feel uncomfortable talking about. We are just not allowed to talk about the power of the wealthy.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, that seems to be the case. A lot of people are very uncomfortable talking about it. I am a capitalist. I believe in the free market system. But I also believe that an economy should be run for the benefit of the overwhelming majority of the members of that society, and that really should be the principle that guides us in all the legislation we put forth here, in the other body, in legislation that the President signs into law. Do what is best for the overwhelming majority of the American citizens economically and in every other way.

It may sound very simplistic, and perhaps it really is. But that is the way the country should be governed; that is the way the legislation should come forward. Unfortunately, the longer I am here, the less and less I believe that is happening.

So I would say to the gentleman, I would like the gentleman to conclude if you have any concluding remarks. I am finished for the evening. I hope to be back next Tuesday, but does the gentleman have anything to say in conclusion?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would just certainly agree with the gentleman that clearly the task of Congress is to represent the vast majority of the people and not just the very few who are wealthy and powerful. But I think that that is very often not the case.

Let me just point out one example of that in terms of tax policy. In fact, we are debating that right now in terms of the budget that was recently proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], which would give huge tax breaks to the wealthy while at the same time we would cut back on Medicare, certain Medicaid programs and very significantly, by the way, on veterans' programs.

In terms of tax policy what has gone on in this country people should know that from 1977 to 1990, the Social Security tax was raised nine times, and today, people are paying, if one is self-employed, one is paying 15 percent before one pays any income tax and a FICA tax. And yet during that same period, while taxes on working people through the FICA tax went way up, taxes for the wealthy and the large corporations went way down, and the Federal Government ended up collecting significantly less money, which helped cause us the deficit problem that we are trying to address right now.

I would just conclude by saying that the gentleman is absolutely right in suggesting what I think the vast majority of the people would agree with at a moment's notice, and that is the function of this institution is to represent the overwhelming majority of our people who are not wealthy, who work hard, who are struggling to keep their heads above water.

Unfortunately, that is not the case now. The people have the money, have enormous power and enormous influence over this institution. What I would hope is that in the towns and cities all over this country, people begin, must begin to get involved in the political process, must study the issues. What is our trade policy? Is it working? Is it not working? Why is it that we have such an unfair distribution of wealth? What about our tax system? Does it favor the corporations and the wealthy, or the middle class and working families?

I would hope that ordinary people begin to study the issues, get involved in the issues, and play a much more active role in the political process, because God only knows, we certainly need their strength and their energy in order to influence what goes on here.

I thank the gentleman very much for allowing me to join him in this special order.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman joining me tonight.

AMERICAN HERITAGE RIVERS INITIATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to talk about the White House and its Council on Environmental Quality's latest flight from democracy, embodied in the so-called American heritage rivers initiative.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many things that are wrong with the American heritage rivers initiative. But tonight I would like to focus on just three of those things. Its procedure, States' rights and water rights, and the separation of powers.

The initiative purports to establish a mechanism by which President Clinton will designate as American heritage rivers 10 rivers per year. It establishes undefined, fictional governing entities known as water communities. These governing water communities will then determine the scope and the size of the designation area, which can include the entire watershed. There are no safeguards for a D designation and no safeguards for private property owners within the area who object to this inclusion in the designation.

I will discuss this in detail later, but first, just before Memorial Day district work period, the Council on Environmental Quality, an unauthorized agency existing on misappropriated funds, I might add, published the American heritage rivers initiative in the Federal Register. It is in the May 19, 1997 volume, page 27253, and I urge my colleagues to read it.

Although CEQ has in the past been the primary overseer of the National Environmental Policy Act process, in this instance CEQ appears to have totally abandoned NEPA's threshold requirements. As the administration knows very well, an environmental impact statement, an EIS, is required any time a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment is contemplated. When CEQ proposes to control our Nation's waters, this, Mr. Speaker, is a significant action. Yet, to my knowledge, CEQ has not even bothered to address NEPA's threshold question.

Where is the environmental assessment? How about an EIS, or, at the very least, the very barest recognition under NEPA of finding of no significant impact?

□ 2215

But nothing from the administration. Mr. Speaker, what CEQ has given us is a mere 3-week public comment period, the May 19 date of publication to the June 9 closing of the public comment, with no NEPA documentation.

The Administrative Procedures Act, the APA, applicable to any agency action, requires a minimum of 30 days' public comment period. In general, unless there is an emergency, NEPA's environmental impact statement requires a 90-day public comment period. Yet, here CEQ blatantly violates its own rules and the rules and requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act and offers a mere 3-week comment period.

I am not aware of an emergency. Why the rush? This violates the Administrative Procedures Act and totally ignores the National Environmental Policy Act. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DON YOUNG] of the Committee on Resources and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BOB SMITH] of the Committee on Agriculture, along with myself and other resources subcommittee chairmen, sent a letter to Katy McGinty strongly advising CEQ to extend the comment period to at least another 90 days. She would have been wise to follow our advice. I entered that letter into the RECORD here on Wednesday, June 4.

Additionally, I am aware of no fewer than 35 other Members making similar extension requests of CEQ. It would certainly be in the best interests of everyone involved in CEQ if that agency would extend the public comment period, and I urge them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, CEQ's comment period closed today. Today I have yet to hear if its counsel has decided to extend its comment period to even the legally required minimum. I read a news account of how baffled CEQ is by the concerns we have raised. Perhaps if the comment period were extended, enlightenment might follow.

The chairman of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DON YOUNG] has also called an oversight hearing for June 26, 1997 in our committee. I have at least a glimmer of hope that we will then have some of our questions answered, but I will not hold my breath.

The last procedural point I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that CEQ has responded to some of these concerns by claiming that the American Heritage Rivers Initiative is not a program, but some other hybrid that does not require a rule. Indeed, CEQ officials have stated that this initiative did not even require a publication in the Federal Register, and to this I say, wrong, absolutely wrong.

Procedurally, I would like to point out that the law, the United States Code that even CEQ is bound by, defines a rule as the whole or part of an agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describing the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of an agency.

Mr. Speaker, despite CEQ's claims, this so-called initiative is indeed an agency statement of general applicability and future effect designed to implement and describe the organization procedure and practice of an agency. As they say, Mr. Speaker, if it walks like a duck, if it talks like a duck, and swims like a duck, then it must be a duck.

Mr. Speaker, the American Heritage Rivers Initiative is indeed a duck. It is, without a doubt, a rule within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. section 551(4), and is therefore an agency action subject to the procedural requirements under the Administrative Procedures Act; also, under the National Environmental Protection Act. Again, where is the NEPA documentation? Where is the adequate public comment?

Last, the newly enacted congressional review of Agency Rulemaking Act, 5 U.S.C. section 801, et al., requires that the Federal agency promulgating such a rule shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report.

To my knowledge, this has not been done. Why? Because CEQ claims that it is not a rule. Again, Mr. Speaker, if it walks like a duck. Procedurally, Mr. Speaker, this proposed American Heritage Rivers Initiative is a disaster, procedurally.

The next issue I would like to discuss is the issue of States' rights and water rights. This necessarily implicates private property.

Mr. Speaker, as I said last Wednesday, one of the reasons for America's strength and meteoric rise is because of the wise use of her rivers and waterways for irrigation, travel, recreation, power, flood control, and all other uses. Through the wise use and allocation of water, America has literally turned our deserts into gardens and a once inhospitable land into wonderful places to live and to recreate. In my State of Idaho, water is the absolute lifeblood of this State. We have more than 15,000 farmers and more than 3 million irrigated acres. That is larger than the sum total of many of the States. Nearly 40,000 individuals are employed in one way or another by agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, many people do not know this, but Idaho has a seaport. The Port of Lewiston and its two adjacent ports via the Snake and Columbia Rivers export 40 percent of America's grain exports to Asia. This is water barge transportation. Yes, Mr. Speaker, water is very important to the State of Idaho and to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Idaho's waters or waterways and reclamation projects help make Idaho the gem State. Water is in fact so important that the Idaho Constitution, as approved by Congress when Idaho entered the Union, expressly states that, ''The use of all waters is subject to the regulations and control of the State.''

Additionally, Idaho code, section 42–101, states:

> All the waters of the State, when flowing in their natural channels, including the waters of all natural springs and lakes within the boundaries of the State, are declared to be the property of the State, whose duty it shall be to supervise their appropriation and allotment to those diverting the same therefrom for any beneficial purpose.

Clearly, water within the boundaries of the State of Idaho are, unless privately owned, property of the State of Idaho. How, then, can the Clinton administration designate something that is not the Federal Government's to designate? This is an assault on private property rights, States' rights, America's values, and certainly our Western values.

Quite simply, this initiative will simply replace the long-established and constitutionally protected policies that govern the use of our waterways which are critical to our economic survival, not only in the West but to the entire Nation. That is why, for the past century, the Supreme Court has held in case after case that in the West it is the States who control the use of water.

As I did Wednesday, let me quote from one of the seminal U.S. Supreme Court cases on this issue, the 1978 case entitled ''California v. United States,'' written by Justice Rehnquist.

The Justice writes:

> The history of the relationship between the Federal Government and the States in the reclamation of the arid lands of the Western States is both long and involved, But through it runs the consistent thread of purposeful and continued deference to State water law by the Congress. Indeed, to take from the legislatures of the various States and territories the control of water at the present time would be something less than suicidal. If the appropriation and use were not under the provisions of State law, the utmost confusion would prevail.

Mr. Speaker, this United American Heritage Rivers Initiative would create utmost confusion. How can the Clinton administration assert control over something that it clearly does not own, and so important to our State?

To make matters worse, this initiative is not just limited to the rivers. It redefines communities, watersheds, and jurisdictional boundaries. It creates a governing entity called the river community, but what is a river community, Mr. Speaker? Who belongs to a river community? Do not believe for a minute that a river community will be made up only of people who make their living from and are dependent on our rivers.

Mr. Speaker, this fictional entity, the river community, will then define the area covered by the American Heritage River designation. They decide the length of the area, whether it be an entire watershed, the length of an entire river, or a short stretch of a river, and may cross jurisdictional boundaries, including State boundaries.

Apparently when it comes to rivers, the Clinton administration believes that it takes more than a village, it takes a river community. When someone sitting in New York City can appeal land management decisions in the West, such as a timber sale and grazing allotment plans, with a mere postcard, who is it that the Clinton administration will decide is a member of the river community? What interests will the members of the river community have? Also, how will the designation be made?

Watershed, as we all know very well, Mr. Speaker, can literally be from mountaintop to mountaintop, and include vast areas. What about private property inside these watershed areas? If a private property designation is being contemplated, will the private owner be able to protect and sustain his ownership right? No, he will not. I have learned, Mr. Speaker, through my inquiries that this designation could happen even over the objections of a homeowner, a shopowner, a farmer, a rancher.

What about State and local property? Mr. Speaker, an American Heritage River designation will further dilute local control and decisionmaking. It will do nothing but add another layer of bureaucracy that must be dealt with, another hurdle to overcome when an entity, the private landowner or the State, desires to utilize the land.

CEQ has argued that the designation carries no legal meaning. I disagree. The very designation creates yet another obstacle, legal or not, and yet another tool for the use by environmental extremists to stop the wise use of our lands. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court recognized the importance of water to the arid western United States. Why cannot the Clinton administration respect this supreme law of the land?

As the Supreme Court has stated in the case entitled ''California v. United States'' in 1978:

> The legislative history of the Reclamation Act makes it abundantly clear that Congress intended to defer to the substance as well as the form of State water law * * * to do otherwise would trivialize the broad language and purpose of the Reclamation Act.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the utmost confusion will prevail.

The final issue I would like to talk about tonight, Mr. Speaker, is the wisdom of our Founding Fathers as embodied by the doctrine of the separation of powers. As I learned it, the legislative branch creates the laws, the executive branch is to implement and enforce the laws, and the judiciary interprets the laws.

Yet the American Heritage Rivers Initiative was created and tendered solely by the White House and executed without congressional approval. When it comes to our resources issues, the Clinton administration has once again usurped the Congress' lawmaking authority. Nowhere in law can one find the American Heritage Rivers Initiative, nor has Congress conferred to CEQ the power to govern and control our rivers and watersheds.

This raises some very, very serious issues, going beyond who and how this program is authorized. But how is it paid for?

□ 2230

Since the American Heritage Rivers initiative has never been authorized by Congress, exactly which land and water program's funds were siphoned to prepare this proposal? How does the administration intend to continue funding this unauthorized project, if it is established?

CEQ has stated that this program is merely a coordination of existing and ongoing Federal programs. Yet the American Heritage Rivers initiative assigns a so-called river navigator, a Federal official, to the river community, the governing body, to help guide it toward Presidential designation. But I challenge the CEQ to show me where it is that the Congress has authorized a river navigator. And it would be foolish to believe that these river navigators work for free. Who authorized this position? Who appropriated the funds?

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that funds needed forward on the ground management activities such as rangecons, engineers, biologists, and foresters are being misdirected from other legitimate and authorized programs. Similar to other so-called initiatives unauthorized by Congress, like the Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Project, which comes to mind, it costs hundreds of millions of dollars to the American taxpayers and the administration is again operating ultra vires and is misusing taxpayer dollars.

This program is a misappropriation of time, of resources and the taxpayers' money. You can be assured, Mr. Speaker, that we will be addressing each of these three issues at the June 26 Committee on Resources meeting.

CEQ has stated that if any legitimate opposition were to surface against the designation, including opposition by a Member of Congress representing the proposed area, the proposal will not go forward. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, but if this does not give me much comfort, do not be surprised.

For the RECORD, I oppose any designation of an American Heritage River in the State of Idaho or any place in this Nation. But I call the Members' attention to President Clinton's designation of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in Utah. Despite CEQ's protestations to the opposite, not one of the members of Utah's congressional delegation nor the Governor were informed of this pending action, which set aside nearly 2 million acres in the State of Utah plus a very, very valuable coal mine.

The Resources Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, of which I am a member, held a hearing in which Senators HATCH and BENNETT, Utah Governor Leavitt, Secretary Babbitt and CEQ chairman Katy McGinty testified. In the face of both Utah Senators and the Governor, Chairman McGinty stated she informed them of the impending monument designation. Both Senators and the Governor clearly and unequivocally stated that they were not informed. At best, the administration acted without consulting the leaders of the State of Utah. At worst, President Clinton acted over the unified objection of that State.

Nonetheless, whether Utah's delegation knew or not is no matter, and I tend to believe the Senators and the Governor that they had no prior knowledge.

CEQ's promises that only a community that wants these designations are empty to me. Its promises leave me with very, very little comfort. The American Heritage Rivers proposal is just one in a string of Clinton administration attacks on natural resource policies in America and most especially in the West.

This is a nation of laws. But from the Utah Monument Ecosystem Management Projects to BLM's law enforcement regulations, this administration has demonstrated an absolute lack of regard for our Nation's laws and regulations, including requirements of the environmental laws.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has blatantly ignored Congress' lawmaking authority, and the American Heritage Rivers initiative is just another example. Take, for instance, Secretary Babbitt's attempted rewrite of 43 CFR 3809 pertaining to surface mining. Secretary Babbitt has stated publicly that he did not need the Congress' help to rewrite the mining law of 1872 but that he could do it administratively.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the administration to ignore this body. Without a check on the executive branch, this Nation will continue down the road to chaos. And unless Congress asserts its constitutional responsibility, it is well on its way to becoming a toothless tiger, capable only of doling out the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to fund big bureaucracies like the CEQ. Where are we with regard to the protection of property and States rights?

As James Madison wrote in Federalist No. 47, the accumulation of all powers legislative, executive and judiciary in the same hands, whether of one, a few or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of separation of powers, in the vein of preserving Congress' lawmaking authority and for the good of our country, we must take a stand. We must draw a line and simply say no, we will not let you do that. We must say to the administration, you must act only within your designated authority.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of laws. As such we must all follow them, even the White House, but most especially all of us in government.

Tonight, I, along with a number of our colleagues, am introducing H.R. 1843. This bill will prohibit any funds from being spent by the administration on the American Heritage Rivers initiative. I urge the Members to join us on the Chenoweth-Pombo disapproval of the American Heritage Rivers initiative.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to some comments made by CEQ's Katy McGinty. She is quoted by the Associated Press as stating that she is bewildered and perplexed by our opposition to the American Heritage Rivers initiative. She states that it is 100 percent locally driven. It is government acting purely in partnership with local communities.

To this, Mr. Speaker, I can only say she simply does not get it. When one sees a person in her position state that it is government acting in partnership with local communities, I have grave concerns. We do not want another Federal designation. We do not want a greater Federal presence, and we do not want enhanced Federal control over our waters.

This is not what this Congress is about. The spirit of this Congress is the revitalization of the 10th amendment, the empowerment of local communities and States, and the recognition that the Federal Government is one of limited and enumerated powers. It is not about another Washington, D.C.-created designation of our resources. It is not about yet another sphere of influence for Federal bureaucrats. And it is certainly not about a Federal Government partnership when the State and local communities are quite capable of governing themselves.

This Congress is about less government, self-determination and freedom. Freedom is still the issue. It is about States rights and property rights and the right of the people to be free of Federal entanglements. And the American Heritage Rivers initiative does not fit this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is really about control, control over our rivers and watersheds. If the Federal Government wants control of the States' waters, then what is next?

If anyone thinks that this CEQ so-called initiative will be anything but a

tool of the environmental extremists, they had better think again. Just today I read that an organization dedicated to tearing out the dams and transportation waterways along the Snake and Columbia Rivers have already petitioned the White House to designate the Columbia River as an American Heritage River, which would end the water-based barge transportation, affecting hundreds of thousands of jobs, communities and families in the Northwest. No, this is an issue of control of the wealth and control of our people.

What is next, Mr. Speaker? Part 2, No. 2, calls for aerial and satellite surveillance of the rivers. Well, I ask myself, will I have to wear a number on my hat, on the top of my head, so that the Federal bureaucrats in Washington, DC, using aerial photographs, can monitor when I am out skipping rocks on the river with my grandchildren? What is next?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this issue is indeed about control of our resources, our wealth and our people. It is sad.

As I discussed earlier, water is the lifeblood of America, of the West and of my State, Idaho. But it is not just control over water that is threatened by this un-American ''make our backyard every bureaucrat's business'' Heritage Rivers initiative.

Nothing less than private property rights and freedom from unnecessary and harmful Federal intrusion is at stake. Farmers, ranchers, fishermen, homeowners and others who live along rivers and deeply love their rivers may find themselves with diminished rights and reduced control over their property and their activities on the river.

Mr. Speaker, these people, the ones who know the river and depend on its health and preservation, should not lose their rights because Federal bureaucrats or Eastern environmentalists want to initiate a warm and fuzzy, politically correct Federal program or another Clinton photo-op.

State sovereignty, individual freedom, protection of property rights are the ideals that have distinguished this Nation, this great Nation. We do ourselves and all American citizens a disservice if we allow power to be usurped in this fashion.

I urge my colleagues to stand up against this ill-conceived and misdirected American Heritage Rivers initiative and to cosponsor the Chenoweth-Pombo bill.

Mr. Speaker, the imposition of the Clinton-Gore extreme environmentalist policies has taken a tragic toll on the West. We are losing our culture, we are losing our heritage, and we are losing the very way of life that we love so much. My good friend Perry Pendley sums up this feeling about the West in his book, ''War on the West,'' when he writes, and I quote:

''The environmental extremists' vision of the West is of a land nearly devoid of people and economic activity, a land devoted almost entirely to the preservation of scenery and wildlife habitat. In their vision, everything becomes a vast park through which they might drive, drinking Perrier and munching on organic chips, staying occasionally in the bed-and-breakfast operations into which the homes of westerners have been turned, with those westerners who are able to remain fluffing the duvets and pouring cappuccino. They are well on their way to achieving their objective.''

Mr. Speaker, I think Perry Pendley hit the nail on the head. Many people in the United States east of the Mississippi just view the West as one big national park, and the American Heritage Rivers initiative is just one more assault in a long line of programs designed to turn the West into a playground for the East.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FLAKE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. FARR of California (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

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. CAPPS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. OLVER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SNYDER, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EDWARDS, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HEFNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. STABENOW, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ROTHMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes each day, on June 11 and 12.
Mr. PAPPAS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. BERMAN.
Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
Mr. RANGEL.
Mr. OLVER.
Mr. FAZIO of California.
Ms. SANCHEZ.
Mr. SANDERS.
Mr. LANTOS.
Ms. ESHOO.
Mr. BOYD.
Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
Mr. FRANK of Massachussetts.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. SABO.
Mr. MEEHAN.
Mr. KUCINICH.
Mr. PASCRELL.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. RAHALL.
Mr. PAYNE.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. TORRES.
Mr. BROWN of California.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. FARR of California.
Mr. GEPHARDT.

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

Mr. QUINN.
Mr. PITTS.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Mr. STEARNS.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. COLLINS.
Mr. BONILLA.
Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.
Mr. SPENCER.
Mr. WALSH.
Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. MCCOLLUM.
Mr. LEWIS of California.
Mr. DREIER.
Mr. RIGGS.
Mr. DOOLITTLE.
Mr. MCHUGH.

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

Mr. SHERMAN.
Mr. ETHERIDGE.
Mr. COOKSEY.
Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.
Mr. WELDON of Florida.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 610. An act to implement the obligations of the United States under the Chemical Weapons Convention; to the Committee on International Relations and in addition, to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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,

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. Thomas, from the Committee on House Oversight reported that that