

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, July 25, 1997

The House met at 9 a.m.

The Reverend Bruce Mackenzie, First Congregational Church, Boulder, CO, offered the following prayer:

Oh God of a thousand names and faces, give light to our minds and hearts, fill our inmost depths with Your healing presence, wash what is soiled, heal what is painful, bend what is rigid, and lead us to fullness of life.

Today we offer special gratitude for our Nation: for its freedoms that allow each of us to express our faith in varieties of ways and yet encourages respect for those who express their faith in different ways, and for its continuing concern for our whole Earth and the sharing with equity the resources of the world.

Oh God with the vision of Your future, break us open to new ways of loving and caring for all Your children, so that Your kingdom may come on Earth. Amen.

### CHAPLAIN'S 66TH BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair will note that today is the Chaplain's birthday and everyone in the House should offer him a happy birthday.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain five 1-minute speeches from each side.

### WELCOMING THE REVEREND BRUCE MACKENZIE, GUEST CHAPLAIN

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is my personal privilege and honor to welcome this morning to the House of Representatives my pastor from Boulder, CO, the Reverend Bruce Mackenzie who just delivered the opening prayer. He is the senior minister at the First Congregational Church in Boulder. He is my pastor and my friend; he married me and my wife Laura some years ago. He has led our congregation in Boulder, CO now for 27 years and will be retiring from that post next month, leaving a grateful, if grieving, congregation.

He certainly exemplifies the kind of inspirational leadership that we wish for in our religious as well as our civic life. His entire congregation shares in this honor this morning and wishes him well in his retirement. We have all been the beneficiaries of his caring and joyful leadership.

### A WARNING TO JAILERS OF CUBAN PRISONERS: THEY CAN RUN BUT THEY CANNOT HIDE

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, the Cuban tyrant is engaged in a Stalinist crackdown which is pretty typical of him, but it is nevertheless extraordinarily brutal. I have at this point six pages in my hands of names of opposition leaders and independent press people who have been arrested in the last 4 months alone, renowned leaders such as Vladimiro Roca, Marta Beatriz Roque, Felix Bonne Carcasses, and Rene Gomez Manzano have been arrested; youth leaders such as Nestor Rodriguez Lobaina, Heriberto Leyva Rodriguez, and Rafael Fonseca Ochsa.

As I say, I have six pages and they are growing the list by the day.

I just want to send a word to the jailers of these prisoners. To each of them who go so far as to lay a hand on any political prisoner in Cuba, take note: It does not matter how long it takes, it does not matter how many times they say that they are following orders, it does not matter where they go, the Cuban people will make certain that they will be found, and they will be taken to justice.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, an-

nounced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1585. An act to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps, and for other purposes.

### TAX RELIEF FOR THE WEALTHY CONTRIBUTORS WHO HELPED THE REPUBLICANS WIN CONTROL OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, Republicans have manipulated their tax bill to deliver as many tax breaks to the wealthy as possible, a new analysis shows. The Treasury Department this week released an analysis demonstrating that Republican tax breaks for the wealthy explode in cost in the outyears, posing a serious threat to the balanced budget which Republicans pretend to care so much about. The Treasury analysis found that the GOP tax package doubles in cost in the second 10 years to a staggering \$790 billion, with nearly three-quarters of the tax cuts going to the wealthy.

It is time, Madam Speaker, for Republicans in Congress to come clean with the American people about their priorities and admit that their plan delivers tax relief not to the hard-working middle-income families who deserve it, but to the wealthy contributors who helped them win control of this Congress.

### LONGSTANDING CAMPAIGN DEBTS REASON FOR MISTRUST OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, it has recently been reported that a former Presidential candidate still has a campaign debt that was incurred in the 1980's, years ago.

At the conclusion of my first campaign for a seat in the Congress, I was saddled with a campaign debt. I promptly borrowed money and paid those to whom my campaign was indebted. To have done less, Madam Speaker, would have been inexcusable and without defense. Responsible people simply do not casually ignore debts.

□ 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.

Campaign reform is consistently discussed on Capitol Hill. Perhaps the time has come to direct attention to the propriety of paying off campaign debts rather than ignoring them.

Frequently we ask incredulously why the American people do not trust Members of Congress. Longstanding campaign debts that remain unpaid and ignored is one glaring reason.

#### ALBANIA COULD BECOME THE NEXT BOSNIA

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is in turmoil. A new law limits the flying of the Albanian national flag. Infuriated Albanians gathered by the thousands in protest. In Macedonia police opened fire on their crowds, killing 4, wounding 70, and they have locked up 400 Albanians that have yet to be accounted for. Macedonia's actions are a clear violation of international law, and after all this the State Department has turned and looked the other way.

Shame on the State Department.

Albanians are being systematically persecuted. Albanians are subject to the next possible killing fields of the world. Madam Speaker, Albania needs help. Albania could become the next Bosnia.

The State Department should do its job, and I urge Congress to pass House Concurrent Resolution 36 sponsored by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

#### STOP TWISTING THE TRUTH ABOUT TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, David Gergen writing in this week's U.S. News & World Report says, and I quote, and David Gergen is a former Clinton administration adviser, he says it is time for the left to stop twisting the truth about tax relief.

Why is that important and why do we agree? And let me explain, because seniors in my district are starting to become confused because our liberal friends are talking about this imputed income scheme where we can take people with one income level and impute their income up to a different level.

Let me give my colleagues an example of a couple in my district. Their real income is \$8,700 a year, but their home is paid for; of course they could rent that home out. They also have accrued value and some pension plans and other things, but they are living on \$8,700 a year. Using the imputed in-

come scheme of the Democrats we can take their income up to about \$40,000 a year. So the question they have is if the Democrat tax plan passes, will they pay taxes on \$40,000 a year or will they pay on \$8,700 a year?

Madam Speaker, there is a big difference. Seniors are confused. We owe them the truth. I hope that we can pass our plan.

#### CAUSAL CONNECTION BETWEEN NO ACTION ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM AND FAST ACTION ON TAX BREAKS FOR THE WEALTHY

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

Mr. FARR of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to point out something that I think is pretty obvious around here, and that is the President was here earlier this year asking that this House deliver a campaign finance reform bill to him by July 4. We did not do it. We have had no hearings, we have had no votes, we have had no discussion; we have had a lot of effort to try to get a campaign bill on the floor.

Yet at the same time the tax bill, which gives incredible breaks to very wealthy people, moves through here like a knife through butter. Why is that? Why do we not move for campaign reform for the people but we can move very quickly for tax breaks for the rich? I think there is a causal connection.

Madam Speaker, just wait and see this next election period why we have not passed campaign reform under the Republican leadership and why there are big tax breaks for the rich under the Republican leadership.

#### THOSE WHO PAY 80 PERCENT OF THE TAX BURDEN SHOULD GET SOME TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, when was the last time that we heard a liberal talk about who pays what share of the tax burden?

Now let us think about that for just a minute. I am very curious to know if anyone can think of a single instance in the past 84 years where a liberal Democrat has talked about who pays what share of the tax burden.

According to the IRS, and C-SPAN viewers can check these figures for themselves, the top 1 percent of income earners in this country pay 29 percent of the income taxes. Again, the top 1 percent pay 29 percent of the income tax burden.

How about this one? The top 25 percent of income earners pay 80 percent of the income taxes.

Madam Speaker, I leave it to my colleagues to decide. Are the wealthiest Americans paying their share? And do my colleagues think that maybe those who pay 80 percent of the tax burden ought to get some of the tax relief? My colleagues should decide.

□ 0915

#### WORKING AMERICANS DESERVE THE CHILD TAX CREDIT

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

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, the other day I talked to a hard-working woman in my district. Sue has two children under the age of 18. Unfortunately, she is divorced and her ex-husband is not too reliable on his child support payments. Sue is a hard-working woman with a full-time job. She made \$200 a week on her first job, and then got a better job that paid her \$7 an hour, where she grosses \$14,500 a year.

Every payday Sue pays her State taxes, Federal taxes, and her Social Security, FICA. When she filed her taxes, she received the earned income tax credit. She said the EITC helped her get caught up on her bills. It also in 1 year allowed her to buy tires so she could drive back and forth to work.

Sue has never received public assistance. Because Sue received the earned income tax credit, and would receive the \$500-per-child credit under the Democratic tax cut plan, Republicans say she is looking for welfare. Republicans say she should not receive the \$500-per-child tax credit. Democrats see Sue as a hard-working American, and we will stand with her and her two children and give her the \$500-per-child tax credit.

#### A STIFLING TAX BURDEN

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

Mr. RYUN. Madam Speaker, the great historian, Will Durant, wrote, and I quote,

A great civilization is not conquered from without until it has destroyed itself within. The essential causes of Rome's decline lay in her people, her morals, her class struggle, her failing trade . . . her stifling taxes.

Madam Speaker, as in ancient Rome, our tax burden is stifling, and instead of working to reduce taxes, just as Members have heard, the Democrats are trying to promote class warfare. We should not be arguing over who is rich in this country; we should provide a \$500-per-child tax credit for all Americans who honestly pay an income tax.

There are more than 130,000 children in my second district of Kansas whose

families need this tax cut. These Kansans deserve relief from a crushing tax burden and an oppressive government that undermines the family unit.

Madam Speaker, when we balance the budget for the first time in 30 years and cut taxes for the first time in 16 years, we will come a step closer to the America envisioned by our Founding Fathers, where we have freedom, faith, and families that prosper.

#### A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS THAT HAS COMPASSION FOR BILLIONAIRES

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I must be missing something. One of the great things about this country was that we have been a compassionate country. My Republican friends seem to have incredible compassion for billionaires.

Let me explain the difference to Members about the concerns. When we cut taxes for the top 1 and 2 percent, yes, they can get their new Mercedes a couple of months earlier. They have to make choices. When we cut their taxes, they are able to make choices about yachts and trips and Mercedes.

When we talk about the people who work for a living and are at the bottom of the economic ladder, those people who we deprive of the \$500-per-child tax credit because they pay other taxes, not just income taxes, these are people who are making decisions about putting clothes on their children's backs, feeding them nutritious meals, keeping the family together under a roof, and staying warm in the winter.

So it seems to me the compassion ought to start with those with the greatest need, not with the greatest greed.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2209, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 197 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 197

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2209) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 302 or 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report are waived. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business: *Provided*, That the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mrs. MORELLA]. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution, and that I may be permitted to insert extraneous material into the RECORD following my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 197 makes in order the bill H.R. 2209, the fiscal year 1998 legislative branch appropriations bill, under a modified closed rule.

At the outset I would like to commend the chairman, the gentleman from New York, Mr. WALSH, and the ranking member, the gentleman from New York, Mr. JOSÉ SERRANO, and the

rest of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work in bringing what has historically been a difficult bill to the floor.

During this year's bill, we will not be free of controversy, I am afraid. I am sure we will hear from our friends in the minority about their concerns. Unfortunately, the bill has been hampered by issues that are outside the control of the Committee on Rules. But given that there may be some folks who would go so far as to recommend zero funding for the legislative branch and send us all home to get jobs in the real world, I believe this is a very responsible rule for a responsible bill.

As the Reading Clerk has described for us, the rule waives a limited number of points of order against the consideration of the bill to permit timely consideration and to address some technical requirements with regard to the Congressional Budget Act, and transfers of funds within the bill.

The rule makes in order four amendments printed in the Committee on Rules' report to accompany this resolution, to be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member specified, and debatable for the time specified in the report. The amendments are to be considered as read and are not subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in either the House or in the Committee of the Whole. In addition, all points of order against the amendments are waived.

Furthermore, the rule provides that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone recorded votes on any amendment and that the Chairman may reduce voting time on a postponed question to 5 minutes, provided that the vote immediately follows another recorded vote, and that the voting time on the first in a series of votes is not less than 15 minutes.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

Madam Speaker, while the annual funding bill for the operations of the House, the Senate, and various congressional agencies is often a lightning rod for partisan conflict, we should not forget that the legislative branch appropriations bill has also been a prime vehicle for reforming this institution from within to make it more open, more effective, and more accountable to the people we serve. By adopting this fair rule, we continue those important reforms while further streamlining and updating the operations of this unique and historic institution.

As most of my colleagues know, this Congress has consistently emphasized the need to have a balanced Federal budget, and I am pleased to note that under this year's legislation funding for congressional operations will be \$10

million less than last year's enacted level.

Now, that may not be a great amount of money, but it is important for our constituents back home to know that we are taking the task of cutting government very seriously here. We are looking at our own backyard. We are doing our part to contribute to the larger deficit reduction effort, and we have saved nearly \$400 million since fiscal year 1996, the first year of the Republican majority.

This year, for example, H.R. 2209 cuts a total of 316 positions throughout the legislative branch, and since 1994 nearly 4,000 positions have been cut. The bill saves \$1.6 million in House Information Resources by cutting funding for 20 unused positions, reducing costs for equipment replacement and generating greater savings from increased competition for telecommunications services.

It also funds the Joint Committee on Taxation at a level lower than was originally requested. I am also pleased to note that this year's bill includes funding for a modest cost-of-living increase for congressional staff. I commend the subcommittee for including this COLA, because in so many ways we are indebted to the hard work, dedication, and commitment of our staffs, who are dedicated public servants.

Finally, let me say a word or two about the amending process of this bill. The rule makes in order four amendments, two by Republican sponsors and two by Democrat sponsors. In addition to considering those amendments, any Member who is still opposed to the bill can offer a final amendment through the customary motion to recommit with instructions.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is the traditional structured rule that we have used in the past to debate funding for the legislative branch. We should keep in mind that the bill which this rule makes in order is about more than just appropriations. It is also about protecting the integrity of this institution, ensuring that we have the proper resources to legislate responsibly and efficiently, and to preserve the Capitol and its grounds for Americans and visitors to see and to enjoy.

Summer is the time when the Capitol Building plays host to thousands of vacation visitors who have come to see firsthand this hallowed shrine of history, democracy, and freedom. Throughout the year, these Halls of democracy echo with the sounds of adults, children, and youth alike who want nothing more than a front row seat to watch the democratic process in action. It is for their sake and for future generations of Americans who will want to experience their democratic heritage that we are considering this very important funding legislation today.

While a completely open rule may seem appealing, the operations of the

Congress and the organizations that support our work are extremely vital, Madam Speaker. We should consider floor amendments in a very, very careful, measured way, something which is less likely to happen under an open rule. In other words, I believe it is beneficial to ourselves and to the people who sent us here to consider this bill in a disciplined manner.

Madam Speaker, this is a responsible rule for a very responsible and reasonable legislative branch spending bill that maintains our commitment to fiscal responsibility and to doing more with less.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is a modified closed rule. It allows for the consideration of H.R. 2209, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal 1998. This bill funds the activities of Congress and other agencies in the legislative branch.

I will oppose the rule, Madam Speaker, and ask to defeat the previous question because it fails to make in order an amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDESON] to prohibit the use of \$7.9 million previously set aside in a contingency fund for use by House committees.

□ 0930

I am reluctant to oppose this rule because the bill which funds the Congress is critical for operating our national Government. Furthermore, I am reluctant on the grounds that just a single amendment has been denied. However, that single amendment is so important to the integrity of this institution that my side has no choice but to force a debate on the issue.

Madam Speaker, I believe that a woeeful and gross violation of the House rules may have occurred in connection with the approval of \$1.4 million out of the committee reserve fund for an investigation into labor laws and union activity. Even if such a violation did not occur, there has been an unmistakable breach in the commitments made on this House floor and a demonstration of contempt for the American taxpayers who will foot the bill for this unnecessary investigation.

On January 7, 1997, the House adopted an amendment to rule XI authorizing the creation of a reserve fund expressly for the use of unanticipated expenses of committees. There is no ambiguity in this language. The rules explicitly state that the expenses must be unanticipated.

On February 13, 1997, the Committee on Education and the Workforce adopted an oversight plan which included a project called the American Worker and the Department of Labor.

Four months later, the chairman of the Committee on Education and the

Workforce submitted a similar proposal to the Committee on House Oversight and requested \$1.4 million from the contingency funds. This time the proposal was called a continuation of the Education at a Crossroads project.

Let me quote from the original proposal, the American Worker and the Department of Labor, written February 13, and this is available on the Internet for all Americans to read: "The committee intends to initiate a systematic and comprehensive review of the Department of Labor, its programs and activities."

Let me read from the alleged unanticipated, emergency proposal, Education at a Crossroads project, 4 months later: "This will include a review of the Department of Labor and its programs, activities, and spending habits."

Now, quoting from the first proposal: "Among other things, the Committee hopes to review the DOL's activities in response to the Government Performance and Review Act."

Quoting from the so-called unanticipated, emergency proposal 4 months later: "The project, in particular, will examine agency submissions under the newly implemented Government Performance and Review Act."

If this is not a violation of the House rule, it certainly violates the spirit of the rule and the repeated assurances House Members were given when the contingency fund was established.

A statement by the chairman of the Committee on Rules from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the rule was adopted on January 7 stated that the reserve fund is expected to be for use only in extraordinary emergency or high priority circumstances.

That statement was read back to the House by the vice chairman of the Committee on Rules on March 20 when the House took up a measure to put \$7.9 million into that fund: "extraordinary, emergency, or high priority circumstances."

Again, on March 21, he reassured the House that the reserve fund would be fully accounted for and open to public scrutiny to cover unexpected funding emergencies.

The decision to spend \$1.4 million of taxpayer money from the contingency fund was made by the House Committee on House Oversight. It was made at a stealth meeting on the evening of July 8 for which notice was given only the day before. The committee denied a request to postpone the meeting so that the ranking minority member who at the time was on official business with the President could attend. Of course details of the emergency funding request, such as they were, were provided barely 24 hours before the start of the meeting. The promised opportunity for public scrutiny never happened.

Now it is time to shed some sunshine on this decision.

Just what is the American taxpayer getting for this \$1.4 million? Details are sketchy but one Member on the Republican leadership team told the newspaper Roll Call the study will look at the ways labor leaders are not representing workers and this will include using dues for political purposes.

I challenge any Member to come to this House floor and tell his colleagues that this funding request complies with the House rules because the project was unanticipated.

I challenge any Member to say with a straight face that the need to investigate the Labor Department is extraordinary or emergency. I challenge any Member to tell the American people that this \$1.4 million boondoggle that they are paying for is a high priority circumstance.

If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule-making and order the Gejdenson amendment to put an end to the contingency fund and the wasteful spending it represents. A vote to defeat the previous question is a vote against spending millions of dollars on yet more endless investigations that no one really cares about. Cutting unnecessary spending is what our constituents elect us to do, so this is what we should do now. I would say oppose the rule, defeat the previous question.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me time.

I would like to thank very much the Committee on Rules for the good solid rule that they provided us for consideration of this bill. Let me begin by stating that the Subcommittee on Legislative worked in a very bipartisan manner to produce this bill. My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], was extremely thoughtful and helpful throughout the process, as was his staff.

The rule that was provided by the Committee on Rules is a modified closed rule. This is the traditional approach to the legislative branch, the reason being this is the budget that we use to govern and to fulfill our responsibilities as legislators. This is always an opportunity for mischief. I am sure that we will hear from a number of Members from the other side who are disappointed that certain amendments were not granted, but those amendments, Madam Speaker, had absolutely nothing to do with this bill. This bill funds the legislative branch. It also funds the other aspects of the legislative branch other than the House, which would include the Library of Congress, the Architect, Government

Printing Office, General Accounting Office, Capitol Police, Botanic Garden, et cetera. It is important that we stick to those issues as laid out by the subcommittee.

We had a good solid bipartisan approach all the way along on this bill. And unfortunately, as we came through subcommittee to full committee, outside issues, as they have on other appropriations bills, have entered in and sort of poisoned the well somewhat.

I do think we have a good bill here. I think it is something that we can support on both sides of the aisle. But we will hear some weeping and gnashing of teeth about the amendments that were not allowed, and I would submit to my colleagues that they do not belong on this bill. I think the Committee on Rules exercised good judgment in providing us with a rule that allows for two amendments from Democrats, two amendments from Republicans.

I think every Member of the House should take a moment and look around at our complex, at this campus where we work and remind themselves of how fortunate we are to be working here. The bill that we will be debating later provides the needed funds to maintain this vast campus and the wonderful people who work here on a daily basis. It is not just our personal or committee staffs who make up the House. There are Capitol Hill Police, maintenance personnel, cafeteria workers, clerks, and a variety of services, elevator operators, countless people, the sea of faces that we see every day who make this place work. We have a responsibility to them also, not just to each other as legislators but to the people who work here and make this place work. We are very, very fortunate to have the degree of professionalism that we have.

We are also responsible for other offices I mentioned, General Accounting Office, Congressional Budget Office, Library of Congress, the greatest repository of information on Earth, Madam Speaker. We have a huge responsibility to make sure that not only we take care of the physical structure but also the wonderful, intelligent, thoughtful people who work in these institutions.

This bill continues a trend that was begun under the leadership of my predecessor, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] to downsize, to right size the legislative branch. The Federal Government has grown like Topsy over the past 20 or 25 years. The legislative branch since the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] became chairman 2 years ago has exercised tremendous restraint.

We are leading the Federal Government in the effort to downsize Government. In fact, we have reduced staff on the legislative branch by almost 14 percent. No other branch of the Federal Government has done nearly as well, as

the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] mentioned.

If this budget is adopted over these 3 years, we will have reduced Federal spending just in the legislative branch by almost \$400 million. If every branch, if every bureau of the Federal Government did what the legislative branch has done, we would have a Federal Government surplus in the year 1998. We would not have to wait for a 5-year budget deal. We would not have a balanced budget. We would have a budget surplus of \$183 billion, if we did what the legislative branch has done.

Madam Speaker, I am very proud of this bill. I am very proud of the way that we arrived at this bill. Unfortunately, there will be some carping today about the rule and about the bill, but overall I think in their heart of hearts everybody can agree that we did our best. This is the best bill we could bring forward. There is something here that we can all support.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I cannot believe we are here again with this kind of a rule. We have just gone through a very frustrating and acrimonious period because the Committee on Rules chose to turn previously bipartisan bills reported out of the Committee on Appropriations into partisan war zones by the nature of amendments which they did and did not allow on appropriation bills.

It took us a long time to work out the arrangement last night on the foreign operations bill which ended that controversy, I had hoped.

Now apparently we are right back at it. It is important that we have our responsibilities to manage these bills just as they have their responsibilities. And it is disruptive of the legislative process when on a routine basis the request of our party's bill managers on these bills is ignored and frustrated. We asked—and we gave them their choice—we asked that they make any one of three amendments in order which would allow us to eliminate or reduce the expenditure of public money under the Speaker's slush fund. And we were denied the opportunity to reach that problem with any of the amendments that we had before us.

I think that is a very basic mistake. The fundamental job of this House—we can argue about taxes, we can argue about all other authorizations—the fundamental job of this House, after all, is to get the basic work of the Government done through the appropriations process. Rules like this get in the way of that obligation. They extend the acrimony rather than shorten it. They extend the debate rather than shorten it. They make it more difficult for the House to complete its work in a timely fashion.

Most of all, with this rule the House has a clever way to sneak around the staff cuts which were provided in committees 2 years ago under the Republican contract and now under this, committees are able to get large amounts of additional funding for large amounts of additional staff without ever having taken a vote on that on the House floor. That is just plain wrong. They ought not to do this. They ought to listen to what witnesses before their committee said last night. I would hope that this episode will not be repeated on future appropriation bills or, again, the House will not be providing the leadership to this country that it ought to provide.

□ 0945

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, the last speaker is the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. It is a very important position in this body, and I personally have a great deal of respect for him.

But the gentleman used to be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and when I hear statements like those just mentioned in the well a few minutes ago, it really disturbs me because we always have to be consistent.

I made a pledge when I became chairman of the Committee on Rules 3 years ago that we would be fair and open as much as possible, and at all times at least as fair and more fair than the Democrats treated us when we were in the minority.

And the gentleman comes to the well and he says that the majority, when he was chairman, never shut out the ranking members when they wanted to offer an amendment because, as the ranking member of the committee, they ought to have that opportunity. And I believe the gentleman is right. But the truth is, we have an example right now, we have the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], who now is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Legislative, but he used to be the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, of which Madam Speaker has a lot of interest in.

And just in the last Congress, in other words the Congress that the Democrats controlled, on the bill that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] brought to the floor as the ranking member at that time, he requested at that time three amendments to be made in order. And the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], who was chairman of the committee, recommended to the Committee on Rules they make none of those amendments in order. Yet he was the ranking member at the time and they shut him out.

I just saw the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] walk through, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, and he had requested in that 103d Congress that he have amendments made in order, too, as the ranking member, and they just arbitrarily shut him out.

So let us be consistent around here. We are at all times trying to be fair. This rule that is on the floor now, because it does deal with our funding for the legislature, should be fair. And of the 8 or 9 or 10 amendments that were offered, we tried to consider all of the Democrat amendments that we could, and we ended up making in order 2 Democrat amendments and 2 Republican amendments. Yet we are in the majority. Now, how much more fair can we be than that?

And when we talk about closing down the rules, we have come under great criticism for putting out so many open rules. And we have heard Members on that side of the aisle and Members on our side of the aisle complain about all these open rules. They cannot get their planes, they cannot go home on Friday afternoon to be with their constituents and their families.

In the 103d Congress, the last time that the Democrats controlled this House, they had open rules about 40 percent of the time. Yet when we took over in the 104th Congress, we opened those rules up to 60 percent of the time. So when we talk about this, let us try to get some comity in the House.

We solved a big problem last night, tried to bring a compromise so that we could move the legislation which is so vital to the American people, and so let us not come down here and be critical of something that does not exist. We are here to try to move this legislation. We are under great deadlines because we do not want to get into a situation where we close down the Government because this Congress could not get together.

So let us move these appropriation bills. They have to be dealt with by September 30. We are going to be off for 3½ weeks in August for constituent work periods back home. There are very few legislative days left until September 30. It is imperative we move the legislation. So let us work together and let us move the legislation and have a free and fair and open debate on it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I want to correct the comments of the previous speaker.

If he will go back and review the history of the D.C. bill, what happened on that bill, and on several other occasions, is that the gentleman in question asked that the Committee on

Rules make in order amendments which would otherwise not have been allowed under the rules. It would have been nongermane under House rules, and we asked under those circumstances to deny them.

I never said that there were not occasions when the wishes of the ranking minority member were not granted. Go back and read what I said. I never described that in any way. What I urged my colleagues to do was not on a routine basis turn down the request of ranking members.

I do not expect the committee to grant all of them, but I do expect them to grant a reasonable number. And the fact is that this year the Committee on Rules has routinely turned down the requests of the ranking minority members, and the record demonstrates that.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, the gentleman has just made my point. He has mentioned that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], the chairman, at the time the ranking member, wanted to offer amendments that would not otherwise have been in order unless he received a waiver.

And that is really what this whole argument started from at the beginning from our very good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who I greatly admire and respect, he has been around here for so many years, on the NEA issue. Whether we are for or against it, the gentleman from Illinois wanted to offer an amendment that would otherwise not be allowed without waivers because the program had not been authorized, the same thing as was the situation with the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

So let us, again, put this aside, let us get down and really debate the issues. That is what is important. That is what all the American people watching us today want us to do.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, the Gingrich Republicans have done it again. They have launched another sneak attack in their campaign to undermine the rights of working families, and this time they are using taxpayer dollars to do it.

I am talking about the Speaker's allocation of \$1.4 million to investigate, intimidate, and to harass people and organizations that are standing up for fair wages, worker safety, decent pensions, and the freedom of speech. This partisan slush fund, which was rushed through the committee without any notice, without any substantive debate, is part of a broad Republican effort to silence the voices of anybody who disagrees with them on working

issues. It is an effort to stifle the opposition, to muffle the ideas they do not like, to stuff a rag down liberty's throat.

And why would Republicans try to silence the voice of America's working families? Because they do not like what they are saying. They do not like what they are saying and they do not like the fact that these families, through their membership in unions, are able to speak with force and passion and clarity about their vision for a better America.

Madam Speaker, our parents and our grandparents fought, went to jail, were beaten, sometimes even died for basic rights that millions of working Americans now enjoy and, unfortunately, take for granted: The 40-hour workweek, the 8-hour day, maternity leave, paid sick leave, the weekend, secured pensions, safety laws in this country. They did not just happen. They happened because someone stood up and struggled and fought for them.

Now, the Speaker and his Republican colleagues are trying to take those basic rights away from us and they are trying to give big corporations unprecedented powers over our lives. All we have to do is look at the tax bill. The corporate minimum tax. They want to basically forgive corporations from paying Federal taxes. They have a \$22 billion giveaway in their proposal to the large corporations, to go back to the 1980's when companies like AT&T and Boeing paid no Federal income tax and the rest of us picked it up. Their tax bill? Five percent of Americans, the richest 5 percent, get 60 percent of the benefits.

And, of course, they have made an all-out assault on the minimum wage in their bill through independent contracting, which would allow people to be paid below the minimum wage, would allow health benefits and pension benefits to be taken away.

So what they are doing with this slush fund, to silence workers and their unions as a voice to stand up for worker rights, is a pattern of attack on working families' basic rights. It fits this pattern they have been about. It is intending to intimidate and undermine labor's voice in the political process.

Vote "no" on the previous question, vote "no" on the rule, and let us make in order the Gejdenson amendment so we can get some justice in this institution. This is the wrong way to treat working people.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Madam Speaker, I have never voted against a rule on legislative branch before in all the years I have been a Member, and I have only voted against the conference report on one legislative branch bill because of the removal of the Office of Technology Assessment in that conference after this floor sustained it.

But I rise today in opposition to this rule and of this bill, and I do so ruefully because I have great respect for the gentlemen from New York, [Mr. WALSH] and [Mr. SERRANO]. I think they are going to make the institution proud. I think they will do an excellent job of taking one of the more important roles that we have, and that is to protect this institution and, by doing so, the rights of all Americans.

But what we are talking about today is a gag rule that does not permit this House to discuss the problems that are eating us alive, and I mean problems that are attendant to investigations, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] said, of labor, that are not voted by Members here on the floor but done in a back-room deal using a cookie jar fund that was put aside for the fun and pleasure of the Republican leadership.

More important, we are engaged in an investigation, supposedly of campaign finance violations, by another committee which is being run in the most partisan manner anyone has ever recognized in Washington. The similar investigation on the other side puts us to shame because of the bipartisan manner in which it is being conducted.

But we are also in the midst of another investigation that I think we all have to focus on, and that is a concerted effort to prolong the agony of one of our Members. The gentlewoman from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, won, and has been certified as the winner by the California Secretary of State, a close race in what had been totally Republican Orange County. Today, we continue to prolong her agony by preventing her from being made a permanent Member of this institution.

I think we have to be very sensitive to what has been going on in this investigation. If her name were Smith and not Sanchez, we would not be investigating the Browns and the Joneses and the Littles, we would be investigating people who may have, perhaps, made some inappropriate decision about voting. But we would not be doing it by investigating the Rodriguezes and the Ortizes, because they happen to be Hispanic.

In my view, this investigation is out of bounds and over the line and ought to be ended. And we have no chance here today to express our frustration during the course of this debate. We should have and, therefore, we should defeat this rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

I am pleased to follow my colleague from California. I do not know that there are any two more stronger supporters of the institution than the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and I. There are strong supporters on that side of the aisle as well, in particular the chairman of this committee. I believe and agree with the gentleman from California that he is going to be a strong supporter, and that he and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] are going to make a team that will stand up for honest debate and honest policies with respect to the administration of the House of Representatives, the people's House.

□ 1000

But I wanted to follow the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and I wanted to follow him with respect to this investigation that is going on with respect to one of our Members, an investigation that has now been going on for 8 months that is unprecedented.

First of all, it is the first time in history, the first time in history, under the Federal Contested Election Act, where a Member has ever been allowed to have subpoena power to subpoena organizations like Catholic Charities and ask for all their financial records. It is the first time in history that we have not disposed of a Federal Contested Election Act case either because it was withdrawn or because in a preliminary fashion we decided there was not sufficient evidence to move forward.

The gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ]. It is the first time in history in any district in America that INS has been asked to compare the names of the voters with their lists. My colleagues, think of the message that we are sending. Think of the message that we are sending to those Americans; Americans, I stress, of Hispanic background.

I am a Danish-American. Never in history has anybody asked that we check on Danish-Americans through the INS. That is why I am against this rule, because they did not allow debate on this critical issue and recompense of \$150,000 to the INS, as they should do.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. This debate really is disintegrating, and it is really unfortunate. To wave the bloody shirt of ethnicity on a debate on the rule really demeans all of us. It really does.

I am chairman of the subcommittee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], the ranking member, is Hispanic. I do not think there is a Member in this body who I respect more than that gentleman. The points that were made I do not think reflect well on this body. They certainly do not reflect well on this rule.

To get back to the specifics of the request, \$150,000 out of the legislative

branch to give the Immigration Naturalization Service. They did not ask for this money. It takes money out of the operations of the legislative branch, which, as we all know, we have reduced 3 years in a row.

This amendment does not have anything to do with the legislative branch. It is an opportunity for the minority to vent. They are frustrated. We were frustrated when we were in the minority, too. It goes with the turf. But we have tried to be fair. This rule allows for amendments for Democrats and Republicans, but they have got to be germane to the bill. They should be fair. I think we have been fair. Fairness, obviously, is in the eyes of the beholder. But we really have done our best to give everybody their opportunity on this bill. And this idea of ethnicity really has absolutely nothing to do with this bill.

I am Irish-American. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is Danish-American. There is room in this bill, in this Nation, for all of us.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern about the subject being discussed and how some of the moneys in this bill could be appropriated.

Since the polls closed in November, one of our colleagues, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ], has been subjected to unprecedented harassment. Her defeated opponent has been given subpoena power. He has used this power to harass not only the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] and her family, but Catholic nuns, college students, and many others.

We are now 9 months into this ludicrous tantrum by this poor, disappointed man who lost. We have expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this assault, and it is time for it to stop. I say to my colleagues in the majority, accept the word of the voters, cease this constant undermining of this Member, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ]. Let her do what she came to Washington to do, to vote all her considerable intelligence, energy, judgment to the constituents who have sent her here.

I urge my colleagues, in the name of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ], to oppose this rule.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I will be relatively brief. Actually, I am one who presented three amendments, which were turned down. But I rise in support of the rule.

My concern is, as it has been for some time, and this raises bipartisan hackles, I might add, is the use of the

franking privilege. I believe that sometimes it is used in a political context, which concerns me a great deal. And I presented three amendments to address this.

But I must say that this Congress and this Committee on Rules, and particularly the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], have really started to address these issues. And for this I have tremendous praise for them.

For example, we have gone from a high in 1988 of \$113.4 million for frank mail to free mail, which is sometimes used for political reasons, to a low of \$30 million in fiscal year 1995. I am convinced, after discussing this with the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, that we are going to try to address even additional areas with respect to this to make sure that our mail is used for the purposes of responding to our constituents and not for mass mail used in a political sense.

For that reason, I am here to report that even though my particular amendments, which I do not think we need to discuss now, are not being considered on the floor, the direction is good, the effort is good, the focus is there, Congress is going in the right direction. I just hope we can continue to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today because I'd like you to make in order three amendments to the legislative branch appropriations bill. These amendments build upon the progress Congress has made in recent years to reduce the cost to taxpayers of the congressional franking privilege.

During the last decade, Congress spent from a high of \$113.4 million in fiscal year 1988 to a low of \$30 million in fiscal year 1995 on franked mail. This is an impressive reduction. Nevertheless, I believe improvements can still be made, notwithstanding the legitimate need Members have to respond to the inquiries and concerns of their constituents.

My first amendment will ban mass mailings during election years up to the general election. Use of the frank increases cyclically during every election year. During the 103d Congress, the House spent \$24 million in 1993, and \$42 million in 1994. During the 104th Congress, the House spent \$24.5 million in 1995 and \$27 million in 1996.

Currently, Members cannot send franked mass mail 90 days before a primary or general election. Since primaries occur on different dates in different States, Members are held to different mass mail standards depending on the dates of their primaries. My amendment will simplify the issue by banning all mass mailings prior to election day in election years. It will prevent House Members facing tough reelection campaigns from tapping into their official office accounts to flood constituents with self-promoting newsletters and mailings.

My second amendment addresses a relatively new issue, raised by changes in House rules which permit Members to use their Members Representational Allowance [MRA] to pay for radio advertisements. The cost of these

advertisements are not counted against a Member's Official Mail Allowance, even though these radio advertisements are generally substituted for town meeting notices sent by mail. This oversight frees up additional funds for a Member to spend on unsolicited mass mailings. I believe that these advertisements should be counted against a Member's Official Mail Allowance to avoid this substitution affect and my second amendment does this.

My third amendment reduces the MRA by \$5,674,000, the amount that the Appropriations Committee recommends as an increase in the Official Mail Allowance. This 27 percent increase over fiscal year 1997 funding is completely unjustifiable. Given the excellent work the Appropriations Committee has done in recent years to reduce taxpayer funding of franked mail, I believe this is the wrong approach to take.

I know that it is impossible to serve constituents well while spending relatively little on franked mail, because I represent the third largest congressional district in the country, and yet I am consistently among the lowest franked mail spenders. We are diligent, however, at responding to letters and phone calls from constituents, and we have a very organized, computerized system of tracking the mail we receive and send out. The way I accomplish this is by refusing to send my constituents unsolicited newsletters, questionnaires, or postcards using the franked mail privilege.

Last year, the Rules Committee made in order two franking disclosure amendments I offered, which were adopted on the floor and have been made permanent. Those were good reforms, and I appreciate your making the amendments in order. I believe that these amendments also make important reforms, and hope you will give them every consideration.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] for his continued vigilance. Amendments made in the last Congress have moved us much along the path of making sure that the former tactic of having a sawed-tooth pattern of mail, oddly enough, the greatest expense during election years, has been smoothed out significantly. No longer is the old partisan pattern being followed. It is largely due to the continued vigilance of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, how much time does my side remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has 11 minutes. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] has 10 minutes.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago, Republicans met behind closed doors and hatched a devious partisan political campaign with \$1.4 million in public funds to harass and intimidate workers, union leaders, and the Department of Labor. Now under this rule, which prohibits amendments, Republicans want to deny Members of this House a vote to eliminate their \$7.9 million slush fund from which this \$1.4 million boondoggle was withdrawn. The Republican slush fund was supposed to be used, and I quote, for unanticipated expenses of committees.

Well, if there is one thing in this Congress that was not unanticipated, it is the continued Republican assault on the rights of working men and women. Time and time again, the leadership of this House attacks the rights of workers and then abuses House procedures to choke off dissent against their extremist agenda. By denying the vote on the Gejdenson amendment, the Republican majority is striking another blow against democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we should reject this rule.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. I think we only have two speakers remaining.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. KILPATRICK].

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for allowing me the opportunity to speak.

As a member of the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and a new Member of this Congress, as many Members and people of America may remember, on January 7 this Congress adopted budgets for the various committees of the Congress; and in that adoption, after some dismay, there was set aside a \$7.9 million reserve fund, more commonly known as slush fund, that was supposed to be used for three purposes: high priority, emergencies, and extraordinary circumstances.

On July 8, with less than 24-hour notice, as the rules require, the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight was called together and a \$1.4 million deduction from that slush fund was had for an investigation of the Labor and Education Department. As a member of the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, I felt then, as I do now, that the rules had not been followed, that we did not have proper notice, that we were again going to spend another \$1 million of the American people's money on another investigation.

Since 1996, over \$10 million have been spent on investigations. Over the last 18 months, over \$30 million has been spent on investigations.

I rise to oppose the rule. I rise to defeat the previous question, because I

believe the American people want us to have the input and the exchange. That is why they sent us here. I believe the American people want us to debate the issues. And, therefore, because the Gejdenson amendments were not adopted yesterday, it would allow that opportunity. That is why we put it on the table, why this \$1.4 was deducted, why the slush fund initially was incorporated, and why today we have before us another investigation.

The Labor Department is a fine department, and its employees do good work. It is unfortunate that we are here today to oppose the rule. It is unfortunate that we as elected representatives of the people cannot debate the question. Why? America, speak out. Do not let this Congress get away with again going after investigation and investigation. Let us get back to the people's work.

Mr. Speaker, oppose the rule, oppose the previous question.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to this rule because I believe when this House debates the legislative appropriations bill, each Member has a right to question the expenditures of this House. I believe that the prolonged investigation of the election of our colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] is an issue that confronts the integrity of this House.

For the first time in the history of this Nation, voters, legitimate voters, have been put on a list and run through the INS register simply because they have ethnic last names, Hispanic, Asian. I think that is an affront. And that practice has been more or less authorized by this House if we do not inquire into it. It is a very, very specious way to conduct an investigation. And I believe the House has a right to go into it, inquire on the practice of this committee, and root out those that are beginning this kind of racist inquiry.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me offer my respect for the respective chairman and ranking member of this committee. Many of us hate to have to come before this body and oppose the rule and oppose the bill. Primarily we think that it is a question of dignity and respect. Already we understand that many of our Members on the side of the minority have not been allowed to address the attack on one of our Members, a Member who has

been duly elected by her constituents, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

In an instance where it was one of the largest victories that the Federal Election Contest Act has ever had to review, where a task force looking into it has said Dornan, who lost, really has no credible evidence that there has been any violations.

Independent scholars have already challenged Mr. Dornan on the constitutionality of his subpoenas. And, yes, a Los Angeles newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, said, "Yet a close review of Dornan's contentions shows them to be overstated and riddled with uncertainties."

What do we do in this House? Continue to comfort and pamper Mr. Dornan, while a working Member, a Hispanic woman, is attacked by the Republicans. I wish we would vote against this rule and vote against this bill.

□ 1015

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back onto the issue here if I could. I rise in very strong support of this rule. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] was talking a few minutes ago about the number of people here who have a great deal of pride and reverence for this institution. I clearly consider myself to be among them. I am very proud of the work that the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] has done to try and deal with reform of an institution which spent most of its time on legislative branch work simply trying to ensure the reelection of its Members. I am very proud of the work of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] and of so many others who have focused on ensuring that this institution expands the deliberative nature and that we are in fact accountable to the people who sent us here. I am very saddened to see this debate deteriorate to, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] has said, a case of waving the bloody shirt of racism. I happen to like the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ]. She agrees with me on a number of issues like cutting the capital gains tax rate. I think she is a very decent, hardworking person. And I am very concerned about the prospect of seeing us in any way discriminate against Hispanic-Americans. I come from Los Angeles, CA. I am very sensitive to this issue. But the fact of the matter is there are many Hispanic Americans in my State who have said to me, we have to ensure that that very precious franchise, the right to vote, is not in any way jeopardized.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think that the work that is being done to ensure that every single vote counts is correct

work, and I believe that this rule is a very fair and balanced rule. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] has said, it ensures that the consideration of both Democrats and Republicans is brought into the mix here. Let us support the previous question, let us support the rule, and let us support what I am convinced will be a very, very good legislative branch appropriations product that will emerge from this House.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule. The Republican leadership is trying to fund its own partisan attack on their enemies while they are trying to deny Democrats the right to bring amendments to the floor. The Republicans are using the Committee on House Oversight to fund an unprecedented attack on the election of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ]. They have spent over \$300,000 of taxpayer money to attack a Hispanic woman and to intimidate Hispanic voters.

This is a clear attack on the voting rights of minorities and an utter abuse of power. The Republicans have even subpoenaed the INS to try to dig up dirt on immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership must not be allowed to trample the rights of Latinos. They must not be allowed to use their power to prevent Democrats from bringing important amendments to a vote. Vote "no" on the rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJJDENSON].

Mr. GEJJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, what has developed here over a number of years is class warfare. It is exhibited in almost every action taken by the Republican majority on the Sanchez matter. It did not start with SANCHEZ. In 1980, we watched men wearing black armbands descend upon polling places that have large minority populations trying to dissuade them from voting.

Any of us who are immigrants, who come here without all the guarantees of freedom and protection of law, know how easy it is to intimidate the poor and the new Americans from participating, how they can easily remember the fears of the countries they fled. The Republican majority opposes motor-voter and particularly opposes poor people having systems where the poor can get registered.

One of the members of the Committee on Appropriations in a discussion last week said that the real motive behind the Sanchez contest was not simply SANCHEZ, the reason for pursuing it was to get motor-voter. We have a right and an obligation to review elections. But the extent, the lack of due process that has occurred in this review is outrageous.

On the money side, \$30 to \$50 million of investigations have been initiated by those who claim to be careful with dollars. The outrageous slush fund and its use, to add over \$1 million, \$1.4 million to the Committee on Education and the Workforce is as if we have an in-house counsel, we had a lawyer that worked for our company and then when the lawyer actually did something, he said, "Wait, I've got to be paid again, I'm a lawyer."

The Committee on Education and the Workforce, all of what they have asked for is in their original jurisdiction. But it is one more attempt to get labor, to politicize the legislative process. We have a responsibility here to do our work, to try to stay in budget, but to make sure that what we do here really serves the best interests of the American people.

We have had sufficient funds appropriated to that committee so that we do not need to dip into this slush fund. This slush fund ought to be abandoned. It is a political tool directed by the Speaker to get people that are in his way.

When we take a look at what this committee has been doing, it has left the minority without rights. But we are not going to argue process. It has held meeting after meeting without notice. Let me tell my colleagues when I was a committee chair, my ranking Republican TOBY ROTH, we gave him everything as soon as we had it. We notified meetings weeks in advance.

When we take a look at what has happened here, we walk in, we do not see the language until we sit down to vote. But all that is secondary. The issues that are here and outrageous are the continued harassment of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] and the continued use of funds for political purposes out of this slush fund.

The Speaker basically gets to decide who he is going to go after by tapping into \$7.9 million. The House does not get to look at those funds. You snuck that through early, got a nice party line vote to make sure you could have a slush fund to continue your political and partisan wars.

We are here today to say that is enough. Let us join together and reject this rule and go forward with a process that gives every Member of this House the right to cleanse the funding of that slush fund.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, millions of dollars for a partisan investigation into campaign finance abuses, millions of dollars for an investigation intended to intimidate organized labor, hundreds of thousands of dollars to harass and intimidate a Hispanic woman Member of Congress.

It is not right, it is not fair, it is a shame and a disgrace. Defeat the previous question and defeat this rule.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I think the Republicans are trying to do their very best job here. We heard a lot of screaming and yelling. I do not know if my colleagues remember exactly what happened, but when the Democrats were in charge, they were not exactly perfect. We had a lot of complaints, too. I think some of the complaints that we had were very legitimate. When I first came here, Jim Wright was the Speaker and Jim Wright had to leave and there were some problems there. We had a House bank scandal. We had a House post office scandal. We had all kinds of things going on. Republicans were screaming and yelling about it.

Today I have to tell my colleagues, after all these years, and with all due respect to my colleagues, I think we are working better together right now than we were back in those days. I will have to admit I was frustrated in those days. I was very frustrated and I was probably screaming. In fact most of my colleagues can remember me screaming and yelling in those days. But I think that we are actually working better now than we did when I first became a Member of the House. There is always room for improvement and I hope we will.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating the previous question to make in order the amendment by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJJDENSON] which was defeated in the Committee on Rules yesterday. The amendment would cap funds for committee expenses at the level identified for them in the committee funding resolution for the 105th Congress.

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote.

A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan.

It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD:

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow

the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's "Precedents of the House of Representatives," (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership "Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives," (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual:

Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's "Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives," the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues:

Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Bakersfield, CA [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee of House Oversight.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio very much for yielding me this time. I want to start by complimenting the gentleman

from New York [Mr. WALSH]. As the new chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch, he is, in this proposal, building on the excellent record laid down by the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], which showed between the Democratically controlled 103d Congress and the Republican-controlled 104th a dramatic reduction in expenses. After the dramatic work of Mr. PACKARD, the gentleman from New York, Mr. WALSH, follows him by additional reductions.

Anyone who needs to know what the Democrats did when they ran this place simply has to go out and look at the Botanical Gardens. It was falling apart for years. They would not fix things. What we have done is come in and in a businesslike way know that deferred maintenance is going to eventually cost us. It cost us. There is no roof on the Botanical Gardens. They were here for 40 years and the building collapsed. Come back in 3 years and under Republican control, you will see a rebuilt Botanical Gardens. We go to the foundation and build it back up. I want to compliment the gentleman from New York for doing that.

In terms of amendments, first of all, let me say that I am very, very saddened by the comments of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. He has an amendment that has been made in order by the Committee on Rules. The gentleman's amendment seeks to cut staff. I will have to tell Members that in the years the gentleman from California was chairman of the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch, he never ever offered an amendment to cut staff. In fact, he is known as a champion of making sure that there are enough helping hands around here to do the job. His amendment clearly is out of character. The reason, of course, is because his status changed from majority to minority. But I cannot understand, unless it is the demands of leadership and the pressure put on him by the outrageous elements within his party for him to come to this well and use the ethnic card, to try to argue that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] and her election is being investigated because her name is Sanchez.

I would ask my colleagues to reflect on the fact that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] is a Member of the House of Representatives. She had a certificate of election. When the Democrats ran the place, if your name was McIntyre and you had a certificate of election, you were not allowed to be seated.

□ 1030

What the Democrats did was go in, set up a phony way of counting votes and then did not even follow the way they said they were going to count the votes to make sure that they stole that election.

What are we doing right now in the contested election? My colleagues heard all the racist comments from the Democratic side of the aisle. I will tell my colleagues what is going on. In Orange County today the District Attorney of Orange County is carrying out a criminal investigation preparatory to a trial against an organization called Hermandad Nacional because these people abused and misused Americans who wanted to become citizens. Legal aliens were used in illegal activities. That is the basis for our requiring by subpoena the Immigration and Naturalization Service to take those core names that Hermandad used for illegal purposes and put on the voter rolls without complying with the law.

The labor card was played once again. I just find it ironic that if one's party affiliation is Democrat, somehow you are with working people. Contrarily, if one's label is "R" you are somehow against working people.

My father, his lifetime job was a plumber. He belonged to Local 582, Plumbers and Pipefitters, and he went out and worked as a plumber his entire life. I was the first member of my family to complete college.

My colleagues should look at some of their backgrounds. What they do is exploit the labor union movement. These people never belonged to labor unions. All they do is play that cheap labor card over and over again.

Let me tell my colleagues about this investigation, this oversight vote that we are looking at. It was voted in committee. We have a 2-year budgetary process. When needs come up, we will vote the money, this time, \$1.4 million. They get \$433,000 out of that money. They have not mentioned that. We play a fair share game, \$2 on our side, \$1 on their side.

Mr. Speaker, they get \$1 for every \$2 that we have. When they ran the place, we got 10 cents on the dollar. But what they need to do is to hide behind racial epitaphs and abuse-of-class arguments to try to carry the day.

I know those people are upset they are not the majority anymore, but come on, grow up. More important, do not let the American people think that the way we are supposed to win is to not deal with facts, not face reality, but hide behind scapegoats and epitaphs which may allow them to get elected when they can sway people in their district but should not be allowed to be the basis for discussion on the floor of the House of Representatives.

So I would tell my colleagues as we examine this rule and the vote for the legislative branch appropriation that the work that the new majority is doing to continue to build to make sure that roofs are on buildings, that people who obtain the franchise illegally are not able to use it. Black, white, red, yellow, Hispanic, Welsh; illegal voters should not be on the rolls.

If illegal voters participate in an election, the American people have a right to know that their legal vote counts and illegal votes have to be removed from the rolls.

Support the rule, support the legislation.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following proposed amendment:

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section.

Section 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of the resolution, it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider the following amendment by Mr. Gejdenson.

Page 8, insert after line 5 the following new section:

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the expenses of any committee of the House of Representatives during any session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress in excess of the amounts specifically identified for and allocated to such committee under primary and supplemental expense resolutions, or to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the House of Representatives who certifies, approves, or processes any disbursement of funds from any reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees established pursuant to clause 5(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to a rule and an appropriations bill which permits continued funding for a wasteful, and pointless challenge to the duly-certified election of our colleague, LORETTA SANCHEZ.

I faced a similar challenge in the last Congress. After 9 months and taxpayer expenditures of approximately \$100,000, that challenge was finally withdrawn.

The Sanchez challenge should be ended now before more taxpayer money and more Members' time is wasted. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, those of us from California—a State where a majority of our population will soon be Hispanic—should condemn the effort to intimidate legal Hispanic voters which is, in my view, a central goal of the ongoing Sanchez challenge.

The right way to challenge LORETTA SANCHEZ is the 1998 election. The wrong way is to use funding in this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 (b)(1) of rule XV the

Chair may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 201, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

YEAS—222

Aderholt	Gibbons	Packard
Archer	Gilchrest	Pappas
Armey	Gillmor	Parker
Bachus	Gilman	Paul
Baker	Goodlatte	Paxon
Ballenger	Goodling	Pease
Barr	Goss	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Petri
Bartlett	Granger	Pickering
Barton	Greenwood	Pitts
Bass	Gutknecht	Pombo
Bateman	Hansen	Porter
Bereuter	Hastert	Portman
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Bilbrakis	Hayworth	Quinn
Billey	Hefley	Radanovich
Blunt	Herger	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hill	Redmond
Boehner	Hillery	Regula
Bonilla	Hobson	Riggs
Bono	Hoekstra	Riley
Brady	Horn	Rogan
Bryant	Hostettler	Rogers
Bunning	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Burr	Hulshof	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Hunter	Roukema
Buyer	Hutchinson	Royce
Callahan	Hyde	Ryun
Calvert	Inglis	Salmon
Camp	Istook	Sanford
Campbell	Jenkins	Saxton
Canady	Johnson (CT)	Scarborough
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer, Dan
Castle	Jones	Schaffer, Bob
Chabot	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Chambliss	Kelly	Sessions
Chenoweth	Kim	Shadegg
Christensen	King (NY)	Shaw
Coble	Kingston	Shays
Coburn	Klug	Shimkus
Collins	Knollenberg	Shuster
Combust	Kolbe	Skeen
Cook	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Cooksey	Largent	Smith (OR)
Cox	Latham	Smith (TX)
Crapo	LaTourette	Smith, Linda
Cubin	Lazio	Snowbarger
Cunningham	Leach	Solomon
Davis (VA)	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Spence
DeLay	Linder	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Livingston	Stump
Dickey	LoBiondo	Sununu
Doolittle	Lucas	Talent
Dreier	Manzullo	Tauzin
Duncan	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Dunn	McCrery	Thomas
Ehlers	McDade	Thornberry
Ehrlich	McHugh	Thune
Emerson	McInnis	Tiahrt
English	McIntosh	Trafficant
Ensign	McKeon	Upton
Everett	Metcalf	Walsh
Ewing	Mica	Wamp
Fawell	Miller (FL)	Watkins
Foley	Moran (KS)	Watts (OK)
Forbes	Morella	Weldon (FL)
Fowler	Myrick	Weldon (PA)
Fox	Nethercutt	Weller
Franks (NJ)	Neumann	White
Frelinghuysen	Ney	Whitfield
Gallegly	Northup	Wicker
Ganske	Norwood	Wolf
Gekas	Oxley	Young (FL)

NAYS—201

Abercrombie	Barrett (WI)	Bonior
Ackerman	Becerra	Borski
Allen	Bentsen	Boswell
Andrews	Berman	Boucher
Baessler	Berry	Boyd
Baldacci	Bishop	Brown (CA)
Barcia	Blagojevich	Brown (FL)

Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Pascrell
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Cardin	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Carson	(TX)	Pelosi
Clay	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Clayton	John	Pickett
Clement	Johnson (WI)	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Johnson, E.B.	Poshard
Condit	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Conyers	Kaptur	Rahall
Costello	Kennedy (MA)	Rangel
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Reyes
Cramer	Kennedy	Rivers
Cummings	Kildee	Rodriguez
Danner	Kilpatrick	Roemer
Davis (FL)	Kind (WI)	Rothman
Davis (IL)	Kleczka	Royal-Allard
DeFazio	Klink	Rush
DeGette	Kucinich	Sabo
Delahunt	LaFalce	Sanchez
DeLauro	Lampson	Sanders
Dellums	Lantos	Sandlin
Deutsch	Levin	Sawyer
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
Dingell	Lipinski	Scott
Dixon	Lofgren	Serrano
Doggett	Lowe	Sherman
Dooley	Luther	Siskiy
Doyle	Maloney (CT)	Skaggs
Edwards	Maloney (NY)	Skelton
Engel	Manton	Slaughter
Eshoo	Markey	Smith, Adam
Etheridge	Mascara	Snyder
Evans	Matsui	Spratt
Farr	McCarthy (MO)	Stabenow
Fattah	McCarthy (NY)	Stenholm
Fazio	McDermott	Stokes
Flner	McGovern	Strickland
Flake	McHale	Stupak
Foglietta	McIntyre	Tanner
Ford	McKinney	Tauscher
Frank (MA)	McNulty	Taylor (MS)
Frost	Meehan	Thompson
Furse	Meek	Thurman
Gejdenson	Menendez	Tierney
Gephardt	Millender-	Torres
Goode	McDonald	Towns
Gordon	Minge	Turner
Green	Mink	Velázquez
Gutierrez	Moakley	Vento
Hall (OH)	Mollohan	Visclosky
Hall (TX)	Moran (VA)	Waters
Hamilton	Murtha	Watt (NC)
Harman	Nadler	Waxman
Hastings (FL)	Neal	Wexler
Hefner	Oberstar	Weygand
Hilliard	Obey	Wise
Hinches	Olver	Woolsey
Hinojosa	Ortiz	Wynn
Holden	Owens	Yates
Hooley	Pallone	

NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer	Miller (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Molinar	Stark
Gonzalez	Nussle	Young (AK)
Martinez	Schiff	

□ 1053

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. CLEMENT changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the Chair's previous announcement, this will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 203, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

AYES—218

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Parker
Archer	Gillmor	Paul
Armey	Gilman	Paxon
Bachus	Goodlatte	Pease
Baker	Goodling	Peterson (PA)
Ballenger	Goss	Petri
Barr	Graham	Pickering
Barrett (NE)	Granger	Pitts
Bartlett	Greenwood	Pombo
Barton	Gutknecht	Porter
Bass	Hansen	Portman
Bateman	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Bereuter	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Bilbray	Hayworth	Ramstad
Billrakis	Hefley	Reid
Billey	Herger	Regula
Blunt	Hill	Riggs
Boehert	Hilleary	Riley
Boehner	Hobson	Roemer
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Rogan
Bono	Horn	Rogers
Brady	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Bryant	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Hulshof	Roukema
Burr	Hunter	Royce
Burton	Hutchinson	Ryun
Buyer	Hyde	Salmon
Callahan	Inglis	Sanford
Calvert	Istook	Saxton
Camp	Jenkins	Scarborough
Campbell	Johnson (CT)	Schaefer, Dan
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Schaffer, Bob
Cannon	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Kasich	Sessions
Chabot	Kelly	Shadegg
Chambliss	Kim	Shaw
Chenoweth	Kingston	Shays
Christensen	Klug	Shimkus
Coble	Knollenberg	Shuster
Coburn	Kolbe	Skeen
Collins	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Combest	Largent	Smith (OR)
Cook	Latham	Smith (TX)
Cooksey	LaTourette	Smith, Linda
Cox	Lazio	Snowbarger
Crapo	Leach	Solomon
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Spence
Davis (VA)	Livingston	Stearns
Deal	Lucas	Stump
DeLay	Manzullo	Sununu
Diaz-Balart	McCormack	Talent
Dickey	McCreery	Tauzin
Doolittle	McDade	Taylor (MS)
Dreier	McHugh	Thomas
Duncan	McInnis	Thornberry
Dunn	McIntosh	Thune
Ehlers	McKeon	Tiahrt
Ehrlich	Metcalfe	Trafficant
Emerson	Mica	Upton
Ensign	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Everett	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Ewing	Morella	Watkins
Fawell	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Foley	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Fowler	Neumann	Weldon (PA)
Fox	Ney	Weller
Franks (NJ)	Northup	White
Frellich	Norwood	Whitfield
Gallely	Nussle	Wicker
Ganske	Oxley	Wolf
Gekas	Packard	Young (FL)
Gibbons	Pappas	

NOES—203

Abercrombie	Blagojevich	Clayton
Ackerman	Bonior	Clement
Allen	Borski	Clyburn
Andrews	Boswell	Condit
Baesler	Boucher	Conyers
Baldacci	Boyd	Costello
Barcia	Brown (CA)	Coyne
Barrett (WI)	Brown (FL)	Cramer
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Crummings
Bentsen	Capps	Danner
Berman	Cardin	Davis (FL)
Berry	Carson	Davis (IL)
Bishop	Clay	DeFazio

DeGette	Kennelly	Pickett
DeLauro	Kildee	Pomeroy
Dellums	Kilpatrick	Poshard
Deutsch	Kind (WI)	Price (NC)
Dicks	King (NY)	Quinn
Dingell	Kleczka	Rahall
Dixon	Klink	Rangel
Doggett	Kucinich	Reyes
Dooley	LaFalce	Rivers
Doyle	Lampson	Rodriguez
Edwards	Lantos	Rothman
Engel	Levin	Roybal-Allard
English	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Eshoo	Lipinski	Sabo
Etheridge	LoBiondo	Sanchez
Evans	Lofgren	Sanders
Evans	Lowey	Sandlin
Farr	Luther	Sawyer
Fattah	Maloney (CT)	Schumer
Fazio	Maloney (NY)	Scott
Flner	Manton	Scott
Flake	Markey	Serrano
Foglietta	Mascara	Sherman
Forbes	Matsul	Sisisky
Ford	McCarthy (MO)	Skaggs
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (NY)	Skelton
Frost	McDermott	Slaughter
Furse	McGovern	Smith, Adam
Gejdenson	McHale	Snyder
Gephardt	McIntyre	Spratt
Goode	McKinney	Stabenow
Gordon	McNulty	Stenholm
Green	Meehan	Stokes
Gutierrez	Meek	Strickland
Hall (OH)	Menendez	Stupak
Hall (TX)	Millender	Tanner
Hamilton	McDonald	Tauscher
Harman	Minge	Thompson
Hastings (FL)	Mink	Thurman
Hefner	Moakley	Tierney
Hilliard	Mollohan	Torres
Hinchee	Moran (VA)	Towns
Hinojosa	Murtha	Turner
Holden	Nadler	Velázquez
Hooley	Neal	Vento
Hoyer	Oberstar	Visclosky
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Waters
Jackson-Lee	Olver	Watt (NC)
(TX)	Ortiz	Waxman
Jefferson	Owens	Wexler
John	Pallone	Weygand
Johnson (WI)	Pascarell	Wise
Kanjorski	Pastor	Woolsey
Kaptur	Payne	Wynn
Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi	Yates
Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)	

NOT VOTING—13

Blumenauer	Martinez	Stark
Crane	Miller (CA)	Taylor (NC)
Gonzalez	Molinar	Young (AK)
Johnson, E.B.	Schiff	
Linder	Smith (NJ)	

□ 1106

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 325, I was detained by constituents in my office. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to House Resolution 194 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2203.

□ 1107

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2203) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. OXLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 24, 1997, the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to divide the 5 minutes between myself and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] in order to briefly discuss the amendment that is about to be voted on.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

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

Members will want to listen. This debate occurred late last night. It is confusing and they need to know what is happening. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] offered an amendment to the DeFazio-Petri amendment, which on its face would seem to restrict the expenditure of funds on the Animas-La Plata project, which a majority in this House voted last year to not fund.

The Animas-La Plata project, and many of my colleagues have heard of it, is a proposed \$400 million plus water project with a .36 to 1 cost-benefit ratio. It is purported to provide a settlement to tribes. It does not. It is purported to do many other things it does not. But it does spend a lot of money.

What we did, Petri-DeFazio, last night was offered an amendment to say, no more funds should be expended on this project which has even been abandoned by its proponents. Its proponents have offered an alternative. The alternative has not had any hearings. It is not authorized. It has not been reviewed by the Bureau of Reclamation. That is progress. They have admitted this \$440 million boondoggle should not go forward.

What the Fazio amendment actually does is require that that project go forward. If read carefully, it starts out with a limitation, but what it does is limit funds to be expended for current authorized purposes, which is the \$440 million Animas-La Plata project, which even the proponents now admit should not go forward. There is almost \$9 million unspent at the Bureau of Reclamation, more than enough to go forward with the planning process, more than enough to develop an alternative.

Surely it cannot cost more than \$8 or \$9 million to have a planning process and develop an alternative to this

project that will meet the obligations to the tribes and be more responsible.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, just to summarize, the issue that we will be voting on is whether we should continue to spend money on this project pending an agreement on a new scaled back project, or whether we should suspend acquisition and just have money for planning until the new project is agreed on.

If Members do not want to spend money until we have a new project, vote against Fazio and then vote for the underlying amendment, Petri-DeFazio. If they want to keep spending money, even though we do not have agreement and negotiations are going on, then vote for the substitute.

I urge Members to vote against the substitute and for the underlying amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman is correct. Anybody who last year voted in the majority to not appropriate further funds for Animas-La Plata will want to vote against Fazio, I know this is a little confusing, and then vote for DeFazio-Petri, Petri-DeFazio.

This obfuscation, the wording of the Fazio amendment is obfuscation. It starts out with a limitation but it limits nothing. Having the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] be the principal sponsor is even more confusing, and Members should in principle vote "no" on the Fazio amendment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I think this debate will once and for all, contrary to a rumor circulating on the floor, this amendment is not an attempt to clarify the pronunciation of the gentleman's name and mine, but it is the Fazio substitute to the DeFazio-Petri amendment that we are about to vote on.

I am offering this on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] and on behalf of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS].

This is an attempt to allow a process undergoing success in Colorado, the so-called Roemer-Shoettler process, to downsize and change the Animas-La Plata water project. It will assuredly reduce the cost of this project by over \$400 million. But we have ongoing responsibilities to the Ute and Mountain Ute Indian tribes.

□ 1115

Those tribal water rights need to be honored. We need to complete this process. We need to have a bill that can be supported broadly on this floor.

The gentlemen from Colorado, Mr. MCINNIS and Mr. SKAGGS, would not be

supporting this if they did not believe this process was working to the benefit of their constituents.

My view is that this amendment, offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO], will interfere with that process and not allow us to accept the results of it and move to completion of an endless legal hassle which has kept these native Americans from getting their water rights.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and I want to clear up the confusion between the two names and ask the gentleman a question.

If our side of the aisle wanted to help our newest Member from New Mexico, Mr. BILL REDMOND, we should vote for the Fazio substitute to the DeFazio amendment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] would agree with that.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely correct. Vote "yes" on the Fazio amendment.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

This project seems to have become the poster child for all those who wish to show that they're environmentally sensitive though fiscally prudent. That though they're willing to make tough choices on spending, they still are moved by the sight of a tree or free-flowing water. In short, it is offered by people who have never been the Four Corners area of the Southwest and are not willing to know the history involved there.

This project is intended to deliver water to the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe and fulfill a treaty obligation between this country and that tribe.

Now it had been charged that the A-LP project would deliver more water to non-Indians than Indians and that this was all a smoke screen. So the people in that area changed the project. They cut the project's cost by \$400 million. Two-thirds of the water will go to Indians. It will satisfy tribal water rights claims.

Naturally, A-LP opponents still don't like the project. They say they want more time to study the new plan but environmentalists have already criticized it. They can't see why the Indians can't buy water elsewhere and not build a project at all. Sure, let 'em buy Evian water.

Lt. Gov. Gail Shoettler has been trying to broker a compromise on the A-LP since January. This amendment would essentially block that from going forward. Which is what opponents want; they certainly don't want a settlement. Instead, they can say they've killed a water project.

But lost in all of this will be the Ute Mountain Utes. Their reservation is located in one of the most arid areas of the country. Mesa

Verde National Park commemorates the ancient inhabitants of that site. Those inhabitants disappeared, probably because they ran out of water.

The Utes now live there and, I think, their tribal unemployment rate is 40 percent. They'd like this water to develop agriculture and improve their standard of living. So, basically this amendment says they should do without this water, just like their predecessors. It says they should be satisfied with tourism and handouts.

This amendment's supporters will say they want the Shoettler negotiations to go forward. But don't kid yourself; next year, we'll be back here for another amendment to kill what's left of this project. And its supporters can pat themselves on the back and say they've saved money.

But the reality is we'll have broken yet another promise to these Indians and, I suspect, left ourselves open to a lawsuit somewhere down the road.

Therefore, I strongly urge your opposition to this amendment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I urge Members to support the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], and myself.

#### SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 194, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], and the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLUG:  
Page 29, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$90,000,000)".

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 97, noes 328, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

AYES—97

Andrews  
Archer

Armey  
Barcia

Bass  
Bereuter

Blagojevich  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cannon  
Castle  
Chabot  
Christensen  
Coble  
Coburn  
Condit  
Cox  
Crane  
Cunningham  
Davis (FL)  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLay  
Doggett  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Ensign  
Foley  
Furse  
Ganske  
Goss  
Hall (TX)  
Harman  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hill

## NOES—328

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Berry  
Billbray  
Billirakis  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Blunt  
Boehkert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Canady  
Capps  
Cardin  
Carson  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Collins  
Combest  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer

Hooley  
Hostettler  
Hulshof  
Ingralls  
Istook  
Johnson, Sam  
Kasich  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kind (WI)  
Kingston  
Klecza  
Klug  
Largent  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
McCarthy (MO)  
Dunn  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Meehan  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Morella  
Neumann  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Pappas  
Paul  
Paxon

Peterson (MN)  
Porter  
Ramstad  
Rohrabacher  
Roukema  
Royce  
Ryun  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Schaffer, Bob  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Skaggs  
McCollum  
Smith (MI)  
Smith, Linda  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sununu  
Talent  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Upton  
White  
Wolf

Lowey  
Lucas  
Maloney (NY)  
Manton  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCrery  
McDade  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meek  
Menendez  
Metcalf  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Packard  
Palone  
Parker  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pease

Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hamilton  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hefner  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinckey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Horn  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (WI)  
Johnson, E.B.  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kim  
King (NY)  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren

Pelosi  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pickett  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Redmond  
Regula  
Reyes  
Riggs  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer, Dan  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)

Blumenauer  
Gonzalez  
Martinez  
Miller (CA)  
Mollinari  
Schiff

## NOT VOTING—9

Blumenauer  
Gonzalez  
Martinez

## □ 1134

Messrs. NETHERCUTT, BALDACCI, HOEKSTRA, and OLVER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. WOLF, SHERMAN, and MARKEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 194, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each additional amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARKEY:

Insert at the end before the short title the following:

SEC. 502. (a) LIMITATION.—No funds shall be made available under this Act for—

(1) nuclear technology research and development programs to continue the study of treating spent nuclear fuel using electrometallurgical technology; or

(2) the demonstration of the electrometallurgical technology at the Fuel Conditioning Facility.

(b) REDUCTION.—Under the heading "Department of Energy-Energy Programs-Energy Supply" insert after the dollar figure the following "(reduced by \$33,000,000)" and under the heading "Department of Energy-Atomic Energy Defense Activities-Other Defense Activities" insert after the dollar figure the following: "(reduced by \$12,000,000)".

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 290, not voting 10, as follows:

## [Roll No. 327]

## AYES—134

Abercrombie	Ganske	Owens
Ackerman	Gedjenson	Pallone
Allen	Gephardt	Pascrell
Andrews	Hall (OH)	Paul
Baldacci	Hefner	Payne
Barrett (WI)	Hinckey	Pelosi
Bass	Hooley	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Kasich	Pomeroy
Blunt	Kennedy (MA)	Portman
Boehkert	Kennedy (RI)	Price (NC)
Bonior	Kennelly	Rahall
Borski	Kildee	Ramstad
Boswell	Kilpatrick	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Kind (WI)	Rivers
Capps	Kingston	Roemer
Cardin	Klecza	Rothman
Castle	Klug	Roybal-Allard
Chabot	Kucinich	Royce
Coble	LaFalce	Sabo
Condit	Levin	Sanchez
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Coyne	LoBiondo	Sanford
Cunningham	Luther	Scarborough
Davis (FL)	Maloney (CT)	Schumer
DeFazio	Maloney (NY)	Sensenbrenner
DeGette	Markey	Serrano
Delahunt	Matsui	Shays
DeLauro	McCarthy (MO)	Sherman
Dellums	McCarthy (NY)	Skaggs
Deutsch	McDermott	Smith, Adam
Doggett	McGovern	Snyder
Duncan	McKinney	Spratt
Engel	McNulty	Stabenow
Eshoo	Meehan	Stokes
Etheridge	Menendez	Strickland
Evans	Miller (FL)	Sununu
Farr	Minge	Tierney
Fattah	Mink	Velazquez
Filner	Moakley	Vento
Foglietta	Morella	Walsh
Foley	Nadler	Waxman
Ford	Neal	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Obey	Weyand
Franks (NJ)	Olver	Woolsey
Furse		

## NOES—290

Aderholt	Bateman	Bono
Archer	Bentsen	Boucher
Armey	Bereuter	Boyd
Bachus	Berman	Brady
Baesler	Berry	Brown (CA)
Baker	Billbray	Brown (FL)
Ballenger	Billirakis	Bryant
Barcia	Bishop	Bunning
Barr	Blagojevich	Burr
Barrett (NE)	Bliley	Burton
Bartlett	Boehner	Buyer
Barton	Bonilla	Callahan

Calvert	Hinojosa	Pickering
Camp	Hobson	Pickett
Campbell	Hoekstra	Pitts
Canady	Holden	Pombo
Cannon	Horn	Porter
Carson	Hostettler	Poshard
Chambliss	Houghton	Pryce (OH)
Chenoweth	Hoyer	Quinn
Christensen	Hulshof	Radanovich
Clay	Hunter	Redmond
Clayton	Hutchinson	Regula
Clement	Hyde	Reyes
Clyburn	Inglis	Riggs
Coburn	Istook	Riley
Collins	Jackson (IL)	Rodriguez
Combest	Jackson-Lee	Rogan
Cook	(TX)	Rogers
Cooksey	Jefferson	Rohrabacher
Costello	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Cox	John	Roukema
Cramer	Johnson (CT)	Rush
Crane	Johnson (WI)	Ryun
Crapo	Johnson, E. B.	Salmon
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Sandlin
Cummings	Jones	Sawyer
Danner	Kanjorski	Saxton
Davis (IL)	Kelly	Schaefer, Dan
Davis (VA)	Kim	Schaffer, Bob
Deal	King (NY)	Scott
DeLay	Klink	Sessions
Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Dickey	Kolbe	Shaw
Dicks	LaHood	Shimkus
Dingell	Lampson	Shuster
Dixon	Lantos	Sisisky
Dooley	Largent	Skeen
Doolittle	Latham	Skelton
Doyle	LaTourette	Slaughter
Dreier	Lazio	Smith (NJ)
Dunn	Leach	Smith (OR)
Edwards	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Ehlers	Lewis (KY)	Smith, Linda
Ehrlich	Linder	Snowbarger
Emerson	Lipinski	Solomon
English	Livingston	Souder
Ensign	Lofgren	Spence
Everett	Lucas	Stearns
Ewing	Manton	Stenholm
Fawell	Manzullo	Stump
Fazio	Mascara	Stupak
Flake	McCollum	Talent
Forbes	McCrery	Tanner
Fowler	McDade	Tauscher
Fox	McHale	Tauzin
Frelinghuysen	McHugh	Taylor (MS)
Frost	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Gallely	McIntosh	Thomas
Gekas	McIntyre	Thompson
Gibbons	McKeon	Thornberry
Gilchrest	Meek	Thune
Gillmor	Metcalf	Thurman
Gilman	Mica	Tiahrt
Goode	Millender-	Torres
Goodlatte	McDonald	Towns
Goodling	Mollohan	Trafficant
Gordon	Moran (KS)	Turner
Goss	Moran (VA)	Upton
Graham	Murtha	Visclosky
Granger	Myrick	Wamp
Green	Nethercutt	Waters
Greenwood	Neumann	Watkins
Gutierrez	Ney	Watt (NC)
Gutknecht	Northup	Watts (OK)
Hall (TX)	Norwood	Weldon (FL)
Hamilton	Nussle	Weldon (PA)
Hansen	Oberstar	Weller
Harman	Ortiz	White
Hastert	Oxley	Whitfield
Hastings (FL)	Packard	Wicker
Hastings (WA)	Pappas	Wise
Hayworth	Parker	Wolf
Hefley	Pastor	Wynn
Herger	Paxon	Yates
Hill	Pease	Young (FL)
Hilleary	Peterson (PA)	
Hilliard	Petri	

NOT VOTING—10

Blumenauer	Miller (CA)	Stark
Gonzalez	Molinar	Young (AK)
Kaptur	Schiff	
Martinez	Smith (MI)	

□ 1144

Messrs. CUMMINGS, NEUMANN, FORBES, and MORAN of Virginia changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WALSH and Ms. STABENOW changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETRI

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FAZIO of California as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. PETRI:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title the following new section:

None of the funds made available in this act to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Interior may be used for the Animas-La Plata Project, in Colorado and New Mexico, except for (1) activities required to comply with the applicable provisions of current law; and (2) continuation of activities pursuant to the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights settlement Act of 1988 (Pub L. 100-585).

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 201, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

AYES—223

Abercrombie	Burr	Edwards
Ackerman	Burton	Emerson
Aderholt	Callahan	English
Archer	Calvert	Ensign
Army	Camp	Everett
Baessler	Canady	Ewing
Baker	Cannon	Fattah
Baldacci	Carson	Fawell
Ballenger	Chenoweth	Fazio
Barr	Christensen	Flake
Barrett (NE)	Combest	Foglietta
Bartlett	Conyers	Ford
Barton	Cooksey	Fowler
Bateman	Cox	Frelinghuysen
Bereuter	Crane	Frost
Bilbray	Crapo	Furse
Bilirakis	Cubin	Gallely
Bishop	Cunningham	Gekas
Bliley	Davis (VA)	Gibbons
Blunt	DeLay	Gillmor
Boehner	Diaz-Balart	Goodling
Bonilla	Dickey	Gordon
Bono	Dicks	Goss
Borski	Dooley	Graham
Boyd	Doolittle	Granger
Brady	Doyle	Green
Bryant	Dreier	Gutknecht
Bunning	Dunn	Hall (TX)

Hamilton	McCrery	Sawyer
Hansen	McDade	Scarborough
Harman	McHale	Schaefer, Dan
Hastert	McHugh	Schaffer, Bob
Hastings (WA)	McInnis	Sessions
Hayworth	McIntosh	Shadegg
Hefley	McIntyre	Shaw
Hefner	McKeon	Shimkus
Herger	Mica	Shuster
Hill	Mink	Sisisky
Hilleary	Moakley	Skaggs
Hilliard	Mollohan	Skeen
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)	Skelton
Holden	Moran (VA)	Smith (OR)
Hostettler	Murtha	Smith (TX)
Hoyer	Myrick	Smith, Linda
Hunter	Nethercutt	Snowbarger
Hyde	Nussle	Snyder
Istook	Ortiz	Solomon
Jackson-Lee	Oxley	Spence
(TX)	Packard	Sperr
Jefferson	Parker	Stenholm
Jenkins	Pastor	Stump
John	Paxon	Talent
Johnson, E. B.	Pease	Tauzin
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)	Taylor (NC)
Jones	Pickering	Thomas
Kanjorski	Pickett	Thornberry
Kennedy (RI)	Pitts	Thune
Kildee	Pombo	Thurman
Kilpatrick	Pomeroy	Tiahrt
King (NY)	Porter	Trafficant
Kingston	Pryce (OH)	Turner
Klink	Quinn	Visclosky
Knollenberg	Radanovich	Walsh
Kolbe	Rahall	Wamp
LaFalce	Redmond	Watkins
LaHood	Regula	Watts (OK)
Lampson	Reyes	Weldon (FL)
Latham	Riley	Weller
LaTourette	Rodriguez	White
Lewis (CA)	Rogan	Wicker
Lewis (KY)	Rogers	Wise
Linder	Rohrabacher	Wolf
Livingston	Ros-Lehtinen	Wynn
Lucas	Roukema	Young (FL)
Mascara	Sandlin	

NOES—201

Allen	Deutsch	Kind (WI)
Andrews	Dingell	Klecza
Bachus	Dixon	Klug
Barcia	Doggett	Kucinich
Barrett (WI)	Duncan	Lantos
Bass	Ehlers	Largent
Becerra	Ehrlich	Lazio
Bentsen	Engel	Leach
Berman	Eshoo	Levin
Berry	Etheridge	Lewis (GA)
Blagojevich	Evans	Lipinski
Boehler	Farr	LoBiondo
Bonior	Filner	Lofgren
Boswell	Foley	Lowe
Boucher	Forbes	Luther
Brown (CA)	Fox	Maloney (CT)
Brown (FL)	Frank (MA)	Maloney (NY)
Brown (OH)	Franks (NJ)	Manton
Campbell	Ganske	Manzullo
Capps	Gejdenson	Markey
Cardin	Gephardt	Matsui
Castle	Gilchrest	McCarthy (MO)
Chabot	Gilman	McCarthy (NY)
Chambliss	Goode	McCollum
Clay	Goodlatte	McDermott
Clayton	Greenwood	McGovern
Clement	Gutierrez	McKinney
Clyburn	Hall (OH)	McNulty
Coble	Hastings (FL)	Meehan
Coburn	Hinche	Meek
Collins	Hobson	Menendez
Condit	Hoekstra	Metcalf
Cook	Hooley	Millender-
Costello	Horn	McDonald
Coyne	Houghton	Miller (FL)
Cramer	Hulshof	Minge
Cummings	Hutchinson	Morella
Danner	Inglis	Nadler
Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Neal
Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Neumann
Deal	Johnson (WI)	Ney
DeFazio	Kasich	Northup
DeGette	Kelly	Norwood
DeLahunt	Kennedy (MA)	Oberstar
DeLauro	Kennelly	Obey
Dellums	Kim	Olver

Owens	Sabo	Sununu
Pallone	Salmon	Tanner
Pappas	Sanchez	Tauscher
Pascarell	Sanders	Taylor (MS)
Paul	Sanford	Thompson
Payne	Saxton	Tierney
Pelosi	Schumer	Torres
Peterson (MN)	Scott	Towns
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Portman	Serrano	Velázquez
Poshard	Shays	Vento
Price (NC)	Sherman	Waters
Ramstad	Slaughter	Watt (NC)
Rangel	Smith (MI)	Waxman
Riggs	Smith (NJ)	Weldon (PA)
Rivers	Smith, Adam	Wexler
Roemer	Souder	Weyand
Rothman	Stabenow	Whitfield
Roybal-Allard	Stearns	Woolsey
Royce	Stokes	Yates
Rush	Strickland	
Ryun	Stupak	

## NOT VOTING—10

Blumenauer	Martinez	Stark
Buyer	Miller (CA)	Young (AK)
Gonzalez	Molinar	
Kaptur	Schiff	

□ 1153

Messrs. SMITH of Michigan, CLYBURN, FOX of Pennsylvania, and SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this important legislation and want to take this opportunity to thank Chairman MCDADE for his continued support for projects like the Ramapo River at Oakland Flood project and the tritium production program that are so important to the residents of New Jersey.

As a long-time supporter of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Oakland Flood Protection Project, I am committed to seeing that this project becomes a reality. Flooding along the Ramapo River has occurred 15 times in the past 24 years. The 330 families that live along the 3.3-mile stretch cannot continue to endure the repeated hardship and personal turmoil that the flood waters bring.

The principal problems along the Ramapo River are flooding caused by the backwater effect produced by the Pompton Lake Dam, the hydraulic constrictions produced by bridges crossing the river, and insufficient channel capacity.

The project is now ready to move into the construction stage. The overall cost of the project through construction is estimated at \$12.2 million. This cost is shared by the Federal Government, 75 percent and the State, 25 percent.

Last year, \$250,000 was included in the fiscal year 1997 appropriations bill to complete the planning phase of this project. But we now face the battle of getting past a project on paper and putting shovels into the ground.

The Army Corps of Engineers has indicated that it could use \$3.5 million in fiscal year 1998. This capability would allow construction to advance by one year and substantially complete the first piece of the project. The completion of the first piece, the channel widening, would provide immediate flood reduction benefits to Oakland.

Flood protection is about more than money. The emotional price of being forced from your home by raging flood waters and returning only to find your most prized possessions ruined with mud and water goes far beyond the economic price.

I am acutely aware of how difficult it is to craft a balanced fair bill that meets not only the national needs but addresses various parochial demands. That is why I am so grateful for the \$1.5 million included in the bill for my Oakland residents.

Finally, as we work with the other body to prepare a final bill for the President's signature, I would ask the chairman to support efforts to secure additional funds for this project. We must take the necessary steps to complete this project before the residents in Oakland are forced to endure yet another flood.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, although I am very sensitive to the economic needs of our neighbors who live in the Appalachian corridor of Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, and adjacent States, I support the Klug amendment to delete the money, \$90 million, specifically targeted for highway construction in the Appalachian corridor. This program is duplicative, and it is more appropriately addressed when the House considers ISTEA funding.

In addition, there is convincing evidence that a highway corridor could have very severe environmental consequences to the region. A 100-mile corridor through the sparsely populated mountains in West Virginia would cross 41 streams, go through two national forests, impact two Civil War battlefields, and take some of the State's best farmland for sprawl development. This is not a wise investment.

I thank Congressman KLUG for offering this amendment and urge my colleagues to join me in support of it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a matter that was not included in the energy and water appropriations bill, but which I believe deserves further consideration, perhaps in conference.

Our Nation's electrical transmission grid is strained to the point where blackouts and brownouts are occurring at critical times. This is a matter of life and death for older people and those in poor health, whose life can be threatened when faced with high temperatures and a lack of air-conditioning.

There is a potential solution to this transmission problem. A consortium of utilities and high technology companies have developed new transmission cables that can carry twice the electricity of today's cables, thereby alleviating the overload problem without having to install new rights-of-ways. The technology is called aluminum matrix composites, and I hope that the final bill will give the Department of Energy enough flexibility to consider funding this project.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

I congratulate the chairman and ranking member and their staffs for producing a solid bipartisan bill.

I would also like to thank the chairman and ranking member for the report language directing FERC [Federal Energy Regulatory Commission] to give priority to the processing of hydroelectric licenses for which there are compelling applications.

This language is important to the city of Holyoke to prevent any delay in FERC's review of competing dam license applications. Such a delay may place an undue burden on the city of Holyoke.

I would also ask that the chairman hold the House language in conference, as it is more precise than the language in the Senate bill.

Again, I thank the chairman for his assistance and I look forward to supporting the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. OXLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2203) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 194, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 7, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Bateman	Boucher
Ackerman	Becerra	Boyd
Aderholt	Bentsen	Brady
Allen	Bereuter	Brown (CA)
Andrews	Berman	Brown (FL)
Archer	Berry	Brown (OH)
Armey	Blibray	Bryant
Bachus	Bilirakis	Bunning
Baessler	Bishop	Burr
Baker	Blagojevich	Burton
Baldacci	Bliley	Buyer
Ballenger	Blunt	Callahan
Barclay	Boehert	Calvert
Barr	Boehner	Camp
Barrett (NE)	Bonilla	Campbell
Barrett (WI)	Bonior	Canady
Bartlett	Bono	Cannon
Barton	Borski	Capps
Bass	Boswell	Cardin

Carson  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyle  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fowler  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gilchrist  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Green  
Greenwood

Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinchee  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (WI)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kim  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kleczka  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBlondo  
Lofgren  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McDermott

McGovern  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Menendez  
Metcalf  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Pappas  
Parker  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pickett  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Redmond  
Regula  
Reyes  
Riggs  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Ryun  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer, Dan  
Schaffer, Bob  
Schumer

Scott  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith, Adam  
Smith, Linda  
Snowbarger  
Snyder  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt

Stabenow  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Strickland  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tierney  
Torres  
Towns  
Trafcant  
Turner

Upton  
Velázquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Weygand  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (FL)

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1119) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DELLUMS moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 1119 be instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in section 1207 of the House bill relating to limitation on payments for cost of NATO expansion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

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

During the House's deliberation on the bill, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1119, the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999, the House adopted an amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]. That amendment now embodies the provisions contained in section 1207 of the bill.

Very briefly, let me describe that amendment and now the provisions of section 1207. It would place a limit on U.S. costs for handling the expansion of NATO to 10 percent of the total cost, or \$2 billion, whichever is lesser, for fiscal years 1998 through 2010.

With respect to background, Mr. Speaker, Congress, the House especially, has for a long time expressed concern regarding the relative shares of meeting the burden of providing European and transatlantic security. It has passed provisions on several occasions to secure increases in European support for U.S. troop nonpersonnel costs, and has a provision, adopted again by overwhelming support on the floor in the House version of the 1998 Defense authorization act, the Frank amendment that I have alluded to earlier.

NAYS—7

Ensign  
Gibbons  
Klug  
Paul  
Royce  
Sensenbrenner  
Smith (MI)

NOT VOTING—9

Blumenauer  
Gonzalez  
Martinez  
Meek  
Miller (CA)  
Molinari  
Schiff  
Stark  
Young (AK)

□ 1213

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the further consideration of H.R. 2203, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE SUNDRY PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, having cleared this with the minority, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight, July 25, 1997, to file three privileged reports on bills making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1998; the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for fiscal year 1998; and the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1998.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bills.

With NATO expansion looming on the horizon, concern exists regarding the understanding of both the scale of the costs associated with expansion and the distribution of those costs across new and current members of NATO, including the United States.

Let me quickly reiterate, Mr. Speaker, arguments in support of the provisions contained in section 1207, the subject of this motion to recommit conferees.

First, the United States provides disproportionate support for NATO in many capacities, making available naval forces as well as communications, transportation, and logistics capabilities, and strategic nuclear forces. As a result, it pays a substantially larger portion of its GDP on its military account than our European allies.

Second, several of our European allies are wealthy nations and can contribute more to the burdens of the alliance than they currently do.

Third, new members of NATO should be expected to contribute along the terms of existing members, and should not be admitted without the capabilities to contribute across the panorama of dimensions, that would include financial, military, political, and foreign policy, of current members of the alliance.

Fourth, the amounts contained in the amendment do indeed reflect the administration's current estimates of the probable U.S. share. The provisions contained in section 1207 would establish that in law for the period through the year 2010, after which a review can be made of the continuing appropriateness of that level of commitment or restraint.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, legislative initiatives have in the past provided important leverage, as it were, to the U.S. Government in negotiations with NATO partners on burdensharing arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, with those opening and explanatory remarks, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the distinguished ranking member of the committee. This motion expresses support for section 1207 of H.R. 1119, a provision offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] that would ensure that the United States' share of the costs associated with the proposed expansion of NATO does not exceed the administration's projected estimates.

While I believe we want to closely examine the precise wording of this provision, I support its intent, as it addresses a very important aspect of the administration's NATO expansion policy: How much will this policy cost, and who will pick up the cost?

On this point, a recent letter from President Clinton to the committee states that "all NATO members will share in the cost of NATO enlargement, and the distribution of costs will be in accordance with long-standing financial principles."

However, at the recent NATO summit in Madrid, French President Chirac declared, and I quote, "France does not intend to raise its contribution to NATO because of the cost of enlargement." At a minimum, this development raises important questions that deserve continued attention and scrutiny by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of where one might stand on the broader question of NATO expansion, I agree that the question of cost, how much, who pays, and by when, should be of universal concern. Therefore, I join the gentleman from California in supporting this motion, and look forward to working with him and the Members on all sides of the NATO expansion issue as we arrive at a proper statement of congressional policy on questions of cost.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the gentleman's remarks, the chairman of our Committee on National Security.

Mr. Speaker, I took part in a NATO summit meeting. We certainly are in support of NATO expansion, but I think burdensharing is an extremely important aspect of all of this. We want to make certain that the Congress and the American people fully understand what the burden of costs will be with regard to NATO expansion.

I am pleased to rise with the gentleman in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for their support of this motion to instruct conferees. It certainly gives this gentleman confidence that we will stand firmly and strongly in the context of the conference to bring this provision back.

I in a moment will yield to one of my distinguished colleagues from Massachusetts, the author of the amendment that is now the subject matter of section 1207, but I would first like to say, Mr. Speaker, that over the years there have been several Members very keenly interested in the issue of burdensharing. One of them who has loomed large in the context of our deliberations here in the Congress on the matter of burdensharing has been the

distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], who has been unwavering and unrelenting in his concern about burdensharing.

I think it is a tribute to the gentleman that the Congress on more than one occasion has embraced the wisdom of my distinguished colleague, and that his work is now the subject matter of the motion to recommit conferees today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I am deeply grateful, Mr. Speaker, for the ranking minority member's words of praise, because he is among the most consistently thoughtful and serious Members of this body, and praise from him in this area means a great deal to me.

I am also grateful to the two chairmen who have spoken, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], chairman of the Committee on National Security.

It is appropriate that we be speaking out with virtual unanimity, certainly great consensus. We are not here debating whether or not America ought to join NATO. Indeed, in its specific form, that will not come before us. It will come before the other body as a ratification of a treaty. This House voted on a resolution, a sense of Congress, in favor of the expansion of NATO. That is not at issue. There is a large majority in favor, although some may have questions.

The issue is what is an equitable sharing of the costs. I think it is important to note the history here. Fifty-two years ago, at the close of World War II, this Nation undertook as generous an approach to foreign nations as we have seen in the history of the world. From the Marshall plan through a whole range of other activities, the people of the United States went to the aid in particular of people in Europe who had been devastated by the war, in what is really quite an extraordinary example of national generosity and good sense. It was done in a bipartisan way by President Truman and a Republican Congress that came into power in 1946.

This country not only went to the aid of its former allies, but in what is really an example of the importance of a generosity of spirit and an appreciation of the value of reconciliation, we went to the aid of our former enemies. This country by the late 1940's was a partner in the rebuilding economically and politically of Germany and Japan. Germany and Japan today and for decades have been functioning democracies, and that is something about which we can be proud, our part in having that reaction.

I say that because no one can accuse this country of a lack of appreciation for international responsibilities when we say at this point, dealing with allies that are our equals in wealth, that an element of subsidy from us to them is no longer appropriate. That is what this amendment says.

This amendment says that when it comes to the expansion of NATO, which is, after all, primarily about Europe, although it is obviously going to benefit us as well, the wealthy European nations, and this is not an effort to impose more money on the Czech Republic or the people of Hungary or the people of Poland, but we are talking here about our wealthy European allies.

The chairman of the Committee on National Security correctly noted, I believe, the quotation from President Chirac of France. Remember, the French have two positions. One, more countries ought to be invited into NATO; two, they should not contribute a franc to that.

□ 1230

That is obviously an untenable position. I regard this as strengthening the hands of the administration. The number we have here, \$2 billion, is the upper end of the range that the President has told us this will cost. This is not an effort to force the administration to do with less than they have asked for. The President has said over this 12-year period it will cost \$1.5 to \$2 billion. We say \$2 billion.

We realize he has got to be negotiating with our allies, allies who have refused to bear a common part of the burden, and questions have legitimately been raised. Why is that important? It is important because if they do too much or we get forced to do too much at the expense of other things, we are about to adopt, not with my vote, but it is going to be adopted, a budget agreement. It will very tightly constrain for the next 5 years at least both domestic and international spending, both military and civilian spending, the military spending itself will be tight according to those in charge of it. And it cannot, I think, sustain additional billions for NATO expansion without taking away from important categories that we need to worry about. So this simply takes the President at his word.

I would also point out two things: The chairman of the committee said quite correctly that he, and I appreciated this, agreed in concept but we would work on the wording. Of course, an instruction motion does not tie the hands of our conferees. It does not require them to vote ad infinitum for every word. It, I hope, will send them into negotiation with the other body with a powerful statement that some concern about cost has to be written in.

Second, what we are talking about people will say, suppose something unforeseen comes up there 4 or 5 years from now. The answer under the American Constitution is not that the President should have a blank check to deal with that but where we are talking about the spending power, the President should be required to return to the Congress of the United States and say, this has happened. There is this emergency. This threat has turned out to be worse than we thought. This expense is greater than we thought. There has been a collapse in one of our allies and we understand that they cannot bear the strain of that cost.

This House and the other body will certainly listen to that. This is not an absolute forever limitation. It is saying to the administration, this is what you say you need now and this is what we are going to give you. If circumstances arise which should require more, then under our Constitution you come back and ask because what we fear, many of us, is that our allies will cheer us on, urge us to expand to even more countries and continue the pattern of refusing to cooperate.

I include for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, an article which was published in yesterday's Washington Post by two distinguished Republican Members of the other body:

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1997]

#### THE MISSING NATO DEBATE

(By John Warner and Kay Bailey Hutchison)

Going into the NATO summit in Madrid, conventional wisdom had it that expanding the Alliance would be easy. We believe this perception is changing with the realization of what expansion will entail.

The plan—which would have Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary come under the American security umbrella in just two years—seems to contradict the reality of declining defense budgets and general post-Cold War retrenchment that is taking place in all of the Western democracies. French President Jacques Chirac admitted as much at the recent NATO summit in Madrid, when he flatly declared that “France does not intend to raise its contribution to NATO because of the cost of enlargement.”

One indication of this intensified scrutiny is the recent letter from 20 senators to the president outlining those areas that will be debated prior to NATO expansion. Signatories include senators from every region of the country and from across the political spectrum, from Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) to Paul Wellstone (D-Minn.).

These members have differing views of NATO expansion, from support to skepticism to outright opposition. But they share one concern: The decision to enter into a mutual defense treaty with three additional countries deserves more debate and inspection than it has thus far received.

Under Article 5 of the NATO Charter, the members make a commitment to treat an attack on one member as an attack on all. Are the American people willing to make that same commitment to the three countries in Central Europe being identified for NATO membership, and possibly more in the future? And at what price?

The cost of adding at least three members to NATO will entail increased training for

the new members, enhanced command and control capabilities, communications and intelligence-gathering improvements, upgrading of facilities and the purchase of weapons that will bring the new members up to NATO standards.

The wide variations in the estimates for these improvements are of concern. The independent and respected Rand Corp. in 1995 fixed the cost of NATO expansion at \$1 billion to \$5 billion a year over 10 years, soaring as high as \$10 billion or more should a strong threat to NATO reemerge.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that expanding the alliance (to the three plus Slovakia) would lead to U.S. costs ranging from \$5 billion to \$19 billion over 15 years. The CBO estimates the total cost of expansion at as much as \$125 billion. The cost to the United States assumes, questionably, that the new members of the alliance would increase their own defense spending by 60 percent over the same period.

In stark contrast to these staggering cost assessments are the Clinton administration's rather modest estimates for adding three to five unnamed members to the alliance. In a February 1997 report to Congress, the administration concluded that the cost to the United States over 12 years would be just \$150 million to \$200 million a year, at best only one-fifth of the next highest estimate from an independent source. The same administration estimated the costs of the current U.S. operation in Bosnia at less than \$2 billion. The actual cost will be \$6.5 billion through June 1998, with that withdrawal date now in question.

The administration's February report is further troubling because of its assumptions about burden-sharing, or how much of the total cost of NATO enlargement will be borne by our European allies. According to the administration, the United States will pay just 15 percent or so of the direct enlargement costs. Other members will pay 50 percent, and the new members 35 percent.

The recent statement by President Chirac would seem to call this assumption into question. His statement is consistent with the trends of the last several years. Despite cuts in U.S. defense spending since the end of the Cold War, we still spend nearly 4 percent of our total wealth (gross domestic product) on defense. By comparison, France spends just 2.5 percent, Germany 1.5 percent and Poland 2.4 percent. It seems unlikely that these current and future allies will pay proportionately two or three times more than the United States for the costs of NATO expansion when they spend just half of what we do on general defense.

NATO expansion may well be a good idea, but the plan to bring it about must be based on hard realities, not feel-good perceptions. A heavy burden falls upon elected leaders to make a convincing argument to the American people that changes we make to the alliance are in our national interest and will strengthen the organization.

I cite this because it is, I will tell the Parliamentarian, directly relevant to the legislation under consideration. Under our rules we cannot just idly comment on the other body, but we can talk about things that are relevant. Two Members of the Senate, the Senator from Virginia, who is a senior member of their Committee on Armed Services, and the junior Senator from Texas have an interesting article about

this problem. They talk about, for instance, when they list what the President of the United States has said this will cost us, the recent statement by President Chirac of France would seem to call this assumption into question.

His statement is consistent with the trends of the last several years. Despite cuts in U.S. defense spending since the end of the cold war, we still spend nearly 4 percent of our total wealth on defense. By comparison France spends just 2.5 percent; Germany, 1.5 percent. It seems unlikely that these current and future allies will pay two or three times more than the United States for the cost of NATO expansion when they spend just half of what we do on general defense.

There is one thing we can do about that. We can have this Congress say, yes, the great majority here in this House voted to support the concept of NATO expansion but not in a context in which the U.S. taxpayer has to reduce our contribution. Remember, the European nations have imposed on themselves, the leading NATO European nations are also the leading nations in the European Union. They have impressed on themselves the requirement that they get their budget deficits down to 3 percent of gross domestic product, far higher than ours. They are under pressure to make cuts and their military budgets are going to be cut.

Great Britain, another very important NATO member not in the EU currency union, just announced, under the new government, that they would be cutting defense. It is important for us to have a large vote for this so that our administration understands and is strengthened in negotiations with our allies and in insisting that the American taxpayer not be given an open-ended budgetary problem with the expansion of NATO.

Therefore, I am very grateful to my friend from California, my friend from South Carolina, the gentleman from New York and the others who I think are strengthening the hand of the U.S. Government in this negotiation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Frank motion. Let me stipulate, I am an internationalist. I for 10 years chaired the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations. In that capacity, I worked with many Members in this institution in initiating and then expanding American assistance to eastern Europe after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union. I was deeply involved in ensuring that we had major debt relief for Poland without which Poland would not, in my view, have been able to make the transition from a captive

Communist country to a now economically thriving incipient democracy.

I believe deeply in engagement with countries around the world, including those in Central Europe. But I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is absolutely correct. Uncle Sam cannot be Uncle Sucker. I think frankly, while the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] said this debate is not about the expansion of NATO, I wish it were because frankly we have never really had a debate in this country about expansion of NATO. We have had a very lightly once over discussion in this House last year encouraging the administration to pursue the possibilities of expansion, something which no reasonable Member could oppose; but I do not believe that the expansion of NATO has occurred in the right way. I think that what the West has done and the way it has done it in expanding NATO has been one of the most culturally and politically, internationally politically arrogant acts that the West has undertaken.

I am concerned it will lead to some long-term problems because, first of all, I do not like the fact that, if you expand NATO selectively, we then leave the Baltic States exposed in a no-man's land. I think if we add three or four countries to NATO, we increase the vulnerability to the countries closest to Russia, Ukraine, Balkans, countries like that.

Second, we had in this country our own debate about who lost China more than a generation ago. It was not a healthy debate. I am concerned that the way in which we approach the expansion of NATO will add fuel to the fire and add to the capacity of the most hard-line rejectionist elements within Russia to some year down the road, when the economy starts to slide again, encourage them in their own who-lost-Eastern-Europe debate. I think that would operate to the disadvantage of democratic forces in Russia.

Last, and I think most importantly, as stewards of the taxpayers money, it is our obligation both to know and to be frank with the American people about the cost that will be associated with NATO expansion. I do not think that we have had that frankness and that openness. I doubt very much that, if the country knew that we are going to commit ourselves to the concept that an attack on, say, Budapest would be treated as an attack upon Washington, DC, I think the country would want a whole lot more debate about that than it has had to this point. And certainly it would want to know what that could cost us in this era of competing forces and scarce budgets.

So I wish we had had a more full debate on that subject, but given the fact that we have not, at least I believe that we certainly ought to do what the Frank amendment does, which is to

take at their word what they say the cost to us of NATO expansion will be and to see to it that it does not rise above that ceiling because I believe that will at least force a stronger debate on the issue. If we are going to make this decision, it ought to be made with everybody's eyes open, after a full debate. That is the only way to strengthen rather than weaken the commitment of our society to involvement in international affairs. That is the only way that we can discourage rather than encourage isolationism.

That is why I think that the Frank amendment, while it does not come soon enough to generate a full-blown debate on what is happening in NATO, at least gives us an opportunity to be more frank about what it is we are doing, not meaning a pun there. I congratulate the gentleman and support his motion.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

At the outset let me just sing the praises of the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], ranking member and their staffs for the great job that they do on the most important committee in the entire Congress, even more important than our Committee on Rules. That takes a little bit for me to say that.

Let me also just point out that I rise in support of the concept of this amendment, if not the specifics. I am a little concerned about placing a percentage or a dollar figure in an amendment like this. But if we look at the Constitution of the United States, the primary purpose for forming this Republic of States into the United States of America was to provide for a common defense. And in providing for a common defense, that means in being able to have the capability of defending America's interests anywhere in the world in order to prevent an eventual attack on our sovereignty and our way of life and our democracy.

In doing that, we have responsibilities as leaders of the world. We have to look at the fact that twice we have been called into battle in the European continent. It has cost millions and millions and millions of dollars and a million American lives during those two world wars. Then the cold war erupted when the Soviet Union became an entity and tried to force their atheistic philosophy down the throats of the entire world, and it became necessary to engage in that cold war at great financial expense to the American taxpayer. But it was money well spent because today instead of communism breaking out all over the world we now have democracy, the kind that we enjoy so much breaking out all over this world.

But that is a very, very fragile peace that we have today. The NATO alliance was the greatest defense alliance in the history of this world because, all during that cold war, it kept the peace. It kept this country and others from being annihilated from nuclear attack. And the way to keep that peace for the future is to expand NATO. We have an obligation in America to do that because we are the leader of the free world. We are the beacon of hope for all people throughout this world. We cannot just sit back and say, Europe, that is your responsibility because down the road it then could reflect back on us as a nation.

Therefore, we have to say to the rest of the world, and let me heap praise on the President of the United States of America, Bill Clinton, because before he went to Helsinki he met with me for an hour and discussed his philosophy and our Republican philosophy to make sure they were on line, that we were speaking the same philosophy; and that was that there would be an open door to all of those people who had been deprived of this thing we love so much, our sovereignty, and Bill Clinton lived up to his word.

I went to Madrid with the President and with others and we sat down. And over the objections of Jacques Chirac and even Helmut Kohl and many others, President Clinton stuck to his guns, and he said we will have an open door policy.

□ 1245

And, yes, we will bring in Poland and the Czech Republic and Hungary. And then tomorrow it will be Slovenia and Romania. And the next day or the next year or the year after it will be the Baltic States. And we wrote that into the communiqué. I actually had the opportunity to write it in, which included the Baltic States.

That means that all countries, regardless of size, regardless of geographic location, regardless of political problems that might affect Russia, that that door will be kept open. And that is why we must be a part of NATO.

And, yes, over the years the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. FLOYD SPENCE, and myself, and the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. DOUG BEREUTER, representatives to NATO, to the North Atlantic Assembly, along with Pat Schroeder, a former colleague of ours on the other side of the aisle, fought for burden sharing to make sure the other countries paid their fair share.

And, yes, we must do that today, but let us not be foolhardy in thinking that when we bring in a country like Slovenia, that has suffered so much, or Romania or the Baltics, who do not have the wherewithal, we must remember we have to help them in order to prepare for this, for an irreversible democracy.

These are the criteria for bringing these countries in: They must have moved to an irreversible democracy; they must believe in the free market system; they must believe in human rights for their own people within their boundaries and those without their boundaries as well; and then they must be able to participate militarily.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska, who has been so active in this over the years, and I am sorry to take so much time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and commend him for his remarks.

The gentleman, of course, is currently serving as one of the vice presidents of the North Atlantic Assembly. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and myself, we have all been involved, with others, for quite some period of time.

I recall my earliest involvement in this particular issue was back in 1982 or 1984, and it seems to me we have been pushing for burden sharing arrangements since that time, both on infrastructure and every other way. So before it became popular, we had been pushing for that, just as I continue to push for reasonable burden sharing on the United Nations.

But I do think we need to keep in mind, regardless of our support for the Frank amendment, that the overriding consideration for us being in NATO is because it is in our national interest. And the overriding reason for us encouraging and participating and actually providing the leadership for expansion of NATO into the Czech Republic and Hungary and Poland, and thereafter, as the gentleman said, to other countries, including Slovenia, Romania, and the Baltic States, is because of our national interest. And that ought to be the overriding factor.

We will push hard for burden sharing in every way. We expect the Europeans and Canada to bear their share of the cost, and especially the new countries, but I also think we need to be careful that we do not fall for the exaggerated cost. It is no longer reasonable for us to consider the full infrastructure we have in the front line states in NATO today, like we have in Germany, and these new states.

So inheriting the infrastructure in places like Hungary, some of which I have seen in good shape, we can have a dramatic improvement and a protected environment for the citizens of these three countries without extraordinary costs.

The defense industry, the opponents of NATO expansion, they put out some extraordinary costs that are not reasonable. But I do think that we need to take this step to try to push the Europeans to pay their share along with the

Canadians, but I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and the chairman and the senior Democrat on the Committee on National Security for their comments here today, as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to stress a couple of points of agreement between us.

First, I very much have in mind trying to get France and Germany and England and Belgium and Denmark and Norway, quite wealthy countries, to contribute. I agree with the gentleman that we should not be trying to get more out of Hungary and Poland and the Czech Republic.

Indeed, I think it is essential for these newer democracies, newer recently, not to put themselves at risk with their own people in terms of excessive demands here. So I am not trying to get more money out of the new members. I believe the problem is with the existing NATO members who have been doing so very well for so long. And that is the key point.

The second thing I would say, in agreement with the gentleman from Nebraska, I hope that those figures we have seen are exaggerated. That is why what this says is we will take the administration's figures at its word. And we always have the constitutional right as Congress, if it turns out there is some unforeseen problems, the way this works is we come back here and nobody doubts they would get very rapid consideration.

So I am not in dispute with the gentleman's views on the costs. Indeed, it is precisely those more moderate costs he described that are the fundamental premise of this amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, and let me thank also the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], who is a former vice president of the North Atlantic Assembly and has done such a great job representing us in that body over these many, many years. He has summed up my debate, so I will not have to go further other than to tell my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], he is absolutely on line and we are all in agreement.

As a matter of fact, we should be telling certain people like Jacques Chirac of France, who have done all they can to disrupt NATO over the years, they should either participate or get out. And having said that, I thank the gentleman, and I will be supporting his amendment.

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

First, I want to say to my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the committee, that I plan to make just a

very few brief remarks. This will be the concluding comments on this side of the aisle, and then I will be more than happy then to yield back the balance of my time. I would also indicate that we will be asking for a rollcall vote.

Just in summary, let me conclude and underscore for emphasis a comment that the gentleman from Massachusetts made. First, what we are about here today is a motion to instruct conferees. That motion to instruct conferees simply says they should work as diligently as they can to preserve the integrity of section 1207, which places a limitation on the resources to be made available for the purposes of expansion of NATO to \$2 billion or 10 percent, whichever is the lesser amount, between the fiscal year 1998 to the year 2010.

My distinguished colleague from New York clearly recognizes that if we are confronted with extraordinary extenuating circumstances, the Congress of the United States, in this Congress next year or new Congresses down the road, new administrations can revisit this matter. We can act. But what we are saying is at this particular moment this is the most prudent thing to do.

Finally, I would like to say when we listen to the comments offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. BEREUTER, and the gentlemen from New York, Mr. GILMAN and Mr. SOLOMON, it points out that this ought to be a beginning point for a debate that has not occurred in this country, a discussion that has not occurred in this country, and that is the efficacy and the appropriateness and the direction of NATO expansion.

In the context of this Republic, there ought to be an informed and enlightened discussion in America. There ought to be an informed and enlightened debate in the context of the Congress. And the comments that the gentlemen have made, to take the opportunity on this motion to instruct to discuss the merit or the lack thereof of the need for expansion, simply underscores the comments that many of us have made, that there ought to be a significant discussion and debate in America on this issue.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and will only add to this that the gentleman from California and myself, as chairman and ranking member of the Committee on National Security, wrote to our President raising some of these concerns that have been talked about here today and had a full, lengthy letter back from him explaining these different positions. We also had a hearing in our committee and we discussed these same matters today.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been one of the strongest supporters in this House of the concept of NATO enlargement. I believe that it is only as a result of our efforts in the Congress that the Clinton administration and our NATO Allies came to the momentous decision earlier this month in Madrid to invite Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to join NATO. And our efforts—most recently in the form of the European Security Act, passed by this House last month—helped make certain that NATO would keep the door open to other countries such as Slovenia, Romania, the Baltic States, and Bulgaria, that will want to join NATO in the future.

The amendment offered by Mr. FRANK, which now appears as section 1207 of the bill, was not offered in an effort to block NATO enlargement. Rather, it was offered in an effort to signal our continued concern about the issue of burdensharing within NATO. For this reason, I do not oppose the motion by Mr. FRANK to instruct our conferees on section 1207.

I am pleased to join Chairman SPENCE, however, in pointing out that there are very serious problems with section 1207 the way it is currently drafted. It would be most unwise to impose an inflexible, binding cap on the amount that the United States will pay for NATO enlargement. At this point, no one knows for certain just how much NATO enlargement will cost. But one thing is absolutely clear: We must make certain that the NATO security guarantee that we are about to extend to Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic is not any hollow guarantee. It must be a serious guarantee, one that we and our NATO Allies can back up in a crisis. Therefore it cannot be subject to any arbitrary cost ceiling.

I would also point out the limitation contained in section 1207 is not consistent with the administration's cost estimates for NATO enlargement. The administration's February 1997 cost study projected that our share of enlargement costs would be approximately 15 percent of the total, not 10 percent as provided in section 1207.

I am assured that the Committee of Conference will correct these defects in section 1207. With that understanding, I join Chairman SPENCE in urging my colleague to support the motion.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. 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 414, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie	DeFazio	Holden
Ackerman	DeGette	Hooley
Aderholt	Delahunt	Horn
Allen	DeLauro	Hostettler
Andrews	DeLay	Houghton
Archer	Dellums	Hoyer
Armye	Deutsch	Hulshof
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Baesler	Dickey	Hutchinson
Baldacci	Dicks	Hyde
Ballenger	Dingell	Inglis
Barcia	Dixon	Istook
Barr	Dooley	Jackson (IL)
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Jackson-Lee
Barrett (WI)	Doyle	(TX)
Bartlett	Dreier	Jefferson
Barton	Duncan	Jenkins
Bass	Dunn	John
Bateman	Edwards	Johnson (CT)
Becerra	Ehlers	Johnson (WI)
Bentsen	Ehrlich	Johnson, E. B.
Bereuter	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Berman	Engel	Jones
Berry	English	Kanjorski
Billbray	Ensign	Kaptur
Billirakis	Eshoo	Kasich
Bishop	Etheridge	Kelly
Blagojevich	Evans	Kennedy (MA)
Bliley	Everett	Kennedy (RI)
Blunt	Ewing	Kennelly
Boehlert	Farr	Kildee
Boehner	Fattah	Kilpatrick
Bonilla	Fawell	Kim
Bonior	Fazio	Kind (WI)
Bono	Filner	King (NY)
Borski	Flake	Kingston
Boswell	Foglietta	Kleccka
Boucher	Foley	Klink
Boyd	Forbes	Klug
Brady	Ford	Knollenberg
Brown (CA)	Fowler	Kolbe
Brown (FL)	Fox	Kucinich
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	LaFalce
Bryant	Franks (NJ)	LaHood
Bunning	Frelinghuysen	Lampson
Burr	Frost	Lantos
Burton	Furse	Largent
Callahan	Gallely	Latham
Calvert	Ganske	LaTourette
Camp	Gejdenson	Lazio
Campbell	Gekas	Leach
Canady	Gephardt	Levin
Cannon	Gibbons	Lewis (CA)
Capps	Gilchrest	Lewis (GA)
Cardin	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Carson	Gilman	Linder
Castle	Goode	Livingston
Chabot	Goodlatte	LoBlundo
Chambliss	Goodling	Lofgren
Chenoweth	Gordon	Lowe
Christensen	Goss	Lucas
Clay	Graham	Luther
Clayton	Granger	Maloney (CT)
Clement	Green	Maloney (NY)
Clyburn	Greenwood	Manton
Coble	Gutierrez	Manzullo
Coburn	Gutknecht	Markey
Collins	Hall (OH)	Mascara
Combest	Hall (TX)	Matsui
Condit	Hamilton	McCarthy (MO)
Conyers	Hansen	McCarthy (NY)
Cook	Harman	McCollum
Cooksey	Hastert	McCreery
Costello	Hastings (FL)	McDade
Cox	Hastings (WA)	McDermott
Coyne	Hayworth	McGovern
Cramer	Hefley	McHale
Crane	Hefner	McHugh
Crapo	Hergert	McInnis
Cubin	Hill	McIntosh
Cummings	Hilleary	McIntyre
Cunningham	Hilliard	McKeon
Danner	Hinches	McKinney
Davis (FL)	Hinojosa	McNulty
Davis (IL)	Hobson	Meehan
Deal	Hoeckstra	Menendez

Metcalfe	Rahall	Solomon
Mica	Ramstad	Souder
Millender-	Rangel	Spence
McDonald	Redmond	Spratt
Miller (FL)	Regula	Stabenow
Minge	Reyes	Stearns
Mink	Riggs	Stenholm
Moakley	Riley	Stokes
Mollohan	Rivers	Strickland
Moran (KS)	Rodriguez	Stump
Moran (VA)	Roemer	Stupak
Morella	Rogers	Sununu
Murtha	Rohrabacher	Talent
Myrick	Rothman	Tanner
Nadler	Roukema	Tauscher
Neal	Royal-Allard	Tauzin
Nethercutt	Royce	Taylor (MS)
Neumann	Rush	Taylor (NC)
Ney	Ryun	Thomas
Northup	Sabo	Thompson
Norwood	Salmon	Thornberry
Nussle	Sanchez	Thune
Oberstar	Sanders	Thurman
Obey	Sandlin	Tiahrt
Oliver	Sanford	Tierney
Ortiz	Sawyer	Towns
Owens	Saxton	Trafficant
Oxley	Scarborough	Turner
Packard	Schaefer, Dan	Upton
Pallone	Schaffer, Bob	Velázquez
Pappas	Schumer	Vento
Parker	Scott	Visclosky
Pascarella	Sensenbrenner	Walsh
Pastor	Serrano	Wamp
Paul	Sessions	Waters
Paxon	Shadegg	Watt (NC)
Payne	Shaw	Watts (OK)
Pease	Shays	Waxman
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Weldon (FL)
Peterson (PA)	Shimkus	Weldon (PA)
Petri	Shuster	Weller
Pickering	Sisisky	Wexler
Pickett	Skaggs	Weygand
Pitts	Skeen	White
Pombo	Skelton	Whitfield
Pomeroy	Slaughter	Wicker
Porter	Smith (MI)	Wise
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Poshard	Smith (OR)	Woolsey
Price (NC)	Smith (TX)	Wynn
Pryce (OH)	Smith, Adam	Yates
Quinn	Smith, Linda	Young (FL)
Radanovich	Snyder	

## NOT VOTING—20

Baker	Martinez	Schiff
Blumenauer	Meek	Snowbarger
Buyer	Miller (CA)	Stark
Davis (VA)	Molinar	Torres
Doggett	Pelosi	Watkins
Gonzalez	Rogan	Young (AK)
Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1312

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

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that due to unforeseen circumstances I was unable to vote on H.R. 1119, Rollcall No. 330, and H.R. 1119, Rollcall call No. 331. If I had been present I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on National Security, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. SPENCE, STUMP, HUNTER, KASICH, BATEMAN, HANSEN, WELDON of Pennsylvania, HEFLEY, SAXTON, BUYER,

Mrs. FOWLER, and Messrs. MCHUGH, TALENT, EVERETT, BARTLETT of Maryland, LEWIS of Kentucky, WATTS of Oklahoma, CHAMBLISS, RILEY, DELUMS, SKELTON, SISISKY, SPRATT, ORTIZ, PICKETT, EVANS, TAYLOR of Mississippi, ABERCROMBIE, MEEHAN, Ms. HARMAN, and Messrs. MCHALE, KENNEDY of Rhode Island, BLAGOJEVICH, SNYDER, and RODRIQUEZ.

As additional conferees from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 2 of rule XLVII:

Messrs. GOSS, LEWIS of California, and DICKS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Commerce, for consideration of sections 344, 601, 654, 735, 1021, 3143, 3144, 3201, 3202, 3402, and 3404 of the House bill, and sections 338, 601, 663, 706, 1064, 2823, 3136, 3140, 3151, 3160, 3201, and 3402 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BLILEY, DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, and DINGELL.

Provided that Mr. OXLEY is appointed in lieu of Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado for consideration of sections 344 and 1021 of the House bill and section 2823 of the Senate amendment.

Provided that Mr. BILIRAKIS is appointed in lieu of Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado for consideration of sections 601, 654, and 735 of the House bill, and sections 338, 601, 663, and 706 of the Senate amendment.

Provided that Mr. TAUZIN is appointed in lieu of Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado for consideration of section 1064 of the Senate amendment.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 374, 658, and 3143 of the House bill, and section 664 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FAWELL, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

Provided that Mr. RIGGS is appointed in lieu of Mr. FAWELL for consideration of section 658 of the House bill and section 664 of the Senate amendment.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for consideration of sections 322 and 3527 of the House bill, and sections 1068, 1107, 2811, and 3527 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BURTON of Indiana, HORN, and WAXMAN.

As additional conferees from the Committee on House Oversight, for consideration of section 543 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. THOMAS, NEY, and GEJDENSON.

As additional conferees from the Committee on International Relations, for consideration of sections 1101-1111,

1202, 1204, 1205, 1207, 1210, and 1231-1234 of the House bill, and sections 1009, 1013, 1021, 1022, 1056, 1057, 1082, and 1085 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. GILMAN, BEREUTER, and HAMILTON.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 374, 1057, 3521, 3522, and 3541 of the House bill and sections 831, 1073, 1075, 1106, and 1201-1216 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HYDE, SMITH of Texas, and CONYERS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Resources, for consideration of sections 214, 601, 653, 1021, 2835, 2901-2914 and 3404 of the House bill, and sections 234, 381-392, 601, 706, 2819, and 3158 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska, TAUZIN, and MILLER of California.

Provided that Mr. HEFLEY is appointed in lieu of Mr. SAXTON for consideration of section 3404 of the House bill.

Provided that Mr. DELAHUNT is appointed in lieu of Mr. MILLER of California for consideration of sections 2901-2914 of the House bill, and sections 381-392 of the Senate amendment.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Science, for consideration of sections 214 and 3148 of the House bill, and sections 234 and 1064 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, CALVERT, and BROWN of California.

Provided that Mr. ROHRBACHER is appointed in lieu of Mr. CALVERT for consideration of section 1064 of the Senate amendment.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sections 345, 563, 601, 1021, 2861, and 3606 of the House bill, and section 601 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. SHUSTER, GILCHREST, and BORSKI.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for consideration of sections 751, 752 and 759 of the House bill, and sections 220, 542, 751, 752, 758, 1069, 1074, and 1076 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. SMITH of New Jersey, BILIRAKIS, and KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

**MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998, WHEN CLASSIFIED NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION IS UNDER CONSIDERATION**

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXVIII, clause 6(a), I move that

the conference committee meetings on the bill (H.R. 1119) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information is under consideration, provided, however, that any sitting Member of Congress shall have the right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Pursuant to clause 6(a) of rule XXVIII, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 1, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie	Collins	Frost
Ackerman	Combest	Furse
Aderholt	Condit	Ganske
Allen	Conyers	Gejdenson
Andrews	Cook	Gekas
Archer	Cooksey	Gephardt
Armey	Costello	Gibbons
Bachus	Cox	Gilchrest
Baesler	Coyne	Gillmor
Baldacci	Cramer	Gilman
Ballenger	Crane	Goode
Barcla	Crapo	Goodlatte
Barr	Cummings	Goodling
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Goss
Barrett (WI)	Danner	Graham
Bartlett	Davis (FL)	Granger
Barton	Davis (IL)	Green
Bass	Davis (VA)	Greenwood
Bateman	Deal	Gutierrez
Becerra	DeGette	Gutknecht
Bentsen	DeLauro	Hall (OH)
Bereuter	DeLay	Hall (TX)
Berman	Dellums	Hamilton
Berry	Deutsch	Hansen
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart	Harman
Bilirakis	Dickey	Hastert
Bishop	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Blagojevich	Dingell	Hastings (WA)
Billey	Dixon	Hayworth
Blunt	Doggett	Hefley
Boehlert	Dooley	Hefner
Bonilla	Doornick	Hill
Bonior	Doyle	Hillery
Bono	Dreier	Hilliard
Borski	Duncan	Hinchey
Boswell	Dunn	Hinojosa
Boucher	Edwards	Hobson
Boyd	Ehlers	Hoekstra
Brady	Ehrlich	Holden
Brown (CA)	Emerson	Hooley
Brown (FL)	Engel	Horn
Brown (OH)	English	Hostettler
Bryant	Ensign	Houghton
Bunning	Eshoo	Hoyer
Burr	Etheridge	Hulshof
Callahan	Evans	Hunter
Calvert	Everett	Hutchinson
Camp	Farr	Hyde
Campbell	Fattah	Inglis
Canady	Fawell	Istook
Cannon	Fazio	Jackson (IL)
Capps	Filner	Jackson-Lee
Cardin	Flake	(TX)
Carson	Foglietta	Jefferson
Castle	Foley	Jenkins
Chabot	Forbes	John
Chambliss	Ford	Johnson (CT)
Christensen	Fowler	Johnson (WI)
Clay	Fox	Johnson, E. B.
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Johnson, Sam
Clement	Franks (NJ)	Jones
Clyburn	Frelinghuysen	Kanjorski
Coble		Kaptur
Coburn		Kasich

Kelly	Myrick	Serrano
Kennedy (MA)	Nadler	Sessions
Kennedy (RI)	Neal	Shadegg
Kennelly	Nethercutt	Shaw
Kildee	Ney	Shays
Kilpatrick	Northup	Sherman
Kim	Norwood	Shimkus
Kind (WI)	Nussle	Shuster
King (NY)	Oberstar	Sisisky
Kingston	Obey	Skaggs
Klecza	Olver	Skeen
Klink	Ortiz	Skelton
Klug	Owens	Slaughter
Knollenberg	Oxley	Smith (MI)
Kolbe	Packard	Smith (NJ)
Kucinich	Pallone	Smith (OR)
LaFalce	Pappas	Smith (TX)
LaHood	Parker	Smith, Adam
Lampson	Pascarell	Smith, Linda
Lantos	Pastor	Snyder
Largent	Paul	Solomon
Latham	Paxon	Souder
LaTourette	Payne	Spence
Lazio	Pease	Spratt
Leach	Peterson (MN)	Stabenow
Levin	Peterson (PA)	Stearns
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Stenholm
Lewis (GA)	Pickering	Stokes
Lewis (KY)	Pickett	Strickland
Linder	Pitts	Stump
Livingston	Pombo	Stupak
LoBiondo	Pomeroy	Sununu
Lofgren	Porter	Talent
Lowey	Portman	Tanner
Lucas	Poshard	Tauscher
Luther	Price (NC)	Tauzin
Maloney (CT)	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (MS)
Maloney (NY)	Quinn	Taylor (NC)
Manton	Radanovich	Thomas
Manzullo	Rahall	Thompson
Markey	Ramstad	Thornberry
Mascara	Rangel	Thune
Matsui	Redmond	Thurman
McCarthy (MO)	Regula	Tiahrt
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Tierney
McCollum	Riggs	Torres
McCrery	Riley	Towns
McDade	Rivers	Trafficant
McDermott	Rodriguez	Turner
McGovern	Roemer	Upton
McHale	Rogan	Velázquez
McHugh	Rogers	Vento
McInnis	Rohrabacher	Visclosky
McIntosh	Rothman	Walsh
McIntyre	Roukema	Wamp
McKeon	Roybal-Allard	Waters
McKinney	Royce	Watt (NC)
McNulty	Rush	Watts (OK)
Meehan	Ryun	Waxman
Menendez	Sabo	Weldon (FL)
Metcalfe	Salmon	Weldon (PA)
Mica	Sanchez	Weller
Millender	Sanders	Wexler
McDonald	Sandlin	Weygand
Miller (FL)	Sanford	White
Minge	Sawyer	Whitfield
Mink	Saxton	Wicker
Moakley	Scarborough	Wise
Mollohan	Schaefer, Dan	Wolf
Moran (KS)	Schaffer, Bob	Woolsey
Moran (VA)	Schumer	Wynn
Morella	Scott	Yates
Murtha	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)

NAYS—1

DeFazio  
NOT VOTING—24

Baker	Gonzalez	Neumann
Blumenauer	Gordon	Pelosi
Boehner	Herger	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Lipinski	Schiff
Buyer	Martinez	Snowbarger
Chenoweth	Meek	Stark
Cubin	Miller (CA)	Watkins
Gallegly	Mollinari	Young (AK)

□ 1335

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inquire of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], of the schedule for the remainder of the week and next week.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have had our last vote for the week. The House will next meet on Monday July 28 at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Members should note that there will be no recorded votes before 5 p.m. next Monday evening.

On Monday the House will consider the following 11 suspensions:

H.R. 1855, establishing a moratorium on large fishing vessels in Atlantic herking and mackerel fisheries;

Sense of Congress regarding acts of illegal aggression by Canadian fishermen with respect to Pacific Salmon Fishery;

House Concurrent Resolution 98, Authorizing the Use of the Capitol for the Safe Kids Buckle Up Car Seat Safety Check;

H.R. 2005, Death on the High Seas Act;

H.R. 1596, Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1997;

H.R. 1953, To clarify State Authority to Tax Compensation Paid to Certain Employees;

House Concurrent Resolution 75, Sense of Congress that States Should Work More Aggressively to Attack the Problem of Repeat Criminals;

H.R. 103, the Private Security Officer Quality Assurance Act of 1997;

H.R. 1109, Regarding Citizenship for Children of U.S. Citizens Born Abroad;

H.R. 1348, Expanded War Crimes Act of 1997; and

We expect to concur to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1866, the Charitable Donation Antitrust Immunity Act.

The House will then resume consideration of H.R. 2209, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998, under a modified closed rule.

On Tuesday, July 29 and the remainder of the week, the House will consider the following bills all of which will be subject to rules:

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998;

The Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 1998;

H.R. 2159, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998;

Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998;

H.R. 2015, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 Conference Report; and

H.R. 2014, the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 Conference Report.

Mr. Speaker, meeting times for next week are as follows:

On Tuesday, July 29, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Wednesday, July 30, and Thursday, July 31, the House will meet at 10 a.m.; and at 9 a.m. on Friday, August 1.

As Members may know, the annual bipartisan congressional baseball game will be held Tuesday night. I know that our stellar athletes, it says here, Mr. Speaker, stellar athletes, on this side of the aisle have been rising early in the morning to practice. We very much look forward to a victory on the diamond next week, and we will end voting early Tuesday evening in order to ensure adequate batting practice. However, as the August district work period approaches, we are faced with the usual legislative crush. As this is the case, it is difficult to predict with any certainty the get-away time for next Friday, August 1. Members should be prepared for votes throughout all of that day, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Texas, "If you want to ensure adequate batting practice, you're going to have to get us out of here a lot earlier than early Tuesday evening."

I would ask my friend from Texas, "Do you expect the House to complete its business by next Friday, and my sense is that you do from the schedule, and to begin the August recess as scheduled after Friday?"

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, it is our expectation, as he knows, and as a longstanding tradition in the House that when we have important business, as it were, on the eve of the commencement of an extended recess period, that it is very difficult to predict the get-away time. But I would predict that some time Friday next we will complete that work that requires completion prior to that extended district work recess period.

Mr. BONIOR. And I also noticed in the gentleman's statement that he expects we will finish our conference reports both on the spending and tax reconciliation bills; is that correct? Does the gentleman expect we will finish those conference reports next week?

Mr. ARMEY. Again, if the gentleman would yield, that is our expectation. Conferees are meeting now. There is consultation with the White House that I think is progressing with general enthusiasm on the part of all parties. And so we have, I think, good reason to expect that we could complete that work and have it acted on by the House before we leave on Friday next.

Mr. BONIOR. I would also just thank the gentleman for accommodating the bipartisan events that are scheduled next week, the baseball game; as well, I think, the gym dinner is on Wednes-

day, and that does not pose too much of a problem to work through; but the baseball game is one that traditionally we have been able to work together on, and I thank the gentleman for his concerns there.

And one final question. Well, actually two. How late on Monday night? And the second question is, do we expect a motion to go to conference on the State Department authorization bill next week; and what day if we do?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for the inquiry, and if the gentleman would yield, we would hope to be able to go to conference on State Department Monday evening, and we would expect that probably, depending on how our work goes, we would complete work between 9 and 10 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, and I wish him a good weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. May I please respectfully request of the distinguished majority leader that he consider, although I know he cannot answer me now, that on Tuesday next it is anticipated that Justice Brennan's funeral will be held and several, indeed a considerable number of our colleagues, are desirous of attending that funeral; and if it will be possible to roll votes in the event votes are being had, I would ask the majority leader to please consider that.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will continue to yield, let me just say to the gentleman from Florida, perhaps after this colloquy we could talk a little bit about times and hours and see to what extent that is something we can accommodate, too, in the way we manage the floor on that day.

Mr. BONIOR. It is my understanding the funeral will be held in Washington, DC, so hopefully we can work something out.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to work with the gentleman and I appreciate the gentleman calling it to my attention.

#### AUTHORIZING USE OF CATAFALQUE IN U.S. CAPITOL IN CONNECTION WITH MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. BRENNAN

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res 123) providing for the use of the catafalque situated in the crypt beneath the rotunda of the Capitol in connection with memorial services to be conducted in the Supreme Court Building

for the late honorable William J. Brennan, former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

□ 1345

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, though obviously I will not object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] to explain his request.

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

Mr. Speaker, apropos the gentleman's earlier comments to the majority leader, it is unfortunate that Associate Justice Brennan has passed on. The administrative assistant to the Chief Justice has asked the Architect of the Capitol, as they did with former Chief Justice Warren Burger, if they might use the catafalque in the basement for memorial services over at the Supreme Court building.

It is entirely appropriate, given the former career of the gentleman from Florida, because he fully appreciates the focus of the Lincoln catafalque for an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and especially a Justice like William J. Brennan, appointed by a Republican President, with a very distinguished career in first amendment freedom protection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I fully concur with the gentleman's resolution and am entirely in support of same, reminding all of us that the Lincoln catafalque is reserved for giants in our history, as it was for former Chief Justice Warren Burger, retired, on June 28, 1995.

We anticipate that Justice Brennan will lie in repose at the family's request possibly for 24 hours, beginning on Monday, July 28, 1997. As we have indicated, the majority leader, working with the minority leader, we are hopeful that they will make arrangements for those of us desirous of attending the funeral.

One final thing is to join my colleague in saying that our Nation has lost a great leader, one who wrote over 1,200 opinions and shaped a large portion of the history of this country in the 1960's, particularly the one-person, one-vote decision of Justice Brennan.

On Monday night the Congressional Black Caucus and other interested Members are going to hold a special order, and I would ask all our colleagues to support the concurrent resolution and to participate in the special order, and as many as possible to attend the funeral.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, the

gentleman has eloquently indicated the reason why with pleasure, although with sadness, we will allow the Supreme Court to utilize the Lincoln catafalque.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 123

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to transfer to the custody of the Chief Justice of the United States the catafalque which is presently situated in the crypt beneath the rotunda of the Capitol so that such catafalque may be used in the Supreme Court Building in connection with services to be conducted there for the late honorable William J. Brennan, former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 695, AFFIRMING RIGHTS OF U.S. PERSONS TO USE AND SELL ENCRYPTION AND TO RELAX EXPORT CONTROLS ON ENCRYPTION

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 695.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 28, 1997

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, July 28, 1997, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TOM ROGERS

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

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor the life of Tom Rogers. He passed away on August 24, 1994, in his hometown of Moline, IL, at the age of 60. He was the son of Howard and Helen Rogers and was survived by his wife Kera, who he married on July 12, 1992, and his brother, Jon Rogers.

This was all said in his obituary, but more needs to be said about his life and more needs to be said by three of us in this body who will stand on the floor of the House of Representatives today to say good things about Tom Rogers. Why? Because he was a special, special person who touched the lives of so many people and of us, and countless others. He even touched our lives as we watched him touching the lives of others.

He was not an elected official. He never ran for office. He never accomplished what we would call great things. He was not wealthy or rich, but he lived a life that was an example to all who knew him and knew people who knew him.

In September, 1953, at the age of 19 Tom Rogers contracted polio. He was paralyzed from the neck down and had serious respiratory problems. I knew Tom and our families were close. He was a 6 foot 2 strapping guy who had boundless energy, and had just finished his first year at Cornell University.

Since I was 6 years his junior, he was one of my heroes. But I did not know at that time what I would learn later, how brave he was, how determined, and what a great character this man would display in the next 41 years.

He set goals; he organized his life; he prepared for a new career. He adapted his life's philosophy. He signed on as a believer in God's son, Jesus Christ, and generally got on with his life, however bleak it looked back in the 1950's.

In the process he never was tempted to feel sorry for himself, and he could have in the following ways: Just within the next year after his contracting polio, the Salk vaccine was developed, but he never dwelt on "what if". He never complained that he could not walk, or talk without great effort, or function without mechanical aids or nurses.

He never talked about his condition, his disability, or his frustration. I

know. I tried several times to get him to talk about those things, but he would not. The comments we made about his disability were deflected ever so graciously.

He was cheerful and inquisitive. As he continually deflected attention away from his condition, he constantly talked to others about what was important to them. Only one other person, in my opinion, was as good as Tom was in this regard, and his name was Sam Walton, a great man, also.

Tom's mind was both like a sponge and a steel trap. He was a person of good humor. As a young boy he came running into the house one day after having heard an orchestra and said to his mother, "Mom, I just heard a parade sitting down."

Tom became a successful investment banker, and in the context of the language of his profession, he once said that in the marriage corporation that he bought into with his lovely wife, Kera, that his 50 percent shares were all issued non-voting. In discussing his investment in the racehorse business, he stated once that what he found out early was that slow horses ate as much as fast ones.

He was smart and he loved children. My four kids came into contact with Tom in the summer days when they were little. A special time for them was when Tom came over to eat. After dinner he would line up pennies, nickels, dimes, and quarters, as well as my kids. He would then ask them history question after history question, deciding on the basis of difficulty as against the age of the child what level the rewards for a correct question might be. His knowledge of history was complete and far-ranging, and my children would be riveted on Tom and his command of the facts of history.

Tom built a constituency, which is a good term for politicians to use, with the people who helped him. He was completely paralyzed. Looking back, it was never a factor to us, but he was completely paralyzed. He could not move anything but his head, so he had to depend on people.

A good friend, after his death, started a list of all the people who pushed Tom's wheelchair, drove his van, typed for him, cooked for him, bathed him, combed his hair, placed calls for him, and other things. Seventy-five names went on the first list, each of those people all becoming his friend and admirer. He always left people better off than they were before—it was an incredible skill and gift.

One of his favorites of the pushers, as we called them, was Jim Rosborough, who is now an assistant basketball coach in the fabulously successful University of Arizona basketball program. He loved to see Jim on television, and Tom talked about him constantly. Jim's letter to me and to others after the funeral showed what Jim thought of Tom and how close and sincere that relationship was.

His politics: He seemed to be a Republican, but he was not a fanatic. On a letter 10 years before I entered politics he taped a dime to a sheet of paper and sent it to me as my first campaign contribution. He was always giving me advice, and reminding me that he had also elected to the House his close boyhood friend, Tom Railsback.

He was a bumper sticker lover, on his wheelchair, no less, first with mine, but after my election he put Representative RICHARD BURR's bumper sticker on top of mine, never getting my permission, of course. RICHARD was then elected, so Tom could say he elected two of his friends to the House.

He could also lay claim to electing the Honorable JIM LEACH of Iowa to the House. He spoke of JIM in the most respectful terms, and in some of the papers they found after his death this sentence was set out. "Had lunch with JIM LEACH, I am impressed. I will stuff ballot boxes for him whenever necessary." They say that only happens in the South.

Talking to Tom about his relationship with God was a little like talking to him about his polio. Not much did he say, but he lived a great deal of it.

As already stated, He had a relationship with God's son, Jesus Christ, and though he would never say so about his own life, a casual observer could readily see this in his actions. His life was led exactly as the Bible lays it out.

Now why are the three of us standing up here, taking floor time to speak of this man?

Maybe it's because we need to let Tom's life encourage more people, not only people who are disabled, but all people. If the United States—no, the world—could be inhabited by people like Tom Rogers, we would have less problems, we would have a world full of people who would want to work hard to prepare themselves, no matter what the obstacle, to be better each day. We would have more love, we would have more respect for good manners, and just plain decency. We would have more humor and laughter—much needed qualities in a much too serious world.

There's no way a person could know Tom Rogers and not love him and receive love from him.

Here's what he had to say about his life: "My life is close to perfection." "I would not have changed my life for anything."

Reminiscent of Lou Gherig when he stood at Yankee Stadium, his body dying from disease and said, "I consider myself the luckiest guy on the face of the earth!"

On August 24, 1994, my son Ted and I left a contested campaign to go to Tom's funeral, having been to that same church two year's earlier, also in the midst of a campaign for his wedding. We went to share the joy the first time and to show respect the second time. The people at his funeral were wonderful folks—laughing, telling stories about Tom and sharing the grief. What a tribute—but what was really significant was that inside the church right up front an orchestra was playing—a parade sitting down—only fitting.

A lot of the same people of Moline will gather in their city tomorrow to have a

groundbreaking for the Thomas W. Rogers Visitor's Center on Sylvan Island, an island in the waters of the Mississippi. We hope today to add a little to their tribute and maybe bring a little to the expression of love for Tom that is wrapped up in this event.

Such pleasure in preparing this little talk; it has done me good just to reflect on his life.

The summers will never be the same for me and my family, for we will no longer see Tom on earth, but soon I will see him in Heaven, and he'll look like that strapping 19-year-old that I remember and he will probably say to me, "Dickey—that's the way they talk to people in the North—come on we got things to get done, don't think for a minute we sit still up here."

To join me in their remarks are Tom's good friend Representative JIM LEACH of Iowa and Representative RICHARD BURR of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY] has expired.

Mr. DICKEY. I ask unanimous consent for additional time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that request during the 5-minute period, so the gentleman's time has expired.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if the three gentlemen present are going to speak about the same gentleman during special orders, I do not have any objection that they can finish their remarks, and then we can come back. I ask unanimous consent that they be allowed to proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlemen speaking on the same subject may speak consecutively.

There was no objection.

#### TRIBUTE TO TOM ROGERS

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

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. DICKEY, was about to say, the reason that himself, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. JIM LEACH, and myself, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. RICHARD BURR, are here is to talk about a dear friend, to talk about somebody that touched the lives of not only the three of us, but who touched the lives of every person he met.

Mr. Speaker, I did not grow up with Tom Rogers and I was not a peer of Tom Rogers. I was a friend of Tom Rogers. Tom Rogers never met a person, though, that was not a friend. Tom was a unique individual. Tom had a love for life, but he also became friends with every individual he met. Tom loved children. He was fascinated by children and the time they would spend

with him as an individual confined to a wheelchair, but that was what was so great about Tom Rogers.

□ 1400

Tom never saw himself confined to a wheelchair. He saw himself as an integral part of everybody's life, an integral part of his community, a family member, somebody who looked at what God had bestowed him with as only another challenge in life and not as a hurdle in life, and Tom was there to overcome that hurdle.

You see, he was a historian. He was not only a successful broker. Tom was one that loved to read. I can imagine every night what Tom must have gone through just to be moved from a wheelchair to a bed. What would be so tiring for most of us was an everyday occurrence for Tom Rogers. Just the thought that with his mouth and with a wand he could operate a computer and run the finances of many people in the community and across this country who he represented is just an amazing feat in itself.

I remember the story that, when Tom first went to the hospital, after polio, went into the ward where the iron lungs were and where many were stricken with polio, the first thing his mother said was that she was not going to let Tom Rogers die. Tom was also committed that he was not going to let polio change his life significantly, that he would be successful, he would win in the end. Tom was known for saying his greatest success was helping others see how lucky we all are, not just him.

In this day and age all too often we hurry through life without stopping to realize the gifts that we have all been given. Well, Tom Rogers knew the gift he had been given and more. He knew how to use these gifts to enjoy his life and to help others see their importance. Though obstacles were in his way, Tom gained more knowledge and love of life than most of us dream about.

Tom was successful in many ways. But he overcame every adversity, everything thrown at him, to truly teach so many so much.

Tom Rogers had the ability to take a stranger and treat him like family. He had the ability to take family and make them think that they were the most special thing in the world. Tom Rogers gave us a vision to take risks and to go out on a limb, encouraged us to test our outer limits. By following Tom's way of life, we learned more about ourselves and we gained more than we ever thought possible. There are few people who are able to accomplish so much while still having an intense love of life. I can truly say that Thomas Wallace Rogers saw life in a hopeful light with sincere friends and true leaders.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to be here as a tribute to Thomas Wallace

Will Rogers, a man that lived life to its fullest with every obstacle in his way and shared so much with so many across this country.

IN THE HONOR OF TOM ROGERS  
OF MOLINE, IL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friends, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURR] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], for their wonderful accolades and the minority leader for agreeing to let the three of us without request speak in order.

Mr. Speaker, if ever an individual personified the ideal that the human condition can overcome any handicap, it was Tom Rogers. Tom was everybody's all-American boy. An active athlete and budding scholar, Tom left Moline in 1952 to attend Cornell University. At the end of his freshman year at the age of 19, just before the widespread introduction of the Salk vaccine, he was struck so severely with polio that he was paralyzed from the neck down. He came to be able to breathe only through the laborious technique of swallowing air. In a circumstance which would have led most of us to give up, to turn inward in bitterness, to be prone to shriveling up and spiritually dying, Tom took the opposite course. He determined that even though he could not move a finger, he would widen his horizons and become a functioning member of society.

Tom studied to become a stock analyst and broker and soon had as dedicated a following as anyone in his profession in the country. Using methods and machines he designed, he came to be able to read stacks of material and spreadsheets placed on a bookstand or reflected in magnification off the ceiling.

Tom's two principal avocations were bridge and travel. One of the most competitive bridge players I have ever known, he would call on his unsorted cards to be played from a specially made wooden tray placed on the table in front of his wheelchair. My mother, who was a life master many times over, used to tell me Tom was her favorite partner. Now and again during high school summers, I was privileged to be able to play against the two of them.

To watch Tom successfully defeat three no trump doubled was to watch the joyful triumph of an engaged mind. Despite his physical paralysis, he could precipitate action and when he won a hand, his eyes would impishly twinkle, causing his opponents to redouble their effort yet never begrudge being thumped by this remarkable soul.

The one Christmas card friends in the Quad cities waited for every year would be one Tom would send showing a cartoon of himself, his wheelchair and generally a reindeer or two boating the Mississippi, playing bridge, or standing against a vista or symbol of whatever State or city he had visited that year. One of my favorite memories was the trip Tom made to Washington in the van he had converted to indulge his love of travel.

I toured the Capitol with him and then we had lunch together in the Members dining room. Everyone who encountered Tom soon forgot the chair and brace, the interruptions in this conversation as he gulped to breathe, and saw and heard only the image and voice of a vibrant and captivating human being. Amelia Earhart once wrote, courage is the price that life exacts for granting peace. The soul that knows it not, knows no release from little things.

The little things we take for granted, even being able to breathe unaided, were very big things to Tom Rogers. But no one handled the big or small challenges of life with greater joy. I recently spoke with a former colleague and one of Tom's boyhood chums, Tom Railsback, and his dear friend and dedicated doctor, Lou Sears. Each could only describe in awe the emancipating cheerfulness of an individual who addressed each new day with such boundless optimism.

I am convinced that God gave us Tom Rogers because he wanted to provide a lesson in the preciousness of life and the need for perspective. There is no single person whoever came into contact with Tom who did not walk away murmuring, my troubles are vastly smaller but I pray to God I can learn to handle them with one hundredth of the courage and good nature as this man from Moline.

Tom's peace has finally been granted. His friends honor him this weekend with a groundbreaking of a nature center to be built in his honor on a beautiful island in the Mississippi. No friend could be more missed than Tom Rogers. He remains an inspiration to us all.

JUSTICE BRENNAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to read an editorial that I think aptly described the life of Justice William Brennan. It is entitled "Justice Brennan's Vision":

William J. Brennan, Jr., who died yesterday at the age of 91 brought to his long and productive career on the U.S. Supreme Court a tenacious commitment to advancing individual

rights and the Constitution's promise of fairness and equality. He served for 34 years, a tenure that spanned eight Presidents.

Named to the court in 1956 by Dwight Eisenhower, Justice Brennan saw the law not as an abstraction but as an immensely powerful weapon to improve society and enlarge justice. As such, he was a crucial voice on the Warren Court of the 1960's, a body that boldly expanded the role of the Federal courts and the Constitution itself to protect individual liberties.

Yet even when the Court shifted in a more conservative direction under Chief Justices Warren Burger and, later, William Rehnquist, Justice Brennan was not content to play a marginal role as an eloquent dissenter. Armed with a keen intellect, a forceful personality, and a gift for building coalitions, he had surprising success in mustering narrow majorities to keep alive the legacy of the Warren Court and its core notion that the Constitution was a living document that could and should be interpreted aggressively.

There is no individual in this country, on or off the Court, who has had a more profound and sustained impact upon public policy in the United States for the past 27 years, said an article in the conservative journal *National Review* in 1984, and it is hard to disagree with that assessment. Justice Brennan was the author of 1,350 opinions, many of them landmark rulings that altered the political and social landscape.

He left his mark on a wide range of issues. Baker versus Carr, in 1962, asserted the one-person-one-vote doctrine that transformed democracy and, through reapportionment, the composition of the Nation's legislatures. His famous first amendment ruling in *New York Times versus Sullivan* in 1964 reconfigured the law of libel to give breathing space for free expression and the robust debate of public issues. In *Goldberg versus Kelly*, a 1970 ruling of which he was particularly proud, Justice Brennan initiated what turned out to be a steady expansion of the 14th amendment's guarantee of due process by ruling that a State could not terminate a welfare recipient's benefits without a hearing.

Over all, Justice Brennan's greatness was rooted in his vision of the law as a moral force and his understanding that the genius of the Constitution would be betrayed if the court insisted on the narrow, static doctrine of original intent, the notion that the Constitution can best be interpreted through the eyes of the Framers. This unique feature of the Constitution, he argued instead, was the adaptability of its great principles to cope with current problems and needs.

That vision and driving passion are not thriving in today's court. Like Justice Brennan himself, they are sorely missed.

I had the occasion, Mr. Speaker, to know Justice Brennan. He was a remarkable man. He will dearly be missed. He is one of the truly great Justices and great people of our times and we send our condolences and our best to his family.

#### USE OF THE INTERNET

The SPEAKER pro Tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak with regard to the matter of personal privacy and the absolute vulnerability and risks and abuses that are taking place with regard to personal privacy. I specifically want to reference the use of the Internet, the Internet system, the online service providers and web sites that exist on the Internet. The Internet, of course, is accessible through our computers and the online services that we purchase.

Earlier this year, in fact last year, in 1996, I first introduced legislation that would require an affirmative action by the individual Internet user, the subscriber, to permit the use of personal information; that is to say, the telephone numbers, the e-mail address, and the profile that is possible. A service provider or for that matter a web site can in fact, through the information and activities that an individual uses on the Internet, can in fact make almost a complete profile of all the web sites that you visit and utilize.

They can do this, quite frankly, without the knowledge of an Internet user; that is, a subscriber or web site can in fact do that. It is as if you are walking down the street with \$100 bills sticking out of your pocket and you are not aware of it. That is to say, we as individual Internet users are very vulnerable.

Of course, as I introduced that bill last September and reintroduced it this past January, H.R. 98, I hope some Members will join me in terms of requiring affirmative approval of a service provider or a web site to use personal information about an individual that is using the Internet.

□ 1415

And this had been the subject this past June, and I might commend Commissioner Varney of the Federal Trade Commission for the work she had done at that time, she has since left the FTC, but this June she had a seminar and a series of meetings on, in fact, personal privacy on the Internet.

At that time some of the service providers, namely Netscape, the one that we use, incidentally, in the House of Representatives, and Microsoft pointed out they were going to make efforts to provide for personal privacy and some security. But 7 weeks after that, this week we picked up the paper, the

Washington Post here yesterday in Washington, DC, and it says America Online, one of the service subscribers, will share the users' numbers for telemarketing.

Eight and a half million individuals are customers of America Online, and they were going to share their personal telephone numbers, and I assume their E-mail addresses, for sale. They were going to receive money back for this information. They were going to receive \$150 million back for sharing the personal information, sharing the privacy, selling for profit the personal privacy of the users to the tune of \$150 million.

Well, that is wrong. And the fact was that after this became public, this has been out for some time that they were going to do this but they did not share it, it was like looking for a needle in a haystack trying to discover what America Online was doing, but after that, after this happened, America Online, I am pleased to report, has backed off their plan to give out phone numbers.

I think what this does point out in living color and in graphic detail is the vulnerability, as suggested in the legislation I have introduced, H.R. 98, of individual Internet users to have the abuse, the involuntary sharing, even being unaware sharing of their personal information.

It is really unbelievable, as I said yesterday, that America Online would be cashing in for profit by selling the personal privacy of their users. The fact is that we need to correct this problem. We need to have some standards.

I think most of us are very leery of any type of censorship with regards to information. We do not want to thwart the development and limit the development or the availability of information, or the development for that matter and use of the Internet, but the risk we run here is that the Internet is going to be filled or be a great wasteland in the fact that it will not have any type of security.

There will not be the type of credibility and certainly not the responsibility on the part of the Internet user. We will not know when we purchase something whether we are participating in a transaction, whether, in fact, a communication or message, or just a complete absence of security or personal privacy.

So I urge my colleagues to join in sponsoring H.R. 98 after they have seen this graphic example of abuse by America Online with regards to personal privacy.

Mr. Speaker, I provide for the RECORD two articles covering the issue I have just been discussing.

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1997]  
AOL WILL SHARE USERS' NUMBERS FOR TELEMARKETING: CONSUMER GROUPS, PRIVACY ADVOCATES CALL SUBSCRIBER NOTIFICATION INADEQUATE

(By Rajiv Chandrasekaran)

America Online Inc. plans to disclose the telephone numbers of its 8.5 million subscribers to certain business partners for telemarketing purposes, a decision that industry specialists say could generate a financial windfall for the online service but anger many of its customers.

AOL said it will make the subscriber information available to companies such as consumer-services firm CUC International Inc., which signed a \$50 million marketing arrangement with AOL last month. Such agreements, which industry analysts say could become more common because of the telephone list, are an increasingly important source of revenue to AOL as it seeks to reduce its dependence on monthly user fees.

The new policy is outlined in AOL's revised user rules, which were posted online earlier this month and become effective on July 31. The policy allows users to request that their phone numbers not be disclosed to telemarketers.

The company's decision, however, has outraged consumer advocates, who say AOL members have not been adequately informed of the new policy, which as of yesterday evening had not been mentioned on any of the screens a user sees when logging on.

"Their disclosure is not good enough," said Jean Ann Fox, the director of consumer protection at the Washington-based Consumer Federation of America. "This sets a new low in turning subscribers into a commodity."

Although it is a fairly common practice for companies to sell customer information—AOL has long offered the names and addresses of its subscribers to direct-mail marketers—disclosing phone numbers is a rarer practice, industry experts said. "It's not at all common in the online world," said Patrick Keane, an analyst at market-research firm Jupiter Communications in New York.

AOL's decision comes just as the company largely has repaired customer relations frayed by widespread busy signals that occurred on the network in the winter and spring because the company failed to anticipate the demand a flat-rate pricing plan would generate. The new policy, some analysts said yesterday, risks re-opening old wounds.

"They're walking a fine line with a customer base that already has been nettled," Keane said.

AOL officials played down such concerns, saying they believed most subscribers would welcome the solicitations. "We're telemarketing to our members goods and services we see as benefits of their AOL membership," said spokeswoman Tricia Primrose.

Primrose said AOL does not plan to publicize the new policy before July 31, but will notify members before they begin to receive calls. "We're going to give them every opportunity to get off this list," she said.

Privacy advocates contend, however, that AOL customers should be asked in advance if they want to be on telemarketing lists. The advocates also say that as an online service, AOL should be held to a higher standard in protecting customer information than companies that don't do business in cyberspace.

"Many people who subscribe to AOL like the feature that they have a certain distance between their use of the keyboard and the outside world," said Robert Ellis Smith, editor of Privacy Journal in Providence, R.I.

"They don't have to give out a physical address or a home number. Now AOL is suddenly exposing these customers to intrusions at home during the day."

Initially, AOL plans to offer the phone number to two companies, CUC and Tel-Save Holdings Inc., a long-distance company with which AOL signed a \$100 million marketing agreement earlier this year, Primrose said. CUC and Tel-Save do not plan to start telemarketing until later this year, she said.

AOL plans to screen the telemarketers' solicitations, Primrose said. The company now monitors mailings that are sent to its customers by firms who purchase its subscriber mailing lists, she said.

AOL's mailing lists include members' names and addresses, as well as demographic profiles, with information such as household income and past buying habits, that the company says it obtains from outside marketing databases.

[From the New York Times, July 25, 1997]

AMERICA ONLINE BACKS OFF PLAN TO GIVE  
OUT PHONE NUMBERS  
(By Seth Schiesel)

Responding yesterday to consumer outrage and mounting concerns about privacy in cyberspace, America Online, the largest on-line service provider, abandoned its plans to begin providing lists of its customers' telephone numbers to telemarketers and other direct-sales peddlers.

The reversal came less than 24 hours after the plan became widely known through news accounts and on-line postings. America Online drew immediate fire from politicians and privacy-rights groups for the telemarketing venture, in part because the company for years had assured subscribers that it would not release their phone numbers and other personal information to outside parties.

Because America Online's eight million subscribers are already besieged by "junk" electronic mail, customers bemoaned the prospect of some of those same advertisers, or different ones, ringing the phone at home.

"That's the most obnoxious form of solicitation," said Camilla M. Herlevich, an environmental lawyer in Wilmington, N.C., an America Online subscriber. "They always call at dinner time. We call it the arsenic hour."

But the controversy goes beyond telephone numbers—and transcends America Online, for that matter.

For consumer-privacy advocates, the case illustrates the need for increased Government oversight of the buying and selling of the copious consumer information gathered in the course of everyday commerce. Savvy companies already mine the trove of available credit card information to find buying patterns that might lead to one more sale.

But with the advent of cyberspace commerce, marketers are able to track their quarry even more easily—tracking each click of the mouse, in some cases, as a user surfs the World Wide Web. So far, such efforts typically can identify no more than a user's computer, and not the identity of the individual operating the PC.

Experts predict, however, that personal identification will eventually be possible, making privacy difficult to protect—whatever the stated policies of companies collecting such data.

Like magazines and other businesses with valuable subscription lists, America Online has already been selling lists of its subscribers' names and addresses. But those lists do not include the corresponding E-mail

addresses or customer phone numbers. A few weeks ago, however, America Online quietly proposed changing its longstanding policy to begin selling its telephone lists.

Privacy advocates said that adding phone numbers to the mix would allow marketers to cross-tabulate with additional sorts of information that people might not be aware they were exposing by simply signing up to an on-line service.

"The phone number is used as an identifier the way that the Social Security number is," said Evan Hendricks, the editor of Privacy Times, a privacy-rights newsletter. "They can use the phone number to look up the name and address and then you can find out about their house and how many kids they have."

Telemarketers and other direct-sales organizations have resisted Government regulation by agreeing to self-imposed privacy-protection guidelines that typically include provisions allowing consumers to request that their personal data not be sold to third parties. But the America Online episode is certain to raise new questions about whether the industry can continue to police itself.

"It's unbelievable really, that AOL would be cashing in for profit by selling the personal privacy of their users," said Representative Bruce F. Vento, Democrat of Minnesota, who has introduced a bill to regulate the use of consumer information on line. "It just boggles the mind that they would do it quite this boldly."

America Online would not reveal how many of its members called, faxed or sent electronic mail to the company to vent their displeasure. America Online executives insisted that they did not intend to "rent" the phone numbers. Instead, they said, America Online would provide the numbers to companies only as one part of an overall marketing deal.

"The only calls we intended for you to receive would have been from AOL and a limited number of quality-controlled AOL partners," said Stephen M. Case, the company's chief executive in a letter to subscribers yesterday.

Those partners would have included Tel-Save Inc., a discount long-distance telephone company that reached a \$100 million marketing pact with America Online in February, and CUC International Inc., a telemarketing giant that made a \$50 million deal with America Online last month.

America Online officials said yesterday that those pacts were broad based and would not be affected by scrapping the plan to share telephone lists.

"We said, 'It's so insignificant, just drop it,'" said Robert W. Pittman, chief executive of America Online's operating subsidiary. "For it to get this blown out of proportion says we really screwed up the communication."

"At the end of the day we didn't want to soil our reputation or confuse our members."

The members were certainly confused, or at least angry. Internet bulletin boards were ablaze with irate missives about the company, some of them profane. Many of the complaints stemmed from the fact that America Online had tucked its only notice of the proposed policy shift in an obscure corner of the service. The notice had been posted on July 1, but did not come to widespread attention until Tuesday.

"Unless you stumbled across it you wouldn't know unless you saw it on the evening news," said David Cassel, a freelance writer in Berkeley, Calif., who runs an Internet mailing list about America Online that

has 12,000 subscribers. "People thought it was exploitative, deceptive and intrusive. People were outraged."

The Federal Trade Commission has been investigating marketing practices in cyberspace since last summer, most recently holding a series of four "workshops" with industry groups last month.

Yesterday, noting that credit card companies often pitch services to their customers based on analysis of spending patterns, Commissioner Christine Varney said: "The difference in perception is that people believe that AOL knows a whole lot more about them or has the capacity to know a whole lot about them than American Express does. Presumably they can see where you go, what you do, where your email comes from, who you're sending it to."

Earlier this month the commission's staff sketched the outlines of a regulatory structure for Internet advertising when it determined that a World Wide Web site called KidsCom had probably engaged in deceptive practices when it collected personal information from children and used the data for marketing purposes without the consent of parents.

But the commission has not issued any regulation on Internet marketing aimed at adults, and is still leaning toward allowing the industry to police itself.

"It's about creating a dialogue with industry, and this marketplace is not going to work unless consumers have confidence in it," said Victoria Streitfeld, a commission spokeswoman. "The real effort has been to really not have Government come down on this emerging technology but to raise the issue."

ON ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS BILL AND WHAT IT MEANS TO COMMUNITIES; TRIBUTE TO BISHOP N.H. HENDERSON, SR.; AND SYMPATHY TO FAMILY OF JUDGE NORMAN BLACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am very delighted today that in an act of positive and effective bipartisanship the energy and water appropriations bill was passed by this body.

Now, many would ask what a technical bill like that has to do with the real nuts and bolts of the quality of life in this Nation. Well, first of all, it has to do with our highways and byways that are water directed. It has to do with protection of our communities against the tragedies of flooding. It has to do with the edification and beautification of our river banks and our bayous and, yes, it has to do with protecting us from the tragedies of the wrong type of disposal of nuclear waste, which in many instances is sometimes used for our medical care.

At the same time, this legislation was particularly special to a group of people in my community in the 18th Congressional District, and I would like to thank some community activists, ministers in and around the Sims

Bayou area, particularly around Martin Luther King and Cullen Boulevards, James Brooks a community activist, and Reverend Kyles, along with many other ministers and community leaders who for a long time, and continue to at this time, fought to get some response to the terrible flooding that was going on in their community.

I remember distinctly in 1994, as a city council member, traveling streets by boat that heretofore had not seen any more water than a slight puddle in a yard because it had been watered too much. But unfortunately, in a very heavy rainstorm, many of their homes were flooded out. Now, what I should most compliment is how that community came together, with churches opening their doors and with people gathering clothes and food. They rose up in the time of tragedy and adversity.

Another problem that they faced, however, was, unlike areas that flood regularly, many of those homes did not have flood insurance so many of the people were left devastated. That was 1994. And since that time, we have seen three or more times that that same area has flooded.

With their energy, we took the bull by the horns, and just this past winter, in a terrible flood, we were out there walking those bayous with the Army Corps of Engineers, the Harris County engineering group for flood control, and other local citizens and officials, and we said that this is something that we need to do a lot about.

Those community leaders were undaunted by the task of trying to get Federal funding, more of course, working with local government cooperatively and giving comfort to their citizens who one more time this past winter had been flooded again. Even as I walked the bayou, I could see fences that had been knocked down not by wind but by storm waters.

Now, after working with them and the Army Corps of Engineers, rather than go backward, we are very glad to have gone forward with the \$3.5 million added as the completion of what the Army Corps of Engineers asked for to reach the particular area of concern around Cullen and Airport and Martin Luther King Boulevards, in particular in the 18th Congressional District. This \$3.5 million will have us going forward and not backward.

But the tribute goes to those citizens who worked very hard. Many times we hear our constituency base ask, "I send money to Washington and it seems like it takes wings and goes off somewhere." Many times they complain about the spending that goes on in this body and elsewhere. The only spending that should go on, we hope, will be to enhance their quality of life.

I am delighted that these citizens maintained the course, and I will continue to work with them so that we can

jump-start this project, so that it completes itself way before 2006. We will work with Harris County, we will work with the city of Houston, and we will work with these activists who have not sold their homes in desperation but they have continued to live there. And we will work with FEMA, who still has not been able to consider their claims. But most of all we will congratulate them on their hard work.

I would also at this time, Mr. Speaker, like to acknowledge another activist, but an activist in Christianity, in the Christian experience. Bishop N.H. Henderson, Sr. has served in the ministry for some 50 years, pastoring six churches. He now pastors Law Memorial in Houston.

He has shared his life with his wife, he has shared his life with his family, but most of all he has shared his life with his community. The community of Houston, particularly in the 18th Congressional District, owes Bishop N.H. Henderson, Sr. a great deal of gratitude for the 50 years that he has given to us, for the 77 years that he has lived, for the 60 years of his Christian experience, and for the 50 years of his gospel ministry.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to very quickly pay a special note of sympathy to the family of Judge Norman Black. We lost him this past week, a cheerful and thoughtful jurist, someone who gave of his life, but most of all treated all mankind and womankind with human dignity. My sympathy to his family and the community who mourn his death.

#### ON BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a very important issue facing this Nation: It is the growing debt that faces this country. Today our debt stands at \$5.3 trillion, \$20,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States of America.

To begin this discussion, I think it is very important that we understand the difference between balancing the budget, that is, reducing the deficit to zero, and paying off the debt. The deficit is the part we talk about out here, and it is important to understand that the deficit is the overdrawn checkbook. When Washington talks about balancing the Federal budget, what they are actually talking about is not over-drawing their checkbook anymore.

What has been going on since 1969 is, every year the Government collects taxes out of the American people's pockets and it puts it in their checkbook and then the Government writes out checks. But it writes out checks

for more money than they have in their checkbook. We all know in our houses that would not work and it does not work out here.

So what it is they do when the checkbook is overdrawn, is they go and borrow the amount of money the checkbook is overdrawn. The result of that borrowing is what is shown in this chart. It is the growing debt facing this great Nation that we live in.

From 1960 to 1980 the debt did not grow by very much, but from 1980 forward they started overspending by a lot, and they started borrowing lots of money, and that is why the debt is growing as fast as it is. And we can see it in this chart. As a matter of fact, right now, today, we are at about this point on the chart. And it brings to light how important it is that we deal with not only the deficit but that we stop the Government from spending more money than it has in its checkbook.

But after the deficit is dealt with we still have the \$5.3 trillion debt, and we need to put a plan into place that also deals with that. I have recently introduced legislation called the National Debt Repayment Act. And what the National Debt Repayment Act is, it goes the next step beyond balancing the budget. After the budget is balanced, it says that we must start making payments on reducing the size of this debt.

I am a former home builder, so we set it up very much like we would when we borrow money to buy a house. We pay the loan off over a 30-year period of time. Under the plan, as the surplus is developed, one-third of the surplus would go to additional tax relief for the American people and two-thirds would go to start paying down this Federal debt.

A lot of people might ask, how did we get this debt this big and what is going on out here that would lead us to this size of a debt? I think it is important that we get a handle on what happened in this city before 1995.

Before 1995, this city, the people in Washington, continually made a series of promises to the American people. What I have on this chart is the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings promises of 1985, and then again in 1987. And one can see how they promised, and the blue line shows how the deficit was going to go to zero, they were going to stop overdrawing their checkbook. The red line shows what they actually did with the deficit. They made promises to the American people and they broke those promises.

Again, I would emphasize this is the past. This is pre-1995. Promises were made, the deficits exploded, the promises were broken.

In Washington, they figured out the logical thing to do if they could not keep their word was to make a new set of promises. So they made another set

of promises, the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings II, and the blue line shows what they promised in that set. And again the deficit exploded and they did not keep their promises. They could not hit their targets.

The reason we have this debt is because, as these promises were made in the late 1980's and early 1990's, the people representing the United States of America, the people here in Washington, they were not able to keep their commitment to the American people.

In 1993, recognizing that they had broken all their promises, they got serious about this and they said, "We know what we can do about this, we will raise taxes. We will take more money out of the pockets of the American people. And maybe if we do that, we can stop overdrawing our checkbook." Because if they took more money out of the pockets of the American people and they put it in their checkbook out here, they would have more money to spend but they would be closer to a balanced checkbook.

So they raised taxes in 1993, and I would point out the tax increase passed the House of Representatives by a single vote. Not one single Republican voted for it. And it passed the Senate by a single vote.

So we have these broken promises before 1995, we have the tax increase of 1993, and we have the revolt of the American people in 1994. In 1994 the American people said, "Enough of this stuff, we do not want any more broken promises of a balanced budget, and we do not want these tax increases," and they put a new group of people, they put the Republicans in charge of both the House and the Senate.

Now, I think it is reasonable that the American people should ask are they any different. Is there any difference between the Democrats that were here before and this picture of broken promises and higher taxes, and the group of people that is now in Washington, DC, in control in the House and the Senate?

□ 1430

I brought some charts along for that, because I think the answer to that question is very important. It is more than fair that the American people ask are they any different than what has happened since 1995, when we sent a new group there to control. I brought this chart along because this chart shows just how different things really are.

The red columns that one sees on this chart are our plan to balance the budget, too. When we got here in 1995, we made a promise to the American people that we were going to balance the budget too and preserve this Nation for our children. The red column shows the deficit numbers that we promised the American people.

This is very different than those last charts, though, however. Instead of

missing the targets, in the first year of our plan, we not only hit the target but were ahead of schedule. The blue column shows what actually happened. So in year one, we were not only successful, but we were ahead of schedule. Along came year two. We were not only successful but we were ahead of schedule. We are now in year three of this plan; and, again, we are not only on schedule, we are ahead of schedule.

It now appears that, because of the success of this group since 1995, along with a strong economy, that we are in a position to balance the budget by next year. So we have not only hit our target of balancing by the year 2002 and keeping our promise, but it now appears that we will have a balanced budget as soon as 1998, 1999 at the latest, and that is great news for the American people.

Why is this happening? What is the message here? What is different? Well, this group curtailed the growth of Government spending to a point where we were able to hit our targets. No raise of taxes. No taking money out the pockets of the American people. Our vision was we should curtail the growth of Washington spending.

When Washington spends less money out of their checkbook, it is no different than in our household, their checkbook was overdrawn by a smaller amount. As a matter of fact, if we look at the year 1997, for example, they overdrew their checkbook by \$100 billion less than what was expected. Well, what happened?

When Washington did not go into the private sector and borrow that \$100 billion, that left the money available in the private sector. With \$100 billion available out there in the private sector, of course that is more availability of money. More availability of money meant the interest rates stayed down. And this is where it now translates out of Washington and into the real world. In the real world, when the interest rates stayed down, it was very predictable what happened next. People started buying more houses and buying more cars.

This was our vision in 1995. If Washington could just stay within their means, could meet their targets and stay ahead of schedule, they would borrow less money out of the private sector. More money available would keep the interest rates down. And with the interest rates down, people would buy more houses and cars and they would do all the things to make this economy work. Because when they bought houses and cars, other people had to go to work. That meant they left the welfare rolls, took less money away from the Government, and started paying taxes in.

That is the working model that has led to this picture. Again, I cannot emphasize enough how different the picture is now than it was before. We are

not only on track to balancing the budget, we are ahead of schedule.

I would like to also point out the success that we have had in terms of curtailing the growth of Government spending. This chart shows it the best I can. Before the Republicans got here in 1995, Government spending was going up at an annual rate of 5.2 percent.

We have heard a lot about draconian cuts. I would like to point out that, since the Republicans have been here, spending is still going up, much to the chagrin of some us out here, but it is going up at a much slower rate. What has actually happened is the growth of Government spending, growth of Washington programs has been slowed by about 40 percent.

Since Washington spending is not growing as fast, we are able to both reach a balanced budget and offer tax relief to the American people. What a wonderful situation this is that we have out here right now. We are now in a position because of this success that we can offer the American people both a balanced budget and tax relief, \$500 per child; college tuition \$1,500 for your kids going to college; capital gains being reduced from 28 percent to 20 percent; the death taxes, reform; the dream IRA has pulled into place. All of these good things are happening out here because Washington is no longer expanding like it was before. That is good news for the American people.

I had a conversation this morning and the person was talking and he said, "I have got two kids at home." And I said, "Good. January 1 of next year what you should do is you should walk in the door of your employer and you should tell your employer you wanted to keep \$66 more in your paycheck in January that you were sending to Washington before. You just get to keep that money. It is his money anyhow."

And this person just simply has to walk in the door of his employer on January 1 next year and say, "I want to keep an extra 66 bucks a month of my own money," and he gets a \$66 raise in one month simply by walking in and doing it because these tax cuts are put into place. Good news for America.

The logical question is, "What is next?" I think the logical question, we look at this picture, we look at the broken promises of the past and the tax increases of 1993 and the American people stepping forward and rejecting those broken promises and the tax increases, and they have now moved to a point where they put a group of people here that are going to both stay on track to balancing the budget and reduce the taxes at the same time, the logical question is, "Where do we go from here?"

I think the answer to that question goes back to kind of where we started tonight. Even after the budget is balanced, we still have this \$5.3 trillion

debt hanging over our head. For any of the viewers that have not seen this number, this is what the number looks like. It is staggering. It is \$20,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States of America. It is \$100,000 for a family of five like mine. And the kicker is, a family of five pays \$580 a month in interest only on the Federal debt.

Now a lot of people say, "I do not pay that much in taxes." Well, the reality is, you pay taxes all over the place. When you walk in the store and buy a loaf of bread and the store owner makes a profit on that loaf of bread, the store owner sends part of that profit to Washington, DC, to help pay the interest on that Federal debt. So they are paying it.

So the logical question is, "What next?" The logical answer to that question is after we balance the budget, we should start addressing this national debt. Recently I introduced a bill called the National Debt Repayment Act. And it does this. After the budget is balanced, we cap the growth of Washington spending at a rate 1-percent lower than the rate of revenue growth. That creates a surplus. Two-thirds of the surplus goes to paying down this debt. One-third of the surplus goes to additional tax cuts for the American people. I think it is real important that we point out, as this debt is repaid, the money that has been taken out of the Social Security trust fund by the people in Washington over the last 15 years gets put back into the Social Security trust fund so Social Security once again becomes solvent for our senior citizens. The people that are working today would get additional tax cuts; so for our seniors, solvency in the Social Security trust fund, security in the Social Security system for our seniors. For our working families, for people in the work force today, taxes is part of this bill.

I think most important of all, for future generations, for our children and for our grandchildren, we get to pass this great Nation on to our children debt-free. We pay off the Federal debt by the year 2026 under this bill, and we get to pass this great Nation on to our children debt-free. I think that is the message of the future, and I think that is the message of the Republican Party.

The past, the party that was here before us in control, the broken promises of the late 1980's and the early 1990's and the tax increases of 1993, that is gone. The American people sent a different party here to run Washington, DC. This party is in the third year of a plan to balance the Federal budget. We are on track. We are ahead of schedule. The budget should be balanced in 2002 but probably as early as next year or the year after, on track, ahead of schedule, by curtailing the growth of Washington spending so that we can

provide both a balanced budget and lower taxes for the American people.

This vision for the future includes paying off the Federal debt, restoring the Social Security trust fund, and giving this great Nation that we live in to our children absolutely debt-free. I can think of no better vision for the future of our Nation.

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

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for the remainder of the majority leader's hour. That time would be 47 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ETHERIDGE].

#### REGARDING TAX RELIEF FOR WORKING FARMERS.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the hard-working farmers of North Carolina. I want to thank my colleagues that voted yesterday to preserve crop insurance for tobacco farmers.

Defeating the amendment this week could not have come more timely. Just this week, rain and wind from Hurricane Danny damaged thousands of tobacco farms in North Carolina as farmers prepared to go to market. As insurance adjusters began to survey the damage, farmers will count on crop insurance to pay the bill as they try to salvage what they can.

If crop insurance were not available to these small farmers, not only would this year's crop be a near total loss for them, but others would be forced off the farm entirely. Many of these very farmers are still repairing the damage to curing barns, irrigation equipment, and other farm equipment received during Hurricane Bertha and Hurricane Fran just last year. Others are just now recovering to pay off farm loans and bank debts that they sustained during that period. And their families also faced damage from blue mold just last year on their tobacco.

Yesterday's vote was a huge victory for small farmers, especially poor, minority, and disadvantaged growers. Tobacco has been in the news a great deal lately. It has been the source of quite a bit of controversy. However, there is one fact about tobacco that is indisputable. The golden leaf has helped build the State of North Carolina, and it has helped transform the Tar Heel State into an international force in business, technology, education, research, medicine, and the arts.

Before the turn of the century, North Carolina was known as the Rip Van Winkle State, devoid of good education, economic wealth, and many other things that others enjoyed. Jobs were hard to come by, and a week's pay at a textile mill never seemed to be quite enough to pay the bills at the town general store.

Education was a privilege only for a very special few people. At the turn of the century, most children left school early to work on the farm or in a textile mill, and only a lucky few graduated from high school, and even less went on to college. Health care was atrocious. But because of the geography and climate, North Carolina farmers found that they could grow a variety of crops and especially one that turned a good crop, flue-cured tobacco.

Tobacco has helped educate our children, help establish our community college system, build our roads, and send thousands of young people to a public university system that is the rival of any in this Nation and around the world. Tobacco and the tax revenues and economic development it has generated has provided the State and local government the resources necessary to foster an environment of technological achievement in our State that would not have been deemed thinkable just a few decades ago.

North Carolina boasts the best research universities that exist anywhere. Our community college system is the model used by States all over the country. North Carolina boasts more miles of State maintained highways than any State in this Nation. And the Research Triangle Park has become a research technological manufacturing center that has put North Carolina ahead of the pack in the creation of new jobs and economic development opportunities as we look forward to the new millennium.

Just over 50 years ago, tobacco was the economy of North Carolina. And it remains an important part of our State today, but it is a less important part. North Carolina has a well-diversified, multifaceted economy, thanks to the sweat and toil of the farmers all over our State.

But tobacco is extremely vulnerable to the fury of nature. Hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, and other acts of nature that have visited North Carolina in recent years have devastated our family farmers. Crop insurance would have made it more difficult had farmers not had to insure themselves against nature's fury.

So let me thank my colleagues again for casting a vote on behalf of family farmers. I also want to thank my colleagues that voted to preserve the peanut program and the reforms that were made to it in the 1996 farm bill. Because had they not voted against the Neumann-Kanjorski amendment, peanuts would have been in trouble.

Peanuts have also played a big role in the agriculture economy of North Carolina. Before tobacco became the king crop, peanuts sustained the fragile economies in many of our poorest counties in North Carolina, as it still does today. Peanut farmers face many obstacles, as do others. Too much water turns them to mush. Too much drought turns them to dust.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank my colleagues for casting their vote to help our farmers yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BURR]. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized and has 42 minutes remaining.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk a little bit about what has been happening over the last 40 years, what is happening in the Congress today, and sort of pursue some of the ideas that our colleague, the gentleman Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], was talking about.

I am pleased to have joining me the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], who came in with me and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] in the class of 1994, to talk a little bit about what is happening with this budget, what is happening with taxes.

I want to mention something that our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], neglected to mention. I think it is a very important point.

□ 1445

He said that we are ahead of goal, we are under budget, we are closer to a balanced budget today than we have been since I was in high school. I would like to talk a little bit about some of the things that are happening. We have eliminated something like 289 Federal programs. We have cut over \$50 billion in discretionary spending. We have the first real welfare reform plan passed literally since 1965.

There is a lot of good news that goes along with this. As a matter of fact, 3 weeks ago when the President did his Saturday radio address, he said that there are 1,023,000 fewer families on welfare today than were on welfare when he signed the Republican welfare reform bill just a little over a year and a half ago. That is good news. It is saving money. But the goal of the welfare reform plan was not to save money. The goal of the welfare reform plan was to save people, and to save families and to save children from one more generation of poverty, dependency, and despair. We are making real progress in the areas of welfare reform, in the areas of Medicare reform, entitlement reform, downsizing the Federal bureaucracy, holding the Federal Government more accountable, squeezing more out of the taxpayers' dollars. We are limiting the growth in spending.

In fact, in 1995, when we passed our first 7-year budget plan in which we

said we will balance the budget by 2002 and we will provide tax relief to working families in the United States, when we passed that original blueprint for balancing the budget, when we said in 1995 that in fiscal year 1997 we would spend \$1,624 billion, that is how much we would spend in this fiscal year that we are in right now.

The truth of the matter is we are actually going to spend only \$1,622 billion. This Congress is actually going to spend less money this year than we said we were going to spend just 2 years ago. That is good news. But I think the news is even better if we stop and analyze it, because in the intervening time because we have had stronger consumer confidence, we have stronger confidence in the business community, we have lower interest rates than even the Treasury estimated just 2 years ago, as a result of all of that, more people are buying homes, more people are buying cars, the economy is stronger, and the revenues coming into the Federal Government have actually increased by more than \$100 billion. At the same time revenue has increased by over \$100 billion, real spending by this Congress is less than we said it would be just 2 years ago.

I think that is great news for the American people, and it is particularly good news I think for our kids, because we are on the path now toward a balanced budget. There was a published report just a few weeks ago that said if the economy remains even relatively as strong as it is today, even close to where we are today, we could actually balance the budget as early as next year. I think that is great news.

Joining me is the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON]. I welcome any comments he may have.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wanted to rise and talk a little bit with the gentleman today and with the people viewing in the C-SPAN audience a little bit about who this tax cut package is really going to help. It is important for all our colleagues in the House of Representatives and everyone watching to understand exactly what this means for the families and their neighbors' families. Tax relief is about real people, real Americans. If the gentleman would allow me to come down there, I want to put up on that easel next to him a picture of one of those families.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. In fact, while the gentleman is bringing a chart down, I think he has made an excellent point and sometimes we forget because we get so bogged down in \$1,624 billion and 2.3 percent and \$100 billion and \$200 million and all of these numbers. We sometimes talk about these kinds of things as if it were some kind of an accounting exercise when really this in the end is about real people and how it is going to affect their lives.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a picture of a family from

my congressional district, specifically the town of Palm Bay, the town that I live in on Florida's east central coast, an area we call the Space Coast because of Kennedy Space Center and Cape Canaveral being there.

This is the Auger family, a middle-class family. Here we have Jim Auger. He is a plumber. We see him there with his wife and his three kids. They have a family income of less than \$40,000. Jim juggles his roles as husband and plumber, and his wife, of course, is very busy with the household chores. I believe she also earns some extra income cutting hair. They have three kids. I want to talk a little bit about the kids.

The oldest boy is Christopher. There is Christopher there. Then they have Anthony and their daughter Denae. She is 10 years old. Of course also they have the two dogs, Bridget and Oreo.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Which dog is which?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I think this one is Oreo actually. I think I may have gotten that one wrong.

I want to talk a little bit about what the Republican tax cut package actually means for them and how it will specifically affect this family, because it means a lot to this family. In fact, it means a lot for all families like the Augers, and the importance of this vote cannot be overemphasized. Indeed, I think it may be one of the most important votes that we will cast in this Congress.

It is not always easy for Jim to look out for his family and to make ends meet, especially when so much of his hard earned money goes to the Federal Government. Indeed, like most middle class working American families, Jim sends more to the Federal Government than what he spends on food, clothing, and shelter combined, which is a very significant, important fact for many American families.

What they will receive with this middle-class tax cut package is very important. They will receive \$500 for each child.

The gentleman from Minnesota has another picture of the family. I think what they are doing there is playing Pictionary at that particular moment. They are not trying to fill out their IRS forms and figure out how they are going to make ends meet. They are actually enjoying themselves there.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I want to get back to an important point because I think this sometimes is lost. This typical American family, and this is not all that different from the family I grew up in during the 1950's. In fact, when I was growing up in the 1950's, the average family, the largest single payment that they made was for their house payment. Today the typical family, according to the National Taxpayers Union, pays more in taxes, we are talking about total taxes, they pay more in taxes than they do for food, clothing,

and shelter combined. That is why the typical American family is being squeezed so much and why this tax relief package we are talking about is so important.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. The gentleman raises a very good point. The typical American family does not pay more in Federal income tax than they spend on food, shelter, and clothing. But when we add up the FICA, the Medicare tax, when we add up the property taxes, if they own their own home, their sales taxes and all the other taxes the families pay out, the typical American family is spending more money on taxes than anything else, and it is greater than food, clothing, and shelter combined.

This family is going to get the \$500 per child tax credit. But because their oldest son is getting close to college age, they can also get a \$1,500 a year eligibility for an IRA scholarship deduction which, if we do the math and translate it all out, this family will be saving in excess of \$1,500 a year on their income taxes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is money that they get to keep, and sometimes people misunderstand. They confuse credits with deductions. We are talking about \$1,500 more that this family will have in their checkbooks to spend as they see fit rather than having that money being sent to Washington to be spent by Members of Congress and bureaucrats as they see fit.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. The gentleman is absolutely correct. An important point here that I would like to make is the Augers are not the only family in my congressional district who are going to benefit from this tax relief package. Indeed, the Heritage Foundation, a think tank here in Washington, DC, did a calculation for me indicating that 84,000 families in my congressional district will see their income taxes go down based on this Republican middle-class tax cut package. That will mean \$39 million in the pockets of working families in my congressional district, which includes Brevard County, Indian River County, Osceola County, and portions of Polk County in Florida. I am sure in the gentleman from Minnesota's district, it is ditto. He has got thousands and thousands of families that will benefit from it.

This is a very important point: When we put more money in their pockets, in working families' pockets, it not only makes it easier for them to make ends meet, it not only makes it easier for them to be able to send their kids to college with the tuition tax credits that we are providing, but it is also going to be good for the local economy, it is going to be good for the local businessman. If you are a businessman and you own a hardware store or if you work in a barber shop or a restaurant, you are going to have more families with more spending money in their

pocket, and that is going to in turn, well, Jim Auger here in this picture is a perfect example. He is a plumber. There are lots of families that are going to benefit that he does plumbing work for. How many families in my congressional district or in the congressional district of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] have a leaking faucet that they would like to get fixed but they do not have the money, the end of the checkbook comes before the end of the month? What is going to happen, people will have more spending money and the spinoff benefit will not only be that it is going to be easier for him to send his kids to college; they are going to have more spending money. But as well, it may actually help his business because it is going to help the families that he does plumbing work for.

This is something that has the potential to help everybody in America. It will create jobs, it will make working families and families with kids better able to make ends meet, and probably most importantly, it is going to make it a lot easier for this mom and dad in this picture to send these three kids to college.

These kids are bright kids and their parents believe they are college material and that they should be able to succeed in college. But as everybody knows, it is not just the tuition. It is the room and the board and the books and paying the medical insurance while the kids are in college. So providing for a kid for another 4 years and seeing him through the process of college is very, very difficult on families. This family is going to be better able to send their kids to college. That is a big part of what this tax package is all about.

I am very, very pleased to rise today and join the gentleman in this special order and talk about not just the statistics and not just the numbers, but real flesh and blood people like the Augers and their three kids, because this is going to mean a real difference for their quality of life. For too long, American families like them have been bearing too much of the burden of government here in Washington. If we look at the facts and look back 40 years when my mom and dad and the gentleman from Minnesota's mom and dad were raising our families, I know I have my sister Carol visiting from Tennessee in the gallery up there listening to this speech. I have three sisters, Carol is the youngest, my sister Maryann, who is younger than me, and then my older sister Christine. When my parents were raising the four of us kids, my father was a postal clerk, working in the post office, they were sending about 2, 3, 4 percent of their income to Washington, DC. Now these families are sending 25 percent of their income to Washington, DC.

As I understand it, she likes to cut hair and she enjoys cutting hair. But

there are a lot of working moms who would rather not be out in the workplace. They would rather be home with the kids. Particularly when the kids are really little, they would rather be home with them. This tax package is going to go a long way to helping a lot of those families.

One of the things that I think is most ironic is that not only has this been a very difficult process over the 3 years to get the administration to come along with us on a tax cut package, but as well it really is taking our initiative, the initiative of the Speaker, the majority leader, the leader in the other body as well as all the other Members, to really get the President of the United States to fulfill a pledge that he made in a campaign in 1992 to provide a middle-class tax break. So it is really a pleasure for me to join the gentleman.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I will hold this picture up of this family, but I think if he flips to the next chart, let us talk a little bit about that. He is absolutely right that the President promised when he ran for office the first time a middle-class tax cut. He did not promise a lower income tax cut, he did not promise to cut taxes for people who pay no income taxes. He promised a middle-class tax cut.

In many respects, what we are doing is we are helping the President keep that promise. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, which is a bipartisan committee and is the official scorekeeper of all tax bills, 76 percent of the tax relief in the package that passed this House, and we have not yet got the calculations on the bill that is being finalized in the conference committee, but my suspicion is it will be very close to the same number, at least three-quarters of the benefit of this tax package will go to families who earn less than \$75,000 a year.

□ 1500

And there are lots and lots of families in that category, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Yes, if the gentleman would yield, I appreciate it, thank you.

I just wanted to explain what this chart represents. And our tax cut package is about an \$85 billion net tax cut, but actually its total amount is about \$115 billion. This pie chart represents all of that money, the whole tax cut package, and we are looking at who does it go to. And this section in the yellow here represents 76 percent of that tax cut package, and it goes to families earning between \$20,000 and \$75,000.

That to me says a great deal. It says this truly is a middle-class tax cut. That is the working middle class.

Now some people may say well, gee, \$50,000, \$60,000, \$70,000, where I live is not middle class, and that is true.

Where I am in Florida, making \$65,000, \$70,000 a year, some people would legitimately argue is not middle class anymore. But I can tell you in some of our more urban areas, places like New York City, Long Island, Los Angeles, there are a lot of families struggling to make ends meet on \$65,000 a year because of the very, very high cost of housing where a house can cost \$300,000 a year. And if you really look, that is the middle class in the United States of America, with incomes between \$20,000 and \$75,000 a year.

This pie chart shows you very, very clearly, 76 percent goes to those working middle-class families.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is what the President promised, and that is what we have delivered.

Perhaps we can flip to the next chart because this is another chart that was put together by the Joint Economic Committee on Taxation, again the people who actually are the official scorekeepers, and what you see in yellow is current law or pre- the tax cut package that has been agreed to by the House and Senate. And what you see are the five different, if you broke the economic groups into equal parts of one-fifth, the lowest one-fifth of taxpayers currently pay in the yellow there on the left, they currently pay 1 percent of all the taxes paid in the United States. The top or the lowest 20 percent of income earners in the United States currently pay 1 percent. Under this tax plan they would still pay 1 percent.

If you drop all the way over to the highest 20 percent, they currently pay 63 percent of all of the taxes paid in the United States. Under this tax plan they will still pay 63 percent. In fact, if you really are honest about the way the distribution of this tax cut goes, it really does little to change the differences between the wealthy and the poor.

The important point is, and one of the things that our friends on the left, they do two things with our tax bill that I think in some respects are incredibly disingenuous. One is they use what is called family economic income or otherwise imputed income. And by doing that you can literally take a family that is earning \$47,000 a year, which currently is the median family income, that lives in their own home, that perhaps has accrued values of pensions, perhaps has an IRA that they could cash in, have some undeclared capital gains; in other words, they have got some stock perhaps that they inherited from Aunt Matilda. And if you put all those together using a very convoluted and tortured arithmetic developed by the Treasury Department, you can literally take that typical family, that median family with \$47,000 of income, and you can say they have an imputed income of \$80,000 a year. And that is what sometimes our friends on

the left are referring to when they talk about tax cuts for the rich.

The other thing they do, which I do not think is completely fair or honest, is they talk about capital gains and they say capital gains are tax cuts for the rich. Well, in some respects there is some truth, and as a matter of fact if Bill Gates were to sell all of his Microsoft stock under this tax plan with the tax relief that we have included in that for capital gains sales, he would get a very large tax cut. That is a fact, OK? The likelihood is he is not going to do that. As a matter of fact, many wealthy people never sell their stock. They leave it to a trust; in fact, in my guess what probably will happen to Mr. Gates' stock in Microsoft is one day he will leave it to some foundation to build electronic libraries throughout the galaxy. That is what historically has happened with many very wealthy people. They create foundations, they create trusts, and so in some respects they really do not take advantage of these tax breaks anyway. But even if they did, that is their business, it is not the government's business, and he would still be paying billions of dollars worth of taxes.

But let us talk about normal people. Let us talk about farmers. Let us talk about small business people. Let us talk about families who save and invest for their future which, of course, is what ultimately I think we want people to do more of. One of the problems we have had with this Tax Code over the last 40 years is that it has discouraged personal responsibility by saying, you know if you save, if you invest, if you take care of your family, you will be punished. If you do not do those things, you will be rewarded. And what we are saying is we have got to reverse some of those perverse incentives.

But let us talk about tax cuts for the rich, because the truth of the matter is most people who pay a capital gains tax are rich for 1 day, the day they sell their farm, the day they sell their business or the day they sell some other asset or investment which in many cases they have been paying taxes on for many, many years.

So I happen to believe that we ought to encourage people to invest and save and that the real purpose of capital gains tax relief is not to help the wealthy. It is to help more people of modest means become wealthy and to help those people take better care of themselves and better care of their families, particularly in their retiring years.

So I strongly support capital gains tax reductions, and frankly I do not have any problem defending or discussing those back in my home district, particularly among small business people and farmers, because they understand that they live poor and they die rich because they have invested, saved and been prudent.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman, and I want to talk about one particular aspect of the capital gains reduction which is part of the tax package that is being discussed here in Washington right now.

The capital gains tax reduction, the reason why I support it and the reason why many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support it is because it stimulates jobs, it helps create jobs, and the way it does that is if you have made an investment and you realize some profit off that investment, if when you go to sell and the government takes slightly less, you are left with a little bit more. And most people who make an investment reinvest their money.

Now some people will use it for a vacation or a college education, but the majority of people reinvest their money right back into the economy in the form of stocks or bonds or business.

And so when you lower the rate of tax on capital gains, and you leave more money in people's pockets who are most likely to invest it, they are putting more money back into the economy, and then, as a consequence, they are creating jobs.

And what is probably most important about this is they are more often than not creating good, high-paying, quality jobs. Often it is in high-tech industries, the kind of industries that are clean, that are less polluting and that frequently are paying better salaries.

I want to make one other extremely important point. In our Republican tax cut package we do something called indexing capital gains, and I want to explain what that is. If you make an investment today, a thousand dollars, and 10 years from now your investment has doubled in value to \$2,000, according to the current Tax Code you have got a capital gain on a thousand dollars.

But guess what? Inflation is such that 50 percent of your profit has been eaten up by inflation, so instead of really having an extra thousand dollars, because of inflation, the decline in value of the dollar, you maybe only have realized \$500 in real profit.

Indeed, when inflation is going along very rapidly, if inflation was at, say, 7 percent, and your investment went from 1,000 to \$2,000, you have made absolutely no profit because your \$2,000 now only buys what a thousand dollars did years ago.

Well, in the current Tax Code, you pay taxes on that inflated money. You actually have to pay the Federal Government for the inflation, and I just think that is absolutely wrong, and one of the things I am most proud of in our tax cut package is we allow you to index it for inflation.

So if you made that thousand dollar investment and it is now worth \$2,000, but the dollar has gone down in value slightly so your real capital gains is

only \$500, you pay capital gains tax on only \$500.

What I have been most disappointed in is the President does not want this provision. He wants it eliminated, and he is going around this city, and he has his Treasury Secretary, Robert Rubin, going around saying that this will, quote, explode the deficit, trying to put fear in the hearts of the American people that this tax cut package is going to explode the deficit. In truth, it is going to do nothing at all like that. And in truth, what we are trying to do is just basic fairness. We are trying to take the family values that you are trying to raise your kids with every day, a fairness and honesty, and we are trying to apply it to the U.S. Tax Code. And believe me in this city it is very hard. But to have the President running around and saying it is going to explode the deficit, in my opinion, is to say the current system is the way we want to keep it, we want to tax you on your inflated dollars. Even if your \$1,000 investment is worth \$2,000 and inflation has eaten up half of that, we are going to tax you on all of that.

And I just think that is dead wrong, and it is just not fair. One of the things that I know that I have been striving for since I have been here in Washington, all the Members of our freshman class, particularly the freshman class of the last Congress and the people like Mr. GUTKNECHT, is to try to put fairness into the system, fairness in giving working families like the Augers, the people I showed earlier, more money to spend at the end of the month, more money for college education, better able to make ends meet, but also to put fairness into the law itself and have it make common sense.

Mr. Speaker, it does not make common sense if the dollar has gone down in value such that your investment is really not worth anything more, but then for the Federal Government to come along and tax you on that; well, my colleagues, let me tell you, you can end up losing money on your investments if the government is going to eat away all of it, even the gains that have been made purely on inflation. Your purchasing power can go down, and what happens when you live in a country like that where they are taxing you on everything and taxing you on your taxes, well, people will not make investments, and then you will not create good, high-paying, quality jobs, and then we all suffer.

So we want a Tax Code that makes sense, we want a Tax Code that is fair, we want a Tax Code that helps working families, we want a tax system that encourages families to be able to send their kids to college, and I am very, very pleased to be able to join the gentleman in this special order here.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to a point the gentleman from Florida made, and this is

one of the things that has been incredibly discouraging and frustrating in that we have the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Rubin, and I want to talk specifically about the Treasury Department and their imputed income scheme and, even more importantly, to talk briefly about their notion of exploding, reducing capital gains, exploding the deficit. The real tragedy of that tale is they know that that is not true.

As a matter of fact, the Treasury now has updated numbers that shows by reducing capital gains at the levels that we are talking about in this tax bill, you actually increase revenue to the Federal Government over the next 10 years by an additional \$25 billion. Yesterday there was an article written by one of the former Federal Governors who said reducing capital gains will actually increase revenues to the Federal Government by hundreds of billions of dollars more because it will encourage people to sell assets that they have been sitting on for a long time and convert those and allow other people to buy them. And as this happens, as we get more and more transactions, as we get more and more people investing in savings, as we encourage investments in savings, you increase the size of the pie.

You do not have to raise taxes to increase revenue. If you lower capital gains, even the Treasury Department now acknowledges, you actually increase revenue. You do not explode the deficit, you explode revenues, because the economic activity is growing and the biggest benefactors, and I think you said this, again are not the wealthy.

And I will just also quote, there was a gentleman in my office yesterday, and some people know him, he is the president of Godfathers Pizza, a remarkable human being, and I asked him that question about capital gains, and I asked him what kind of tax package would benefit low- and middle-income people the most. And you know what he said? Whatever tax package lowers total taxes the most.

□ 1515

He said, do you know why? He said, because wealthy people already have all the toys they want. They already have the boats. They have the Gulfstream IV's, they have lots of toys. So if they have more of their money to spend, particularly as they sell investments, guess what they are going to do? They are going to reinvest it. They are going to invest it in new businesses and new opportunities and new job opportunities for people who need them the most.

So the real benefit of this package I think goes to people of modest means and to middle-income families, and that is the way it should be. Just because there may be some wealthy peo-

ple who will benefit, that is no reason to play this class warfare.

I want to remind people and our Members who may be watching, it has not been that long ago that this Congress started to play this class warfare game. What happened? They passed something called the luxury boat tax. They were going to get those wealthy people who bought those cigarette boats and those wealthy people who bought yachts. They were somehow going to get them to pay more taxes. Do Members remember what happened?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I had or still have one of those boat companies in my district, Sea Ray, and it just about put them out of business. As I understand it, 20,000 working Americans who worked in the boating industry lost their jobs, and I know they laid off lots of people in my district, and it was a disaster because people stopped buying the boats, so they got absolutely no income into the Federal Treasury off of that tax.

And because they stopped buying boats, it put the boating industry in a tailspin. I know in my congressional district it hurt the company very, very badly, and people ended up losing their jobs. When people lose their jobs they go on unemployment, they may end up on welfare, they are not paying income tax anymore. So that luxury tax I think is an excellent case study. I am glad the gentleman brought it up.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. It underscores the real danger of playing this class warfare game. Abraham Lincoln warned many, many years ago that you cannot help the poor by hurting the rich. In other words, we are all in the same boat. You cannot sink half of them. When they tried to do it, when they tried the luxury boat tax, it had a net negative revenue consequence. That was bad. But what was worse, over 10,000 honest, hard-working Americans lost their jobs. That is the danger of playing this class warfare game.

I think we have to talk in the terms that President Kennedy talked about over 30 years ago. He said a rising tide lifts all boats. When he cut marginal tax rates across-the-board, guess who benefited the most? People with the highest incomes. But in the end who really benefitted in terms of more jobs, more economic activity, and a faster growing economy? It was people who needed the jobs worse.

President Kennedy understood the principle of a rising tide lifting all boats. Unfortunately, there are Members of this body today who seem to think that if you cannot pick winners and losers you should not do anything to try to improve the state of everybody. I think that is wrong. I think there are people here who unfortunately have gotten into this game that there always have been to be losers and we must always defend the losers. That is simply not true. We have to talk

about expanding the pie for everybody. If we do, the American people understand this.

If the gentleman could put up this last chart, I know the gentleman wants to talk a little bit about the space race. There is an awful lot of cynicism, Mr. Speaker, and I absolutely understand it. A lot of times I tell people on my money it does not say, "in Republicans we trust," it does not say, in "Democrats we trust," it does not say "in Congress we trust." It says "in God we trust." I do not ask people to trust me, but I do ask them to trust themselves.

What we have put on here, and I hope people can see this chart, if they want to know how much this tax package will benefit them, we have a couple of web sites where people can actually call it up on their computer. There is a GOP tax calculator, and hopefully they can see that on their television. People can actually calculate the tax relief for themselves: What does this package mean to me?

Do not worry about what it might mean to some wealthy investor who may sell a large investment. Obviously they may get a tax break. But what people really want to know is, what will it do for me? What will it do for my family? If people look at this in those terms, they will decide it is a fair tax package, it is good for them, it is good for their family, and it helps them to save and invest for their future as well as take care of their kids. I am very proud of this tax package.

Let me say one other thing. I have just written a letter to the gentleman from Texas Mr. BILL ARCHER. The President and some of his friends are saying this gives too much tax benefits to the rich, and there are families at the lower-income levels who are working but yet would not receive tax relief under this package. What we have done is send a letter to the gentleman from Texas Mr. BILL ARCHER, and this is from a recommendation from a gentleman who called in on C-SPAN.

He said, "I understand what the Republicans are saying, only people who pay taxes are going to get tax relief. But I kind of understand what the President and some of the Democrats are saying, too, and that is there are teachers just starting out, fire fighters just starting out. Under the Republican plan they would not get much tax relief."

He offered what I think is a simple and sensible compromise solution. He said, "Why do we not just say, let each family decide which package gives them the best bang for the buck?" In other words, if right now they get a better deal under the earned income tax credit, they could take that. On the other side, if they thought they got a better bargain under the per child tax credit that the Republican conference committee has worked out, they should

take that. They could either have the system under the earned income tax credit or the per child family tax credit. Give them the best of both worlds. They could choose one or the other.

I think that is a reasonable compromise. I would hope that the conferees would at least look at something like that to try and break this impasse, so that for the first time in 16 years we can actually provide working families with real tax relief.

I know the gentleman wants to talk a little bit about, and I want to give the gentleman a compliment, because he represents Cape Canaveral and the space industry down there, and the gentleman does it very admirably. Here recently we have heard a lot of interesting news about the space program, both with the Mir Space Station that is up there circling now, and we all hope and pray that that turns out for the better, but more interestingly, what has been happening on the planet Mars.

I know the gentleman has some great pictures that have come back from NASA, and I yield to the gentleman to discuss some of those projects that are currently going on at Cape Canaveral and with NASA in general. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for being a space supporter. I know he has been fascinated by some of these issues.

I want to talk a little bit about our Nation's space program and the tremendous asset it is to America. We are a great Nation, 275 million people, 50 States, from sea to shining sea. It is a very variegated fabric of what makes up America. There are many great things that make our Nation great. Our number one asset is obviously our people and the people who make up so many of the great industries and institutions.

Of course, the space program has been getting a lot of attention lately, particularly as it relates to exploration of Mars. I wanted to talk a little bit about that.

Our space program is something that truly fascinates our children. Teachers in my district tell me, if you want to get kids excited about math and science and just why it is important and how it applies, just start talking about the space program and you will get their attention.

Why is that? I think there is something that burns in the heart of every human being, not just every American but every human being: a sense of curiosity, what is our destiny. We all know we have explored the world. There is much more to explore in this world, but we also know that much of it has been explored.

What is man's destiny? Is it just to reside here on planet earth, or is it to reach out and truly grasp the stars, to

go to other planets, to visit other stars, to explore new worlds, to some day colonize other places in the universe?

If I could quote Neil Armstrong, his "one small step for man," we had a small step a few weeks ago with the Mars Pathfinder, an incredibly successful mission, a mission that was launched from Cape Canaveral in December of last year, and it arrived at the red planet, a successful landing of the Mars Pathfinder vehicle shown here in this diagram, or this is actually a photograph of Mars. This is a photograph taken of the Sojourner, the vehicle that is able to go out and explore around on the planet.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also show this very, very interesting photograph. The Sojourner rolled off of the Mars Pathfinder and then turned around and took a picture of the Mars Pathfinder, and here we can see the Mars Pathfinder, and these bags that are around it are actually deflated balloons.

The way that Pathfinder landed, once it came into the atmosphere balloons all around the Mars Pathfinder blew up, and the thing actually bounced on the surface something like 20 times and then came to rest. Slowly the air was let out of the balloons, and the thing opened up and out goes this rover.

Here we can actually see in this photograph the tracks that the rover made in the surface of the planet. So it is a fascinating vehicle. It is a tremendous success, something I think that everybody at NASA can be proud of, particularly the people at JPL.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from references to occupants of the gallery.

#### FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to use my time today, and I do not plan to use it all, but I would like to use the time that I have today to discuss some foreign policy issues. The first relates to south Asia and to India in particular.

I am the cochair of the India Caucus, and very much a supporter of the efforts by the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan to bring their countries closer together, pursuant to the so-called Gujral Doctrine, which is named after the current Prime Minister of India.

Progress is being made by the two countries towards a peaceful settlement of their differences, as well as improved economic and trade relations,

and a big part of this has been the discussions that have been held between the Prime Ministers and between officials in India and Pakistan at a level lower than the Prime Minister level.

But this progress is really one of the major reasons why I am concerned and very worried about a Senate initiative, an initiative by the other body that tilts, in my opinion, U.S. foreign policy again in favor of Pakistan and against India.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express today my strong opposition to an amendment that was passed in the other body, in the Senate last week, to the foreign operations appropriations bill, that lifts existing United States restrictions on military and economic assistance to Pakistan. This amendment would allow for the resumption of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the International Military Education and Training Program, the Trade and Development Assistance, as well as the democracy-building programs such as the National Endowment for Democracy in Pakistan.

These restrictions were imposed by the Glenn-Symington amendment a few years ago, which restricted the delivery of aid and bilateral programs to Pakistan because of Pakistan's continual development of a nuclear weapons program. The restrictions were in place due to Pakistan's externally aided nuclear weapons program.

What is troubling to me, Mr. Speaker, is that the Senate repealed the Glenn-Symington amendment among reports that Pakistan has recently fired and tested a Chinese-built M-11 missile, or an indigenously developed medium-range missile similar to the M-11. United States intelligence reports that Pakistan is building or has built, with the aid of the Chinese, a missile factory. These missiles can carry nuclear devices. This factory is not subject to international inspection.

Mr. Speaker, for those familiar with Pakistan's nuclear program, it is well known that for several years Pakistan has moved forward with an aggressive program of acquiring nuclear technology and weapons delivery systems, as well as providing arms and training to rogue nations and terrorist groups.

The intent of the Senate action last week may have been, I hope that was the intention, but may have been to encourage Pakistan to cap its nuclear program. However, I would contend that history has shown otherwise. In 1985, United States intelligence reported that Pakistan was receiving United States arms and was simultaneously developing a nuclear weapons program. In response, and with the support of Pakistan, Congress in 1985 enacted the Pressler amendment, to deny assistance to Pakistan if the President could not confirm that Pakistan did not have or was not developing a nuclear device.

But later, in 1990, a few years later, United States intelligence found via overwhelming evidence that Pakistan did indeed have the bomb. The Bush administration at the time invoked the Pressler amendment and restricted United States aid to Pakistan.

The invocation of the Pressler amendment by the Bush administration gave Pakistan an opportunity to make an important choice. Pakistan could either work with the United States and cap its nuclear program, or ignore the Pressler amendment and continue with its nuclear weapons program.

□ 1400

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Pakistan chose the latter course. In 1995, just 2 years ago, Congress amended the Pressler amendment with the so-called Brown amendment that allowed 370 million dollars' worth of previously embargoed conventional weaponry to be transferred to Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that Pakistan did not agree to do anything in exchange for the equipment and no conditions on its nuclear program were imposed. Why do we keep rewarding Pakistan when it continues to work against our interests?

Nearly all of Pakistan's nuclear program is for military use with very little attention toward infrastructure and civilian use. In fact, in 1986, China and Pakistan signed a nuclear cooperation agreement. The details of that agreement are not known although intelligence reports show that the agreement includes the transfer of nuclear weapon technology in both the design of weapons and the enrichment of uranium fuel.

Mr. Speaker, we have to be very careful. We cannot allow this amendment, passed last week in the other body, to be viewed as support for Pakistan's nuclear program. Very little information exists with regard to Pakistan's nuclear program. Command and control systems that manage Pakistan's nuclear program are vague and really nonexistent.

A leading American think tank has stated that the primitive state of the Pakistan arsenal suggests that any Pakistan nuclear response could be haphazard and ill-managed. That is from the Institute for National Strategic Studies, a strategic assessment from 1997.

Furthermore, this amendment may hinder the progress, this Senate amendment may hinder the progress that has been made by talks between India and Pakistan over the last 6 months. This is really what I am concerned about.

I talked in the beginning about the Gujral doctrine and how these two countries are now working together toward peaceful solutions. This amendment passed in the other body, I think,

could hinder these talks, because the Indian Government has already stated on the record that in light of the circumstances India will take the appropriate steps to safeguard India's security.

What is happening is that the traditional tilt toward Pakistan in United States foreign policy, which so many of us in the India caucus have been trying to reverse so that the United States is not partial toward Pakistan, this tilt is beginning to express itself again as a result of this amendment that was passed in the Senate. And I find it interesting that when India allegedly deployed the Prithvi missile, the United States quickly denounced the deployment. Yet when Pakistan continues to develop its nuclear program with the aid of the Chinese, we turn the other way. In fact, we reward them with aid.

Mr. Speaker, if we desire a peace in South Asia, we must work equally and fairly with all countries in the region. This amendment passed in the other body does not do this.

I know we are going to have discussions, we are going to have a vote here in the House next week on our foreign operations appropriations act. That bill will go to conference with the bill that passed the other body. My hope is, and I will certainly work toward taking out the amendment in that conference so that when the conference bill eventually comes back to the two Houses, it does not include that amendment. I think that it is an amendment that again tilts United States foreign policy toward Pakistan, is not helpful in the overall effort to bring peace to the South Asia region and basically should not survive the conference, if there is anything that we can do in this House about that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now to another matter that is also important in terms of United States foreign policy toward India. When I visited India earlier this year, I had the opportunity to talk to the then-Prime Minister Gowda, who expressed continued concern that the United States has not prioritized India as part of its foreign policy.

Mr. Gowda stressed that an important gesture could be made in that regard if President Clinton was able to travel to India in conjunction with the 50th anniversary celebration which begins this August 15. There are many members of our congressional caucus on India, including myself, that have contacted the White House over the last few months in order to convince the President that he should travel to India this year. We know that the White House has given serious consideration to this request, and we want to reiterate our plea collectively today now that August 15 is drawing close.

The majority of our 90-member India caucus signed a letter today to the

President, and I would like to just take some time now to read that letter for my colleagues.

It says, Dear Mr. President, as members of the congressional caucus on India and Indian Americans, we urge you to visit in India next month to celebrate the 50th anniversary of India's independence.

The United States and India, the world's two largest democracies, have many areas of common interest that have not been developed to the degree that they could be. The end of the cold war, combined with the historic opening of the Indian economy, forced us to significantly reassess our strategies and priorities with regard to Asia. There is substantial room to build on the current Indo-U.S. partnership and the political, diplomatic, economic, and security spheres.

Under the auspices of our India caucus, we have had a number of opportunities in the past few years to interact with leaders from India's Government and private sector. Further, some of us have had the opportunity to travel to India recently. These direct contacts have convinced us that relations with India must take on a far greater prominence in United States foreign policy considerations as we move toward the 21st century.

At the same time we have seen that the Indo-U.S. relationship has at times been strained, often unnecessarily so, and owing in many cases to the lack of a firm foundation in relations between our two great nations.

Although many Americans may not recognize it, there is a rich tradition of shared values between the United States and India. Just as the United States proclaimed its independence from the British colonial order, so was India born of the struggle for freedom and self-determination. India derived key aspects of her constitution, particularly its statement of fundamental rights, from our own Bill of Rights. The Indian independence movement, under the inspired leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, had strong moral support from American intellectuals, political leaders, and journalists. In turn, Dr. Martin Luther King, in his struggle to make the promise of American democracy a reality for all of our citizens, derived many of his ideas of non-violent resistance to injustice from the teachings of Gandhi. Thus we see a clear pattern of Indian and American democracy inspiring and enriching one another at every historical turn.

August 15 marks this historic occasion. A visit by an American President is long overdue. The last President to visit India was the Honorable Jimmy Carter. There is no doubt in our minds that a visit by an American President will improve and strengthen relations between the world's two largest democracies.

Mr. Speaker, this was signed by over 60 Members today alone. Many of us

really feel very strongly that it would be a great thing if Pakistan could take the opportunity, either by August 15 or sometime after August 15, in this year of independence, which begins August 15, to visit India as a gesture, an important gesture really, of its priority in terms of United States foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now to another foreign policy issue to a different part of the world. I would like to basically take this opportunity, if I could, to express my opposition to a state visit that will occur next week, a state visit to Washington, to the President, to the Congress, that will occur next week by President Aliyev of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

Mr. Speaker, while I recognize that our President must from time to time receive foreign leaders with whom we have differences, in the case of the visit of President Aliyev, I have grave reservations based on both the past actions and the current policies that Mr. Aliyev has pursued and is pursuing.

I would hope that this visit would offer an opportunity for our President and our administration to express our concerns about the lack of democracy and basic rights and freedom in Azerbaijan. I would especially hope the message would be sent to President Aliyev in no uncertain terms that Azerbaijan should immediately lift its blockades of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh.

Finally, I hope that President Clinton would stress to President Aliyev American support for a freely negotiated settlement of the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict that recognized the self-determination within secure borders of the people of Nagorno-Karabagh.

I am circulating a letter, Mr. Speaker, today that I have circulated today when we were in session, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. We are the coauthors of the Armenia caucus. Our letter to Pakistan expresses our concerns about the visit of President Aliyev.

Most of the members of our House Caucus on Armenia have signed the letter, and I would hope, I sincerely would hope that we can make something positive come out of this visit by President Aliyev. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the direction which U.S. foreign policy is headed in the caucuses region does not bode well for the positive outcome that we seek.

The United States is in a unique position to be able to bring about a fair settlement of the Nagorno-Karabagh situation and to help promote the long-term security and economic development of that region. But that is not the way things are going.

The OSCE, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, established the Minsk conference to mediate a settlement of the Karabagh

conflict. The United States, along with France and Russia, is a cochair of the Minsk group. However, I am concerned that the United States not use its position to force a settlement that does not allow Nagorno-Karabagh to adequately protect its land and its people in the future.

I am working with my colleagues to bring an official from the administration, the State Department, to come up to the Hill next week, hopefully to bring us up to date on the status of negotiations and for us to have an opportunity to impress upon the State Department the importance we attach to the self-determination of the people of Nagorno-Karabagh.

Mr. Speaker, Azerbaijan has some pretty powerful allies in its corner, including former top administration officials from both the Democratic and Republican parties. This was documented in a recent front page story in the Washington Post. Basically what the Post described is an effort, a big money influence effort being driven by oil money. In this case Azerbaijan has proven oil reserves in the Caspian Sea basin off Azerbaijan, some of the richest oil reserves in the world. And many U.S. oil companies are interested in getting into this region.

I want to stress that I have no problem seeing these petroleum reserves developed. Indeed, I would encourage construction of an oil pipeline from the Caspian Sea to the Mediterranean via Armenia. That would actually improve cooperation and the economic prospects of the entire caucuses region.

But, Mr. Speaker, the big problem that many of us have is that these oil companies and the former top United States Government officials that are working for their interests are essentially lobbying for United States foreign policy to ignore the unacceptable behavior of Azerbaijan in order to curry favor with the regime and gain access to the oil reserves.

Mr. Speaker, on the eve of President Aliyev's visit, I want to inform our colleagues about the type of leader this man is. The reason that so many of us oppose his coming here and are concerned about what it means is that he is coming here on a state visit, that Aliyev has a long record of human rights violations that date back to his four decades as an official of the Soviet KGB. During the 1960's, he orchestrated the depopulation of Armenians from their homes in Nakhichevan.

As the Communist party leader of Azerbaijan during the 1970's, he violently suppressed all nationalist and democratic dissent. His ardent support, and I stress his ardent support, for the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan earned him a seat on the Soviet Politburo under Leonid Brezhnev where he served until he was removed by Mikhail Gorbachev in 1987, for having engaged in widespread corruption.

Since his return to power through a military coup in 1993, President Aliyev has suppressed democracy in Azerbaijan and committed widespread violations of human rights in that country, which have been documented by the State Department.

I am also concerned that this visit to Washington by President Aliyev at this critical stage in the negotiations over Nagorno-Karabagh threatens to harm the peace process by undermining confidence in the role of the United States as an impartial mediator.

Many of my colleagues know that section 907 of the Freedom Support Act prohibits direct United States Government aid to Azerbaijan because of the Assyrian blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh.

The administration continues to advocate against section 907 and this further reinforces the Azerbaijani perception that the United States, since the most recent OSCE summit in Lisbon has tilted toward Azerbaijan.

What we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that this visit, this state visit by President Aliyev now could serve to encourage Azerbaijan to further harden its negotiating stance in negotiating a peaceful settlement of the Karabagh conflict.

This encouragement is particularly dangerous given President Aliyev's pattern of unacceptable behavior including his use of oil as a weapon against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh, his blockades of Armenia and Karabagh, his rapidly expanding military capabilities, his threats of force and intimidation tactics and his refusal to negotiate directly with the democratically elected representatives of Nagorno-Karabagh.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say, in conclusion, that I would urge my colleagues to join the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and me in letting President Clinton know of our concerns about his upcoming meeting with President Aliyev and to push our State Department toward a fair solution to the very difficult Nagorno-Karabagh conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Armenia and in Nagorno-Karabagh earlier this year and believe me, there are no countries and no people that are more supportive of the United States and love and see the United States as such a great example of democracy and a market economy.

□ 1545

Armenia and Karabagh are Democratic nations. They are capitalistic nations. They really honestly believe that we are on their side. And we should be. Because they are on the side of what is right. They simply want to retain their own independence, their own freedom and exercise their own self-determination.

I think the U.S. policy should at least be neutral in this conflict. Unfor-

tunately, there are many indications that it is not, and particularly our concern and my concern is that President Aliyev's visit is going to give the impression once again that the United States and our State Department tilt towards Azerbaijan.

But we will continue our efforts to raise the issue and to make sure that the United States takes a neutral position with regard to negotiations over Karabagh and, hopefully, we will be heard at the White House and in the State Department, if not now at some point in the future.

#### THE SPACE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to talk about our Nation's space program. I rose earlier in a special order with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] to talk about our Republican tax package and how it was going to help working families, and I talked at great length about a particular working family in my congressional district that was going to be helped tremendously by our tax package.

It was going to help them in many, many different ways. The \$500 per child tax credit was going to help them, because they had three kids, and it was going to give them an extra \$1,500 a year. But probably also, more importantly, the education tax credits were going to help them to be better able to send their kids to college.

This is the Auger family I was talking about, and they had one young man 15 years old, their oldest son, college material, and they were looking at some very, very serious financial strain. They had a family income of about a little less than \$40,000 a year, but trying to raise three kids and send them to college was a real strain.

I was pleased to get up and to be able to talk about them, but I did want to talk a little more about our Nation's space program. I represent an area of our country that most people have heard a great deal about. We call it in the Space Coast of Florida. It is where Cape Canaveral and Kennedy Space Center is located.

We have a lot of men and women in our community that work in our Nation's space program, and I wanted to rise today and salute them and talk about the role that they have played in really forming a whole part of our American fabric.

We are a great Nation, extending from the bustling cities of our Northeast to the beautiful beaches of Southern California, from the beautiful northern Pacific coast to our sunny beaches in Florida.

There is a lot that goes into making up America and what makes this Nation the great Nation that it is, and a big part of it, in our modern era, is our Nation's space program, and it is something that all Americans, I believe, are very proud of.

What we have today was really built on a lot of the hard work of the people that began the program, the early pioneers, so to speak, in our Nation's space program. One important point I want to make is these people were risk-takers. We all know some of the hardships and, indeed, that actually people have lost their lives in our Nation's space program. So going up in space and exploring space has its risks. But I believe it is well worth the price.

I think there is something that beats in the hearts of every human being, not just Americans but all people all over the world, but particularly Americans, because we are a nation of pioneers. We all, except for our native Americans, we were all raised with the knowledge that our parents came to this country. They were either brought as slaves or their ancestors came from Europe or from Asia.

We are a nation of pioneers, people who ventured out into the unknown, and that desire that beats in the hearts of all people, and particularly all Americans, I think, is encapsulated in our space program and what our space program is.

We have had tremendous successes. Of course, we began with the Mercury program and the early astronauts, one of whom is a Senator in the other body to this day, and then it continued with the Gemini program, and, of course, on to the Apollo program, something that all schoolchildren today learn about, how the United States took part in the great space race with the Russians and we were able to succeed and win and get to the moon first.

But now we are in a new era, a new era of space exploration, and I wanted to talk a little about that. I have some really wonderful photographs I wanted to show. This, of course, is a photo of our space shuttle, the current reusable launch vehicle that we use to bring men and women up into space.

It has been a tremendously successful program. For those who have never seen one take off, I would highly encourage all Americans to try to get down there to the Kennedy Space Center area for a launch. You cannot get any closer than 3 miles, but even at 3 miles away, when this thing takes off, your shirt actually shakes from the power of the thing taking off.

It is 11 million pounds of thrust putting this thing into orbit, and what is amazing about it, it is the only reusable launch vehicle. It comes back, lands on a runway, and then can be reconfigured and restacked and cycled again, and they go up and they come back. What is truly amazing about this

program is not only the amazing technology of the program, but that this is actually 25-year-old technology.

What I think is very, very exciting is a program that we are working on today in NASA, which is the new reusable launch vehicle. And I wanted to take a little time to talk about this program, because it is really in its infancy, but this artist's rendering of what it will look like, I think, encapsulates it very nicely.

This shows the new replacements for the shuttle that we are currently doing the early design work and engineering on, and it shows, obviously somewhere over our desert West, maybe California or Arizona, hypothetically coming in for a landing. Because it would take off going straight up, the vehicle would then land on a runway like our current shuttle does.

The important thing about this is that the whole idea with the new reusable launch vehicle to replace the space shuttle is to reduce the costs of putting payloads into orbit. Even though the shuttle program is a tremendous success, it is still costly to go up into space. It actually comes down to about, I believe it is \$10,000 a pound for each pound that we put up into orbit. That is a considerable cost.

So our idea here in the Congress and the Senate, and the President supports this program, is to come up with new technologies and new designs for a new vehicle to replace our Nation's space shuttle that, hopefully, we can deploy sometime in the next decade and, most importantly, that it would reduce the cost of getting payloads into orbit by a factor of ten, reducing the costs from \$10,000 per pound down to \$1,000 per pound.

This could create a tremendous revolution in space travel. It would allow us to put satellites in orbit more cheaply. It would also allow us to put men and women in orbit at a lower cost.

I want to talk a little about that, because we have another very exciting program that is well ahead of this program. This program will be on line, hopefully, sometime later in the next decade. We have a program called the international space station that I wanted to talk about and share with those listening.

This is an artist's rendering of the future international space station. This is a tremendously exciting program. Most people are aware of the Russian space station that is up there right now, it is called the Mir. It has been up there for many years. There have been recently some serious problems with the Mir, and it is probably ready for retirement now, but it most certainly will be ready for retirement soon.

What we have in the international space station is an effort to have our international partners, the Europeans, the Japanese, the Canadians, and as

well the Russians, come together and form a consortium to truly build a true international space station that would have people from different countries participating in.

This program is so exciting for so many reasons, and I wanted to talk about that a little bit. One of the biggest reasons, I think, why it is so exciting is the tremendous amount of research that will be possible on the space station.

I am a physician. Prior to being elected to the Congress, I practiced medicine, and I was able to see on a daily basis the spin-off benefits of our space program in terms of helping people on earth. I took care of a lot of heart patients, people with cardiac conditions, for example, and the technologies that we use in things like pacemakers, in imaging technologies, like used in the cardiac catheterization lab, as well as imaging technologies like MRI scanning and CAT scanning, these are all spin-off benefits of our space program.

There have been a tremendous number of other spin-off benefits, such as breakthroughs in material science. What is very, very exciting for me as a physician about the kinds of research that can be done on the space station is the tremendous breakthroughs that are a potential to be made in the area of pharmaceuticals.

Because so many of the new drugs that they want to design and develop, there are problems with trying to work with them in the gravitational environment here on earth. But because of the weightlessness of the space station, they will be able to do tremendous amounts of additional research in this area, particularly in the area of crystal growth and understanding molecular structures better. So this has the potential of tremendous benefits for people all over the world.

This shows the space station orbiting, and it is going to be orbiting at about 200 miles above the surface of the Earth. And I believe it is showing the space station orbiting over Greenland, I believe is what that is supposed to be.

We can see those solar panels here. They will be generating the electricity to run the environmental systems that provide oxygen and clean the carbon dioxide out of the system, but as well provide the lighting and the cooling and the heating systems. But additionally, these solar panels will generate the electricity for the labs that will actually do the scientific research.

□ 1600

You can see here, this module right here shows the European research area, and this module over here shows the Japanese research area. You cannot really see it very well, but the U.S. module is back in here where the U.S. scientists will be doing their research.

As somebody who has followed the shuttle program very closely and the

tremendous amounts of scientific research that have come out of the shuttle programs, what amazes me is the amount of breakthroughs they have made in science and our understanding of technology. But the shuttle was only up there for 2 weeks. But in this program, the astronauts doing the research will be able to be up there for months and months at a time.

Indeed, this is projected to be orbiting above the Earth for more than a decade, a decade and a half, possibly longer. So this is one of the ways we are heading in our space program, a cooperative effort. There are some problems that lie ahead with the space station program. In particular, I want to talk a little bit about the Russians.

One of the critical partners in the program are the Russians. And they have not been paying for their components that go into the Space Station. I have been asking the administration, particularly the Vice President, to do their best to try to work with the Russians. I went over to Russia in February of this year to meet with the Russians and talk with them about the importance of them having the financial resources to continue to invest to make sure that our space station program is a success.

But to just get back to the next replacement to the space shuttle, the reusable launch vehicle, or RLV, as it is shown, or X-33 shown in this picture, someday the shuttle program will be phased out in the future and, hopefully, this will be replacing the shuttle and, importantly, will be dramatically reducing the cost of getting payloads into orbit. And that will have a tremendous number of additional spin-off benefits. I want to talk a little bit about that.

Why do we want to reduce the cost of getting payloads into orbit? Well, there are a lot of reasons. One of them is to be able to better service the space station. But there are a lot of new, exciting technologies that are coming forward that could have tremendous benefits for people on Earth, and one of them is in the area of power generation. And I wanted to just talk a little bit about that.

We all know we are very, very dependent in our modern society on electricity. Electricity is critical for not only our lighting and heating and running air conditioning systems, but, as well, it is critical for industry. Every business runs on electricity. We all know that there are basically three sources of electricity. Hydroelectric power, of course, is a clean and non-polluting way to get electricity. But we rely predominantly on power generation from burning fossil fuels and from nuclear power.

There are two major concerns that are involved with both of those power sources. One of them is greenhouse gases and burning fossil fuels and burning oil and burning coal, it puts a lot of

carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. And the potential long-term consequences of that are of concern to everybody, the impact on the environment, the possibility that it could cause temperatures on Earth to rise slowly over time exists.

And then, of course, with nuclear power, there is the concern about what do we do with the spent nuclear fuel. After the fuel has burned and generated electricity in the nuclear power plant, what do you do with that nuclear waste? Nobody wants it in their backyard. Well, there is another solution available and that, of course, is solar power. But solar power has had its problems. One of the problems with it is just weather. If we put solar panels on our roof, we can generate a lot of electricity, but not on cloudy days.

Another problem area is we cannot generate electricity at night with solar power. Well, it turns out that the technology is available to us today to put solar collectors up in space and to generate electric power up there and to transmit that electric power to Earth, using microwaves, and then collecting those microwaves on the surface of the Earth using a special type of antenna called a rectifying antenna, or rectenna, and then converting it back to electricity.

One of the first concerns everybody is worried about when they hear about this is, are not those microwaves going to be dangerous? Well, it actually turns out they will have only 25 percent of the energy of sunlight. So actually a bird could fly right through the microwave beams and it would have absolutely no effect on them. So they are very environmentally friendly.

It turns out that one of the problems with putting solar collectors in orbit is gradually over time they will tend to descend down into the atmosphere, so you have to keep reboosting them. But an efficient way to do it would be to actually put the solar collectors on the Moon.

In this photo that I show here, it shows people, men and women, working on the Moon, possibly in some kind of a base that would be doing something like collecting solar power. And there are scientists in this country today who believe that not only is the technology here and available now but that if we are willing to make the investment, that we could actually produce electricity for less money than what it costs. Indeed, some argue that it could be as cheaply as 3 cents a kilowatt.

This is why we need to develop a replacement for the shuttle that reduces the cost of getting payloads into orbit, and this is why we need to learn by working in space and our space station about what are the problems associated with long-term exposure in space and what is it like to have to be able to construct something large like that in space; because the technology and the

science will help us to possibly be able to move on to something like this, actually generating power in space and the potential benefits that this could have for all of mankind to be able to produce more cheaply not only for the United States but possibly for all people all over the world and produce it without any pollution.

But there is another aspect to space exploration that I want to talk about, and it is not just the practical side. I have spent a lot of time this afternoon talking about the practical applications of space exploration, the practical benefits of going up in terms of breakthroughs in medical science and engineering and our understanding of technology. But there is just more to it than that. There is a desire, and I talked about this earlier in my comments, there is a desire that is burning in the heart of all people to explore and find out new things, to go places where you have never been before.

I want to talk a little bit about the possibility of going to Mars. We have heard a lot recently about Mars in the news, the Mars Pathfinder mission and the tremendous success that was and how important that was for a better understanding of Mars. We have learned a great deal, for example, that Mars indeed may have once had an atmosphere much more like Earth's and that there may have been abundant amounts of water. And one of the big questions, of course, has life evolved on Mars in some form, some microscopic form? Some day we may be able to go to Mars.

I wanted to show one more diagram. This artist's rendering shows what it would be like to possibly send a man to the Moon. And this involves using new technologies that are being researched right now at NASA. This would be a habitation module. This right here would possibly be a module where you would actually grow possibly plants in a controlled atmosphere; because the atmosphere out here is mostly carbon dioxide but you could create an environment inside a plastic shell like this where you would put oxygen and you would possibly be able to grow plants to be able to feed the men and women that would be working in this environment. And this, of course, shows what would be their return vehicle. Is this practical? Can we do it?

Well, there are some people who argue that it would be just too expensive. There are some people who have argued that a trip to Mars could cost as much as \$500 billion and, therefore, it is just too prohibitively expensive.

Well, recent research has shown that it may be possible to do it for substantially less, possibly as little as one-tenth that cost. And this is why it is so important, I believe, for the cooperative effort like we are seeing with the international space station. If our international partners can come to-

gether and people like the Europeans, the Japanese, the United States, the Russians, work together successfully on the space station program, it may indeed be possible then afterwards for us to come together as a people from all over the world and cooperatively fund something like this so that we could be able to send a manned expedition to Mars.

We just do not know what we will find out, what we will discover. The Mars Pathfinder sent an unmanned rover vehicle to Mars, and we are discovering a lot from that. But imagine the tremendous amount of discoveries that we could make if we were able to send men and women to Mars driving around in a vehicle like that, people who could actually get out and look at the rocks and dig for things and try to discover. We have no idea what science and technology breakthroughs could come from this and what we could learn as a people by exploring Mars and sending men and women to Mars.

I do not believe that is where it will end. I believe Mars may just be one more step. We went to the Moon. Some day we may go on to Mars. Some day we may go beyond our own solar system. We may be able to find other planets that potentially could be colonized by men and women.

And it all began back in the 1960's. It began with a challenge, a challenge made really by an American President, John F. Kennedy. And I wanted to just dwell on something that he said that I think is very important. He said that we go to the Moon not because it is easy, but because it is hard. He accepted the challenge and knew it was going to be difficult, but he also knew that if we applied ourselves and God's will was with us and good fortune, that we would be able to succeed. But he knew that there were going to be risks.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, today we are at that same kind of a threshold. We are on the verge of getting our international space station up and running. We are on the verge of a newer, less expensive, more efficient replacement vehicle for the shuttle. There is the possibility of returning to the Moon, of going on to Mars. But yet there are always people in this body rising up and saying, "No, no, no, we shouldn't do it, we should spend money elsewhere on something else." There were people back then during the Jefferson administration who were saying the same exact thing: "Let's not do it."

I want to talk about one other aspect of that book that I found fascinating. Not only were there Congressmen who did not want to fund the program, that did not think we should be going forth into the unknown, but the program ran over budget. When it ran over budget, there were those who were harshly critical of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Such is the case today. Every

time any one of these space programs run even this much over budget, there are people who come forward and say, "No, no, no, we need to end the program, it's not worth the cost, we need to turn back from the future." That is really what this is about, the future. It is about our kids.

I talked earlier this afternoon about an amazing thing that teachers tell me in my congressional district, that when they want to motivate children to learn science and math, the thing that motivates them the most is to talk about our space program and to talk about how knowledge of science and math can be applied in the space program. It opens their eyes and it motivates them to get involved and be educated more in those areas. Those are crucial areas. Not every one of those kids who gets motivated is going to end up working in the space program, but we all know that many of them will be working in areas where science, engineering, math, and technology are critical for the United States to be able to continue to maintain and be the world's leader. I believe it is critical for us to continue to try to make these investments in the future. That is what it is really about when we talk about space and exploring space. It is about our kids, it is about the future.

Are we going to turn our backs on the future? Are we going to turn our back on exploration? The history books are filled with the stories of nations and peoples who turned their backs on the future, who stopped exploring and stopped looking into the unknown. Those nations no longer continue to thrive and grow. I do not believe that will ever happen to the United States. I believe there will always be a majority in this body that will continue to support our space program and supporting the future. That is to so great a degree what our space program is about, looking on ahead into the future, taking the risks and willing to look on into the unknown.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 198

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 198.

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

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BLUMENAUER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of the death of a family friend.

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

Mrs. MEEK of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of constituent business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VENTO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, 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. DICKEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LATOURETTE.

Mr. COBLE.

Mr. HORN.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. WEYGAND.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. THOMPSON.

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

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado.

Mr. MCINNIS.

Mr. FARR of California.

Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. PORTMAN.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the OAS-CAIV Mission in Nicaragua; to the Committee on International Relations.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that

committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 9, 1997:

H.R. 173. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize donation of Federal law enforcement canines that are no longer needed for official purposes to individuals with experience handling canines in the performance of law enforcement duties.

H.R. 649. An act to amend sections of the Department of Energy Organization Act that are obsolete or inconsistent with other statutes and to repeal a related section of the Federal Administration Act of 1974.

On July 14, 1997:

H.R. 1901. An act to clarify that the protections of the Federal Tort Claims Act apply to the members and personnel of the National Gambling Impact Study Commission.

On July 25, 1997:

H.R. 709. An act to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1226. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the unauthorized inspection of tax returns or tax return information.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 28, 1997, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4346. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Turkey (Transmittal No. 22-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4347. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Greece (Transmittal No. 23-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4348. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Turkey (Transmittal No. 21-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4349. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Turkey (Transmittal No. 20-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4350. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting

the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Greece (Transmittal No. 15-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4351. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Greece (Transmittal No. 14-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4352. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Greece (Transmittal No. 13-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4353. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Greece (Transmittal No. 12-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4354. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the United Arab Emirates for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 97-29), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4355. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the United Arab Emirates for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 97-28), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4356. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 97-26), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4357. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 97-31), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4358. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting Semi-Annual Report on Program Activities to Facilitate Weapons Destruction and Nonproliferation in the Former Soviet Union, April 1, 1996 through September 30, 1996, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 5956; to the Committee on International Relations.

4359. A letter from the Director, Office of Public/Private Initiatives, International Trade Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—International Buyer Program (Formerly known as the Foreign Buyer Program); Support for Domestic Trade Shows [Docket No. 970702162-7162-01] received July 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

4360. A letter from the Mayor, District of Columbia, transmitting the actuaries review of benefit changes to the police officers and firefighters retirement programs, pursuant

to D.C. Code section 1-722(d)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4361. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska, Pacific Ocean Perch in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 961126334-7025-02; I.D. 070397F] received July 23, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4362. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation making technical amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, and the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, in order to clarify and correct the provisions therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4363. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense and Assistant Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a report of the Advisory Committee on Criminal Law Jurisdiction over Civilians Accompanying the Armed Forces in Time of Armed Conflict; jointly to the Committees on National Security and the Judiciary.

4364. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Maritime Terrorism: A Report to Congress," for Calendar Year 1996, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1802; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Transportation and Infrastructure.

4365. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for human space flight, science, aeronautics, and technology, mission support, and Inspector General, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly to the Committees on Science and Government Reform and Oversight.

4366. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the final report on the 3-year Staff-Assisted Home Dialysis Demonstration; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means 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. GILMAN: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 695. A bill to amend title 18, United States, to affirm the rights of U.S. persons to use and sell encryption and to relax export controls on encryption; with an amendment (Rept. 105-108 Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1953. A bill to clarify State authority to tax compensation paid to certain employees (Rept. 105-203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1348. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, relating to war crimes; with an amendment (Rept. 105-204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PORTER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2264. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and re-

lated agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2266. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2267. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-207). 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. TALENT (for himself and Mr. LAFALCE):

H.R. 2261. A bill to reauthorize and amend the programs of the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 2262. A bill to make certain modifications with respect to overtime pay and premium pay of customs officers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCHALE (for himself, Mr.

CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HORN, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. SFRATT, Mr. BUYER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. TALENT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. QUINN, Mr. KLINK, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOB SCHAFER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. REYES, Mr. GILCHRIST, Mr. JONES, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. NEY, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. HARMAN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BASS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. TURNER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BONO, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. WISE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON,

Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. COYNE, Ms. DELAURIO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TANNER, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. PACKARD):

H.R. 2263. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the congressional Medal of Honor posthumously to Theodore Roosevelt for his gallant and heroic actions in the attack on San Juan Heights, Cuba, during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 2265. A bill to amend the provisions of titles 17 and 18, United States Code, to provide greater copyright protection by amending criminal copyright infringement provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2268. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2269. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2270. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2271. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. TORRES, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2272. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to eliminate the prohibitions on the transmission of abortion related matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FROST, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. FURSE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NEY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON, Ms. CARSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DIXON, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 2273. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the reduc-

tions in social security benefits which are required in the case of spouses and surviving spouses who are also receiving certain Government pensions shall be equal to the amount by which the total amount of the combined monthly benefit (before reduction) and monthly pension exceeds \$1,200; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAZIO of New York:

H.R. 2274. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to reauthorize certain programs for rural housing assistance; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. LAZIO of New York):

H.R. 2275. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment on the basis of genetic information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 2276. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for official travel after Election Day of members of Congress who will not serve as members during the next Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution providing for the use of the catafalque situated in the crypt beneath the rotunda of the Capitol in connection with memorial services to be conducted in the Supreme Court Building for the late honorable William J. Brennan, former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. SAXTON):

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding acts of illegal aggression by Canadian fishermen with respect to the Pacific salmon fishery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUTKNECHT (for himself, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FROST, Mr. HORN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. NEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MCINTOSH, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania):

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that each State should enact legislation regarding notification procedures necessary when a sexually violent offender is released; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. YATES):

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning the war crimes committed by the Japanese military during World War II; to the Committee on International Relations.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. FARR of California introduced a bill (H.R. 2277) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Manawanui*; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 59: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. RYUN, and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 108: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 145: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 176: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 195: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 304: Mr. RUSH and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 306: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 404: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 424: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 484: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 519: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 536: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 731: Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 758: Mr. RYUN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 768: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 820: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 866: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 900: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 950: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 981: Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 989: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 1010: Mr. PACKARD and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 1018: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 1036: Mr. WICKER, Mr. HORN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1070: Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1104: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1194: Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1195: Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1231: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1232: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1247: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 1270: Mr. SUNUNU and Mr. KIND of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1279: Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 1346: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 1353: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1453: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1493: Mr. CANNON, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1515: Mr. RILEY, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1524: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1531: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1534: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. KIM, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr.

CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GILMOR, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ROGAN, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.R. 1614: Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 1636: Mr. WATT of North Carolina and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 1710: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DREIER, Ms. DANER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MINGE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1711: Mr. BRADY and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 1719: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1741: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1788: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1839: Mr. TANNER and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1872: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. GANSKE, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1972: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 1984: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 1987: Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2022: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 2064: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2094: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STARK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2121: Mr. JACKSON and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 2129: Mr. NEY, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 2173: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2183: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 2185: Mr. CLYBURN and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 2198: Mr. TORRES and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 2221: Mr. COBURN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. GEKAS.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RILEY, and Ms. CARSON.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. HEFNER.

H. Con. Res. 83: Mr. KING of New York.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. CONDIT.

H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. PACKARD.

H. Con. Res. 114: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. FROST, and Ms. ESHOO.

H. Res. 37: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 157: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA.

H. Res. 183: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OLVER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FROST, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MANTON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MEK of Florida, Mr. STOKES, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. OWENS.

H. Res. 188: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. KING of New York.

H. Res. 195: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. SALMON.

## DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 198: Mr. TOWNS.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. FORBES

AMENDMENT NO. 62: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR THE P.L.O., THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 572. (a) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Palestine Liberation Organization (hereafter the "P.L.O.") should do far more to demonstrate an irrevocable denunciation of terrorism and to ensure a peaceful settlement of the Middle East dispute, and in particular it should—

(1) submit to the Palestinian Council for formal approval the necessary changes to those specified articles of the Palestinian National Charter which deny Israel's right to exist or support the use of violence;

(2) to the maximum extent possible, preempt acts of terror, discipline violators, publicly condemn all terrorist acts, actively work to dismantle other terrorist organizations, and contribute to stemming the violence that has resulted in the deaths of over 230 Israeli and United States citizens since the signing of the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements (hereafter the "Declaration of Principles") on September 13, 1993, at the White House;

(3) prohibit participation in the P.L.O. or the Palestinian Authority or its successors of any groups or individuals which promote or commit acts of terrorism;

(4) cease all anti-Israel rhetoric, which potentially undermines the peace process;

(5) confiscate all unlicensed weapons and restrict the issuance of licenses to those with legitimate need;

(6) transfer and cooperate in transfer proceedings relating to any person accused by Israel or the United States of having committed acts of terrorism against Israeli or United States nationals; and

(7) respect civil liberties, human rights and democratic norms as applied equally to all persons regardless of ethnic, religious, or national origin.

(b) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated for assistance, directly or indirectly, for the P.L.O., the Palestinian Authority, only for the period beginning 3 months after the date of the enactment of this Act and for 6 months thereafter, and only if—

(A) the President has exercised the authority under section 604(a) of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1995 (title VI of Public Law 104-107) or any other legislation to suspend or make inapplicable section 307 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and that suspension is still in effect; and

(B) in addition to the requirements contained in such Act or other legislation, the President prepares and transmits to the Congress a report described in paragraph (2).

(2) REPORT.—A report described in this paragraph is a report containing the following:

(A) A description of all efforts being made to apprehend, prosecute, or have extradited to the United States Mohammad Deif (allegedly responsible for the death of Nachshon Wachsman, a United States citizen), Amjad Hinawi (allegedly responsible for the death of David Boim, a United States citizen), Abu Abbas (responsible for the death of Leon Klinghoffer, a United States citizen), Amid al-Hindi (allegedly responsible for the death of David Berger, a United States citizen), and Nafez Mahmoud Sabih (who helped plan the February 1996 attack on a Jerusalem bus in which Jewish Theological Seminary students Sara Duker and Matthew Eisenfeld, both United States citizens, were murdered).

(B) An official, updated, and revised copy of the Palestinian National Charter (Covenant) showing which specific articles have been rescinded by the decision taken on April 24, 1996 by the P.L.O. Executive committee.

(C) A description of all actions being taken by the Palestinian Authority to eradicate and prevent the use of the map of Israel to represent "Palestine".

(D) A certification that the Palestinian Authority has established a court system that respects due process requirements, including the right to a lawyer, the right to confront witnesses, the right to be informed of the charges under which one is accused, and the right to a jury trial.

(E) A certification that the Palestinian Authority has established humane prison conditions.

(F) A certification that the Palestinian Authority has taken all measures to rescind the death penalty imposed for the sale of land to Jews, has eliminated the practice of incarcerating real estate agents for the sale of land to Jews or Israelis, and has actively sought the perpetrators of such actions.

H.R. 2266

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFazio

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for the public printing or binding of Government publications in contravention of measures established by the Joint Committee on Printing pursuant to section 103 of title 44, United States Code.

H.R. 2267

OFFERED BY: MR. CUMMINGS

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Under the heading "RELATED AGENCIES—LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION" insert after the first dollar sign the following: "(increased by \$199,000,000)".

Under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF STATE—RELATED AGENCIES—INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATION" insert after the first dollar sign the following: "(reduced by \$199,000,000)".