The dedication, the determination, the discipline of these young women is truly amazing. This is my hometown team, representing one of my alma maters, so I am especially proud of this outstanding group, but they have made all of Tennessee very proud, indeed.

Coach Pat Head Summitt, her assistants, Mickie DeMoss, Holly Warlick, Al Brown, and the Tennessee Lady Vols are great representatives for the sport of basketball and for this Nation.

ETHICAL STANDARDS IN POLITICAL FUND-RAISING

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Democrats' call for national standards in education reflects their high regard for high ethical standards when it comes to raising money for their political campaigns?

I have no doubt that the other side, so proud of what they did during the 1996 elections, have learned a few lessons from the most ethical administration in history. Selling the Lincoln bedroom to the highest bidder; White House coffees with the most impressive rogues gallery of drug smugglers, arms dealers and con artists ever assembled.

I wonder if the national standards they have in mind will help with the little ''I do not recall problem'' that seems to afflict the majority from the White House who are asked to come to Capitol Hill to testify about campaign finance law breaking.

I wonder if the national standards they have in mind will do anything about shaking down impoverished Indian tribes for money, using the power of the IRS to target America's most vulnerable citizens, or invading the privacy of ordinary citizens by illegally obtaining their FBI files.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker. I wonder.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, there was some debate yesterday on the floor about whether or not the majority party, the Republicans, were serious, coming to the floor with a bad campaign finance reform proposal, and setting up a procedure that meant they needed two-thirds of the House, not one-half-of-the-House-plus-one to win.

Well, I think there were two-thirds votes for something. There was two-thirds of the House at least that voted against the Republican proposal, and, frankly, it just shows how insincere this effort has been.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take back the political system in a way that will give the American people confidence. We have to put limits on spending. We have to decrease the amount of money to campaigns, not increase the amount of money to campaigns, and we have to have an honest debate on this floor with not just the ideas that have been created inside the Republican caucus, which were even rejected by a large number of the Republicans, but the ideas that are out here in the American public.

I have a proposal to limit spending to a $100 contribution from any person in the country; not thousands, not $25,000, not $75,000. Other people have other ideas. I believe in public financing. Many people agree with that; some disagree with that.

We ought to have an honest debate about these issues, and not let it die with the sham that occurred last night.

MAKING TAXES UNDERSTANDABLE

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, this year, millions of Americans will buy new cars. We will go on to car lots and select cars of our choice, and be told how much they cost.

But think about it for a minute, how complicated it must be to price a car; tires, computer systems, the radios and speaker systems and bumpers. And then there are the labor costs involved in it, and the liability for the insurance, and the utilities for the factory.

It is indeed a very, very complicated process to bring a car to your lot nearest to you in your hometown and say that car costs $31,286. It is a miracle of the capitalist system.

Now think in terms of what it is to pay your taxes. Have you paid your taxes yet? Probably not. Why not? Because it is too complicated. You know it is going to take hours and hours. You will have to sacrifice two or three evenings of your busy schedule, all to figure out what you owe Uncle Sam.

Why can the IRS not take a lesson from the motor companies and the private sector and just have clarity and simplicity, so that when you and I go to pay our taxes on April 15th, even though we might not like the amount, at least we understand what it is?

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last week several of my colleagues and myself stood in the well of this House, and we talked to the American public about the Republican leadership's lunacy and their crazy idea to impose a 30 percent sales tax on the American public. Lunacy. A 30 percent increase in the sales tax, a national sales tax.

In the course of that debate, I spoke out and I said that Republicans want to say that Democrats are not for tax cuts, and that we should not let them get away with saying that Democrats are not for tax cuts, because, quite frankly, Democrats have been standing on their feet talking about targeted tax cuts for working middle-class families in this country, and not the richest people in this country, which is where the Republican leadership and my colleague from Texas (Mr. DELAY) are coming from.

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. DELAY got up to speak this morning, and I say to him, watch the debate on the floor before you distort the words of a colleague. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is being corrected on how they misinterpreted the comments that I made.

We have the tape. You are going to have to eat your words.

DEFEAT OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on yesterday's debacle. Some rose and said that this was legitimate campaign finance reform. The American public wants campaign finance reform. They do not want money to be the arbiter of the politics of America. They want money contributed honestly and reported effectively.

The chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, who offered these bills to the Congress, had one principal large bill. That bill, he said, would pass. We said it was a sham. The New York Times said it was a sham. The Washington Post said it was a sham. We were criticized on our side of the aisle for being partisan and saying it was a sham.

But, Mr. Speaker, when the vote was called, two-thirds of the majority party voted against their leadership's bill, including their leadership.

It was, indeed, a sham.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3579, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 402 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 402

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. 3579) making emergency supplemental appropriations 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 clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI, clause 7 of rule XXI, or section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall not exceed 90 minutes, with 60 minutes of general debate confined to the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and 30 minutes of general debate confined to title III equally divided and controlled by Representative Skaggs or his designee and a Member opposed to title III. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. The amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. No other amendment shall be in order except the further amendment printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. That amendment 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, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against that amendment are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendment 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.

□ 1145

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for purposes of debate on this issue only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 402 is a modified closed rule that will allow the House to consider H.R. 3579, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1998, in an expeditious and responsible manner.

The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(L)(6) of rule XI, requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report; clause 7 of rule XXI, requiring a 3-day availability of relevant printed hearings and reports on general appropriations bills; or section 306 of the Budget Act of 1974, prohibiting consideration of legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget unless reported by that committee.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It also provides an additional 30 minutes of debate on the provision of the bill in title III relating to the prohibition on the use of funds in the bill for military operations against Iraq. This time is to be equally divided between the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) and an opponent of the bill language.

I am sure Members on both sides of this issue would agree this is a timely and important debate, and I am pleased we were able to accommodate additional time for this purpose.

The rule provides that the bill be considered as read and that amendments printed in part 1 of our Committee on Rules report be considered as adopted. The rule waives points of order against the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill, or clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting reappropriations.

Additionally, the rule makes in order the amendment printed in part 2 of the Committee on Rules' report and provides that such amendment 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 a proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The rule waives all points of order against this amendment, which is a manager's amendment designed to meet a specific need in the Northeast.

For the record, I have been advised by the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), that additional specific needs for the State of Florida, this recent emergency and tragedy that has happened in that State, have not been incorporated in this bill because of the timing of matters. These points will be addressed in conference with the other body, I am informed.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for a motion to recommit with or without instructions. It is a somewhat complicated rule, which is why I have taken so long to lay it out. There are other points about it that are worth noting by Members.

What we are attempting to do today is move ahead with an important supplemental spending bill made necessary by a series of natural disasters and several ongoing military missions in need of additional funding in this fiscal year.

I have heard little disagreement about the merit of the funding proposals that are included in today's legislation. We have all been saddened, in fact horrified, by the devastating impact of a series of storms and weather phenomena associated with El Nino in congressional districts across the country.

I think we also all recognize that the young men and women doing the hard work of peace in such places as Bosnia and the Persian Gulf rely on us to ensure that they have the resources necessary to conduct their missions as safely as possible. Whether we agree with the long-term policy that put them in harm's way or not is not the issue at this point.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, there has been much public commentary and disagreement among Members about the process by which these needs are to be met. We did hear much testimony yesterday from Members seeking to offer amendments to this bill. Most of the amendments were in some way or another in violation of House rules. Some of them dodge the tough issue of offsets, and some were not germane to the subject matter of this bill.

Based on that, and the importance of getting this bill done quickly, we have crafted a structured rule that seeks to keep the focus on the matters at hand; that is, the emergencies and keeping our military supported.

For instance, I know that some of our colleagues believe this bill should have been tied to funding for the IMF and United Nations funding. Given the complexity and the clear controversy surrounding both of those matters, I believe that marrying them with the disaster and defense proposals would only serve to delay our ability to get needed relief to victims and provide adequate funding for our troops overseas.

We cannot allow our efforts to help flood- and storm-ravaged communities or bring peace of mind to our troops to become bogged down in protracted negotiations over International Monetary Fund and United Nations funding. Those matters will be the subject of a subsequent bill next month.

In addition, we have discussed the ramifications of funding these needs with and without spending offsets. I am pleased that this legislation incorporates offsets for the spending it proposes, a difficult task in these times of tightened belts in light of last year's budget agreement.

By adopting this rule, the House will go a step further and declare its support for the general policy that all spending in this bill should be offset. I salute the appropriators for doing due diligence in coming up with the offsets for the new spending in this legislation. They have remained true to the principle of fiscal responsibility our majority has espoused since taking control of this House in 1994: There is no free lunch when it comes to taxpayers' money. Everything has a price, and all spending must be done in the context of making choices.

They are tough choices, but we are accountable. That does not mean that I agree with each and every choice that was made in this bill, nor does every other Member.

In one area involving funding for the airport improvement program, I think

the wisdom of this House will enhance the judgment made by the Committee on Appropriations. In adopting this rule, we will adopt an amendment that restores cuts proposed to the airport program, cuts that could have seriously jeopardized the continued progress of airport expansion and air travel safety across this country, in my view, and in the view of many others.

Mr. Speaker, we know this bill will not meet every need for the current fiscal year. Even as the Committee on Appropriations was marking up this bill, the administration was preparing an additional natural disaster-related funding request of $1.6 billion. Since that time, sadly, we have seen additional damage done to communities from violent storms. I gather the weather forecasters say we could see more. Mother Nature has never adhered to our congressional timetable and probably does not care much about our policies, either.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process, I continue to be troubled by the difficulty we face each year in coping with such natural disasters, emergencies whose specific timing, severity and targets are not predictable, but our only certainty is that we know that they are going to come at some time, somewhere, in some form. Somebody is going to be hurt, and we are going to have victims looking to the government for relief.

I will continue my efforts to find a better way, perhaps through a rainy-day type of reserve fund that we can better plan for these contingencies and make our spending decisions more predictable and rational in the future, but now we have to cope with the disasters at hand.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me speak in general to an issue raised by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations about funding in this bill for intelligence-related activities and programs.

There is some money within this bill for intelligence and intelligence-related activities that are critical to our national security interests. Although some have suggested that this funding is only a result of congressional prompting, let me assure the Members that this request is not from whole cloth. These are areas that the administration has identified as being a significant need at this time. The requests go to the very fiber of protecting our domestic tranquility.

This is accomplished by ensuring that we will have the human and technical means necessary to protect our deployed forces, to protect American citizens abroad and their interests, and to provide the eyes and ears that truly supply the first line of defense for our Nation.

We have let down this defense, particularly over the past year, and we have to make some repairs. These investments that we have before us are not always easy, but who among us is ready to further put our Nation at risk? I daresay, not a Member of this House.

Having been charged by all of this House to keep the portfolio on intelligence and to keep watch over this area of our national security, I can affirm to every Member that the items in this bill are needed and they are needed now.

In closing, I wish to commend, again, our colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work in getting this bill to the House expeditiously and in a fiscally responsible way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow for the consideration of H.R. 3579, which is a bill that makes $2.9 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations. As my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), has described this rule, it provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It provides an additional 30 minutes of debate on title III of the bill.

The rule self-executes three amendments. Only one amendment will be made in order on the House floor. Members will not have the opportunity to offer other amendments.

I oppose this restrictive rule, and all the Democrats on the Committee on Rules opposed it. A total of 32 amendments were submitted to the Committee on Rules. By permitting so few changes in the bill, the House will not be permitted to work its will. Members will not be able to fully represent their constituents during the floor amendment process.

The bill provides vital funding for our troops overseas and for recovery from natural disasters. That is good. However, the bill itself is seriously flawed. The increased appropriations contained in this bill are emergency spending, and they do not have to be matched with offsetting decreases in spending.

However, the Republican majority has chosen to include offsets anyway, using this bill as an excuse to cut important domestic programs. These cuts include a major reduction in housing for low-income people and the elderly. The cuts would also force the AmeriCorps program to shut down, ending this valuable source of people-to-people assistance for the poor, the needy, and the hungry.

I am constantly amazed, especially in the last few years, how, when we bring a bill like this to the floor, we, in order to find some money someplace, the first thing we do is always cut the programs that hurt the most needy of people in our country. I do not know what the reason is. It seems like maybe these people do not have a voice. They do not seem to maybe vote like they should. They do not have PACs or what have you. But we always cut them. This is another example of that.

My friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), wanted to offer an amendment striking the offsets. His amendment would remove the cuts that hurt the poor and the needy. By removing the bill's most controversial section, his amendment would reduce the chance that the bill would get bogged down in partisan politics and ensure that the emergency funds for our military troops would be delivered as quickly as possible.

The Committee on Rules denied the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) the opportunity to offer his amendment, and it denied the House the right to vote on it.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) asked the Committee on Rules permission to offer an amendment that would combine this bill with other emergency supplemental appropriations bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations. This action was requested by President Clinton.

Again, the Committee on Rules denied the gentleman from Wisconsin the opportunity to offer his amendment, and it denied the House the right to vote on it. So it went with most amendments that House Members wanted to offer.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill is a mean-spirited, controversial, and very partisan bill.

□ 1200

It should not go to the floor without the opportunity for Members to improve it. I urge the defeat of the rule.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time remains on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 20½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy at this time if the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) would yield some more of his time so we could equalize the time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed and cruel rule. This rule is cruel because it is closed and it does not allow any Democratic amendments, including the amendment that I offered to respond to the emergency facing this Nation's farmers and ranchers. It is also cruel

because it cuts programs vital to children, vital to senior citizens, immigrants, and others of those who are most unfortunate.

This closed and cruel rule does not allow an amendment that would have corrected the provision contained in the 1996 farm bill that treats American farmers and ranchers worse than we treat individuals who declare bankruptcy, worse than we treat foreign governments to whom we extend credit, and it sought to correct this provision before the planting season is over and before it is too late for many of these farmers.

Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent situation. This is an emergency situation. Contained in the 1996 farm bill is a provision that denies thousands of family farmers and ranchers eligibility to receive FSA direct and guaranteed loans if they have received a loan write-down or a settlement. There is no lending practice in the private sector as harsh and limited as the provisions in the 1996 farm bill, and it is particularly cruel because spring planting season is now and without access to credit, many farmers and ranchers will indeed go out of business and will not be able to produce.

Mr. Speaker, these farmers are not derelicts; they are hard-working citizens, many of whom face a credit crunch because of a hurricane, flooding, drought or other unanticipated economic downturn. This unique, callous provision was not contained in either the House or the Senate version of the 1996 farm bill. It was added in conference without the benefit of hearings, committee consideration or public debate. It was added without the vision of what its impacts would mean on thousands of small farmers and ranchers.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially brutal to those farmers who have been discriminated against and have pending cases. They are being denied a remedy of past discrimination, and they are also being denied the right that most of us have, a right to work and provide for their families.

It is even more astonishing that this closed rule does not permit the amendment that I offered, because the very same amendment is included in the Senate version of the emergency supplemental bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate what this rule does to small and family farmers who so much want to be a part of the American dream. But it is equally shameful that H.R. 3579, if passed, will take money from public housing and will shut down AmeriCorps.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this closed and cruel rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule which self-executes the McIntosh-Neumann amendment to H.R. 3579. This amendment expresses the sense of this House that any fiscal year 1998 emergency supplemental appropriations considered by the 105th Congress must not result in an increased level of total Federal spending.

I think it is absolutely critical that we stick to this principle in this Congress, that if we are going to spend more than the balanced budget, we will have offsets to reduce spending in other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I personally support the President's request for emergency supplemental appropriations to fund disaster relief and U.S. troop deployments in Bosnia and Iraq. However, this funding does not have to come at the expense of last year's budget agreement.

After working diligently to balance the budget for the first time in 30 years, many members of the Republican Conference, especially members of the Conservative Action Team, believe it is counterproductive for us to consider funding the President's emergency spending requests without providing the means to pay for them.

For this reason, I want to personally express my gratitude to the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman LIVINGSTON) of the Committee on Appropriations, and all of the members of that committee that voted to include a package of offsets in the emergency supplemental bill. This was the right thing to do, and I applaud their efforts.

Unfortunately, while the House bill contains these offsets, the Senate version does not. To send the strongest possible message to both the other body and the White House that this House is fully committed to offsetting the President's request for additional spending, this rule self-executes the McIntosh-Neumann amendment. This amendment demonstrates the House's commitment to fiscal responsibility and is intended to ensure that the Federal deficit does not increase as a result of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is this Congress is perfectly capable of providing emergency spending relief to disaster victims and our troops without retreating from our commitment to the American people to keep a balanced budget and not go back to deficit spending.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NADLER was allowed to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE DEATH OF FORMER CONGRESSWOMAN BELLA ABZUG

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to inform the House of the passing of a distinguished former Member of this House. Bella Abzug, who served here from 1970 to 1976 and had a distinguished career before her service here and after her service here, passed away this morning.

We will arrange a special order to talk about Bella and her many contributions to the welfare of this country. When we know about arrangements, we will inform the House, but we have just found out and she passed away just about an hour and a half ago.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for 1998 is a vicious Republican attempt to pit children against the disaster victims. It is an attempt to pit children against the situation that we find ourselves in in Bosnia.

The bill cuts bilingual and immigration education programs by $75 million. The cuts mean that half a million youngsters will be denied the opportunity to be able to learn English as quickly as possible.

I want to add again that this particular cut will strike deeply into the States of California, Florida, Texas, and several other States; that at the same time yesterday the particular amendment that came up regarding the investigation of making sure that citizens were made citizens before they vote, that that particular amendment struck at those particular States instead of trying to make it universal.

Mr. Speaker, it is a deliberate attempt to go after Hispanics. The administration strongly opposes these offsets, none of which are included in the Senate-based version of this bill. The President's senior advisors are recommending a veto of the bill as drafted in the House.

In addition, the Republican leadership has refused to let the House debate the bill under a fair rule, and we only ask that the leadership give us an opportunity to debate it in a fair rule so that we have an opportunity, so that the House, both Republicans and Democrats, will be able to vote up or down whether we should cut those education programs or not.

Bilingual and immigration education services for the neediest children are critical. This is important for them to continue to be able to learn English. For the House leadership and the Committee on Rules to deliberately not allow this democratic process to go forward, to not allow us an opportunity to continue to be able to debate this issue, is an outright attack on Hispanic youngsters throughout this country.

At a time when we are moving to a global economy, we should be making sure that youngsters learn as much about other languages as possible. We are doing just the reverse. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we make sure that we vote this down.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules, who we are pleased to welcome back.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the previous speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), I have great respect for the gentleman. He is one of the Members that stands and speaks his piece on the floor. We

know it comes from his heart, and I understand that. But maybe after the gentleman hears my statement here, he might understand a little bit, because there is certainly no intent ever to go after anyone in this country. That is why we have fought to remain the greatest, freest Nation on earth and we are the beacon of hope for all people in the world, and we want to continue to do that.

Mr. Speaker, last night I was unavoidably detained on my return from Europe where the plane we were flying in had the door burst its seals on two separate occasions and we had to return twice. I would say to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), we came back and hitched a ride back from Europe in a C–141, and I tried to sleep on the floor of that cargo plane, but it did not work. So I may not make any sense here today.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules, under the very able leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) reported out this rule which attempts to be as fair as possible while providing for expedited consideration of this emergency spending bill.

It is true that we were not able to make many amendments in order. I personally favored an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) which would have added money to badly underfunded defense procurement accounts, paid for with cuts in unproductive and unfunded foreign aid programs like aid to Russia. I would much rather have seen the offsets come from there.

But the vast majority of amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules did in fact have violations of either germaneness, and we have to pay attention to this because we, unlike the other body that has no rules over there, we have to live by the rules that we have in the House. These amendments did, in fact, violate the germaneness, legislating in appropriation bills or Budget Act waivers, and we have sworn to the men and woman that we will not bust the budget, these waivers, and we are trying to stick to that.

So all in all, this is a fair rule that will expedite this badly needed legislation in the wake of this winter's disasters around the country, whether it is El Nino in the western part of the country or the terrible ice storms up in my district, up on the Canadian border.

On the bill itself, Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that the supplemental helps alleviate some of the costs of the devastating ice storm that struck the northern part of my district, the entire northern part of New York, as well as Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine and a great deal of the Northeast, as a matter of fact. I could not possibly describe to any of my colleagues the damage that was done to the terrain, to the livelihoods and infrastructure of the area, but I ask my colleagues to just listen to a couple of them.

This storm lasted for 3 days and by many accounts left more than 5 inches of ice coating, toppling trees and telephone poles and power lines, just falling like dominos all across this entire north country in the Adirondack Mountains. One million people were without power, some for as long as 3 weeks, in the dead of winter and below zero temperatures. If any of my colleagues have had to live through that, I can tell them it was devastating.

FEMA, HUD and the SBA, among State and local government agencies, did yeoman's work in the immediate aftermath to help get people back on their feet and get their electricity back on so they would not freeze or starve to death.

However, there is still long-term damage to the roads, to the forests, whether it is the apple trees where the limbs were just totally decimated, whether it was maple trees that produced 90 percent of the syrup in this country that were just absolutely decimated, utility companies, and especially the struggling dairy farmers of that region.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am particularly pleased that this bill provides some much-needed additional relief to the dairy farmers up there who lost their livestock and lost their milk. These people, Mr. Speaker, live on an income of maybe 10 or 11 or 12 or $13,000 per year. Per year. And now they have lost 50 percent of that income for the remainder of this year. I mean, that is absolutely devastating to people like this. They operate on the tiniest of margins and a storm with devastating costs like this threatens to put them all out of business.

Thankfully, working with the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), whose district was literally devastated even more than mine, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) sitting over here, who represents the Syracuse area and some of the northern reaches, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, we were able to come through with additional relief for these farmers.

The relief came most importantly through two forms, Mr. Speaker. Four million dollars is included to help cover the cost of livestock that was lost during the storm. That is where the cows literally died because they could not be milked, and if they are not milked they die by the hundreds.

□ 1215

Just as importantly, we were able to add $6.8 million for the milk that was lost due to the power outage, and to help with diminished future production of cows who were struck with mastitis because they couldn't be milked for days.

Mr. Speaker, this is the least we can do for these areas that have been so hard hit by unexpected storms. I have stood here in this well and helped many areas throughout the country, whether it was the flooding in Iowa and North Dakota in the past, and now we would appreciate this little bit of help for the northern reaches of New York, which benefit from very, very few Federal programs. There is no way to prevent these tragedies but thankfully we can help them with this hardship. This bill starts to do that, Mr. Speaker.

On the defense portions of the bill, and this is even more important, I think, or just as important, let me say that I am extremely pleased that the additional funding for our military operations overseas is not paid for with cuts in other areas of the defense budget. That is very important.

For several years running now, this administration has made a habit of underfunding the defense budget, overcommitting our forces throughout the year time after time, and then coming to this Congress with a supplemental funding request for those operations paid for with cuts in defense procurement and research and development out of military personnel.

In other words, this administration has been robbing tomorrow's military preparedness in order to pay for the multiple overseas adventures on which they have sent the U.S. military, adventures like in Bosnia and Somalia and a half dozen other places. In fairness, most of this supplemental request is for operations in Iraq, a mission that I strongly support. However, it is imperative that even that funding not come out of tomorrow's military.

Mr. Speaker, this year we will most likely cut the defense budget for the 14th straight year, over my objections, but it is probably what will happen. And the logical, predictable results of that are now plaguing the United States Armed Forces and my colleagues all know it, if they go back home and talk to their recruiters. Our force structure has shrunk massively. The Army does not have the number of divisions today to repeat Desert Storm without pulling our forces from Bosnia and perhaps even Korea, which we cannot afford to do.

Our weapons systems are aging rapidly. I know. I was a victim of one trying to come back from Europe last night. Just the other day, the Pentagon announced it was grounding some Vietnam era Huey helicopters for safety reasons. It goes back to what we were doing with the old B–52 bombers when the doggone wings were falling off because they were so old and in disrepair.

How could this situation be? We have cut the military procurement budget by nearly 70 percent since 1985, 70 percent. What else could we expect? Recruiters are failing to meet their quotas. Go into your recruiters and ask them if they are getting a cross-section of American young men and women today. No, they are not, because they know they cannot depend on the military for a career anymore because of

what we have been doing here in Congress. Pilots are leaving the Navy and Air Force in record numbers. This slide has got to be halted, Mr. Speaker.

This bill is a good start in that direction because we do not allow for these supplemental spending increases to come out of the military budget. The choice is this: If President Clinton wants to deploy the U.S. military every time there is a problem throughout the world, some civil strife someplace, he is going to have to provide adequate funding for defense on top of it. And if he does not, he is going to have to pay for those military missions with cuts in some of the domestic spending programs that he considers a priority such as in this bill now. The bottom line is simple. There is no free lunch, Mr. Speaker.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to proceed out of order for 1 minute.)

IN HONOR OF THE MEMORY OF MICHAEL CARDIN

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we just heard, minutes ago, about the death of one of our former colleagues, Bella Abzug. She had a full career and made contributions that her talent and commitment enabled her to do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in great sadness to honor the memory of a young man who did not get the time to live out the promise of his ability, of his character, of his unbelievably goodwill. The son of our colleague, BEN CARDIN, and his wife, Myrna, died suddenly last week. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the entire House of Representatives joins me in extending condolences to the very sad Cardin family on the loss of a gifted and caring young man.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Michael Cardin since he was a very young boy. His father and I went to the general assembly in 1967 together. BEN first became a member of the Maryland general assembly on the year that Michael was born. He graduated from the University of Maryland law school on that day as well, in that year. But the proudest event of 1967 in the Cardin family was the birth of Michael.

I and some of the rest of my colleagues, perhaps, had the opportunity to watch Michael grow as he and his sister, Deborah, and their mother, Myrna, would visit their father in the House of Delegates and here in Congress. There were two characteristics, Mr. Speaker, that I remember most about Michael. He cared more for others than for himself, and he was an intelligent young man whose greatest concern was for those less fortunate than himself.

As a student at Wesleyan University in Connecticut, Michael continued to develop the commitment to serving others that he had shown even as a child. He served as editor in chief of the school newspaper where he demonstrated his strong communication skills and dedication to justice. In 1993, following in the footsteps of his grandfather, a great and good man, who has celebrated 93 years of service to his State and Nation, and his father, like both of them, Michael graduated from the University of Maryland School of Law. With his grandfather in attendance, Michael received his juris doctorate degree after hearing his father deliver the commencement address.

The occasion was a fitting honor for the Cardin family, which has contributed so very, very much to this State and this Nation. At the University of Maryland, Michael was remembered as being a talented student dedicated to becoming a lawyer to help people, not for profit. This past winter Michael was admitted to the Maryland bar, a bright future lay ahead. After passing the bar, he worked in Baltimore for the special counsel and volunteered at the Hamden Family Center working with children and families.

Everyone that I have talked to who worked with Michael at the Hamden Center said he was one of the brightest lights for all the children who were benefited by that center. His willingness to help others has always been a core value to Michael, and he demonstrated it in every part of his life.

At the service this past Sunday, his father rose and said that there were many instances of which he and Myrna had no knowledge, incidents that demonstrated with individual people, homeless, children, people in trouble, Michael repeatedly showed the character that he had, which I suspect was in his genes, because it was consistent with the Cardin contribution.

Mr. Speaker, Michael was 30 years of age. He left us too soon. All those who know him are heart sick. We can take comfort, perhaps, in knowing that in the time he spent with us he made a tremendous difference in the lives of all those he touched. His parents can take comfort in knowing, and I know they do, that Michael was a wonderful son from a wonderful family.

I do not know any family that I have ever met, Mr. Speaker, that is more supportive, closer, more giving, more respectful of one another than the family headed by BEN and Myrna Cardin. They are wonderful human beings, good and decent people who loved and nurtured their son without reservation. Michael, for the 30 years that he had, got the best that there was in the Cardin family.

I know that all my colleagues who know BEN so well, some who know Myrna and some who know Michael will join all of us in Maryland in honoring the memory of Michael Cardin, this compassionate and caring young man, and we will join together in extending our deepest sympathies, love and caring to BEN, Myrna, the Cardin family. We are a lesser land for Michael's loss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) will not come out of the time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL).

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if I might just speak out of order for 30 seconds, I would like to join with my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) to just let our good friend, BEN CARDIN, know on his first day back how much we care for him, how much we respect what he has accomplished here in the House but, more importantly, the kind of individual he is, and how much he has given, not only to his family, but to his country, and the quiet confidence that he walks these halls with and the important contribution that he will continue to make to this country. BEN, you are a dear friend to many of us, and we welcome you back.

Given the gravity of these last few minutes on the House floor, it seems almost inconsequential to go back to the normal business of what we take up in this Chamber. But the bill that is before the House today, which will provide badly needed assistance and aid to families throughout our country that have been devastated by storms, to people in Bosnia, and to our military troops is something that everyone on both sides of the aisle support. There is money in our country to provide that support. In fact, as many of us have talked about, for the first time in several decades, there is actually going to be a surplus this year. But rather than deal with that surplus issue, what this bill says is something different.

What this bill says is in order to provide payments to these programs, we are going to go out and we are going to cut money that needs to be spent to fight homelessness in America. We are going to go out and cut money that needs to be spent on providing Section 8 housing. We are going to provide cuts on money that needs to be spent on education programs.

There is no reason, there is no reason why we have to cut the homeless, why we have to cut Section 8 housing, why we have to cut education in order to fund people that have been devastated by storms. There is a process laid out called emergency spending. The President has paid attention to that process. He has declared an emergency. That is what this bill is about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has 19 minutes remaining.

□ 1230

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, we are all in favor of emergency help to people who suffered from storms and to pay the bills for what we are doing in Bosnia. But, Mr. Speaker, some of the offsets here are unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, in the entire budget there is $10 billion for section 8 housing. This is not for new section 8 units.

This is for supplementing the rent payments of low-income people in existing housing. This bill proposes to cut that by $2.2 billion, 22 percent.

And since there is no new section 8 housing, what does it mean? It means we are going to not renew the contracts of existing section 8s. It means that, in the next couple of years, we are going to say to 350,000 families, leave your homes. We are going to throw them out on the street. We are going to tell them the subsidies end. The rent doubled, they are guaranteed not to be able to pay that because, if they could afford it, they would not be in the program in the first place.

So, in order to meet some people's definition that we should not fund emergency programs out of emergency funds, those 350,000 people are out of their homes. I hope that is not what we want to do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), who is on the Committee on Appropriations and who is able to talk on this subject.

(Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and also in strong support of the emergency supplemental. This rule allows for emergency disaster help to thousands of people throughout the country, and it also allows for a manager's amendment that will allow for additional CDBG funds which are offset.

Mr. Speaker, these people were harmed by these storms. They lost livestock. They in many cases lost the farm in this disaster.

In the northern part of New York State, literally thousands of power poles came down when the ice came. And then the wires laid across the road. Snow came on top of the wires. The plows could not get out. The roads were closed.

Farmers were absolutely isolated. Some of these folks live on roads 2 miles off the main drag with nothing on their road but their farm. So they were in a terrible condition. We need to get this aid to them as quickly as possible so that they can get about getting their lives back in order.

Mr. Speaker, we have done the responsible thing. We have chosen to offset these expenditures. That has not been done in the past. We put it on the credit card and let our children pay for those bills. We are going to pay for these expenses now.

The way we do it primarily is through section 8 housing. And the comments have been made that we are going to put people out on the street, that people are going to lose their subsidies, that they are going to be thrown out of their homes. That is not true, Mr. Speaker. That is absolutely not true.

These are future obligations under section 8 housing. These are next year's expenditures under section 8 housing. Our subcommittee, under the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, has pledged to make this program whole. These funds will be put into the budget.

But, Mr. Speaker, if the President of the United States had done the responsible thing and funded the military adventures that he is not paying for, we would not be put in this position.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it pains me to talk about the situation in which we find ourselves. Our colleague from New York pointed out a few moments ago the underfunding of the defense budget, and I agree; of our overcommitting our troops, and I agree. But that is not the issue before us today.

The issue before us today is whether we truly recognize an emergency, as has been so recognized by the White House and has been so recognized by the Senate, or whether this is to be an offset against other items in the budget.

The rule before us authorizes us to take up a bill that allows offsets. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a mistake. This is a matter of process. It is a matter of doing it right. Though 80 percent of the bill's appropriations are for military programs, all of the measures are offsets in the domestic programs. I think there should be no offsets, whether they come from the military or whether they come from the domestic.

This is an emergency. We do not plan on hurricanes. We do not plan on tornadoes. We do not plan on floods. We do not plan on those international crises, such as Bosnia and Iraq. And yet, this is not treated as an emergency.

This bill rescinds money from the low-income rental housing assistance, from the airport program, from the National Community Service Program, from bilingual education. Should this bill pass in this forum, it is a sure invitation for a presidential veto, an invitation that I am sure will not be refused.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask for a statement of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) controls 8 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) controls 16 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me the time; and I rise in what I would call tepid support of the rule here.

I believe that what we are going through could be prevented, and I think we need to start discussing this on the floor of the House of Representatives. We may have a balanced budget this year, I think CBO says by perhaps $8 billion. But in the 5 years, now my sixth year, that I have been in this Congress, every year we have wrestled at least once, if not more than once, with the emergency appropriations process; and the question is, do we offset it or not offset it? And now that we are starting to balance the budget, we are starting to offset it.

If we do not offset it, all of a sudden we have spending out there which has just been added to the debt in the past and now may take away from the surplus in the future.

If we do offset it, what are we going to offset it with? There lies an entirely different fight, which we will get into later when we get to the bill itself.

But the bottom line is there is a way of avoiding this. I have introduced legislation to this effect which is of a particular consequence because it is budget mechanisms we need to look at. A budget reserve account would do this. They do it in virtually every State and city and county government now. They have an emergency set-aside so that if they run into problems such as these very real emergencies, and they are going to happen, then they are able to pay for it out of that amount of money, which is built into the budget to begin with, and we prevent all this.

Do we not all want to prevent this? Can anybody possibly enjoy what we are going through here?

It is very simple. We look back over a period of 10 years. It comes out to about $5 billion or $6 billion a year. We already have the White House preparing another emergency request right now which would fall into this. If there are large exceptions, such as a war, whatever it may be, obviously, we would have to waive the act in that circumstance and treat it in a different sense. But for the average expenditure, the average emergency which comes along, it could fit into that. And then, instead of talking about set-asides and how we are going to pay for it, that amount of money would already be put into our budget. It makes all the sense in the world.

And, yes, there is a jolt when we initially do it; but the bottom line is this is less than 1 percent of the entire budget amount that we appropriate each year. There is simply no reason why we are not able to do it. It is called a rainy day fund in some States. I think we should call it a budget reserve account.

I believe we should do it. I believe we should do it rapidly so that we can prevent these incredible struggles, which are very counterproductive to what we are doing in Congress.

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

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me also add my sympathy and love to the Cardin family.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), said, it seems almost without meaning to be here discussing these issues at this very sad time for one of our colleagues. But I do want to say that what concerns me about this legislation, and I vigorously oppose the rule, is that we seem to be returning to the radical legislative agenda of the 104th Congress, no bipartisanship, no caring.

There is no doubt that we are concerned as Americans about those who have suffered at the hand of these terrible, disastrous weather events. However, this supplemental appropriations legalization that we bring today is a cold wind from the winter as we enter into the spring to displace thousands upon millions of citizens out of their housing by cutting $2.2 billion from Section 8 housing for those who need housing in this Nation? Twenty-five thousand people are on the list needing public housing in Houston, Texas, alone.

Section 8 housing gives a push to those who are moving from welfare to work. It allows opportunities for young families and women to be housed throughout the community. We are pitting airline safety with housing for the poor. How tragic. How ridiculous. How shameless. Vote no on this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my dissent to the rule prohibiting the two amendments I offered to the emergency supplemental appropriations bill.

The first amendment moved to strike the rescission of $1.9 billion cuts from the Department of Health and Urban Development (HUD) Section 8 program. The program provides Section 8 subsidies to owners of low income housing.

The program is among our Nation's core housing programs—it provides safe, decent and affordable housing to families, the elderly and the disabled.

It is, therefore, a shame that I will not be able to give voice to the supporters of the Section 8 program since there are many supporters. The American people strongly support this program. The administration and the Banking Committee Democrats support this program.

Because of the Draconian cuts in this program, 2.1 million units now are at risk and 4.4 million Americans face the cold possibility of homelessness.

Let me be clear: A vote to restore the funds taken away from the Section 8 contract subsidies is not in any way a vote against the expenditures for recovery efforts from natural disasters, support of our troops in Bosnia, IMF loans or the payment of arrearages to the U.N. The two are unrelated. Therefore, it is disappointing to me that the Section 8 subsidies were used to offset the emergency appropriations when such offsets were not required to keep the budget balanced. We had the opportunity to provide for the Section 8 program and to address the urgent needs arising in Bosnia and areas hit by natural disasters at home. What we chose instead was to tell the American people that although we are engaged in a peacekeeping mission in Bosnia and attending to the victims of natural disasters around the country, there will be no relief for the economically disadvantaged, the elderly and the disabled to maintain affordable housing.

The second amendment moved to strike the rescission of $250 million from the AmeriCorps program in the supplemental emergency appropriations bill. AmeriCorps embodies the spirit of public service where young people nationwide are involved in community work, education and senior citizen programs.

The National Service Program was founded in the same tradition created by President Kennedy, who challenged each American citizen, ''ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country'' according to the CEO of Corporation for National Service, Harris Wofford, the Rescissions mean that approximately 85% of all AmeriCorps programs will be shut down by September 1, and no new programs will start as planned this coming summer and fall. In addition, eighty percent of the Learn and Serve America Program will be closed. For the residents of my home State of Texas, the cuts mean that the AmeriCorps state program will be slashed from $14 million to $2 million; the AmeriCorps National Program, from $2 million to $500,000; the Learn and Serve America Program, from $2 million to $500,000. The total amount of cuts is nearly $16 million.

AmeriCorps encourages its members to attend college by offering financial assistance for tuition purposes if they complete a term of service. In a single stroke, the rescissions will squash any hopeful expectations that the 4,181 currently qualified AmeriCorps members in Texas may have had to apply for the education awards.

In summary, the fate of the AmeriCorps Program is now tied to that of the emergency supplemental bill and unnecessarily, I may add. I hope that for the sake of our young people that AmeriCorps will be saved.

Thank you for allowing me to voice my dissent to the rule before the committee.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of maintaining our presence in Bosnia until lasting peace is established. I was privileged to visit our troops in Bosnia to witness the progress being made. Our continued presence in that region is important to the stability of the region. Yet I rise to oppose the rule and the emergency supplemental appropriation bill.

It is a disservice to Americans to force Congress to vote between full funding of important domestic programs and funding for peacekeeping. It is a disservice that is not necessary. These appropriations do not have to be offset. A choice between helping the survivors of genocide overseas and the much-needed domestic programs in the United States is a choice worthy of this House.

$1.9 billion in low-income housing assistance is at risk here, resulting in more than 800,000 Americans losing their housing beginning in October, many of them elderly. The Bible says, ''Who among you, when your brother asks for bread, would give him a stone?'' I ask, who among you, when your brother asks for shelter, would you turn a deaf ear? Who among you, when your brother suffers from devastation in one place, would take money from brothers in another place where they suffered devastation?

We speak of the requirements of budget mechanisms. Let us also speak of the requirements of people who are trying to survive.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, let me quote from a letter that I recently received from Colchester, Vermont, from a senior citizen who does not have a lot of money. She wrote, ''The list of persons who qualify for the section 8 program'' that she is applying for ''puts my name on a list with 990 persons ahead of me. When you enter your seventh and eighth decade, you don't have to be a rocket scientist to surmise that the likelihood of ever deriving benefit from this program is pretty minimal.'' And that is the story all over this country, elderly people needing affordable housing, working people needing affordable housing.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we have given huge tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America, when we spend $2 billion for B–2 bombers that the Pentagon does not want, when we provide $125 billion a year on corporate welfare, we do not have to continue the assault on affordable housing and on education.

Yes, the Northeast and the rest of this country was hurt by a disaster; and, as Americans, we must rise up, as we always have, to protect those people who were hurt. But let us not take away from the elderly and the working people and the poor to do so. It is unnecessary. Vote down this rule and support emergency relief.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while I am not authorized, I think on behalf of the Clinton administration I can thank the Republican Party.

There has been a lot of controversy about the President's decision to have troops in Bosnia. This bill, if it passes as is, will give him full legal authorization to keep troops in Bosnia longer.

The current law says the funding runs out June 30. This appropriations bill specifically earmarks $486 million to continue the troops in Bosnia beyond the June 30 deadline. For as long as this appropriations bill is in effect, it gives the President the authority to keep the troops in Bosnia.

Now I differ with the President. Because the Republican Party believes that to pay for the additional 3 months

in Bosnia prospective, not because of any back pay, we should cut section 8. The President and the Republican Party both want to keep troops in Bosnia for 3 more months. I disagree. The Republicans want to pay for it in part with section 8 reductions. The President disagrees.

I think the President's position, while wrong, is a little better than theirs. But be very clear, if we pass this bill—and I offered an amendment that was rejected by the Committee on Rules that would have let the House vote and restrict and give the President only 1 more month in Bosnia and then they would have had to pull out in 90 days. But this bill, and we are not talking about past money owed to Bosnia that was authorized and appropriated through June 30, this bill says $486 million for July and August and September.

□ 1245

Pass this bill as is, those of my colleagues who vote for this rule and this bill, and understand that there is no basis for criticizing the placement of the troops in Bosnia. My colleagues are voting here prospectively to give the President authority, but I am not sure how grateful he will be in the end.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, let me say what worries me about this whole procedure.

We anticipated that this bill would come out of committee not offset. We expected to have some sort of a vote on the floor, where on the floor they could make a decision one way or the other.

Now the normal procedure in the House is that we pass a version and the Senate passes another version, and in most cases we can reconcile that. Here is the problem with this bill: This bill is so different from the Senate version of the bill. From everything I can get from the Defense Department, there is a high degree of possibility that we will be laying off civilian employees in the Defense Department after this is passed because they cannot anticipate that a bill will be passed finally that will be agreed to beyond the Senate and the House.

For instance, the version in the Senate side has IMF in, it has all the things that many Members in the House do not agree on. The House obviously does not have all those things in it. The Mexico City language will come into play.

So we have a strong possibility, if this rule passes and we are not able to amend it, that this bill may never be passed into law. It means that training will be cut back substantially, it means that we could only train at the platoon level, that recruiting would have to be cut back. The Defense Department right now is working on a plan about what they would have to do because there is only four months left in the end of the fiscal year after we get back in June.

So I would urge the Members to vote against this rule. I will offer a motion to reconsider in the bill which will eliminate the offsets, and I think it is important that the Members of the House recognize the seriousness that this supplemental is in if it passes the House because there is a great danger that neither will be reconciled and that the Defense Department, because of the short time they have left, will lay off substantial numbers of civilian employees.

So I urge the Members to vote against this rule, come back with another rule where we can offer some amendments which will allow us to adjust the bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN).

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the Committee on Rules for making the amendment, the Neumann-McIntosh amendment, self-enacting in this rule. The amendment that we propose to this bill would simply say that if we spend money, if our generation is going to spend money on something useful and productive, that we have to pay the bill for it.

I have heard a lot of discussion out here today about whether or not this should be paid for, or offset, as we call it here in Washington. We need to all understand that the alternative is not simply that money is going to flow to here from heaven or some other way. The alternative to not paying for this bill is that we simply add it to the debt that is going to be passed on to our children.

I am not opposed to spending money for an emergency disaster relief bill. I think that most people in Wisconsin and most people in this country would look at a disaster situation and say we are willing to help the folks that have been hit by this disaster. I think that is common sense in America, and I think common decency in America would allow us to do that. The question is, when we spend the money to help those people where the disaster has occurred, do we offset that spending by reducing government spending elsewhere someplace in the budget, and that is really what is being debated here.

I heard a lot from the other side that we cannot do the offsets in the way they have been proposed, but I have heard very little about what we might do instead to reduce wasteful Washington or wasteful government spending someplace else. If somebody has got a better idea of how to reduce spending elsewhere so that we do not have to pass this additional expenditure on to our kids, I for one would certainly be listening.

But the bottom line is this: If our generation is going to spend money on something, on virtually anything, whether it be disaster relief or to pay for the fact that our President has forced our troops to stay in Bosnia or the Iraqi situation, when our generation spends that money, we do have a moral and ethical responsibility to pay for what we are spending.

Before 1995 nobody ever paid for these bills. They just simply spent the money, and it was tacked onto the amount of debt that we are going to pass on to our children. Since 1995 I am happy to say that has changed, and since 1995 every time one of these supplementals the has been proposed, at least in budget authority the spending has been offset. That is, we have paid attention to where the money is coming from.

Somehow in this city, in Washington, D.C., I get out here and there seems to be this huge disconnect between spending money and where the money is coming from. That money is coming from the taxpayers' pocket; it is not free.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the situation is that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has one more speaker, and he is going to yield to that speaker in a minute. I am going to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and then ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) to close for our side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Alan Greenspan has told us that we dare not break the budget caps, that the growing economy, interest rates, low inflation are because of that, that the balanced budget is a very important document that we bipartisanly worked on in this House. But if my colleagues take a look, we pay nearly a billion dollars a day on just the interest of the debt. That is before we pay for anything, one area.

Now some of us feel that those offsets, some offsets are good, but one cannot find any offsets in this body that people will agree on that is not painful, should it be National Endowment for the Arts, should it be AmeriCorps that costs $27,000 per volunteer, should it be such things as bilingual education, which over 72 percent of Californians want to get rid of because we are last in literacy, it has been in effect all this time.

But regardless, it is difficult, and we are going to have to make those kinds of decisions, but we feel that instead of going ahead and spending the money, which when we did not have the majority was the case for 30 years that put us into debt, then we have got to offset these and it is going to be painful.

I disagree with my own side on the housing issue; I think that is one area where we need to invest, but I would also say that Somalia was put there by the White House. The White House did Haiti without our input, they armed the Muslims in Bosnia without our

input, they kept us in Bosnia, $16 billion without any offsets or just increases in spending.

And so when we make these deployments, 300 percent uptempo increase for our military while it is about half the size, it means our kids are overseas and doing three times the work and we have a retention rate of our senior enlisted of only 24 percent. That means the quality. Our equipment is 1970s technology. I have got squadrons that have one or two airplanes left in the United States because their parts and all the equipment has got to be to the deployed units. And our kids are saying, ''Enough is enough, in a growing economy I can't hack this away from my family.''

We need to offset this. The fraud, waste and abuse in the military and other areas we need to eliminate, and it is going to be a difficult job, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) certainly the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) very much for the time.

Let us review why we are here. We have this legislation before us today because the President determined that we had an emergency with respect to Iraq; that we have an emergency need for additional funds to support our troops in Bosnia; that we have had a number of natural disasters around the country which require assistance to localities; we had a severe economic emergency facing the country because of the collapse of Asian currencies, something which will result in a huge trade deficit in this country which will close American factories and put American workers out of work; and that it was also time for us to pay the almost $1 billion in back dues that we owe the United Nations and its associated agencies.

The normal process under the budget rules is that, if the President declares an emergency and if Congress concurs, that these funds will be provided without offsets, on the theory, for instance, that if God decides that there is going to be a hurricane somewhere, he does not first have to check with the House of Representatives to make certain that his actions fit under our rules. Some people I guess disagree with that.

The response that we have had from the Congress and from the majority party leadership has been to insist that a number of large cuts in domestic programs be attached to the President's emergency request. And what has happened is that instead of dealing with this bill in an atmosphere of conciliation and partnership, instead we are facing an atmosphere of extreme confrontation as a result of that decision.

Now I believe there are 3 basic problems with the rule before us and with the legislation before us. First of all, it strips out of the bill any ability to deal with the economic crunch facing the country because of the disequilibrium between Asian currencies and our own. That is, in my view, the most serious economic problem faced by the country at this time. And yet we are not going to be allowed to do anything about that despite the fact that the President requested we do so on an emergency basis.

Secondly, this proposal blocks our consideration of 75 percent of the President's request for disaster assistance. That will mean that if we have one more major storm in summer, our ability to deal with emergency needs of communities will be gone, it will be eliminated, we will not have funds readily available to deal with those problems and we could face not only substantial delay in providing assistance to those communities, but they would also see the need for FEMA to take money from States who have already experienced disasters in order to try to deal with those emergency problems. That would slow down the recovery effort in States that are already receiving Federal funds.

Thirdly, it breaches the agreement of the budget deal last year which said that we would not raid domestic programs to pay for defense and we would not raid defense programs to pay for domestic, we would keep a fire wall between the two. This blows that away. Instead it says we are going to cut $2.2 billion in housing costs.

Now it was asserted by one Member on that side of the aisle that that will not cause a problem because these funds are not needed until next year. The fact is we do not just need $2.2 billion in funds next year in order to renew the contracts for subsidized housing for low-income citizens and the elderly. We need $10.8 billion in the budget next year for that purpose or else, if we do not provide that $10.8 billion, there are going to be millions of low-income people and senior citizens knocked out of their housing.

This bill takes 20 percent of that money and uses it for this purpose. That means if it is not replaced, if it is not replaced we will have 935,000 low-income Americans evicted from their supported housing, and one-third of those folks are elderly. I do not believe that is what America wants to see done.

This bill also terminates one of the President's favorite programs in a stick-it-in-your-eye response to the President, namely AmeriCorps.

It also cuts $75 million from bilingual education. I do not know about my colleagues' districts, but in my district I have thousands of Hmong refugees who do not even have a written language, who desperately need help in order to learn language, and I resent the fact that my local taxpayers are going to get stuck with the tab because the Federal Government will not meet its responsibilities in this area.

This reminds me of something an old friend of mine used to say when I served with him in the legislature, a fellow by the name of Harvey Dueholm who said, ''You know the problem in American politics is that all too often the poor and the rich get the same amount of ice, but the poor get theirs in the wintertime.''

□ 1300

That is what the Congress is doing by reshuffling priorities the way it is doing it here. I can find no rule, I can find no rule, which governs the debate for supplementals, I can find no rule that has ever in the past denied the minority an opportunity to offer an amendment to a supplemental appropriation. But that is what this rule does. That alone is reason enough for Members to turn it down.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, in its refusal to move ahead with the IMF, represents a reckless disregard for the future economic security needs of this country, and we ought not to ignore that problem today.

There is one other problem associated with the bill. I will be moving immediately after the rule to ask the House to go into executive session, that means secret session, to discuss a classified item in this bill.

The reason I need to do that is because last year this Congress made significant cuts in the intelligence programs of the country in order to pay for a number of projects not requested by the administration. The two major add-ons in the bill last year were a $700 million piece of pork for the Senate majority leader in Mississippi, and a $500 million piece of pork for the Speaker of the House in his home State of Georgia.

Now, this bill would make further domestic cuts in order to restore some of those intelligence fund reductions. Since that funding is contained in the classified portion of the bill, the House has to go into executive session to discuss this bait-and-switch strategy. So I will be making that motion at the end of consideration of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote ''no'' on the rule, to vote ''no'' on the gag rule, and to vote ''no'' on the bill. This is no way to establish bipartisan consensus. This is no way to establish a decent working relationship between the executive and legislative branches of government.

We need to try to find common ground between the two parties. I thought we had done that fairly well in the appropriations process last year, but apparently the confrontation artists in the majority caucus won the day, and so the rule today, instead of cooperation, is going to be confrontation. I think that is highly unfortunate. I think the best way to avoid needless confrontation is to turn down this rule and start over.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to Members in response to a procedural statement just made by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that there is no need

for the House to go into secret session, because the gentleman's complaint is about the offsets, not about the need for the intelligence matters.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, in 2 minutes I certainly do not have time to respond to all of the arguments I heard here today. I just want to remind Members that in the last 13 years, we have seen the investment in our national security go down dramatically every year, while at the same time spending on the other parts of the government was going up, up and up. So the argument that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has just made about domestic spending versus national security, I think Members should analyze that very closely before making that decision.

I was interested in the comment that our colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) made about not voting for the supplemental that provides for the balance of the year in Bosnia. I would say to the gentleman, whether you vote for that or not, the President is not going to bring those troops home at the end of June. We know that and the gentleman knows that.

The proof of the pudding is that in 5 years the President, without the approval of the Congress, has deployed troops to the area near Iraq, to Bosnia, to Somalia, to Rwanda, to Haiti and to a number of other places, without having the money in advance, and then he sent us the bill.

The problem is we did not appropriate any of this money up front, but we got the bill and we had to pay for it. And if we do not pay for those supplementals, and the biggest part of this defense supplemental, by the way, is not Bosnia, but for the deployment to the Southwest Asia area, but if we do not provide these funds that are already spent, we are going to have to stand down training.

Tomorrow is the beginning of the third quarter of this fiscal year. The Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps are all going to have to stand down training. They are not going to be able to get the spare parts that they need to keep the equipment working that is already being worn out. Our troops are being worn out because of these deployments.

There is no question we have to pay the bill in order to support our own troops. But we would be better served if we were to get the message to the President that before you start these major deployments that you will send us the bill for later on, you had better come to Congress and get some kind of support here, or at least some indication of whether you have the support or not.

Mr. Speaker, we will go into more of the details as we have more time as we debate the bill itself.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would urge a ''no'' vote on this rule.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 199, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—220

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

NAYS—199

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Baesler
Cannon
Davis (IL)
Gonzalez
Jefferson
Paxon
Payne
Rangel
Riggs
Royce
Waters

□ 1324

Mr. BERRY and Mr. MCHALE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. HEFLEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

MOTION THAT THE HOUSE RESOLVE ITSELF INTO SECRET SESSION

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, to enable the House to discuss an item in the classified annex to this bill, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves, pursuant to rule XXIX, that the House resolve itself into secret session, that the galleries of the House Chamber be cleared of all persons, and that the House Chamber be cleared of all persons except the Members of the House and those officers and employees specified by the Speaker whose attendance on the floor is essential to the functioning of the House and who subscribe to the notarized oath of confidentiality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) qualifies by citing rule XXIX that he has secret communications to make to the House.

The question is on the nondebatable motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 227, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

AYES—194

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—227

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

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra
Cannon
Gonzalez
Hoyer
Jefferson
Payne
Rangel
Riggs
Royce
Waters

☐ 1345

Mr. PICKERING changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 111

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JOHN PORTER) as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 111.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 3579) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

1998 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 402 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3579.

☐ 1348

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3579) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.