 14, 1994, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2928. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Communications, Computers and Support Systems), Department of the Air Force, transmitting notice that the Air Force has conducted a cost comparison of grounds maintenance functions at Ellsworth Air Force Base, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2929. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Communications, Computers and Support Systems), Department of the Air Force, transmitting notice that the Air Force has conducted a cost comparison of the military family housing maintenance functions at Langley Air Force Base, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2930. A letter from the Director, Test and Evaluation, Department of Defense, transmitting summaries outlining two test projects recommended for fiscal year 1994 funding, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2931. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary (Acquisition and Technology), Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report detailing test and evaluation activities of the Foreign Comparative Testing [FCT] Program during fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2932. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled "Adequacy of the United States Shipbuilding Industry," pursuant to Public Law 102-484, section 1031(e) (106 Stat. 2489); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2933. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report on enforcement actions for the period of January 1, 1993, through December 31, 1993, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1833; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2934. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office of Thrift Supervision's 1993 annual report to Congress on the preservation of minority savings associations, pursuant to

Public Law 101-73, section 301 (103 Stat. 279); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2935. A letter from the Chairperson, Public and Assisted Housing Occupancy Task Force, transmitting the Task Force's report and recommendations, pursuant to Public Law 102-550, section 643(a)(7) (106 Stat. 3822); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2936. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting a report covering the administration of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act [ERISA] during calendar year 1992, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 1143(b); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2937. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 94-23), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2938. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Israel for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 94-24), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2939. A communication from the President of the United States; transmitting notification of the use of United States combat-equipped aircraft on April 10-11 to provide protection for United Nation personnel who came under attack in Gorazde, Bosnia and Herzegovina (H. Doc. No. 103-235); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2940. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the noncombatant evacuation operations of United States citizens and designated third-country nationals in Rwanda (H. Doc. No. 103-237); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2941. A letter from the Chairman, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, transmitting the results of the audit of the financial statements of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation for the fiscal year 1993, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 305 (104 Stat. 2853); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2942. A letter from the Vice President, Human Resources and Planning, Farm Credit Bank of Spokane, transmitting the 12th District Farm Credit Retirement Plan and Thrift Plan for the years ended December 31, 1991, and December 31, 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2943. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2944. A letter from the Executive Director, Marine Mammal Commission, transmitting the annual report on the activities of the inspector general for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2945. A letter from the Executive Director, Marine Mammal Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2946. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a copy of the Government National Mortgage Association [GNMA] management report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 306(a) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2947. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting proposed regulations governing special fundraising projects and other use of candidate names by unauthorized committees, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(d); to the Committee on House Administration.

2948. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2949. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Government's helium program providing operating statistical and financial information for the fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 167n; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2950. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to designate a segment of the Nolichucky River in the States of North Carolina and Tennessee as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2951. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to designate a segment of the Little Bighorn River in the State of Wyoming as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2952. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the annual report on the operations of the private counsel debt collection project for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3718(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2953. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's 15th annual report to Congress pursuant to section 201 of the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (Fiscal Year 1992), pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 18a(j); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2954. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an update of the situation concerning activities of the People's Republic of China [PRC] and Taiwan in illegal trade of rhinoceros and tiger parts and products, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1978(b) (H. Doc. No. 103-236); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

2955. A letter from the Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the biennial report of the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for fiscal year 1992 and 1993, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1462; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2956. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for the fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2957. A letter from the Inspector General, Services Administration, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Thomas Jefferson Commemoration Commission"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2958. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report entitled "Entering Professional Positions in the Federal Government," pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1205(a)(3); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2959. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of the construction prospectus for a Federal Building, the U.S. courthouse in Phoenix, AZ, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2960. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a statistical report, "Federal Support to Universities, Colleges, and Nonprofit Institutions, Fiscal Year 1991," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1862(a)(7); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2961. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report covering the disposition of cases granted relief from administrative error, overpayment, and forfeiture by the Administrator in 1993, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 210(c)(3)(B); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2962. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the management plan for the Demonstration and Commercial Application of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Technologies Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 12006; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

2963. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting notification that the report pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6276(d) will be delivered by September 30, 1994; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Foreign Affairs.

2964. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report entitled, "Report to Congress on Low-Level Radioactive Waste Transportation," pursuant to Public Law 101-641, section 8 (104 Stat. 4657); jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Energy and Commerce.

2965. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Study on Reimbursement Rates to Pharmacists," pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 4401(d)(4) (104 Stat. 1388-161); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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. BROWN of California: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 3254. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONDIT:

H.R. 4182. A bill to require the transfer of air emission credits attributable to the closure of a military installation to the redevelop-

ment authority established for that installation; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. COLLINS of Michigan:

H.R. 4183. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make grants to State and local governments for infrastructure projects in distressed areas, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Education and Labor.

H.R. 4184. A bill to amend the Job Training Partnership Act to establish a public works and public service job training program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4185. A bill to establish a Federal Coordinating Council on Community Safety and Empowerment to make grants for projects to improve the health, education, and safety of the residents of economically distressed communities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4186. A bill to provide demonstration grants to local governmental agencies and community-based organizations for mentor programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4187. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to strengthen and preserve families, enhance foster care, and develop qualified child welfare personnel to provide parent education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. FROST, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. KING, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and Mr. REYNOLDS):

H.R. 4188. A bill to amend section 1738A of title 28, United States Code, relating to child custody determinations and child support orders, to modify the requirements for court jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ORTON, Mr. BLUTE, and Mr. QUINN):

H.R. 4189. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for budgeting for emergencies through the establishment of a budget reserve account, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. DE LUGO:

H.R. 4190. A bill to designate the U.S. post office located at 41-42 Norre Gade in Saint Thomas, VI, as the "Alvaro de Lugo United States Post Office"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4191. A bill to designate the U.S. post office located at 9630 Estate Thomas in Saint Thomas, VI, as the "Aubrey C. Otley United States Post Office"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4192. A bill to designate the U.S. post office located at 100 Veterans Drive in Saint Thomas, VI, as the "Arturo R. Watlington, Sr. United States Post Office"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4193. A bill to designate the U.S. post office located at 100 Vester Gade, in Cruz Bay, Saint John, VI, as the "Ubalina Simmons United States Post Office"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4194. A bill to designate the U.S. Post Office located in the Tutu Park Mall in Saint Thomas, VI, as the "Earle B. Otley United States Post Office"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr.

GUTIERREZ, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. TORRES, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 4195. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to individuals who maintain a household which includes an elderly low-income relative; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKS (for himself, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. INSLEE):
H.R. 4196. A bill to ensure that all timber-dependent communities qualify for loans and grants from the Rural Development Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:
H.R. 4197. A bill to deter and punish crime, and to protect the rights of crime victims; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Armed Services, Science, Space, and Technology, and Government Operations.

By Mr. EWING (for himself, Mr. PARKER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BOEHNER):

H.R. 4198. A bill to amend the Balanced and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to require that OMB and CBO estimates for paygo purposes score increased revenues caused by economic growth resulting from legislation implementing any trade agreement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey:
H.R. 4199. A bill to require that Federal prisoners obtain a general equivalency degree before receiving credit toward service of sentence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:
H.R. 4200. A bill to amend chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that annuities for Members of Congress be computed under the same formula as applies to Federal employees generally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTINEZ:
H.R. 4201. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for the creation of jobs and business opportunities by individuals and small businesses through reduction of the social security tax burden on small employers and the self-employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCRERY (for himself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. HOKE):

H.R. 4202. A bill to increase access to high quality, affordable health insurance; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself (by request) and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 4203. A bill to provide for the continued improvement and expansion of the Nation's airports and airways, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:
H.R. 4204. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 711 Washington Street in

Boston, MA, as the "Jean Mayer Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. BLYLEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 4205. A bill to amend title 11, D.C. Code, to clarify that blind individuals are eligible to serve as jurors in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 4206. A bill to provide for the implementation of the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade concerning specific code section, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Rules, the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:
H.R. 4207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow businesses a credit against income tax for providing work experiences for high school juniors and seniors for which the students receive credit toward graduation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENTO:
H.R. 4208. A bill to expand and enhance the Federal Government commitment to eliminating crime in public housing and other federally assisted low-income housing projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CALVERT:
H.J. Res. 351. Joint resolution designating May 22 through May 28, 1994, as "In Celebration of America Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORD of Michigan:
H.J. Res. 352. Joint resolution designating November 1994 as "National American Lacemaker Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOYER:
H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself and Mr. HANSEN):

H. Res. 405. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 1458) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to establish time limitations on certain civil actions against aircraft manufacturers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

327. By the SPEAKER; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, relative to sanitary landfills; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

328. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, relative to encouraging the President and the United States Congress to reexamine United States foreign policy towards Ethiopia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

329. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to supporting increased access near Mount McKinley through establishment of a visitor activity area at Kantishna; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

330. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to urging the U.S. Congress to accelerate the process of developing and approving the National Highway System and that the Congress should pass legislation which designates and approves the National Highway System no later than September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

331. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, relative to certifying legislative opposition to the Federal mandate pertaining to the revocation or suspension of driving privileges of convicted drug offenders, and requesting that the Governor of the State of Kansas join in verifying her opposition to the Federal mandate; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

332. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, relative to the doppler radar in southwest Mississippi; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,
Mrs. VUCANOVICH introduced a bill (H.R. 4209) for the relief of William P. Van Keymeulen; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

- H.R. 27: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 39: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
- H.R. 65: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BLUTE.
- H.R. 84: Mr. FLAKE.
- H.R. 123: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. SISISKY.
- H.R. 303: Mr. BROWN of California.
- H.R. 349: Mr. GRANDY.
- H.R. 417: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. BOEHNER.
- H.R. 441: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. RAVENEL.
- H.R. 518: Ms. FURSE and Mr. WYNN.
- H.R. 538: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
- H.R. 635: Mr. BAKER of California.
- H.R. 643: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
- H.R. 688: Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 743: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
- H.R. 794: Mr. UPTON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. CRAPO.
- H.R. 818: Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 830: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 999: Mr. HUTCHINSON.
- H.R. 1043: Mr. HUTCHINSON.
- H.R. 1126: Mr. RAVENEL.
- H.R. 1127: Mr. RAVENEL.
- H.R. 1128: Mr. RAVENEL.
- H.R. 1129: Mr. RAVENEL.
- H.R. 1146: Mr. HUTCHINSON and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
- H.R. 1181: Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 1277: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.
- H.R. 1330: Mr. QUINN, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLO, Mr. MICA, Mr. PENNY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. EVERETT.
- H.R. 1349: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi and Mr. LINDER.
- H.R. 1354: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1431: Mrs. MORELLA.
 H.R. 1439: Mr. REYNOLDS.
 H.R. 1617: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. LINDER.
 H.R. 1618: Mr. BROWN of California.
 H.R. 1708: Mr. MCINNIS.
 H.R. 1872: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 1897: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 1924: Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 1961: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. REYNOLDS.
 H.R. 2012: Mr. HAYES, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. MFUME.
 H.R. 2092: Mr. STUPAK.
 H.R. 2110: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 2145: Mr. HERGER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SARPALUIS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 2308: Mr. MILLER of California.
 H.R. 2360: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. PORTER.
 H.R. 2429: Mr. LEACH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WILSON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARR, Mr. WATT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. THOMAS of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. BISHOP.
 H.R. 2609: Mr. FINGERHUT.
 H.R. 2663: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 2721: Mrs. UNSOELD.
 H.R. 2729: Mr. SANTORUM.
 H.R. 2787: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 3017: Mr. TORRES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. KREIDLER, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 3023: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WELDON, Mr. FINGERHUT, and Mr. WHEAT.
 H.R. 3121: Mr. CHAPMAN.
 H.R. 3227: Mr. RAVENEL and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3288: Mr. LEVY and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.
 H.R. 3293: Mr. RIDGE and Mrs. MORELLA.
 H.R. 3322: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. WATT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. SUNDQUIST.
 H.R. 3328: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 3365: Mr. VENTO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 3373: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 3374: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 3392: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. TALENT, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3433: Mr. YATES, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FALCONE, Mr. FARR, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HAMBURG, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LLOYD, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. ROSE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALVARADO, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WILSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYDEN.
 H.R. 3472: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3486: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. McDADE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BACCHUS of Alabama, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. COBLE, Ms. BYRNE and Mr. ROGERS.
 H.R. 3508: Mr. FALCONE.
 H.R. 3513: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 3519: Mr. HUGHES and Mrs. UNSOELD.
 H.R. 3573: Mr. HEFNER.
 H.R. 3594: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. LEVY.
 H.R. 3633: Mr. HYDE, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Ms. DUNN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. ISTOOK.
 H.R. 3738: Mr. DINGELL.
 H.R. 3745: Mr. SCOTT.
 H.R. 3789: Mr. HERGER and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.
 H.R. 3790: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 3791: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.
 H.R. 3795: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
 H.R. 3796: Mr. LINDER, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. RAVENEL.
 H.R. 3797: Mr. KASICH, Mr. LINDER, Mr. POMBO, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.
 H.R. 3838: Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 3842: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 3903: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. FALCONE.
 H.R. 3906: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Ms. DANNER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 3907: Mr. DICKS.
 H.R. 3951: Mr. McDADE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mrs. FOWLER.
 H.R. 3955: Mr. PENNY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.
 H.R. 3967: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 3992: Mr. HERGER, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.
 H.R. 4007: Mr. WYNN and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 4024: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. WATERS, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 4040: Mr. BRYANT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 4060: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 4074: Mr. FROST, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CANADY, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 4095: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. DORNAN.
 H.R. 4124: Mr. KREIDLER.
 H.R. 4129: Mr. ROSE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H.R. 4142: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. MCCANDLESS.
 H.R. 4143: Mr. RUSH, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, and Mr. DELLUMS.
 H.J. Res. 229: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. BACCHUS of Florida.
 H.J. Res. 233: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. BLILEY.
 H.J. Res. 253: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
 H.J. Res. 311: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. QUINN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAXON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REED, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. THOMPSON, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. WYNN.
 H.J. Res. 314: Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. GEKAS.
 H.J. Res. 320: Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. FROST, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. CAMP, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.J. Res. 322: Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SWETT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. GEKAS.
 H.J. Res. 333: Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SISISKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. FARR, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. ROSE.

H.J. Res. 335: Mr. SWIFT.
 H.J. Res. 349: Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WASHINGTON, and Mr. LEVIN.
 H.J. Res. 350: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BAESLER, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.
 H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
 H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. WALSH.
 H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. TORRICELLI and Mr. TALENT.
 H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. SWETT.
 H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. VOLKMER.
 H. Con. Res. 152: Ms. FURSE.
 H. Con. Res. 173: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FROST, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MURTHA.

H. Con. Res. 199: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WYNN, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. BISHOP.
 H. Res. 27: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H. Res. 255: Mr. WISE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. GRAMS.
 H. Res. 337: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MANN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FURSE, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. EVANS.
 H. Res. 383: Mr. LEVY, Mr. McMILLAN, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
 H. Res. 390: Ms. DANNER.

84. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Milwaukee, WI, relative to requesting the Congress to oppose certain provisions of H.R. 3636, the National Communications Competition and Information Infrastructure Act, as amended by the House Energy and Commerce Committee on March 17, 1994; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

85. Also, petition of the National Conference of State Legislatures, relative to seeking support for floor consideration of unfunded mandate relief legislation during the 103d Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

86. Also, petition of the city of Santa Monica, CA, relative to supporting the approval of H.R. 3495 and S. 1704, amending the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

[The remainder of the page contains extremely faint and illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the document.]