



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1995

No. 31

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker.

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 16, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable RAY LAHOOD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Teach us, O God, of the force of the words we say and the power of the statements that we make. May our expressions reflect the truth of what we mean and the reality of what we are endeavoring to communicate. Above all else, may what we say make a contribution to the common good and elevate all conversation to a level of respect and mutual consideration, so that our words bring harmony and understanding and healing and always reveal that we are Your people created by Your image. Bless us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN] will lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. QUINN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ORDER OF AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 7 in the Committee of the Whole, subject to the 10-hour limitation on debate, the following amendments be considered in the following order, with these amendments and all amendments thereto debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and Member opposed:

In title I, the McHale amendment, No. 47, for 2 minutes; in title III, the Hefley amendment, No. 5, for 10 minutes; the Harman amendment, No. 1, or the Menendez amendment, No. 2, for 16 minutes; in title IV, the Leach amendment, No. 32, for 20 minutes; in title V, amendments No. 13, 21, 24, 30, or 33, or germane modifications of one of those amendments for 36 minutes; the Johnson amendment, No. 31, for 5 minutes; the Traficant amendment, No. 49, for 5 minutes; in title VI, the Durbin amendment, No. 22, or the Gilman amendment, No. 23, for 10 minutes; the Bate-man amendment, No. 8, for 3 minutes; the Torricelli amendment, No. 48, or amendments Nos. 28 or 43 for 36 minutes; the Skelton amendment, No. 7, or the Spratt amendment, No. 42, for 2 minutes; the Engel amendment, as modified, for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL DEBATE TIME DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. VOLKMER. The unanimous-consent request is that the leader of both sides, Republican and Democratic leaders, be allowed 3 minutes each for debate on H.R. 7.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am taking the time to ask the gentleman if he could spell it out for us. Is that for debate purposes only?

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes. I said, for debate only.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Notwithstanding the time limitation?

Mr. BERMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have one question. I assume this is not within the 10-hour limit?

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. This is in addition to the other time. It does not come out of the time.

Mr. BERMAN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H1853

NATIONAL SECURITY
REVITALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 83 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 7.

□ 0905

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, February 15, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], as amended, had been disposed of, and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Three hours and fifty minutes remain for consideration of amendments under the 5-minute rule, pursuant to the order of the House today.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCHALE

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCHALE: Page 9, after line 21, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly):

(2) to provide for sufficient forces to meet the national security strategy of using forward-deployed and forward-based forces to promote regional stability, deter aggression, improve joint/combined operations among United States forces and allies, and ensure timely crisis response:

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE] will be recognized for 1 minute, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 1 minute.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE].

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the 1 minute.

My hope is there is no Member opposed.

This amendment is being offered with the consent and approval of the leadership on both sides. I particularly want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], for his agreement in allowing me to offer this amendment. I also want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that I offer this amendment with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], because on this issue, she and I absolutely see eye to eye.

Mr. Chairman, it was President Kennedy who said only when our strength is sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that it will never

be employed. This amendment simply says that we guarantee to particularly our naval forces the military resources necessary for peacetime deployment so that when a crisis occurs, when our Nation must quickly deploy forces into a combat theater, that the U.S. Navy and embarked forces will have the opportunity for crisis response. That is what the Navy typically does during peacetime.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and suggest perhaps a few comments from my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], would be appropriate at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek the 1 minute in opposition?

Hearing none, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] for 1 minute.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment with my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE].

As he stated, this just puts into this bill the policy that in order to provide sufficient forces to meet our national security strategy of using forward-deployed and forward-based forces to promote regional stability, that it is very important that we have this policy in our bill, because this is what our U.S. Navy does, and we want to make sure that this language is spelled out clearly in this bill.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor with my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. It is amendment No. 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEFLEY: Strike out section 309 (page 21, lines 19 through 22) and insert the following:

SEC. 309. FUNDING.

Funds for the activities of the Commission shall be made available to the Commission by the Secretary of Defense from funds appropriated for activities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as we marked up this bill in the National Security Committee, I had concerns about spending additional money on a commission. I did

not want an additional \$1.5 million being taken away from our troops.

The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], and his staff have worked diligently to calm my fears.

My amendment would simply state that the commission shall be paid for by funds appropriated for the Office of Secretary of Defense. This is appropriate since the Office of the Secretary of Defense is the one that generally has money to do studies of various kinds. It is also appropriate because these funds will not be coming out of training or readiness accounts, and I think that is the real key, Mr. Chairman, is that we do not want this money coming out of the hides of our fighting forces as we prepare them to meet whatever contingency is out there.

So we are asking that this come out of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. It is my understanding that the chairman is willing to accept this amendment, and I would ask support for the Hefley amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone seek recognition in opposition?

Ms. HARMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] for 5 minutes.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to the Hefley amendment.

First, let me thank my colleague for supporting an amendment I offered in the National Security Committee to strike the entire commission including its funding. I think that is the way to go, and in just a few minutes, my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], and I will offer an amendment again to do that.

I think the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] is correct in pointing out the \$1.5 million that would be appropriated for this commission should not come from new funds, nor should it come from existing funds. We should not spend it.

I am a supporter of the balanced budget amendment, as is he, and it is time to get serious about cutting out unnecessary funding. This is a point I made last night, too, as we made the difficult balance between more funds for national missile defense and readiness.

There is no free lunch, Mr. Chairman, and unfortunately this amendment would seem to be asking for one.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. I would like to again speak for the troops: \$1.5 million will take care of a lot of taking care of their homes, their roofs, their refrigerators, the bathrooms, the quality of life. It will take care of a lot of ammunition for them to shoot on the rifle

range. I think this is really a usurpation of our job here. The Constitution tells us we are in charge, not a commission.

I speak for the troops again.

Ms. HARMAN. I appreciate that. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I, too, oppose the Hefley amendment.

I think it is an obvious attempt to try to deflect from the upcoming amendment that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] and I are offering. The fact of the matter is \$1.5 million out of the taxpayers' money, wherever you do it, is still \$1.5 million out of the taxpayers' money, and it goes and flies against the spirit of the contract.

If you are for smaller government, you do not add another commission. If you are for less bureaucracy, you do not add another commission. If you are for less spending, you do not add another commission.

And so when we have the entire resources of the Congress, all the committees that review it, and ultimately the bottom-up review that has been had, the last thing we need to do is to continue to add another layer of bureaucracy, another \$1.5 million.

You can shift the costs. You can shift the costs, but ultimately it is coming out of the average taxpayer's pocket.

Vote against the Hefley amendment.

Ms. HARMAN. Reclaiming my remaining time, I will just say this, let us balance the budget. Let us vote "no" on the Hefley amendment.

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just, in response, point out that if the Office of the Secretary of Defense has \$5 million to buy Korean oil, they can certainly have the money to do this.

I think the question which we will be debating in a few minutes of whether or not the commission is appropriate is a different question.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

I think he made an interesting statement there with respect to Korean oil. It is my understanding we did make this major Korean oil purchase out of the purse, if you will, of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. It is a massive, massive pool of money. Is that right?

Mr. HEFLEY. It is, indeed. In fact, I think the figure is about \$80 million that they have for studies, and that kind of thing, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. I am not sure what the total budget is.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me offer to my friend that his idea that this comes out of the Secretary of Defense's office, I

think, is a good one, because the Secretary of Defense himself commissions literally dozens and dozens of studies from outside groups. That is where the term "Beltway Bandit," I think, came into being.

□ 0915

Those are all the thousands of consultants that live in this city that do studies, and we are going to get into the heart of this commission shortly. But \$1.5 million coming out of the OSD pot is going to be less, I understand, approximately 1 percent of that money that the Secretary has to run his office and to pay for commissions.

I think it is appropriate. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HEFLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Defense came before us, and he said, "I don't want this study. Leave me alone. I don't want to spend \$1.5 million." He did not want it. So why does the gentleman want to give it to him?

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield further, we are going to get into this. But the Secretary of Defense has some real problems. As my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], knows, my friend from Mississippi, who always has the interest of the troops at heart and was arguing passionately and eloquently last night for more readiness for troops, for more housing, the Secretary of Defense has to come before our committee every time and say, "I have enough." And we know that he does not have enough money. We know that GAO just did this report that says he is underfunded, his own plan, by \$150 billion. So we are going to get into the heart of this commission.

But my suggestion is the gentleman from Mississippi has a great tradition, has established a tradition a lot of us have followed of not always accepting everything the Secretary's office tells us, and having our own ideas.

I think this is going to help the Secretary to have some outside analysis on a number of these questions where there is so much difference in what the Secretary's position is and what other reliable agencies, like GAO, says. He and GAO were \$150 billion apart. I think it is appropriate to figure out why they have a big difference.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, if I might respond to my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], as well, the Secretary of Defense does not want 10 or 12 guard armories every year either. Yet I know the gentleman feels strongly about that, as many of us do. We have an oversight responsibility. Now, whether or not we need the commission, the argument for the commission is there is some question because of what the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER]

said about the Bottom-Up Review and whether that really is a clear picture, and how do we get a clear picture?

The answer in this bill is we get an independent kind of commission that can look.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield further?

Mr. HEFLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman once again.

What we ought to be doing is not closing these military bases, which comes under the gentleman's subcommittee. We ought to save this \$1.5 million in order to keep some of the bases open.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 180, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

AYES—211

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|-------------|
| Allard | Ehlers | Jones |
| Archer | Ehrlich | Kasich |
| Bachus | Emerson | Kelly |
| Baker (CA) | English | Kim |
| Baker (LA) | Ensign | King |
| Ballenger | Everett | Kingston |
| Barr | Ewing | Klug |
| Barrett (NE) | Fawell | Knollenberg |
| Bartlett | Fields (TX) | Kolbe |
| Barton | Flanagan | LaHood |
| Bass | Foley | Largent |
| Bateman | Forbes | Latham |
| Bereuter | Fowler | LaTourette |
| Bilirakis | Fox | Lazio |
| Bliley | Franks (CT) | Leach |
| Blute | Franks (NJ) | Lewis (CA) |
| Boehlert | Frelinghuysen | Lewis (KY) |
| Boehner | Frisa | Lightfoot |
| Bonilla | Funderburk | Lincoln |
| Bono | Galleghy | Linder |
| Brownback | Ganske | Livingston |
| Bryant (TN) | Gekas | LoBiondo |
| Bunn | Geren | Longley |
| Bunning | Gilchrest | Lucas |
| Burr | Gillmor | Manzullo |
| Burton | Gilman | Martini |
| Buyer | Goodlatte | McCollum |
| Callahan | Goodling | McCreery |
| Calvert | Goss | McHugh |
| Camp | Graham | McInnis |
| Canady | Greenwood | McIntosh |
| Castle | Gutknecht | McKeon |
| Chabot | Hancock | Metcalf |
| Chenoweth | Hansen | Mica |
| Christensen | Hastert | Miller (FL) |
| Chrysler | Hastings (WA) | Molinari |
| Clinger | Hayworth | Moorhead |
| Coble | Hefley | Myers |
| Combest | Heineman | Myrick |
| Cooley | Hilleary | Nethercutt |
| Crane | Hobson | Neumann |
| Crapo | Hoekstra | Ney |
| Creameans | Hoke | Norwood |
| Cubin | Horn | Nussle |
| Cunningham | Hostettler | Oxley |
| Davis | Houghton | Packard |
| DeLay | Hunter | Paxon |
| Diaz-Balart | Hutchinson | Petri |
| Dickey | Hyde | Pombo |
| Doolittle | Inglis | Porter |
| Dreier | Istook | Portman |
| Duncan | Johnson (CT) | Pryce |
| Dunn | Johnson, Sam | Quillen |

| | | |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| Quinn | Shays | Torkildsen |
| Radanovich | Shuster | Traficant |
| Ramstad | Smith (MI) | Upton |
| Riggs | Smith (NJ) | Waldholtz |
| Roberts | Smith (TX) | Walker |
| Rogers | Smith (WA) | Walsh |
| Rohrabacher | Solomon | Watts (OK) |
| Ros-Lehtinen | Souder | Weldon (FL) |
| Roth | Spence | Weldon (PA) |
| Royce | Stearns | Weller |
| Salmon | Stockman | White |
| Sanford | Stump | Whitfield |
| Saxton | Talent | Wicker |
| Schaefer | Tate | Wolf |
| Schiff | Taylor (NC) | Zeliff |
| Seastrand | Thomas | Zimmer |
| Sensenbrenner | Thornberry | |
| Shaw | Tiahrt | |

NOES—180

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Gibbons | Oliver |
| Ackerman | Gonzalez | Orton |
| Andrews | Gordon | Owens |
| Baesler | Gunderson | Pallone |
| Baldacci | Hall (OH) | Parker |
| Barcia | Hall (TX) | Pastor |
| Barrett (WI) | Hamilton | Payne (NJ) |
| Beilenson | Harman | Payne (VA) |
| Bentsen | Hayes | Pelosi |
| Berman | Hefner | Peterson (FL) |
| Bevill | Hilliard | Peterson (MN) |
| Bishop | Holden | Pickett |
| Bonior | Hoyer | Pomeroy |
| Borski | Jackson-Lee | Poshard |
| Boucher | Jacobs | Rahall |
| Brewster | Jefferson | Rangel |
| Browder | Johnson (SD) | Reed |
| Brown (CA) | Johnson, E. B. | Reynolds |
| Brown (FL) | Johnston | Rivers |
| Brown (OH) | Kanjorski | Roemer |
| Bryant (TX) | Kaptur | Roybal-Allard |
| Cardin | Kennedy (MA) | Rush |
| Clayton | Kennedy (RI) | Sabo |
| Clement | Kennelly | Sanders |
| Clyburn | Kildee | Sawyer |
| Coleman | Klink | Schroeder |
| Condit | LaFalce | Schumer |
| Conyers | Lantos | Scott |
| Costello | Laughlin | Serrano |
| Coyne | Levin | Sisisky |
| Cramer | Lipinski | Skaggs |
| Danner | Lofgren | Skelton |
| de la Garza | Lowey | Slaughter |
| Deal | Luther | Spratt |
| DeFazio | Maloney | Stark |
| DeLauro | Manton | Stenholm |
| Dellums | Markey | Stokes |
| Deutsch | Martinez | Studds |
| Dicks | Mascara | Stupak |
| Dingell | Matsui | Tanner |
| Doggett | McCarthy | Tauzin |
| Dooley | McDermott | Taylor (MS) |
| Doyle | McHale | Tejeda |
| Durbin | McKinney | Thompson |
| Edwards | McNulty | Thurman |
| Engel | Meehan | Torricelli |
| Eshoo | Meek | Towns |
| Evans | Menendez | Tucker |
| Farr | Miller (CA) | Velazquez |
| Fazio | Mineta | Vento |
| Fields (LA) | Minge | Visclosky |
| Filner | Mink | Volkmer |
| Flake | Mollohan | Ward |
| Foglietta | Montgomery | Watt (NC) |
| Ford | Moran | Williams |
| Frank (MA) | Murtha | Wise |
| Frost | Nadler | Woolsey |
| Furse | Neal | Wyden |
| Gejdenson | Oberstar | Wynn |
| Gephardt | Obey | Yates |

NOT VOTING—43

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|-------------|
| Armey | Gutierrez | Roukema |
| Becerra | Hastings (FL) | Scarborough |
| Bilbray | Heger | Shadegg |
| Chambliss | Hinche | Skeen |
| Chapman | Klecza | Thornton |
| Clay | Lewis (GA) | Torres |
| Coburn | McDade | Vucanovich |
| Collins (GA) | Meyers | Wamp |
| Collins (IL) | Mfume | Waters |
| Collins (MI) | Moakley | Waxman |
| Cox | Morella | Wilson |
| Dixon | Ortiz | Young (AK) |
| Dornan | Regula | Young (FL) |
| Fattah | Richardson | |
| Green | Rose | |

□ 0937

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Arney for, with Mr. Lewis of Georgia against.

Mr. Scarborough for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Messrs. GILCHREST, NEY, BUYER, and MCINTOSH changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So, the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably delayed, and I did not record my vote on rollcall No. 140. Had I been here, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, this morning I was attending an event away from Capitol Hill to which I had been committed before the change in meeting time of the House to 9 a.m. Unfortunately, when the bells rang for the vote on the Hefley amendment, I was unable to return in time and I would therefore ask that the RECORD reflect that I would have voted "yes" on the Hefley amendment to H.R. 7.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider the amendment to be offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HARMAN

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. HARMAN: Strike title III (page 13, line 1, through page 2), line 2..

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] will be recognized for 8 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 8 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

My colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] and I are offering an amendment today that every deficit hawk should love. Balanced budget supporters should unite around it because it would strike a section of this bill, title 3, which would establish an Advisory Commission on National Security Revitalization that we simply do not need.

Let me make three quick points:

First, the commission is a waste of money. Even if we reprogram the money, its timetable is absurdly short, and its \$1.5 million estimated budget wastes taxpayer funds that could be better spent on readiness or quality of life for our troops and their families.

In comparison to other Government expenditures, \$1.5 million is not much. However, the challenge is for all of us

in this economic environment to reduce wasteful Government expenditures, not increase them. If we are serious about balancing the budget, this money must not be spent.

Second, the commission usurps the responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the congressional defense committees. Defense Secretary Perry emphatically stated that, "the proposed commission usurps the responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense." At the same time this independent commission would interfere with the ability of the Committee on National Security to fulfill its responsibilities. Secretary Perry also correctly advised that we should not dilute the responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense by turning a key part of them over to an independent commission.

Third, the commission is redundant. I am holding up a list prepared by supporters of this commission. This 2-page list prepared by supporters of this commission shows 14 other commissions that are already doing work on overlapping subjects. This commission would duplicate tasks of the Rolls Admission Commission, the Quality of Life Task Force, the Reserve Forces Policy Board, the Task Force on Readiness, among others. It is a waste of time and money.

To sum up, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the recent comment of a senior member of the other body who said, "the commission is a real loser."

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] for 8 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment despite my admiration for the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] in her leadership role on the Committee on National Security.

Why do we need this commission Mr. Chairman? Well, let us look at the facts as they are.

We have a Secretary of Defense who tells us we need one fund level for the defense needs over the next 5 years. We have the General Accounting Office tell us, no, we need \$150 billion more than what the Secretary said. We have the Congressional Budget Office saying, no, we need \$67 billion more than what the Secretary said. And then we have one of the most respected Members of the minority side, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], saying, no, we need \$44 billion more over the next 5 years.

□ 0945

No one knows what we need over the next 5 years.

Now, some would say let us let the Secretary go back and tell us. We know what he is going to tell us. He is going to tell us what he already told us, we are OK the way we are, which if I talk to almost every member of the minority party on the Committee on National Security, they will agree with us. They do not think there is enough money in there. What we are saying is we need an independent commission to look at that.

Now, we are not saying a political commission, because we adjusted the makeup and markup process to suit the needs of the minority to make sure it would be six Democrats and six Republicans appointees, and that is in fact what this commission will be, a bipartisan effort to come back to us and give us the real needs in terms of dollars and in line with the problems and challenges that are out there in the next 5 years.

Some of our colleagues are saying this will be a money saver. You want to save money? Boy, we will give you a list. Look at what the President put out. A nice glossy color brochure in two-part form entitled "A Time for Peace." Save money? Eliminate that garbage. We do not need it. It is a total waste of money. Eliminate the L.A. Youth programs in the defense bill, \$10 million. How about electric vehicles? Believe it or not, it is in the defense bill, \$15 million. Cancer research, even though it is important, I would support it if it were part of the health bill, over \$200 million. This commission does not take away the authority of the Secretary. It lets us play our rightful role.

Now, let us look at what the minority party did when they were in power. These are just a few of the commissions that the minority party put into place, in many cases, in most cases, over the objections of the then Secretary of Defense. Everything from women in the military to bottom-up review, total force structure, everything you can think of established through an independent commission, in some instances where the commissioners were actually paid.

In this piece of legislation, no commissioner is paid. The only expenses involved will be those incurred, and they will be reimbursed for that. We are not taking the money from readiness; we are taking the money from the Secretary of Defense's account. What part of it? He will have a few less lunches, a little less money to go on trips overseas maybe. That is where it will come from.

So this in fact is a vote to let us play our rightful role and to see where we in fact can go in terms of the spending needs of the military for the next 5 years, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the Harman amendment and to support the need for the establishment of this.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, does this commission you want established have any authority; can it do anything?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. The commission has the same authority these commissions had, which is basically to come back to Congress and do what the Secretary has not been able to do, and that is give us the straight scoop on what our defense needs are.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. He is a good Secretary.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. A Secretary being misled by an administration that does not support the facts.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The commission does nothing. He does not want it. He is not being misled.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. The Secretary would like to have it, because it would end up supporting his needs for additional money for readiness that his President will not give in to because he pulls his defense budget number out of the air, as you know.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, is this not something? They did it when they were in power, so we can do it. They did it, so we can do it. Let us get serious. Here we are creating a commission to spend money to figure out how we are going to spend more money. We pass a balanced budget amendment, we talk about downsizing Government, we talk about reinventing Government. And what are we doing here today? Let us create a political commission, because we do not want to do our jobs.

We in Congress do not want to do our jobs on the Committee on National Security. We do not want to hold the Secretary of Defense back. Get real, If we are going to cut the size of Government, we cannot begin to create more commissions, created by politicians to appoint politicians to have more partisan rhetoric. National security is more important than partisan politics. This commission is a joke and everyone in the country knows it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, there is an enormous discrepancy between our own institution, the GAO and the Secretary of Defense's office. The GAO says the secretary of Defense has underfunded his own budget by \$150 billion. The Chief of Staff of the Army has made statements to the effect that the Army is on the razor's edge of readiness, meaning they cannot cut another dime, that they are in very difficult shape. General Mundy, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, June 1994, last year, said that the Marine Corps was inadequately funded to carry out the President's own Bottom-Up Re-

view requirements. So we have questions all over the place.

If you are satisfied with the \$150 billion difference in funding projections, then vote no on this commission. If you are not satisfied, vote yes. We still authorize, we still legislate. But we are not going to say we refuse to see the evidence. Let us let this commission come up and try to resolve this \$150 billion difference.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS], a great deficit hawk.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, here is why the Harman-Menendez amendment makes sense. When we go back to our districts this afternoon, if we stood in line at the supermarket this weekend, and we had to say to the person next to us "I am going to take \$20 out of your pocket to pay for this program," could we look them in the eye and tell them they were getting their \$20 worth for this program?

What would we tell them when they said, "Congressman, there were 14 other of these commissions that were supposed to do something like the same thing." What would we tell them when they say, "Congressman, do you not have committees already set up in the House and Senate supposed to do the same thing?" I do not have a good answer to that, and I think neither do you.

Let me just say this to my friends from the other side: Part of your Contract With America is to shed lockstep allegiance to partisan leadership and to do the right thing. The right thing is to vote for Harman-Menendez.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that the reason we are setting up this commission is to reveal the flaws in the previous commission that was set up, the Bottom-Up Review, and point out how wrong it was. That is simply what is going to be. In other words, how can the other side say it is all right for them to have a commission set up and for us not to do the same thing?

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing how we can debate an issue of \$1.5 billion and interject all the rhetoric as if it is \$1.5 billion. Well, gentleman that have particular defense contractors in their districts may be asking for particular things, but come to the House floor and then want to talk about what things are particular, what things are a joke, and what is not a joke.

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

Mr. BUYER. No, not at this particular time. If you became sensitive, that is your particular problem.

In regard to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], I have great respect for you, and you have been a hawk with us on a lot of issues. But on this particular issue I am in agreement with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

The Bottom-Up Review became suspect. It became suspect because of how it came about. We have talked about this on the Committee on National Security often. And that is, and I have to say it again, when Bush-Powell put together the numbers for defense cuts, they cut the \$50 billion. Les Aspin said I can go \$60 billion further on top of the \$50 billion. Then all of a sudden Bill Clinton is a candidate for President, endorses Les Aspin's \$60 billion in cuts. None of us were surprised when Les Aspin became the Secretary of Defense. Low and behold, when we did the 5-year budget resolution, it was \$127, \$128 billion, on top of the existing \$50 billion.

Then all of a sudden, quickly, to cover themselves, Les Aspin comes to our committee and talks about having to do the Bottom-Up Review, a review of how to justify the numbers after the fact. That then made the Bottom-Up Review a very politically suspect document, and those of us then in the committee of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] last year then had to deal with the difficult decisions about the open secret in this town.

The open secret is, my friends, and to those in our country, it is that we do not have a force structure to even meet the national security objectives and being able to fight and win two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts.

So what we are saying is right now, time out. Let us not deal with the politics. Let us have the independent commission to give a real assessment. I understand the politics between the White House and the Secretary, and those are the chiefs that must salute constitutionally.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUYER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the compliment and thank the gentleman for it. I would just say this: That our committee and its composition are competent to do what you are suggesting. Why do we need to interpose a commission between us and the policymakers and the executive branch? Why do not we do this ourselves?

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we have many advisory committees and task forces to help us through the process, and that is exactly what this is. I think it is an excellent compliment to how we want to govern.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] has 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the Republican Contract on America mandates Congress to spend \$1.5 million on a new commission to study our Nation's military needs. Great. A new idea for more government. Do not we already have people studying the Nation's military needs and reporting to the legislative branch and the executive branch? Is not that what the Pentagon does? Is not that what the House Committee on Armed Services under the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman SPENCE, has been doing? Is not that what the Committee on International Relations has been doing under the gentleman from New York, Chairman GILMAN?

Why do we need to spend \$1.5 million on a commission to do what the Pentagon and Congress already should be doing and already are doing? Why do we need to spend money so we can find ways to spend more money? It is the full employment act for unemployed defense consultants. It is a bad idea. Vote for the Menendez-Harman amendment.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], one of the most honorable and impressive Members of this House, and the ranking member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, let me make one point of why I oppose this commission. It is not just that it is something we can do. The Framers of the Constitution gave us this responsibility. From time to time, Mr. Chairman, it is wholly appropriate that we establish commissions to engage until giving their expertise with respect to discrete items. This commission goes far beyond that. This commission attempts to establish the totality of our national security policy.

Set up a commission on roles and missions. But this is something far beyond that. We are being paid, my colleagues, in excess of \$130,000 per annum to do this job fundamentally required by the Constitution of the United States. The Framers of the Constitution said do your job. Do not give it to an independent commission for the purposes of establishing the totality of our national security policy. That is our job.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], the cosponsor of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, if the Contract With America means any-

thing, it means we do not want to waste the taxpayers' money by establishing an unneeded commission to tell us what Republicans both in the bill and on their language on the floor already know they wanted to save. The amendment we offer seeks to strike this unnecessary money for the taxpayers. Whether you spend it out of the Secretary of Defense's budget or through an appropriation, it is still taxpayers' money, and I challenge my Republican colleagues to honor your contract vows to cut wasteful spending, to cut bureaucracy, to make Government smaller and eliminate the commission.

During the last Congress, the House of Representatives spent nearly \$20 million on the budgets of congressional committees with oversight over this issue—Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, Government Operations, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Do you think you can tell the constituents back home that \$20 million was not enough? And if you add the Members who in fact have served on those committees and who have great experience, offer 200 Members, it comes to \$40 million in the House alone, without the Senate. If that is not enough to determine what it is that we need for national defense and security, I do not know what is. And as it relates to the secretary, let us hear what he had.

So to say. He said, "You are my commission," meaning the committee. "I do not need an independent commission interposing itself between myself and you, and you do not need to have an independent commission interposing yourself with me."

If you want to vote for smaller Government, if you want to have less spending, if you want to have less bureaucracy, if you want to save the taxpayers money, you will be voting yes on this amendment, you will vote for the Harman-Menendez amendment, and in fact you will be living with the Contract.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 211, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

AYES—207

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|------------|
| Abercrombie | Barrett (WI) | Bonior |
| Ackerman | Barton | Borski |
| Andrews | Beilenson | Boucher |
| Bachus | Bentsen | Brewster |
| Baesler | Berman | Browder |
| Baker (LA) | Bevill | Brown (CA) |
| Baldacci | Bishop | Brown (FL) |
| Barcia | Blute | Brown (OH) |

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Brownback | Johnson (SD) | Peterson (MN) |
| Bryant (TX) | Johnson, E. B. | Petri |
| Cardin | Johnson | Pickett |
| Clayton | Kanjorski | Pomerooy |
| Clement | Kaptur | Porter |
| Clyburn | Kennedy (MA) | Poshard |
| Coleman | Kennedy (RI) | Rahall |
| Collins (IL) | Kildee | Ramstad |
| Condit | Klecza | Rangel |
| Coyne | Klink | Reed |
| Cramer | Klug | Reynolds |
| Danner | LaFalce | Richardson |
| de la Garza | Lantos | Rivers |
| Deal | Laughlin | Roemer |
| DeFazio | Leach | Rose |
| DeLauro | Levin | Roth |
| Dellums | Lincoln | Roybal-Allard |
| Deutsch | Lipinski | Rush |
| Dicks | Lofgren | Sabo |
| Dingell | Lowey | Sanders |
| Dixon | Luther | Sanford |
| Doggett | Maloney | Sawyer |
| Dooley | Manton | Schroeder |
| Doyle | Markey | Schumer |
| Duncan | Martinez | Scott |
| Durbin | Martini | Sensenbrenner |
| Edwards | Mascara | Serrano |
| Engel | Matsui | Sisisky |
| Eshoo | McCarthy | Skaggs |
| Evans | McDermott | Skelton |
| Farr | McHale | Slaughter |
| Fattah | McKinney | Smith (MI) |
| Fazio | McNulty | Spratt |
| Fields (LA) | Meehan | Stark |
| Filner | Meek | Stenholm |
| Flake | Menendez | Stokes |
| Foglietta | Miller (CA) | Studds |
| Ford | Mineta | Stupak |
| Frank (MA) | Minge | Tanner |
| Frelinghuysen | Mink | Tauzin |
| Frost | Moakley | Taylor (MS) |
| Furse | Mollohan | Tejeda |
| Gejdenson | Montgomery | Thompson |
| Gephardt | Moran | Thurman |
| Gibbons | Morella | Torres |
| Gonzalez | Murtha | Torricelli |
| Gordon | Nadler | Towns |
| Gunderson | Neal | Tucker |
| Hall (OH) | Oberstar | Velazquez |
| Hall (TX) | Obey | Vento |
| Hamilton | Olver | Visclosky |
| Harman | Ortiz | Volkmer |
| Hayes | Orton | Ward |
| Hefner | Owens | Waters |
| Hilliard | Pallone | Watt (NC) |
| Hinchey | Parker | Waxman |
| Holden | Pastor | Wise |
| Hoyer | Payne (NJ) | Woolsey |
| Jackson-Lee | Payne (VA) | Wyden |
| Jacobs | Pelosi | Wynn |
| Jefferson | Peterson (FL) | Yates |

NOES—211

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Allard | Collins (GA) | Gallegly |
| Archer | Combest | Ganske |
| Baker (CA) | Cooley | Gekas |
| Ballenger | Costello | Geren |
| Barr | Cox | Gilchrest |
| Barrett (NE) | Crane | Gillmor |
| Bartlett | Crapo | Gilman |
| Bass | Cremeans | Goodlatte |
| Bateman | Cubin | Goodling |
| Bereuter | Cunningham | Goss |
| Bilbray | Davis | Graham |
| Bilirakis | DeLay | Greenwood |
| Bliley | Diaz-Balart | Gutknecht |
| Boehlert | Dickey | Hancock |
| Boehner | Doolittle | Hansen |
| Bonilla | Dornan | Hastert |
| Bono | Dreier | Hastings (WA) |
| Bryant (TN) | Dunn | Hayworth |
| Bunn | Ehlers | Hefley |
| Bunning | Ehrlich | Heineman |
| Burr | Emerson | Heger |
| Burton | English | Hilleary |
| Buyer | Ensign | Hobson |
| Callahan | Everett | Hoekstra |
| Calvert | Ewing | Hoke |
| Camp | Fawell | Horn |
| Canady | Fields (TX) | Hostettler |
| Castle | Flanagan | Houghton |
| Chabot | Foley | Hunter |
| Chambliss | Forbes | Hutchinson |
| Chenoweth | Fowler | Hyde |
| Christensen | Fox | Inglis |
| Chrysler | Franks (CT) | Istook |
| Clinger | Franks (NJ) | Johnson (CT) |
| Coble | Frisa | Johnson, Sam |
| Coburn | Funderburk | Jones |

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Kasich | Myrick | Smith (WA) |
| Kelly | Nethercutt | Solomon |
| Kim | Neumann | Souder |
| King | Ney | Spence |
| Kingston | Norwood | Stearns |
| Knollenberg | Nussle | Stockman |
| Kolbe | Oxley | Stump |
| LaHood | Packard | Talent |
| Largent | Paxon | Tate |
| Latham | Pombo | Taylor (NC) |
| LaTourette | Portman | Thomas |
| Lazio | Pryce | Thornberry |
| Lewis (CA) | Quillen | Tiahrt |
| Lewis (KY) | Quinn | Torkildsen |
| Lightfoot | Radanovich | Traficant |
| Linder | Regula | Upton |
| Livingston | Riggs | Vucanovich |
| LoBiondo | Rogers | Waldholtz |
| Longley | Rohrabacher | Walker |
| Lucas | Ros-Lehtinen | Walsh |
| Manzullo | Roukema | Wamp |
| McCollum | Royce | Watts (OK) |
| McCreery | Salmon | Weldon (FL) |
| McDade | Saxton | Weldon (PA) |
| McHugh | Scarborough | Weller |
| McInnis | Schaefer | White |
| McIntosh | Schiff | Whitfield |
| McKeon | Seastrand | Wicker |
| Metcalf | Shadegg | Williams |
| Meyers | Shaw | Wolf |
| Mica | Shays | Young (FL) |
| Miller (FL) | Shuster | Zeliff |
| Molinar | Skeen | Zimmer |
| Moorhead | Smith (NJ) | |
| Myers | Smith (TX) | |

NOT VOTING—16

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|------------|
| Armey | Green | Roberts |
| Becerra | Gutierrez | Thornton |
| Chapman | Hastings (FL) | Wilson |
| Clay | Kennelly | Young (AK) |
| Collins (MI) | Lewis (GA) | |
| Conyers | Mfume | |

□ 1016

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Army for, with Mr. Lewis of Georgia against.

Mrs. ROUKEMA and Mr. WILLIAMS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ROTH, WARD, and LAUGHLIN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I was unfortunately detained in my congressional district in Baltimore earlier today and thus forced to miss two record votes. Specifically, I was not present to record my vote on rollcall vote No. 140, the amendment offered by Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado and rollcall vote No. 141, the amendment offered by Ms. HARMAN of California.

Had I been here I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 140 and "yea" on rollcall No. 141.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, on vote No. 141 I am recorded as voting "no." My intention was to vote in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House previously agreed to, it is now in order to consider the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEACH

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEACH: On page 28, strike line 4 and all that follows through line 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(g) INTERPRETATION.—Subject to the power of the Congress to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution of the United States, nothing in this section shall be construed to derogate or limit the authority of the President as Commander-in-Chief of the United States Armed Forces under article II, section 2, clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States."

Beginning on page 28, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 29, line 2.

ON page 29, line 3, strike "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)"

□ 1020

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This is a self-explanatory amendment. It is designed to protect the constitutional authority and responsibility of the President as Commander in Chief from unprecedented and improper congressional tampering with the separation of powers doctrine.

The Commander in Chief clause of the Constitution supports two key policy precepts. First, it gives the President broad authority to command the military forces of the United States, thereby securing civilian command over the military. Second, and most relevant to this debate, the framers also sought to ensure that one commander had sole authority to direct the Nation's fighting forces.

The colonists had learned the difficulties of prosecuting war via committee during the American Revolution. Naming the President Commander in Chief was intended to assure consistent orders, plans, and decisions.

The President was not given the authority to make the political decision to declare war, but he was granted the authority to command the troops in day-to-day operations.

In its present form, this bill, with unbridled gall, undercuts the separation of powers doctrine by limiting the well-established constitutional authority of the President to decide upon the command arrangements for U.S. military personnel.

Title IV, for instance, attempts to prevent the expenditure of funds for any element—even an individual soldier—of U.S. Armed Forces under the command or operational control of a foreign national acting on behalf of the United Nations unless certain commitments are made to Congress.

As a matter of constitutional law, I believe that the Constitution does not permit the President to derogate his power as Commander in Chief to another body. Period. Certification requirements are inappropriate; indeed, they are constitutionally unseemly.

Here, let me stress, there is a distinction between U.S. command, which no President can give up, and operational control, which both constitutionally and as a matter of established military practice, the President may delegate to others.

Yet this bill brazenly attempts to strip the President of his constitutional authority and responsibility for deciding upon the command arrangements for U.S. military personnel lawfully participating in U.N. operations.

Indeed, this bill would deny the President the authority to place U.S. troops under the operational control of another country even a NATO ally for U.N. operations.

In this regard, a fair reading of the Constitution and any understanding of history suggests that the Commander-in-Chief should properly retain the flexibility to place troops temporarily under the operational control of officers of another nation when it serves U.S. interests, as we have done in a number of military conflicts since the American Revolution.

Accordingly, my amendment strikes the existing interpretation section found on page 28 of title IV to the bill and inserts instead a new clause recognizing that subject to the power of the Congress under article I of the Constitution to declare war, nothing in this section of the bill shall be construed to derogate or limit the President's article II powers as Commander-in-Chief.

Title IV, as currently crafted, is poor constitutional law; it is also doubtful policy.

The principle of collective security has been a linchpin of U.S. national security policy of every administration since Franklin Roosevelt.

The effect of title IV, unless amended, is to diminish U.S. leadership in the U.N. and elsewhere and force Presidents in emergency settings to either do nothing or rely exclusively on unilateral actions.

At issue is whether we want to be the policeman for the world or the leading member of an international highway patrol. The second option, in more than a few instances, is more realistic and, I might add, cheaper.

So that there is no misunderstanding, this title is more constraining than the War Powers Resolution.

The War Powers Resolution, passed over President Nixon's veto, deals with Congressional assertions of power to declare war.

Because of modern practices of prosecuting but not declaring war, the war powers resolution was offered to check the President's authority as Commander-in-Chief to direct U.S. Armed Forces in the event of imminent hostilities which might lead to war.

But this bill goes beyond the reach of the war powers resolution by attempting to trench upon and limit the command authority of the President before hostilities are threatened and in instances of actions designed to deter conflict rather than lead to war.

On this point, let me quote from a recent Wall Street Journal editorial:

Yes we should check the exorbitant costs of U.N. peacekeeping by rectifying the ac-

counting and limiting the U.S. share of the burden. But diminishing the legitimate powers of the presidency, even in this particular way, is poor precedent.

In the background of this debate is Somalia. In this Members' view it is a widely misunderstood circumstance. In earlier debate on this bill the minority pointed out that the problem was not command and control of U.S. Armed Forces, in that U.S. military personnel at all points were under U.S. command. This is true, but it begs the larger policy questions.

What happened in Somalia, and it was by no means a totally failed operation, was that President Bush called upon the U.S. military to take part in one of the most idealistic foreign policy interventions in the history of the world. The U.S. military because of its extraordinary organization and logistic capabilities was sent to a foreign country to feed a people whose social infrastructure had broken down. In a high-risk environment, a succeeding U.S. administration chose out of frustration to take sides in a civil war. This decision, made without intellectual rigor, profoundly changed American policy because it caused United States forces in the field to become diverted from the professionalism of their original mission and enmeshed in the history and sociology of internal Somalian politics.

Responsibility for the change of mission rests in the White House. This Congress has every reason in retrospect to be critical, but care should be taken to hold decision-makers, not the system, accountable. What is warranted is consideration of the need for new leadership, not a change in the constitutional framework of decision-making.

The character of modern international affairs is that decision need to be made quickly. What, for instance, would happen if when Congress was out of session a peace agreement were signed between Israel and Syria which included United States participation in peacekeeping in the Golan? Would a President be hamstrung by legal niceties in authorizing the movement of several hundred U.S. troops?

More consequentially, the character of modern Congressional politics is an unwillingness to share accountability with the executive branch. I don't know which is more remarkable: the fact Congress barely authorized the gulf war, giving President Bush much less of a mandate than he received from assorted rivals in the Security Council, or the fact that Congress almost didn't vote at all. The obvious conclusion that has been reached in modern Congresses is that there are no liabilities in standing by and many for taking sides in controversial questions of foreign affairs. Congress simply can't be relied on to share executive authority. Our Founding Fathers had it right then and now.

Finally, a personal note. When I signed the Contract With America last fall, I publicly made clear that I dif-

fered with several parts, particularly that which applied to a prospective bill on this subject. The Republican commitment was to raise the issues of the contract in a measured way. But the oath we all take is to uphold the Constitution. Just because we have little confidence in this President, just because we now control the Congress is insufficient rationale to turn the Constitution upside down.

A strong Presidency is in the national interest whether or not we have divided government.

Let's be measured and reasonable. I urge adoption of this amendment which conforms this title to constitutional stricture, historical experience, and the requirements of future national security.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska rises in strong opposition to the Leach amendment. It is not what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] adds that is the problem. It is what he deletes. As the gentleman may recall, I did something like this in the committee without success, but without deleting language. The amendment would take out of the statement in section 401 the phrase "that nothing in this section may be construed, one, as authority for the President to use any element of the Armed Forces in any operation, two as authority for the President to place any element of the Armed Forces under the command and operational control of a foreign national, or, three, as an unconstitutional infringement on the authority of the President as Commander in Chief."

The third element in this phrase is exactly what the Committee on National Security added to assure that we are not infringing upon the constitutional rights of the President as Commander in Chief.

Without these statements, it would be argued that section 401 is intended by Congress as a grant of authority to the President to place U.S. forces under foreign operational control in those circumstances where it has not been forbidden. I for one do not ever want my vote on this legislation to be criticized as a vote in favor of authorizing the President to place U.S. forces under foreign command. It is to ensure that our approval of this measure is never interpreted as an authorization of foreign command that this language is found in section 401. But the Leach amendment will delete it. He will also delete the report requirement which is in a following subsection.

I would point out that this report language is not a gratuitous requirement. There is a serious question whether foreign command arrangements can ever be constitutional.

A recent article in the Washington Times by distinguished former officials in the U.S. Justice Department, Mr. Casey and Mr. Rivkin, set forth the constitutional problems with foreign command, and I will add that op-ed piece for the RECORD.

The reporting requirements which the amendment would delete provide us further insulation from the charge that we are authorizing something in section 401 that is unconstitutional.

□ 1030

I would say to the gentleman respectfully that his arguments, while learned, do not go to what the gentleman is really doing through his amendment, because what the Armed Services Committee or National Security Committee has done is put in the phrase to assure that we are not violating the constitutional powers of the President, again it is the following:

Nothing in this section may be construed as an unconstitutional infringement on the authority of the President as commander in chief.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Leach amendment.

(The article referred to follows:)

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 30, 1995]
CONGRESS, THE PRESIDENT AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Lee A. Casey and David B. Rivkin Jr.)

When American troops began to arrive in France in 1917, the Allied High Command demanded that they be immediately assigned to fill the gaps (created by the kaiser's machine guns and the Allies' own idiocy) in the French and British formations on the Western Front.

Gen. John "Black" Jack Pershing said no. As commander of the American Expeditionary Force, he insisted that American troops would fight under American officers, in American formations, pursuant to the direction of the American president. American troops were in Europe as the representatives of a great power, fighting to make the world safe for democracy, not as modern-day Hesians.

Pershing's decision was both politically wise and constitutionally correct. It is a precedent that has been honored in the observance more than the breach, and Sen. Bob Dole would like to keep it that way. The new Senate majority leader is so concerned with President Clinton's affection for U.N. peace-keeping missions (and suggestions that American troops may actually be assigned to serve under U.N. commanders) that he has introduced legislation to require congressional approval of any such arrangement.

Ironically, Mr. Dole's bill—S. 5 the "Peace Powers Act of 1995"—has provoked criticism from usually sympathetic quarters. For example, The Washington Times suggested that the bill would unwisely limit the president's power to deploy American troops as necessary around the world. More broadly, a number of senior Republicans (including former Secretary of State James Baker) have admonished the Republican-controlled Congress not to continue their Democrat predecessors' destructive policy of interfering with the president's foreign policy powers. In principle, these admonitions are well-

placed. However, as applied to S.5, they miss the mark.

Mr. Dole's bill might well tie the president's hands in certain instances, but it does not interfere with his constitutional prerogatives. In fact, Mr. Dole's instinct—to try to limit the president's ability to place American troops under foreign command—is constitutionally sound, and the bill has much to recommend it. As a start, it would repeal the War Powers Resolution, replacing that provision's constitutionally impermissible limits on the president's use of American forces abroad with simple consultation and reporting requirements.

Contrary to the claims of its critics, the bill's major flaw is not that it would prohibit the president from assigning American forces to U.N. command, but that it purports to allow such arrangements if Congress gives its consent. Under the Constitution the president does not have the authority, either as commander-in-chief or as chief executive, to subordinate American troops to foreign command—and Congress cannot vest him with that authority.

The president's authority as chief executive to make foreign policy is broad (in the Curtiss-Wright Export case the Supreme Court called it "plenary"), and the Constitution admits of few limits on his ability to command the armed forces as commander in chief. The Supreme Court also has made clear that these powers are at their height when the president acts with the specific authorization of Congress. These powers are not, however, entirely without limit. (It was not the Framers' habit to grant absolute power, with respect to any subject, to any branch of government.) In this instance, the president's authority over the armed forces (and the authority of Congress) is limited by the Constitution's requirement that anyone exercising the legal authority of the United States must be an "officer" of the United States, appointed in accordance with the "Appointments Clause."

The Constitution's Appointments Clause (Article II, section 2, clause 2) provides that the president "shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States." Congress may vest the authority to appoint less important or "inferior" officers in the president alone, the courts of law, or with the heads of federal agencies. "Principal" officers, however, must be appointed by the president with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Supreme Court made clear in the landmark case of Buckley vs. Valeo that only individuals appointed in accordance with this provision may exercise "significant" federal authority.

Although the Appointments Clause is more often analyzed in terms of civilian appointments, it is fully applicable to military appointments—a point the Supreme Court reaffirmed only last term in a case styled Weiss vs. United States. Indeed, it is difficult to think of a more significant federal authority than the right to command American troops and, unlike the civilian service, Congress has required that even very junior military officers be appointed by and with the consent of the Senate. Neither the president nor Congress can waive the applicability of the Appointments Clause. As a result, no individual, whether the secretary general of the United Nations or a U.N. commander in the field, who is not a properly appointed officer of the United States can direct the actions of American troops.

There have, of course, been instances when American troops did indeed serve under foreign command. Pershing himself was forced

to relent—for a time—in the face of a massive German offensive, and allow American troops to serve under Allied command. GIs also fought—again for a time—under British Field Marshal Montgomery during World War II. These are, however, exceptions to the rule, expedients undertaken in the very gravest circumstances of world war. Such instances do not alter the Constitution's clear requirement that only officers of the United States may command U.S. troops; that document cannot be amended by its own violation. Nor do they justify further violation of the Constitution's requirements.

Naturally, there are many possible arrangements for cooperation with the United Nations, and between American and allied troops on the ground, that would not violate the Appointments Clause. A prime example is NATO's practice, where the Supreme Allied Commander Europe—the Alliance's top military officer—has always been a U.S. general, an arrangement that is fully consistent with the Appointments Clause. In this respect, as in other military and foreign policy areas, the president has very great discretion in making agreements with the United Nations, or other international organizations. He is free to consult with the U.N. hierarchy in formulating American foreign policy. He can dispatch American forces to trouble spots at the request of the United Nations, and he can instruct those forces to cooperate fully with the U.N. command structure and with any other forces U.N. members contribute. He can subordinate the interests of the United States to those of the international community if he chooses.

The president is answerable for each of these actions to the electorate, and may well face congressional retaliation in the form of slashed budgets, legislative gridlock or even impeachment, if Congress objects. The Constitution, however, does not forbid any of these actions. What the president cannot do is to interpose a U.N. (or any other foreign) official into the chain of command. The president can delegate his authority only to a duly appointed officer of the United States. Any arrangement for international cooperation that includes the actual subordination of American military command to individuals who are not duly appointed officers of the United States, interposing those officials between the president and American troops, must fail.

If Mr. Clinton persists in placing American troops under U.N. command, Congress would be perfectly within its rights to remind the president that the Constitution forbids such an arrangement. Congress cannot, however, remove the constitutional impediment simply by giving its consent. The branches of government cannot among themselves agree to ignore the Constitution's mandates.

Congress could, of course, remove the constitutional impediment in accordance with the terms of Appointments Clause itself, by allowing the president to commission U.N. officials into the federal service. Senior officers (and junior ones if Congress chooses) would have to undergo Senate confirmation, but there is no constitutional requirement (although there currently is a statutory one) that officers of the United States also must be U.S. citizens. Under these circumstances, U.N. or foreign military officers could command American forces. They would, of course, be subject to the direction of the president, to the Uniform Code of Military Justice and accountable for their actions as are other American officers.

Such an arrangement might or might not be acceptable to the United Nations (probably not), and it is likely that there would be considerable congressional opposition (snowballs in hell come to mind). But Congress

does have the authority to accomplish this within the bounds of the Constitution. What it cannot do is to agree with the president to ignore the Constitution's requirements—and the accountability they ensure—by allowing him simply to assign American troops to foreign command.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADDITIONAL TIME FOR DEBATE DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 10-hour time limit for consideration of amendments to H.R. 7 be extended for 26 minutes, and that the debate time for amendment No. 13, 21, 24, 30, or 33, or a germane modification of one of those amendments be extended from 36 minutes to 44 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed, and that the debate time for the Torricelli amendment No. 48, or amendment Nos. 28 or 43 be extended from 36 to 44 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I wish to take this time to pay tribute to the chairman, both chairmen, who have gone out of their way to make sure we accommodate the minority on time that was lost in a previous vote. This effort, I think, shows a commitment on our part to make sure that we do not take time away. There was a vote that was not anticipated in the past, and with the cooperation of the gentleman from California, who I know wants to speak, and the chairman, it has been worked out. I think that speaks to our wanting to work together and allow for a full and open debate of these remaining issues.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I was not planning to speak. I will simply say I accept the offer as appropriate given the inadvertence of what happened. It does not deal with the fundamental problem of a 10-hour time limit.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 83 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 7.

□ 1033

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, pending was the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This amendment would cut a key provision of this bill. The reason we have a Contract With America is because we want to put Congress back into the loop in the decisionmaking process when it comes to peacekeeping. But this amendment would say that Congress is meaningless whenever the President claims that he is acting as Commander in Chief.

The consequence is that the President can keep sending troops into Somalia, Haiti, Rwanda, the Balkans without congressional approval. What we are saying in the Contract With America is that Congress must be involved. We cannot abdicate our power.

Now, this is a key provision of this bill. The American people on November 8, when they voted for the Contract With America, one of the key provisions was that Congress was going to get more involved in our peacekeeping decisions. How the tax dollars are spent is important, also when young Americans are put into harm's way. This Congress has an obligation, speaking for the American people, to give either our approval or nonapproval, but under this amendment, Congress would be totally irrelevant.

Do you remember the Somalia debacle where we lost some 44 young Americans? When the bodies were dragged through the streets of Mogadishu? Do

you remember that? This House went wild, and the Senate went wild. Does the gentleman from California remember we all went over to HC-5, had a big confab, and Congress said, "Why were we not involved?" That is what the American people were asking. That is why we have a Contract With America. That is why we are putting the Congress back in.

I remember the meeting at HC-5 that day. You know, we cannot just abdicate our power to the President and then, when things go bad, we all meet at HC-5 and we scream at the Secretary of Defense and we holler at the Secretary of State, and one of them has to lose his job. Then it is too late.

If we are going to be there for the crash landing, we have got to be there for the takeoff, too, and that is all we are saying in the Contract With America.

I want Congress to no longer abdicate its power. We made a commitment. We made a commitment on November 8. We said that Congress would be involved, but with this amendment, we would renege. We are stepping back. We cannot renege on our promises.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the Leach amendment. The Leach amendment, I think, simply restates the President's constitutional power as Commander in Chief.

The language that he seeks to strike from this bill can certainly be construed as a limitation on the President's Commander in Chief powers. It says specifically, "Nothing in this section may be construed as authority for the President to use any element of the armed forces in any operation." That is a limitation on the President's power.

It also says nothing in the section may be construed as authority for the President to place any element of the Armed Forces under the command or operational control of a foreign national. A President has done that over and over and over again in our history. The implication of this language that the gentleman from Iowa seeks to strike is to limit the President's Commander in Chief powers. It micromanages and restricts the President's powers.

The Pentagon says if this language had been in effect you would not have been able to have D-Day, because you would not have been able to put together a collective effort that was so successful there.

The point here, my friends, is we have our job to do. The gentleman from Wisconsin stated that quite accurately. We have our constitutional responsibilities. But in exercising our responsibilities, we must not cut into the Commander in Chief powers. We need to allow the President to do his job as Commander in Chief.

I support the gentleman's amendment, and I commend him for offering it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I am the last Member of the House or Senate to have been in Haiti. I am the last Member of the House or Senate to have been in Somalia.

I did not bring out the flag in either case. I wish I had in Somalia.

I went to Somalia within a few days following my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], to find out why 18 of America's best-trained soldiers had died in what they called the firefight from hell.

Three days later, Sergeant Matthew Rierson was killed with an unlucky mortar shot at the headquarters of the Rangers, and a dud landed at the feet of a U.S. two-star general, or we would have lost one of our best Special Forces major generals.

Now, I am standing here to tell you and to tell about 12 to 18 to 20 Republicans, including 2 or 3 freshmen, that we are starting to lose some of you on the Contract With America.

□ 1040

Please pay attention to why this is one of the core items of our Contract With America. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] had this chart made up. This is as of about May 1994. I do not want to distract you from my remarks, but please come down and take a look at this utter madness, what happens when our troops are under foreign command. Here is what I discovered within an hour of landing in Somalia, that we had a two-track chain of command. Major General Montgomery, with whom I just had lunch in Bastogne just a couple of weeks back at the 50th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge, an excellent general, now one of the 3-star deputy commanders of our forces in Europe.

But I asked him about where was the rescue column? I told him I had just come back with him from an overflight in a Black Hawk, taking pictures with my camera, of Russian-license, built-in-India T-72 main battle tanks, 14 of them, and I said where were these Indian tanks to blow through the road blocks? He said, "You will have to talk to the other commander."

The whole thing is so complicated we simply must vote against the Leach amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution includes this language: "The Congress has the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." That is to say that what we are doing in the Contract is

completely consistent with the Constitution and with our right to say as Representatives of those families who are visited by Navy and Marine Corps and Army teams when they have sons who are killed in combat, that that is to say to those families, "We will have a direct chain of accountability, you can always count on that up to an American commander and down from that American commander right down through the platoon and squad level to your son when he is in combat."

Let me just say there has been a lot of confusion about this. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] talked about not being able to have D-day. D-day was not a United Nations operation. There has been confusion about Korea. The commander in Korea, General Luck, has a straight American chain of command. If we go into some type of a preemptive operation, should there be an invasion from the north then you move to a joint American-Korean command, but that is not under United Nations sanctions. So that section, that operation, is not applicable to this section with the Contract With America.

This is constitutional, it is appropriate, in response to our people.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE].

Mr. MCHALE. I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Leach amendment.

As stated by Mr. BEREUTER a few minutes ago, the defect of this amendment is not contained in its actual text but rather in the deletion it makes to the underlying bill.

I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, if American forces are integrated at the strategic level into an overall command structure. We have heard references made to D-Day. I participated in Operation Desert Storm, which was indeed an operation involving the integration of international cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, at the battlefield level, where American forces are under fire, it requires a shared patriotism and peacetime training. That bond between American forces requires American leadership.

I rise in opposition to the Leach amendment.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude with two points: First, I think everybody in this room must understand there is an emotive aspect of this issue that we all share a common sympathy.

But also at stake is the Constitution of the United States, which is very precise on who the commander in chief is and what the command function is.

This is a constitutional issue.

The second point I make is it is also a policy issue. Let there be no misunderstanding, this bill, as currently crafted, drives a stake into the United States leadership in multilateral diplo-

macy. If this kind of approach happened in all other countries in the world, peacekeeping comes to an end, burden sharing comes to an end. We do not have a prospect of expanding the rule of law in a reasoned way.

So I would urge the Members of this body to understand that there is a symbolism as well as a constitutionalism with regard to this particular amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let us be clear about just what is at issue with regard to this amendment. The Leach amendment waters down the restrictions on foreign command of U.S. forces in this bill. While couched as an effort to protect the President's constitutional authority, it deletes other language in the bill and effectively creates loopholes in the foreign command restrictions.

This bill includes language in section 401 protecting the President's constitutional authority. Accordingly, the new language added by the Leach amendment is unnecessary.

The fact is that the foreign command restrictions in the bill have been carefully crafted so as not to unduly constrain the President's authority. Let us not upset this carefully crafted balance.

I urge a vote against the Leach amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 267, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

AYES—158

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abercrombie | Dicks | Hilliard |
| Ackerman | Dingell | Hinchey |
| Baesler | Dixon | Houghton |
| Baldacci | Doggett | Hoyer |
| Barrett (WI) | Dooley | Jackson-Lee |
| Beilenson | Doyle | Jefferson |
| Bentsen | Durbin | Johnson, E. B. |
| Berman | Engel | Johnston |
| Bishop | Eshoo | Kanjorski |
| Bonior | Evans | Kennedy (MA) |
| Borski | Farr | Kennedy (RI) |
| Boucher | Fattah | Kennelly |
| Brown (CA) | Fazio | Kildee |
| Brown (FL) | Fields (LA) | Klecicka |
| Brown (OH) | Filner | Klink |
| Bryant (TX) | Flake | LaFalce |
| Cardin | Foglietta | Lantos |
| Chapman | Ford | Leach |
| Clayton | Frank (MA) | Levin |
| Clement | Frelinghuysen | Lofgren |
| Clyburn | Frost | Lowe |
| Coleman | Furse | Luther |
| Collins (IL) | Gejdenson | Manton |
| Conyers | Gephardt | Markey |
| Costello | Gibbons | Martinez |
| Danner | Gonzalez | Mascara |
| DeFazio | Gutierrez | Matsui |
| DeLauro | Hall (OH) | McCarthy |
| Dellums | Hamilton | McDermott |
| Deutsch | Hefner | McKinney |

Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)

Petri
Porter
Poshard
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Stark

Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Thompson
Torres
Torrice
Townes
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate

Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker

Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Becerra
Clay
Collins (MI)

Green
Hastings (FL)
Lewis (GA)

Maloney
Thornton
Wilson

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1105

Mr. METCALF, Mrs. THURMAN, and Messrs. JOHNSON of South Dakota, BROWDER, DE LA GARZA, and LAUGHLIN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. ROUKEMA changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider the amendments of the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN]; amendments Nos. 13, 21, 24, 30, 33, and a germane modified amendment No. 13.

The Clerk will designate amendments Nos. 13, 21, 24, 30, and 33.

MODIFIED AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BERMAN

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I offer amendment No. 13, as modified, which is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. BERMAN: Beginning on page 37, strike line 7 and all that follows through page 39, line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 501. CREDIT AGAINST ASSESSMENT FOR EXPENDITURES IN SUPPORT OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

(a) PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.—The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287 et seq) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 10. (a) CREDIT AGAINST ASSESSMENT FOR EXPENDITURES IN SUPPORT OF PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.—

"(1) ANNUAL REPORT.—The President shall, at the time of submission of the budget to Congress for any fiscal year, submit to the designated congressional committees a report on the total amount of incremental costs incurred by the Department of Defense during the preceding fiscal year to support or participate in United Nations peacekeeping operations. Such report shall include a separate listing by United Nations peacekeeping operation of the amount of incremental costs incurred to support or participate in each such operation.

"(2) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—(A) In addition to the annual report required under paragraph (1), the President shall submit quarterly reports to the designated congressional committees on—

"(i) all assistance provided by the United States during the preceding quarter to the United Nations to support peacekeeping operations; and

"(ii) all assistance provided by the United States for any operation conducted by the

Department of Defense in support of activities authorized by United Nations Security Council resolutions, including the identification of the element within the Department of Defense that provided such assistance.

"(B) Each report submitted pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall describe—

"(i) the assistance provided for each such operation, listed by category of assistance; and

"(ii) copies of all billings requesting payment by the United States of any contribution for United Nations peacekeeping activities.

"(C) The report for the fourth calendar quarter of each year shall be submitted as part of the annual report required by section 4(d) and shall include cumulative information for the preceding calendar year.

"(3) LIMITATION.—Funds may be obligated for payment to the United Nations of the United States assessed share of United Nations peacekeeping operations for a fiscal year only to the extent that the amount of such assessed share exceeds the amount equal to—

"(A) the total amount identified in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) for the preceding fiscal year, reduced by

"(B) the amount of any reimbursement or credit to the United States of any contribution for United Nations peacekeeping activities.

"(C) The report for the fourth calendar quarter of each year shall be submitted as part of the annual report required by section 4(d) and shall include cumulative information for the preceding calendar year.

"(3) LIMITATION.—Funds may be obligated for payment to the United Nations of the United States assessed share of United Nations peacekeeping operations for a fiscal year only to the extent that the amount of such assessed share exceeds the amount equal to—

"(A) the total amount identified in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) for the preceding fiscal year, reduced by

"(B) the amount of any reimbursement or credit to the United States by the United Nations for the costs of United States support for, or participation in, United Nations peacekeeping operations for the preceding fiscal year.

"(4) EXEMPTIONS.—Paragraph (3) shall not apply to—

"(i) costs for which the Department of Defense has been otherwise reimbursed;

"(ii) the costs of deployments under the auspices of the United Nations Security Council which the United States has undertaken to support its national security interests, in which United States Armed Forces served under United States command, and for which the United States has sought the approval of the Security Council under the United Nations Charter;

"(iii) the enforcement of United Nations sanctions and enforcement of no-fly zones which are in the national security interest of the United States;

"(iv) the provision of humanitarian assistance; or

"(v) the costs of deployments related to the provision of emergency medical care rendered by United States Armed Forces when United States Armed medical personnel or medical care facilities are in the theater of operations in which a United Nations peacekeeping mission is being conducted.

"(5) WAIVER.—(A) The President may waive the application of paragraph (3) for a United Nations peacekeeping operation if the Secretary of Defense reports to the President that support for such peacekeeping operation will not endanger the readiness of the United

NOES—267

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English

Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot

Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinaro
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)

States Armed Forces and if the President consults with the Consultative Group 15 days in advance of such waiver.

“(B) If the President determines that an emergency exists which prevents compliance with the requirement of subparagraph (A) and such waiver is in the national security interests of the United States, such consultation shall occur as soon as practicable but no later than 48 hours after such obligation.”

“(6) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘designated congressional committees’ shall include the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of section 10(a) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as added by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to United Nations assessments for peacekeeping operations after fiscal year 1995.

(c) Definitions.—For purposes of the amendments made by this section—

(1) the term “incremental cost” shall mean those additional costs incurred directly as a result of a peacekeeping operation, but shall not include personnel costs or other costs that would have been incurred otherwise in the regular course of peacetime operations, such as training exercises, maintenance, and logistical support; and

(2) the term “Consultative Group” means the Standing Consultative Group established by section 501A of this Act.

SEC. 501A. CONSULTATION.

(a) STANDING CONSULTATIVE GROUP.—There is hereby established a Standing Consultative Group (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the “Consultative Group”).

(b) PURPOSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) The purpose of the Consultative Group shall be to facilitate improved consultation between the executive branch and the Congress with respect to United States participation in peacekeeping activities.

(B) Consultations in accordance with this section shall occur prior to the United States making commitments to the United Nations, any regional organization in which the United States participates, or any other countries, on United States participation in peacekeeping operations, including in particular any participation under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

(C) Such consultations shall also include details of operational command and control arrangements governing United States participation in peacekeeping operations.

(2) REGULAR CONSULTATIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Consultative Group and the President or his designee shall meet regularly for discussions and consultation, but in no event less frequently than once a month.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The conduct of consultation pursuant to subsection (b)(2) with respect to possible or ongoing United States participation in a peacekeeping operation which may involve the use of United States Armed Forces shall not be construed as a grant of authority to the President under the War Powers Resolution (87 Stat. 555).

Mr. GILMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modified amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California will be recognized for 22 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 22 minutes.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume up to 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is addressed to section 501 of the bill. I am not going to spend a lot of time talking about the amendment because I am not going to ask for a recorded vote on the amendment, but for the reasons I will state, I believe in and of itself section 501 as put forth in this bill is reason enough for every Member in this Chamber to oppose this legislation.

Section 501, if it were ever signed into law, would totally wipe out—let me repeat that—totally wipe out every single regularly assessed peacekeeping operation now incurred or which may ever in the future be incurred by the United Nations.

□ 1110

Let me repeat that one more time: Not one single current U.N.-assessed peacekeeping operation now in place would continue if section 501 were to pass, because section 501, by requiring an automatic offset. For every dollar that is spent on U.S. voluntary contributions, incremental costs to U.N. peacekeeping activities would be deducted from our assessment. We would pay zip, zero, nothing to the United Nations for the regularly assessed peacekeeping operations. They would fall apart. They would end.

I say this in the context of trying to explain the kinds of operations we are talking about. We are talking about U.N.-assessed peacekeeping operations which, as the chart next to me shows utilize, of all the operations and the forces utilized, only 1.4 percent are American Forces. We are talking about a U.N.-assessed contribution that we pay that was legislated by the bill that the majority last year passed and was signed into law by President Clinton, that unilaterally reduces our assessed contribution from the extraordinarily high 31 percent to the 25 percent that we regularly pay for all other U.N. dues.

We are talking about a series of operations, and I want to just tell you the kinds of operations we are involved in, that will be eliminated if this were to happen. We are talking about the peacekeepers on the Golan Heights that help preserve the peace between Israel and Syria. We are talking about the U.N. peacekeepers on the Kuwait border, not American, mind you, who continue to constrain Saddam's ability to threaten his neighbors. We fought Desert Storm, Saddam still survives. Are we going to walk away from that Kuwait border before he is in full com-

pliance with the U.N. resolutions, before it is clear that we have an Iraq that no longer has any aggressive intentions on its neighbors?

We are talking about U.N. peacekeepers who have been for 30 years in Cyprus to help prevent war between two NATO allies, Greece and Turkey. In former Yugoslavia, the United Nations is providing critical humanitarian assistance and helping prevent the conflict from spreading to other parts of Europe. In Mozambique, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Namibia we have U.N. observers. Out of the total forces I have just talked about, 1.4 percent are American Forces. The rest are other countries' contributions through the assessed contribution scheme.

Now, these issues were raised in the Committee on National Security, and I want to take one moment to just compliment the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], because one other part of title IV which was clearly unconstitutional on its face has been deleted by virtue of an amendment passed unanimously last night. But 501, while it does not raise constitutional problems, is the most foolish, self-defeating kind of provision we could want to adopt.

When we raised these issues in the Committee on National Security, people scrambled around, they made an adjustment, they added a waiver. What kind of waiver did they add? They added a waiver that said that we will not deduct those voluntary contributions that the United States now pays, those incremental costs, if the President can certify, and only if the President can certify, that those chapter 7 operations, there is no waiver for chapter 6 operations, those chapter 7 operations he would have undertaken on his own.

What foolishness that waiver is. That waiver, talk about enforcing a boycott against Iraq. By definition an economic boycott enforced by a blockade cannot be done unilaterally. One has to get Turkey to stop letting Iraq use its pipeline for oil. One has to bring in the multilateral nations.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I seek to control the time in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], the senior member of the Committee on International Affairs.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, Liddell Hart, in writing about strategy and how you win wars, said, “Never do directly what you can do indirectly.” So I want to compliment the gentleman from California, because what he is doing is gutting this bill; but he is not doing it directly, he is doing it indirectly.

You know, in this Contract With America we say we will reduce our peacekeeping spending to a fair share. Last year, according to the General Accounting Office, the investigative arm

of Congress, the American taxpayer paid 80 percent of the expense for peacekeeping. We are projected now to pay about 31.7 percent. What we are saying in the Contract With America is we are reducing it to 25 percent. Out of the 182 countries in the world, we will still be paying one-fourth of all the peacekeeping.

Now, what this amendment does is put in exceptions. By the time you get done with all the exceptions, you have gutted the bill. So it is an indirect way of gutting it. Let me say that the issue here is: Do you believe that we are paying our fair share, or do you think that we are paying more than our fair share? Let me repeat again. One hundred and eighty-two countries in the world; one Nation, ours, pays 31.7 percent. What we are saying is we want to reduce it to 25 percent.

We are still paying 2½ times more than any other nation. Last year, again, we paid 80 percent, and that is according to the General Accounting Office. I want to underscore that.

There are those who believe that the U.S. taxpayer should go on paying more and more for all of these peacekeeping missions. In the Contract With America we pledged fairness. For one Nation to pay 80 percent and for its soldiers to do most of the heavy lifting, to do the fighting, I do not think is fair, and the American people do not think it is fair. Eighty percent of the money, our soldiers. That is why on November 8 the American people did affirmatively vote for the Contract With America.

Now, I want to say that you win wars not with op-ed pieces; you win wars with treasury and with soldiers. And that is why it is very important for us to look at this particular bill.

The issue here is whether you want to put the American taxpayer ahead of the United Nations. Do you? Or do you believe that the American taxpayer must automatically keep on paying more and more and more for whatever operations are dreamed up at the UN.

If we vote for this amendment, we will be renegeing on our Contract With America. Keep that in mind. We will be retreating from our Contract With America.

Did you read the headlines this morning in the Washington Times? You do not read the Washington Times? Let me tell you, there it is. "George Stephanopoulos, senior adviser to President Clinton, said yesterday that the Republicans in this House are retreating from their promises." And my dear friends, do not think for 1 minute, not on the 110th day or the 105th day, but on the 101st day, and in fact it is already started and we are only in the 43rd day.

My friends, we are not even at the 50th day. Can you imagine what is going to happen on the 101st day?

Do not be hornswoggled by these amendments. I have been telling you these guys are very deceptive over here. What does he go on to say? He

says, "The Republicans are retreating from their promises they made in their Contract With America," and it says "He accused them of tackling easy elements of the pact and ducking the tougher votes."

Mr. Chairman, this is only the 43d day. The President's senior adviser went on to say that he is predicting that the voters will enact punishment on the Republicans for being reticent and not enacting their provisions of the Contract With America.

Mr. Chairman, let us stick with the Contract With America. That is what the people voted for. Let us not jump up and vote for these amendments that would indirectly gut the Contract With America. Believe me, you will be shown no mercy on the campaign trail or in the 1-minute or at any other time, any time we step away from the Contract With America. We do not want to end up with the contract just enumerating 10 issues and having it gutted, do we? No. Do not vote for the Berman amendment. Stick with the contract.

□ 1120

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, in the 8 years that I chaired the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations, I received three letters from Presidents Reagan and Bush, threatening to veto the foreign aid bills which we reported out of our subcommittee because they said we did not spend enough money. So I think my record in trying to save dollars in foreign aid is clear.

Section 501, just defended by my colleague from Wisconsin, is intended to reduce cost. That is obvious. But the fact is, it will have just the opposite effect. In fact, it will raise costs, because section 501 applies unless, unless the President certifies that a peacekeeping operation is so important that we would do it alone.

That is an open invitation to other countries to simply step back and say: "OK, let Uncle Sam go it alone, let Uncle Sam be uncle sucker." Just brilliant.

I tell you what confuses me about this proposal. I cannot figure out whether this bill was designed to be so dumb or whether it just happened that way by accident.

What when I see it coming from the party of Vandenberg, I do not know whether to cry or laugh.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the criticisms that have been leveled against section 501, I believe, are misplaced. The Committee on International Relations carefully considered the objection and amended the reim-

bursement formula in an effort to ensure that funds would be available for true peacekeeping operations even after the offsets. We have received preliminary estimates from GAO of the amount of unreimbursed incremental chapter 6 peacekeeping expenses from fiscal year 1994. These are the only true peacekeeping expenses and the only ones for which legislation, as amended, would strictly require and offset. The total amount of these expenses is about \$227 million. This is some \$300 million less than the administration's budget request for peacekeeping in fiscal year 1996, and about \$800 million less than the peacekeeping budget for fiscal year 1995, including the supplemental appropriation.

The remaining \$1.5 billion in unreimbursed chapter 7 expenses for operations such as Desert Storm, Operation Deny Flight, and Uphold Democracy, which are more aptly described as peacemaking, would not require an offset provided that the President provided the necessary certification to Congress. In essence, this is a certification that the U.S. role in these operations was in its own strategic interest and not solely at the behest of the United Nations. As long as the United States remains prepared to contribute between \$300 and \$800 million per year to true international peacekeeping operations, it is inaccurate, and I would submit it is unfair, to say that we have removed peacekeeping as an option.

The second way in which the administration's criticism misses the mark is that it incorrectly assumes that the President would be required to certify in advance that we would unilaterally undertake the action in order to exempt it from the offset requirements. The administration then argues that if other nations knew the United States would undertake an operation of its own, there would be no need for them to cooperate in such inaction. This argument simply misreads the bill. There is no requirement that we act unilaterally, or even that we certify after the fact that we did act unilaterally, in order to avoid the offset requirement.

Rather, the President need only certify after the operation that it was the sort of operation that we would have undertaken in the strategic interest of the United States, even if we had been able to secure U.N. cooperation.

This formula, Mr. Chairman, leaves the President the flexibility he needs to protect the U.S. interests wherever he can certify in good conscience that such interests are at stake. Provided only that he can make such a certification, he need not fear that the cost of an operation will be offset against next year's peacekeeping budget.

Some of the proposed amendments would even go further, exempting practically everything from the offset, but that is something we did not have to deal with today.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for Members to vote against this amendment. I believe

that the underlying language is sufficient and will positively serve peacekeeping for the United States and our allies.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Under the theory that inaccurate statements should be refuted as quickly as possible, I ask everyone to read the waiver section of section 501. There is an automatic deduction unless the President certifies as to chapter 7 only, not chapter 6, operations, that the activity is of such importance to the national security the United States will undertake the activity unilaterally, unilaterally. Not in our strategic interest. Not in our national interest. Unilaterally.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just stress I think the big question is not whether there is a modification—it is probably too harsh to call it a retreat—from a quasi-party platform, the contract.

The big question is whether there is going to be a retreat from international leadership, from the traditions of at least half a century of American involvement in world affairs.

I would only ask, as we look at this particular amendment that has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], two questions:

Is it cheaper and more effective to advance the interests of the United States through international burden sharing, or is it cheaper and more effective to go it alone?

The second question is, How can we, in times of trauma, ask others to serve with us if we refuse to serve with them?

It is in this context that I think this particular amendment would add modestly to the bill and make it something that would be more acceptable to more Members of this body.

But I would stress to everyone, this has become a flawed bill in the final measure. With great regret, I am going to have to vote against it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, one of the things I think that needs to be stressed is how much money the United States is paying for U.N. operations, peacekeeping and otherwise.

According to the General Accounting Office, the United States paid 80 percent, 80 percent of the worldwide peacekeeping operations for the United Nations last year. Out of \$3.4 billion, we paid, the American taxpayers ponied up \$2.7 billion.

And on the regular administrative cost of the United Nations, we pay between 25 and 33 percent. Of all the countries in the world, we are picking

up almost a third of all the costs. I do not think it is unreasonable to want a complete accounting for the President to tell us about all these costs. And if we feel it is extremely high, we should be able to do something about it. This is a very, very good amendment.

The American people want us to participate and do what we can to make sure there is peace and harmony in this world, but they do not want to pay the whole enchilada. And 80 percent of the cost last year was paid for by the U.S. taxpayer.

In addition to that, the year before that, we paid 44 percent of the peacekeeping cost. Think about that. Forty-four percent is a lot when we consider all the countries in the world that are in the U.N. But it was almost doubled last year. This is a move that should be taken.

I think it is a good amendment. I hope my colleagues will support it.

□ 1130

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I certainly commend him for his amendment, which I strongly support.

Section 501, as it is drafted in H.R. 7, limits the U.S.-assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping to only the amount that exceeds DOD's costs in support of U.N.-authorized operations.

Mr. Chairman, the provision says in effect that DOD costs include not only DOD support to regular U.N. peacekeeping operations, such as Cyprus, but to any U.N. peacekeeping activity. By that definition, Mr. Chairman, we would include a lot of things that the United States today is doing under the rule; for example, 15,000 United States personnel enforcing no-fly zones in Iraq, very much in the interests of the United States; troops in Operation Provide Comfort, helping the Kurds in Iraq; troops in South Korea, and many other areas.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the impact of all of that would be that, as drafted, it would prohibit the United States from making its assessed U.N. peacekeeping contribution, and will, in effect, kill U.N. peacekeeping. That is the judgment, I think, of all of the experts in the administration that have looked at it carefully. One of the problems here is that the language is so broadly drawn that it includes all kinds of DOD costs.

Another problem here, Mr. Chairman, is we simply do not know what the costs are, so we have very vague language, and the result is that U.N. peacekeeping, our assessment, we would be owed money by the United Nations.

We would not pay our assessment, other countries would note that, they would not pay their assessment, and we would effectively destroy U.N. peacekeeping.

Mr. Chairman, what the Berman amendment does is to define those DOD costs much more narrowly. We have two purposes that are sought here, it seems to me. The first is that the Defense Department be fully reimbursed for these reasonable expenses. That is the concern that the majority is emphasizing, and it is a perfectly legitimate concern, but they have overdrawn their amendment much, much too broadly.

The second concern, I think, is that we maintain U.N. peacekeeping capabilities. The advantage of the Berman amendment is that it accomplishes both purposes, DOD reimbursement on a reasonable basis, a limited basis, but at the same time not destroying American national interest.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge support of the Berman amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are not anti-United Nations, we are not anti-reasonable peacekeeping operations. There are some good peacekeeping operations, we have to say. There have been some bungled ones, obviously. Those are the ones we need to focus on.

However, let me say this, Mr. Chairman, three points. There must be some fairness in the sharing of the burden of peacekeeping in the world. The United States is being overburdened in this process. The direct contribution that we make is, as has been noted, almost a third of the total cost, not to mention the extra costs of the Department of Defense and the others in support of those missions.

It is reasonable to say we are paying upwards of 60 to 70 percent of the total cost of peacekeeping missions. That is unfair. That must be addressed by the United Nations. The only way to get them to address those kinds of questions is for this Congress to be obstinate on funding. That is what we will be doing.

Two, the ineptitude of the United Nations operations, both its regular operations and peacekeeping. There are some 40,000 employees of the United Nations in New York alone. Until recently, only 40 of those people were trying to oversee 17 peacekeeping military operations with 70,000 soldiers around the globe, 5 days a week, 8 hours a day. It absolutely was inept; there is some improvement, but not nearly enough.

Fairness to the Congress, fairness from the administration to the Congress. The administration votes for these peacekeeping missions in the United Nations. We do not know in the Congress how much it is going to cost,

when it is going to cost it, when we are going to get out, how we are going to get out, how we are going to pay for it.

They simply—the United Nations—simply sends the U.S. Congress the bill, after the fact. In former years it was a fairly small amount, \$40 million a year 5 years ago. Now it is \$1.2 billion for 1995 plus another \$672 million supplemental they have just sent up here, so that is \$1.8 or \$1.9 billion, not counting DOD expenses. That is a significant figure.

We have to regularize this process. We simply cannot run the Government in that fashion. The Congress has to be in on the operation from the outset, so we can plan, at least financially, how to deal with it.

Mr. Chairman, the \$672 million supplemental they have just set up for what the United Nations says are 1995 cost overruns is not offset. The administration says "We are not going to ask you to cut other spending, just give us out of the clear blue sky this money."

I say, "This must be offset. You have to pay for it. Then we will think about it."

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I think again we have to understand the fundamental principle. What the U.N. does in the post-cold-war era is carry out American foreign policy interests. If it is not in America's foreign policy interests, we use our veto to stop it.

Therefore, the choice here is we continue to operate within the United Nations or we will end up having to do these things unilaterally; or even worse, we will wait until a crisis in a region explodes to a far greater crisis, to far greater costs in both human life and dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the principal impact of this piece of legislation and this section would be that Saudi Arabia would not pay its U.N. dues for the next 50 years. Japan, France, and the Soviet Union, along with the United States, would ask for additional payment from Bangladesh and other impoverished countries.

Think about what we are saying here. These are our national policy interests. The President of the United States, President Bush, mobilizes the world through the United Nations to stop Saddam Hussein's cut off of oil. Because it is a United Nations operation, rather than an American unilateral operation, we are able to get the Saudis and the Japanese and others to pay for the major portion of this activity.

Now we would all go back to the United Nations and ask the most impoverished countries of the world to pay for our military action, to protect the West's oil supplies.

Mr. Chairman, it would not just stop with the French and the British and the Americans and the Japanese and the Saudis. The Russians would be at

the U.N. immediately as well, because they would say "Look what the Americans have done. We are in Tajikistan and we are in Georgia under U.N. authorization. We want to be paid for that."

Now we would have the Saudis, the Japanese, the French, the British, the Russians, and the Americans coming to the United Nations telling Bangladesh that they owe more dues to pay us for our involvement in the gulf war.

Mr. Chairman, let us be straight about it. If Members are where Congress was at the end of World War I and they believe we should not have been in the League of Nations and they believe we should not be in the United Nations, then get up and tell us to get out of the United Nations, but do not continue to try to either hamstring the President's ability to operate within multilateral organizations, or bankrupt the organization through this budget maneuver.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

□ 1140

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. All of it or half of it or three-fourths of it, how much?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I think that the present law that we passed in the previous year is adequate, 25 percent. I think we are heading in the right direction on our payments. But clearly it should not be Bangladesh subsidizing the Saudis.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Committee on National Security.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, let us be straight with the American people our colleagues. This amendment is not about getting out of the United Nations nor is it against peacekeeping. It is about fairness, to our taxpayers and military.

We heard debate earlier today about saving \$1.5 billion for a commission. Two hundred two Members, largely of the minority party, voted "yes" for that huge savings in defense spending for the readiness of our troops. We had a big vote on missile defense. The key issue was savings. This year we are spending almost \$2 billion of American taxpayer money on the United Nations and its operations around the world, \$2 billion. We simply want to have some accounting and we want to have some credit for what we put in.

Let me use Haiti as an example. We had no debate before our troops were committed to Haiti, I might add, not 1 minute of debate on this floor before the troops went in. Yet we have in fact spent \$1.5 billion of American taxpayers' money. Even more outrageous and the purpose of the three flags in

my lapel, Bangladesh, Guatemala, and Nepal. Here we are right now paying the full salaries, benefits, and housing costs of the troops of these three countries. Yes, my colleagues we are paying with DOD dollars the benefits, the salaries, and the expenses of the troops from these nations in Haiti. At the same time that 600 troops from the Second Armored Division of Fort Hood, TX, had to conduct 10 training exercises in the range walking together pretending they were in tanks because we do not have enough money for fuel and maintenance.

The new slogan of that battalion of 600 troops that used tanks in training is to march together and say, "Clank, clank, I'm a tank." While we are paying the full benefits of troops from Bangladesh, Nepal, and Guatemala.

This has got to stop, Mr. Chairman. We want fairness. That is all we want. We are not saying pull out of the United Nations. We are not saying isolate ourselves. We are saying what our colleagues said. Let us have some concern about the taxpayers' money. It is not a bottomless pit. Two billion dollars is what we are spending. Is that enough? I think it is too much.

I think the provision in the bill allows us to get a hold of the money that we are spending and better use those dollars for American troops so that from time to time we can go together with out allies. But I really have a problem using American DOD dollars to pay the salaries and benefits of foreign troops when we cannot even take care of our own readiness needs as so many of our National Security colleagues mentioned today.

I might add for the RECORD, I just have to insert this letter from one of my constituents serving in Haiti who is absolutely outraged at what role he is paying there now.

Mr. Chairman, the letter referred to is as follows:

HONORABLE CURT WELDON: I am stationed here in Port-au-Prince Haiti, with the U.S. Army. As a local constituent I am writing you concerning several issues about the armed forces and our involvement here in Haiti.

First I would like to mention about our military mission here in Haiti. Several of my fellow service members and I find no purpose in Clinton's administration policy to reinstall Aristide, a communist leader, back into this country. Since when do the U.S. forces work for a communist leader who has always denounced the United States as evil. A leader who has stolen tens-of-millions of dollars from his citizens, which the U.S. tax payers may have to pay back to the people of Haiti. This also does not include the enormous expenses of this entire military operation, to the American tax payers to which there will be no benefits. Now, since this military operation is done and over with, and our mission of restoring Aristide finished, we all should be getting back home. But, now due to the effort of the United Nations and the Joint Staff Commanders, several thousand U.S. service members are staying and we shouldn't be. Staying because the United Nations and the Joint Task Force commanders say they need us. This country is now safer to walk the streets than most

cities back in the states. The Joint Task Forces, under the United Nations are fully capable of keeping the peace here. What my fellow service members and I want to know from you, is what are you doing to end Clinton's U.S. involvement here in Haiti. And to keep future U.S. forces out of the control of the United Nations.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

When the gentleman talks about Haiti, he talks about a United States decision that we went to the United Nations and obtained authorization for under chapter 7. It is an incremental cost. There is nothing in 501 that would do anything about who pays for that. What would happen is every dollar of that would deduct and wipe out the peacekeeping costs for every regularly assessed operation which we supported in the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, it is time we accept the reality. We are a world power. We are a world power. We defeated communism, and no, we cannot expect Nepal and Bangladesh to pay the same amount of money that we do. Yes, we are going to have to take the leadership, and part of that burden means we are going to have to pay more.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that this is a very wise investment, which is why I believe this bill is mistaken when it attempts to undermine funding for U.N. peacekeeping activities. The point I am trying to make is that we have very legitimate and vital national interests which are protected by U.N. peacekeeping.

What are our interests? We have an interest in the global marketplace, that markets are allowed to thrive and not be disrupted by localized aggression and by petty dictators. We do not want to set the precedent that might makes right. We do not want to see our markets disrupted by petty dictators. We want to have the ability to work collectively within the world community to thwart these kinds of efforts.

We have an interest in oil. Our recent efforts in Desert Storm magnify the fact that we need to work collectively and we need to have the resources of other countries join with ours to fight to help protect our specific interests.

We have a very important interest, Mr. Chairman, in fighting terrorism internationally. With the exception of the very unfortunate bombing in New York, we have had the good fortune of not having very much terrorism on our shores. It is better, I submit, to fight terrorism on other shores in a preemptive manner rather than have it come to this country.

What does this have to do with U.N. burdensharing? The gentleman was saying that we are paying for Napalese soldiers. I would submit that is probably a wise investment. Better to have other soldiers involved in the fight

than to have all U.S. soldiers, because this bill provides us with an unfortunate option. We either go it alone or do not go at all. We have got interests that mean we have to go. I submit we are better off if we go with others.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said about this subject and I think there may be some confusion, but I hope some Members focused on the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] a few minutes ago when he said that recently the United States, when you consider all costs, was paying over 80 percent of the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. It is incredible.

What I am suggesting and what I was able to do in the committee is to assure that at least incremental costs are to be offset. We have a tremendous expenditure of funds.

We have an important role to play in peacekeeping. But as I suggested to the Secretary of State when he appeared before us, the status quo is not acceptable. We have to have some changes in the way our assessments are calculated.

Mr. Chairman, I would be absolutely convinced that even though our peacekeeping assessment is 30.7 percent, and even though the last Congress said by resolution that we are going to reduce it to 25 percent, supporters of the United Nations, perhaps even the Clinton administration, will come to us later this year and say again next year, and perhaps next year, "You are in arrearage," even though we had expressed our clear intent to pay no more than 25 percent.

That is a very generous share, because when we consider all of our other calculated costs, incremental costs and others, we are paying far, far beyond 25 percent. We are paying more than 50 percent. Recently we paid 80 percent. I think it should be clear to our colleagues that we can ask for some different procedures to be established when it comes to our contributions to peacekeeping.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for his allowance of time.

Make no mistake about it. Title V is a gilt-edged, hand-engraved invitation to adventurism. It would effectively end U.N. peacekeeping with catastrophic consequences. It would be an open invitation to would-be aggressors and rogue states all around the world. Wars and conflicts with all their suffering and chaos would multiply. Gorazde and Sarajevo would be just a hint of things to come. We would be left with

a stark choice, intervene unilaterally or do nothing at all.

Mr. Chairman, the fundamental problem with the measure as it is written is that it presents a false tradeoff, fulfilling our collective security obligations versus maintaining the readiness of our Armed Forces. In reality, as a practical matter, they are two sides of the same coin.

By leveraging our forces through the United Nations, we ease the demands on our Armed Forces in the same way a high state of readiness bolsters the credibility of a collective security system. But trying to maintain a high state of readiness when we are constrained to unilateral action is simply untenable.

In the period between the wars, we had neither an adequate state of readiness nor credible collective security. The result was unprecedented global disaster.

□ 1150

It was in that period that arch-isolationist, Arthur Vandenberg, was transformed into one of the most formidable advocates of collective security through the United Nations. Today we discard the lessons we learned at our great peril. The conflicts, no matter where they are, no matter how distant, left unattended can affect us all.

John Dunne was absolutely right. The bill's greatest flaw is that it fails to recognize that U.N. peacekeeping promotes our national interests.

Arthur Vandenberg said it best. Let me just share this observation from him.

Much as we might crave the easier way of lesser responsibility, we are denied this privilege. We cannot turn back the clock. We cannot fail by the old and easier charts. That has been determined for us by the march of events. We have no choice as to whether we shall play a great part in the world. We have to play that part. We have to play it in sheer defense of our own self-interest. All that we can decide is whether we shall play it well or ill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Berman amendment. It fails the minimal truth-in-labeling standard required for any provision that calls itself a credit against our peacekeeping assessment.

After all the exemptions in this amendment are added up, the U.S. taxpayer will still be paying roughly the same amount for U.N. peacekeeping.

Our legislation merely seeks to get a handle on our spiraling direct and indirect costs for peacekeeping which amounted to some \$2.8 billion last year. Our bill provides that a portion or our unreimbursed Defense Department expenditures in support of peacekeeping will be deducted from our U.N. assessment.

What we are now considering in this amendment is a so-called credit that has so many loopholes that virtually every peacekeeping mission we support

in the world today would be exempted. It guts the provisions now in the bin.

Adopting this amendment would move us further from our goal of getting credit for the rapidly escalating indirect costs—\$1.7 billion at last count—of DOD support for U.N. peacekeeping. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

This amendment does not in any manner end our support for U.N. peacekeeping. It does undertake a modest first step in ensuring that we get credit for all of our direct and indirect support for any U.N. peacekeeping operations.

I urge my colleagues to delay the Berman amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of our time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, to try to put the debate in perspective of the language in section 501, if 501 had been in place in 1990, \$60 billion that we spent in incremental costs on Desert Storm, \$60 billion that was authorized by the United Nations because we went to the United Nations and got them to authorize it, would have been deducted and wiped out every peacekeeping cost for the next 50 years, even though the vast majority of that money was reimbursed by other countries.

This inflexible, silly language makes no provision for costs that are reimbursed for other countries that have to be reimbursed for the United States.

Second, yes, we can construe U.N.-authorized operations and attribute percent of the costs. It does not cover what is wiped out. You have wiped out U.N.-assessed costs where after this fiscal year we will only pay 25 percent. The other costs are operations we want to help ourselves diplomatically, politically, and militarily in terms of enforcing embargoes we got the United Nations to authorize so other countries would help us, help us. Penny-wise, pound-foolish, this amendment.

Finally, to remind Members, nothing is undertaken by the United Nations unless the United States decides it. If we do not like a specific U.N. operation, whether it is Somalia or Haiti, fight on that issue. Do not wipe out all of the good because of one thing you do not like.

It is the end of the cold war. We are at a point where America's security environment is more complicated than ever, and we are asked with this language in 501 to choose isolationism.

This so-called National Security Revitalization Act is billed as a cost-saving move to limit foreign adventurism, but its effect would be to undermine our national security by gutting our ability to use the United Nations as a tool to pursue U.S. interests.

Vote for the amendment. Defeat the bill. H.R. 501 is wrong.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the distinguished chairman of

the Subcommittee on Procurement of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding me the time and for his great work.

My colleagues, let us look at this part of the Contract With America for what it is. This is a taxpayers' credit, and here is what it says: It says if you have U.N. operation going on, and we are paying almost 30 percent of that, or almost a third of that, we are helping the U.N. operation. We may be undertaking at the same time an American airlift that we are paying entirely out of U.S. taxpayer funds. We have undertaken this airlift in Bosnia now longer than the Berlin airlift, and all we are saying is that we would like to get a little credit for this in-kind contribution.

We spent about \$1.4 billion in DOD airlifts and incremental costs, and at worst case, if the President exercises his exemptions, the U.S. taxpayers are only going to the credited for about \$240 million out of the fiscal year 1994 incremental costs for peacekeeping requirements, we are only getting a credit of 240 million. The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] wants to cut the \$240 million credit down lower.

The U.S. taxpayers have a right to get this tax credit. They are paying two ways. They are paying through the United Nations and they are also paying for U.S. unilateral actions.

Please reject the Berman amendment or we are going to water this doggone thing down to the point where U.S. taxpayers do not get any credit at all for American unilateral actions carried out by DOD.

Please vote "no" on the Berman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the modified amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

The modified amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider an amendment by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON].

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and others have talked about the costs of the United Nations, but what has not been talked about is we are talking about percentages, 25 percent of an already bloated budget. They are not cutting back on their costs, they are not addressing budget reductions.

I had planned to offer an amendment which would have placed a monetary cap of \$250 million for the U.S. contribution to the United Nations. Here at home we are making painful budget cuts, we are eliminating wasteful spending and abolishing unnecessary bureaucracies. The taxpayers have insisted that we change the way we do business here in Washington, and I

think that we can accept no less from the United Nations.

I believe we have the right and indeed the obligation to require the United Nations to do this, because the American taxpayer provides it with a quarter of its \$1 billion plus budget. When we add in peacekeeping, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has already said, \$2.8 billion, we are already at \$3 billion plus. That is too much money, and as the largest donor we are the only country capable of effecting positive change at the United Nations.

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON] certainly raises a pertinent point on the issue of the U.S. contribution to the U.N. regular budget, and I share the gentleman's concerns about the level of our contributions, particularly in light of the poor management practices and inefficiencies that have been characterizing the U.N. organization. And I can assure the gentleman from Texas that our International Relations Committee will continue to press for reforms and hold the United Nations to no real growth in their budgets.

If the gentleman is willing, I would be pleased to work with him on this issue as part of the State Department authorization process. Our Committee on International Relations will be considering the authorization for the State Department for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 in the next few months, and this is a bill that authorizes the funding for the United Nations and the international organizations.

□ 1200

I am certain our Members would welcome the views of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON] on the U.S. contribution to the U.N. budget, so we would look forward to being of assistance to you in addressing your concerns and interest in the U.N. regular budget consideration.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Chairman. I appreciate him yielding time to me to discuss this, and I will take the chairman's suggestion and not offer the amendment today but will, instead, bring it up at the appropriate time, which will be during the State Department authorization process.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 53, beginning on line 15, strike out "25 percent" and insert "20 percent".

Page 53, line 18, strike out "25 percent" and insert "20 percent".

Page 53, line 21, after "the United States." insert the following new sentences:

For any United Nations peacekeeping operation that is initially authorized by the United Nations Security Council before the date of the enactment of this section, the applicable percentages under the preceding sentence shall be 25 percent. For United Nations peacekeeping operations that are initially authorized by the United Nations Security Council on or after the date of the enactment of this section, the President may increase the percentage limitations under the first sentence of this subsection to a percentage not greater than 25 percent. The President may exercise the authority under the preceding sentence only after transmitting to Congress a report providing notice of the percentage increase under the preceding sentence and a statement of the reasons for the increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 2½ minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 2½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I listened very carefully during this debate.

I would just like to offer my little assessment. I think the American people are fed up, fed up knowing that Uncle Sam has become the policeman for the entire world. But what they are really galled about is Uncle Sam then sticks around and organizes a neighborhood crime watch everywhere around the planet.

We happen to have 25,000 murders a year in America. Now, I know that is not germane to this debate. There are 25,000 murders, it is approaching, a year in America and everybody is talking about the borders overseas, controlling borders and patrolling and helping foreign nations.

Somebody better take a look at our borders.

The bill sets a cap of 25 percent for U.N. peacekeeping operations, our share. The Traficant amendment says that it shall be a 20-percent cap as a target, and the President can go to the 25 percent, but he must notify the Congress that they have reached 20 percent expenditure, and he is going to increase it and give us the reasons why the President wants those additional monies.

Now, I have heard everybody saying we are a world power. Ladies and gentleman, we are an almost bankrupt world power, and a bankrupt America does not have much world power in the future. So I do not want the Contract With America to accept the Traficant amendment, go to conference, and throw it out.

I want to take another second to explain it. The Traficant amendment says that somebody in the White House or the Pentagon has to get out an adding machine or a calculator and figure

out what they are spending and say, "Mr. President, we are approaching 20 percent. Now, we have got to send it to the Congress, notify them we are going to use the full 5."

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I seek the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], "You are right on target." I support this amendment.

This amendment further reduces the cap of the U.S. share of U.N. peacekeeping from 25 to 20 percent, and when you see what is taking place in our country, you are right on target. It permits two exceptions, I think, that the Members should know. It grandfather existing operations and it permits the President the flexibility of increasing it to 25 percent where he believes it is necessary.

This is a very well thought out amendment, and the value of this amendment is that it makes it clear a congressional policy is in order that the U.S. taxpayer should not be paying more than 20 percent of the tab. It is time to ensure that the U.S. taxpayer is no longer fleeced.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for pointing that out. Eighty percent of the tab, like the Clinton administration paid last year, is grossly unfair to the American taxpayer, and this is a fair amendment. It is a just amendment, and it deserves the support of this House.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. I rise in support of this amendment. A few months ago the front page of the Washington Post said we had our troops in Haiti picking up garbage and settling domestic disputes. Those should not be the mission of the American military, yet those are the kinds of things we are doing in these peacekeeping operations.

I support the amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which I believe is in keeping with the other provisions of this title providing greater scrutiny and congressional oversight of the funding of U.N. peacekeeping operations. This amendment would establish a 20-percent assessment for new peacekeeping operations which the administration could raise up to the prevailing level of 25 percent to the extent

it reports to Congress on the reasons for our increased financial support.

I would like to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment and the majority accepts the Congressman's amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURBIN: Page 63, line 4, strike "In particular," and insert "Numerous Central and East European countries, particularly"

Page 63, line 5, insert a comma after "Slovakia"

Page 66, after line 12, insert the following few paragraphs (and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly):

(7) that, when any other European country emerging from communist domination is in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area, it should, in accordance with Article 10 of such Treaty, be invited to become a full NATO member, provided it—

(A) meets appropriate standards, including each of the standards specified in clauses (i) through (vii) of paragraph (5)(A); and

(B) remains committed to protecting the rights of all its citizens and respecting the territorial integrity of its neighbors;

(8) that the United States, other NATO member nations, and NATO itself should furnish appropriate assistance to facilitate the transition of other European countries emerging from communist domination to full NATO membership at the appropriate time.

Page 67, line 8, strike the semicolon and insert "including Russia, and"

Page 67, strike line 10, beginning on line 11, strike "cooperation" and beginning on line 12, strike "including the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and" and insert a period.

Page 67, strike line 14 and all that follows through line 21

(8) that the United States, other NATO member nations, and NATO itself should furnish appropriate assistance to facilitate the transition of other European countries emerging from communist domination to full NATO membership at the appropriate time;

Page 67, line 8, strike the semicolon and insert "including Russia, and"

Page 67, strike line 10, beginning on line 11, strike "cooperation", and beginning on line 12, strike "including the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and" and insert a period.

Page 67, strike line 14 and all that follows through line 21.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to say at the outset I want to express my appreciation to the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], who have cooperated in the reparation of this amendment.

Let me try to describe this amendment in very express and succinct terms. This bill envisions the possibility that NATO will be expanded in the future. The North American Treaty Organization, which has been the bedrock of democracy in Europe since World War II, has been a major factor in American foreign policy.

Many countries which were not members of NATO after World War II were under Communist domination and were thereby precluded from participation. Now that we have seen the elimination of the Soviet Union per se and the emergence of new countries in the region, many of them new democracies, we are envisioning the possibility that NATO in the future will embrace these same democracies.

The bill is express in its terms and suggests that we should consider enlarging NATO to include Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia. I have absolutely no objection to that, and feel they are appropriate candidates to be considered for NATO.

Unfortunately, the bill does not list many other nations which were formerly under Communist domination, and I think immediately, but not exclusively, about the Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Ukraine.

What my amendment does is to open the possibility, the potentiality, that other formerly Communist-dominated nations will also be considered for NATO membership.

This a great boost to these countries to know that they, too, are considered potential allies of the United States and all freedom-loving nations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the other 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by Mr. DURBIN which amends title VI regarding NATO.

This amendment makes clear that there are a number of Central European countries beyond the Visegrad Four which should, at some point, be in a position to become full NATO members. I believe this is a very useful addition to the bill.

As I understand it, this is a consensus amendment worked out by the gentleman from Illinois in cooperation with the Central and East European

Coalition which consists of those prominent organizations that represent Americans of East European lineage.

That coalition has reportedly obtained the approval of Baltic-Americans, Ukrainian-Americans, Armenian-Americans, Hungarian-Americans, Czech-Americans, Polish-Americans, and others for this amendment as introduced.

I would also like to note the amendment includes language urging other NATO nations to furnish appropriate assistance to facilitate the transition of these countries to NATO membership. This is a key point. The U.S. cannot be the sole source of assistance for these countries.

This amendment also deletes language in the bill that has been interpreted—I am certain, inadvertently—as giving Russia a veto over NATO expansion in Central and Eastern Europe.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take further time. I understand there are other amendments and other debates that need to be considered.

I certainly thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York. He has been a pleasure to work with, on a very important issue. I also want to salute the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], who share our feelings on this important issue, as well as my colleague from Chicago, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI], who is a cosponsor of this amendment.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I rise to express my strong support for the amendment offered by Mr. DURBIN to include other European countries along with Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia, for NATO membership in the future.

In particular I support restoring the eligibility of the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, as well as Ukraine to join NATO when they are able to meet the necessary requirements.

Since their independence from the Soviet Union, these nations have been working diligently to rebuild internally and establish democratic and free governments. By reaching out to the West, the Baltic states have been striving to develop peaceful relations throughout the global community.

Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Ukraine cannot ignore their neighbor to the east, the Russian Federation. We too cannot help but realize that Russia continues to present a potential threat to these countries. Certainly we all can see that the instability and actions of Russia have heightened tensions within its neighbors who remember all too clearly the history of the past 70 years.

In its current form H.R. 7 sends a message to these nations of Central and Eastern Europe that they are on their own in security

matters. This is a message we surely do not mean and one we cannot risk sending. It threatens to destabilize this region through the implication that NATO expansion would be limited to the four named countries, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia. Certainly we should not imply that consideration of NATO membership will be limited to just these four countries. When the Baltic states or Ukraine meet the appropriate requirements they should be permitted to, at the least, be considered for NATO membership.

The Durbin amendment resolves this problem in a fair and suitable manner. This language making numerous Central and Eastern European countries eligible for consideration in future NATO expansion extends the same criteria for NATO integration to all the nations of Central and Eastern Europe. I support this amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1410

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BATEMAN

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATEMAN: Page 74, after line 16, strike all through line 20; Redesignate current paragraph (B) as the (A); Add after (A) the following new paragraph (B):

(B) certain countries that were a part of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or that were part of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which the President may designate pursuant to Section 203(d)(2) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] will be recognized for 1½ minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 1½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, in the bill as it comes to the floor, there are terms within the bill, or a phrase, "certain other European countries emerging from communist domination." In a section of the bill thereafter this phrase is defined legislatively. The legislative definition now in the bill is written so as to make eligible for participation in programs that bring additional countries into NATO, territories of the former Soviet Union and territories of the former Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia.

My amendment changes that definition of that phrase, "certain European countries which have emerged from

communist domination." But the nature of the amendment makes no substantive difference in the bill. What it does do, however, is to remove that blanket invitation to have someone possibly construe this that we are thinking in terms of countries as remote from NATO as Kazakhstan or Azerbaijan or Armenia or Turkistan, which I do not think anyone really contemplates is what we have in mind.

Similarly, if you say all of the former territories of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] has expired.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee is under a unanimous-consent agreement of the House where it is not in order to ask for additional minutes.

If the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] would like to control the time, he can yield.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment.

I believe it helps to clarify the fact that the President has the discretion to identify certain countries in the former Soviet Union and in the former Yugoslavia which may be eligible for assistance.

Some countries may be designated in those regions. Others may not. It's the President's decision.

I urge my colleague to support Mr. BATEMAN's amendment.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding it is also acceptable by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member of the full committee.

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

Mr. BATEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make sure this language does not preclude the possibility of a country like Slovenia, which is independent, has a privatized economy, had had successful free democratic elections, from joining, having the same status as the already named countries in the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the positive response of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], as well as the concurrence and affirmation by the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, Mr. GILMAN, that the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia and the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], clearly open the door for

admission of Slovenia to NATO membership without specifically mentioning that country by name.

Slovenia clearly deserves equal standing with the other countries already named in the pending bill and merits membership on a full equality basis in NATO, because Slovenia obviously has taken its place in the family of nations as a democratic, free market-based, privatized economy. In a December 1990 plebiscite, Slovenes voted 96 percent for independence from what was then Yugoslavia. That plebiscite directed the Slovene Parliament to craft a constitution, based on democratic, representative, government principles and set June 26, 1991, as the date on which independence from Yugoslavia should be formally declared.

Those directives were carried out by the Slovene Parliament, independence was declared; the Yugoslav army invade Slovenia to stifle independence, but, after a 9-day military confrontation with minimal loss of life, the Yugoslav army retreated and the Slovene people prevailed. The United States formally recognized the Republic of Slovenia on April 7, 1992.

Immediately upon the successful establishment of its independence, the Slovene Government began a very intensive privatization of its national economy, much of which already was operating on a market basis.

In January 1993, an international trade journal, International Trade Reporter, said this about Slovenia: "Of all the countries of eastern Europe, Slovenia has the best preconditions for the transition to a market economy and a fast start toward dynamic economic development."

Now, a fully privatized economy, Slovenia is the 20th largest exporter in the world, exporting over \$7 billion in goods each year, which accounts for 60 percent of Slovenia's GNP. Slovenia now enjoys a lively trade with the United States, shipping \$229 million worth of goods to the United States each year and importing some \$180 in United States goods annually.

However, for Slovenes, these are not surprising numbers. Prior to separation from the former Yugoslavia, Slovenia, with a population of 2.4 million, just over 8 percent of the total population of the former Yugoslavia, represented 40 percent of former Yugoslavia's overall GNP and 36 percent of its total tax base. Slovenes are industrious, hard working, committed to democratic principles and a vigorous market economy. They deserve to have their rightful place in the family of nations and, should they choose to do so, a seat in NATO and in the Western European Alliance.

Not only would such status be emphatically embraced by the Slovene Government and its people, but it would also fill with pride the three-quarter million or so of Americans of Slovene descent, including me, who are scattered throughout nearly every one of these United States.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman he is correct. It is written so as not to exclude the possibility of Slovenia.

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

Mr. BATEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend

him on his work. It has indeed taken care of some clarification both with respect to the Soviet Union and the Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia. I thank the gentleman for his work, it is very fine work.

I hope we can support it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TORRICELLI

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TORRICELLI: Page 68, line 4, strike out "shall" and insert "may."

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] will be recognized for 22 minutes, and an opponent will be recognized for 22 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, never in my memory has a more simple amendment been brought before this institution. It hangs largely on one word, "may" the United States establish the new military aid program and expansion of foreign aid in eastern Europe, or "shall" it do so? Is it mandatory?

In my memory of this institution, I have never known this Congress in its enthusiasm for foreign aid to mandate an expansion of that program to other countries. But indeed, unless my amendment is accepted, that is exactly what we will do today: Add 4 countries in eastern Europe on a mandatory basis, requiring military aid.

Now, I know this is a large institution and we represent very different districts with different electoral experiences. But I cannot believe that anyone in this institution feels that it is a mandate from their constituents in the second month of this new Congress as a matter of the highest priority to come here to this floor to expand foreign aid. I do not think anybody knew it was in the contract. I do not think anyone would have been for it if they did.

But you have got one opportunity to take it out today; change the word "shall" expand foreign aid to "may," based on the judgment of the administration.

Now, I know that the intentions of the authors of the legislation are sound, to bring into the western alliance for security purposes the nations of eastern Europe.

And indeed under the Partnership for Peace, \$100 million has already been authorized to work with eastern Europe nations so that one day they might coordinate their defense policies and perhaps eventually enter NATO.

But this is beyond coordinating defense programs. This is providing direct assistance.

Now, the authors may claim that the \$100 million of the Partnership for Peace can be used to fund this new foreign aid program. But indeed there is no reason to believe that this money would be sufficient. It is already being used with other nations. It may already be entirely consumed.

The simple truth is that if we vote to expand this foreign aid program, that money either has to come from withdrawing other eastern European nations from the Partnership for Peace, coming back to expand overall foreign aid money, or taking it from current recipients, most notably the biggest recipients, the Russian program, the Israeli program, or the Egyptian program.

Indeed, those countries could not possibly be unaffected if we are to mandate this foreign aid program because there are no other sources.

I find myself, Mr. Chairman, in a peculiar position. Having served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs all these years, I have come to this floor previously to argue for foreign aid, for poor nations, for nations with security problems, for nations working with the United States on a bilateral basis for our own defense, but considering our other budgetary problems and the other needs before this Congress, our domestic priorities, I cannot argue that we should add any nation on a mandatory basis for American foreign aid.

My amendment would simply allow the administration to look at each of these countries, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland, gauge the strengths of their democracies, the liberalization of their economies, what they are doing for their own security needs, and then make a determination whether or not we want to expand our military assistance.

It is a discretion that makes sense. Indeed, in the underlying legislation, on page 68 and page 69, this is exactly the formula that the authors use for expanding this to other countries beyond the four I just mentioned. They would gauge the progress of democracy in those countries, Ukraine, Baltics. That is what we should do for these.

□ 1220

Indeed, frankly I think of no better evidence than of the four countries mandated for an expansion of military aid, two of them are now led by former communists. One has an authoritative government. All have declining defense budgets.

So the majority would have us have a mandated foreign aid program for countries led by two former communists? Where they themselves are

decreasing their defense spending? With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, who is doing the thinking here? This cannot make any sense.

Let us work together with the administration to determine whether or not they are making progress, and they should be brought into the program.

There are times, Mr. Chairman, when this Congress feels so strongly and the merits are so overwhelming for foreign assistance programs in our security needs that this Congress should mandate, and we do, for Israel, for Egypt. But if I might paraphrase the words of former Senator Bentsen, Slovakia is no Israel. There is no need at this point to write into the law this which in my judgment is the largest expansion in terms of naming the countries involved with American foreign aid in my memory.

I cannot believe that any Member of this institution wants to go home this evening, meet their constituents on the streets and say to them, "You can be proud. I recognized our needs. I just voted to on a mandatory basis add four countries to the American foreign aid program."

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is recognized for 22 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a senior member of the Committee on International Relations and chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong support for the underlying provisions of the legislation, namely title 6, which squarely addresses the issue of NATO expansion. At the outset, let me dispel the notion that this section would somehow hamstring the administration's foreign policy, assuming it has one. Nothing in the National Security Revitalization Act mandates NATO membership for any country or group of countries. Changes in the membership of NATO are determined on the basis of consensus among the alliance's member states as stipulated under article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty, a point reaffirmed in the pending legislation and known to Members on both sides of the aisle.

The crux of the matter is how best to consolidate and build upon the fundamental political changes which have occurred in many of the countries of Central Europe, the Baltics, and some of the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union. On the security front, a veritable "no-man's-land" has emerged between Germany and Russia following the demise of the Warsaw Pact, and the ensuing moves toward

democracy and market economy by many in the region.

The Clinton administration, like the administration before it, the Bush administration, has been slow to move to fill this vacuum. Mr. Chairman, this has been a source of great consternation to the emerging democracies in the region who rightly view it as a source of potential instability.

I think my colleagues would agree that the Partnership for Peace initiative launched a year ago has failed to fill this void. By making the program mandatory, as we do in title 6, we are ensuring that the job gets done. I would urge my colleagues to read the legislation. The legislation clearly states that the program is to assist in the transition to full NATO membership of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and any other European country emerging from Communist domination that is designated by the President, and so on and so forth.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], making the transition optional would make this entire section a sense-of-the-Congress resolution. Mr. Chairman, title 7 of the National Security Revitalization Act I believe provides a reasonable framework for addressing the concerns consistent with U.S. interests in ensuring stability in Europe. Very clearly delineated in the bill is a list of criteria, such as respect for democratic principles and human rights enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act, against which to evaluate the suitability of prospective candidates for NATO membership. In addition, it establishes a program to provide the emerging democracies with the necessary tools to facilitate their transition to full NATO membership, which, as I pointed out earlier, will ultimately be up to the members of NATO to decide.

Given the broad range of our political, economic, and security interests in Europe, strengthening new free markets and democracies in that region benefits the United States. Interestingly two of the most prominent members of the foreign policy establishment, Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski, are ardent supporters of the timely expansion of NATO.

Dr. Kissinger sees the existing vacuum as a threat, not only to NATO cohesion, but the very existence of NATO as a meaningful institution, and he writes, "NATO expansion represents a balancing of two conflicting considerations the fear of alienating Russia against the danger of creating a vacuum in central Europe. A wise policy," he counsels, "would proceed with the membership for Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, and to reject a Russian veto." Dr. Kissinger concludes, "NATO cannot long survive if the borders it protects are not threatened while it refuses to protect the borders of adjoining countries that do feel threatened."

Zbigniew Brzezinski recently urged NATO to formally declare its "criteria for expansion and indicate which countries appear to meet them. This would end the counterproductive debates with Russia over whether NATO should expand. The longer this step is delayed, the more vociferous Moscow's objections are likely to be."

Mr. Chairman, this is precisely the purpose of title 6 of the National Security Revitalization Act.

Rather than dodging the issue of NATO expansion, as it has largely done to date, the Clinton administration, should move on the membership issue before more time is lost. But that requires leadership. We must seize upon today's opportunities which could be gone tomorrow. A steady and deliberate course of action is one thing, obfuscation, which has characterized the Clinton administration's approach to date is another.

Russia, perhaps sensing a certain timidity within the administration, has sought to block NATO expansion. It is instructive to recall that the Soviet Union vehemently opposed German membership in NATO in 1955 and attempted to deny unified Germany continued participation in the Alliance. A democratic Russia has nothing to fear from a defensive alliance founded on democratic principles. It would be foolhardy and dangerous, as Henry Kissinger rightly pointed out, to give Russia a veto over NATO expansion, and, as Dr. Brzezinski observed, failure to act now will only make matters worse.

Let's look at the earlier inclusion of new countries. As my colleagues know, when we look at countries that were included into NATO, Greece and Turkey were hardly stellar democracies when they joined in 1952. I remind Members that Portugal, one of the founding members of NATO, was under a dictatorship in 1949. In this bill we lay out clear markers which we think have to be achieved before this program goes forward. We are trying to promote and push these countries in the direction of democracy, free markets, respect for human rights. I believe title 6, as a mandatory program, goes much further to ensure those objectives, and, hopefully, a safer world, rather than making this title a sense-of-the-Congress resolution by amending it to an optional program.

□ 1230

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman who coauthored this amendment with me, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

I want to remind the body, however, that this amendment does not impact NATO expansion, only the question of whether there should be a mandatory foreign aid program.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would encourage especially the new freshmen of this body to read this title, pages 61 through 75. All the amendment that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] and I have offered would

do is say that the President may establish this program, not that he has to establish this program as a mandate.

As we read through the next 14 pages, as Members are on the floor or in their offices and they decide whether or not to vote for this amendment, let me say that in title IV what we have been debating is whether or not there should be some accountability and limits to U.S. participation in Somalia, in Haiti, in Bosnia, and other places around the world.

Title VI then says it completely unties that, completely undoes it, and says we are going to possibly send troops and foreign aid to Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, Albania, or Romania.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROEMER. I will not yield until I have finished.

It opens up all these possibilities by mandating to the President that he has to expand NATO and he has to look at providing foreign aid and disarmament aid to these qualifying countries.

I would also argue to my colleagues that in reading through what this legislation says, we read through this and find that on page 71 of title VI, at the top of the page, these countries would be eligible for economic support assistance, they would be eligible for security assistance, and they would be eligible for nonproliferation and disarmament funds.

Where in the Contract for America does it say that we are going to mandate that we expand NATO, that we list to the President of the United States all these countries that have to join, according to this legislation, in title VI, and that the American taxpayer is then going to fund this new expanded NATO? I do not think that that is what the elections in November were about.

I would further argue that whether or not we intended this, the gentleman from New Jersey and I are in complete adherence to what the contract says. The Contract With America at page 108 says, and I quote, "With respect to this program, the President is given authority to establish a program to assist Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic," et cetera, not mandate it to the President.

That is exactly what the Torricelli-Roemer amendment does. It does not mandate. It says the President may. It gives the President authority. It is in complete agreement with what the contract says. It gives the President authority.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROEMER. I will not yield yet.

I will just conclude by saying that I am delighted that somebody did not stick Chechnya in this. What would that mean? Where would we be then? What would that commit us to? What about Albania and Romania? Will the gentleman answer that question? They do not even have an organized military. Yet Title 5 of the NATO treaty

requires mutual cooperation between the countries.

How much does this cost? What would be the financial burden to the United States to start funding this under these three or four different accounts, and would the United States be required to send troops to Albania and Slovakia?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has expired.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, first of all, perhaps we have had too many discussions on the floor about mandates because mandates seem to be on the brain.

There is nothing in this bill that mandates that any country join NATO. That has to be made very clear. What we are doing is saying that the program that would assist nations like Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia and other European nations means that these nations would be designated for transitional help. There is \$100 million being requested for the President by the President for this kind of thing. We want to encourage expansion—that is what we are talking about.

As I have said, we have had a lack of leadership with regard to this, and we are saying that Congress should speak up and say these countries are worth it. A window of opportunity exists and we do not want to see that window closed.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I have the time, I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Again I ask, what is the cost of this? Have we had hearings on this?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As the gentleman knows, there is no cost figure stated in the legislation.

Mr. ROEMER. There certainly is not.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. At a later date we will talk about it, but already we have \$100 million for the fiscal year requested by the President in the Partnership For Peace.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Torricelli amendment.

There is a lot of confusion around here. Nowhere is there a requirement that the President enlarge NATO. Nowhere is there a requirement that the United States support an enlargement

of NATO under all conditions. Section 604 tries to provide some leadership. It is assisting, and it would encourage NATO expansion.

This has been unfairly characterized as mandatory foreign aid, even mandatory military aid. There is nothing about it that is mandatory. If the President decides to create an office but uses no funds, he has that authority.

But what has the President done? He has offered the Warsaw Initiative last July, and in the budget document we submitted, we have \$100 million for the Warsaw Initiative. We would expect that under section 604 as written the Warsaw Initiative funds would be channeled through this source.

Nowhere is it restricted to military assistance. If in fact we talk to the State Department, they will talk to us about transportation improvements and other kinds of ESF related expenditures. There may in fact not be a single penny spent on military aid as a result of this.

What I think we are doing is trying to provide some guidance. If in fact we are going to enlarge into the Visegrad Four countries or other eligible countries for a period of time when they meet the criteria spelled out in title VI, then we would have an opportunity to expand NATO, with the approval of our 15 additional NATO allies.

But what we are attempting to do with this program is to provide some guidance to the executive branch. That is an entirely appropriate activity of the Congress of the United States. The President is proposing to spend \$100 million on the Visegrad Four and other Partnership For Peace countries. We are going to give some direction through section 604.

Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of the Torricelli amendment.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON], a member of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Torricelli amendment. I believe that the mandated-funding provision and other policies contained in title VI of this bill are severely flawed.

Mandating a funding program for these four countries is a serious mistake. Congress should not attempt to legislate the expansion of NATO—NATO expansion must be handled flexibly, in close consultation with our allies, as circumstances in Europe evolve. In addition, NATO expansion would be at an enormous expense—tens of billions of dollars. This bill mandates an expansion of our commitments overseas, yet it doesn't say how we should pay for them—and all during a period of declining foreign assistance resources.

Specifying countries that are to be fast-tracked into NATO membership is also a mistake. As Secretaries Christopher and Perry recently wrote in the New York Times, "If we arbitrarily

lock in advantages now for some countries, we risk discouraging reformers in countries not named and fostering complacency in countries that are."

In general, this bill micromanages U.S. foreign policy to an unacceptable extent. Any policy of NATO expansion should be closely responsive to the very fluid political landscape in Europe—the President should decide how and when NATO is expanded. Members on both sides know well that this sort of micromanaging simply does not work.

Mr. Chairman, I must also question the wisdom of the underlying policy of NATO expansion as expressed in this bill. At the very least, I believe the Nation needs a broad national debate on NATO expansion, a debate that has hardly begun.

This policy of NATO expansion would draw clear new lines across Europe. It would prejudice, and I believe adversely affect, the outcome of transitions underway in Russia and throughout the region. Moreover, I am not convinced that NATO expansion is viable politically. Do the American people truly understand the legal and financial implications of providing security guarantees to Bratislava and Budapest? Are we ready to sacrifice the lives of our sons and daughters to defend Slovakia and the other countries? Once the public debate begins in earnest, the expansion of NATO by treaty obligation may well be politically impossible.

I strongly support the Torricelli amendment to this bill.

□ 1240

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to respond to a couple of the points that have been made in this debate. I am very familiar with Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, having visited and examined some of their emergence from the former Soviet bloc, and I can tell you that this amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey is a grave mistake at this time.

The point was made here that this is some extension of foreign aid, and that is not correct. There is foreign aid already in all of these countries, United States foreign aid. This amendment says the President shall establish a program to assist in the transition to full NATO membership. He says "may."

Well, the President already may. That is what we are suffering from, is a lack of leadership, a lack of direction. And what this Congress is trying to do is say that we shall assist these emerging nations to reach NATO status. And that is the clear intent.

That is what has been lacking here, and that is what will be lacking if we miss this opportunity. We will make a grave mistake if we pass this amendment and put us back in the situation we are in, because these countries, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and

Slovakia want this status and want to work toward this status, and this directs from the Congress, providing leadership, to say that we will establish a program and the President will cooperate with us to bring these people into NATO. And that can only be in the long-term interests of the security and peace of not only this Nation, but the entire world.

If we adopt this amendment, we are voting for the status quo, and we are voting to make a great mistake in the history of these emerging nations. I urge its defeat.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, if I were a NATO ally, I would be scratching my head in wonderment and asking has the U.S. Congress gone mad, or is this a joke? Did the Americans hear that the cold war is over, or is this a time warp?

Whatever happened to consultation with our NATO allies? What does the President think about this initiative? Oh, I forgot, we now have 230 Secretaries of State and Defense, and we do not need an executive branch. We now have an imperial Congress with a constitutional authority to run foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bad bill. It is an attempt to dictate the terms of NATO expansion with no criteria for membership. England is against this, France is against this, Germany is against this. Russia is going to think we are indicating aggression. Slovakia is run by an authoritarian leader. Poland is run by a former Communist Party member. Should we not be discussing these issues with others, rather than dictating to NATO and the executive branch?

We are also starting a new military assistance program, an entitlement program. This is going to take money from other strategic allies like Israel, like Turkey, like Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, let us not allow this amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] to go down. It corrects a serious flaw. This bill is not going to become law, but it sends a chilling signal to our allies that the United States is divided, that there is no cohesion between the executive and congressional branches.

Mr. Chairman, let us debate NATO expansion within the Congress, within the American public, but with our allies. Let us pass the Torricelli amendment and correct a very, very chilling signal that is going to arrive in Europe and NATO tomorrow that the United States is divided.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman, I hope

the gentleman is aware there is no entitlement program created by this. The President, of course, is proposing to spend \$100 million for the Warsaw Initiative, part of which could go for the countries which would be eligible. There is no mandatory timeframe, of course.

We have by the action of the framers of H.R. 7 and by action of the Committee on International Relations taken additional criteria that ought to be considered, giving some guidance to these countries on how we ought to proceed. But we certainly are not forcing our allies or the President to take them in.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is an expert on many of these issues, NATO especially. The gentleman knows our allies are seriously concerned about this initiative, and you are going to be taking money from other strategic allies. You are setting forth a military assistance program. The language is very clear.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Torricelli amendment. It calls on NATO membership for four countries in the near future. It mandates an assistance program of all kinds to aid in the transition to NATO membership. It specifically designates four countries. Now, there are a lot of things wrong with that.

First of all, it prejudices and dictates the pace and direction of NATO expansion. What you have got going on in this part of the world is a very elaborate historical process to determine the security regime of Europe in the years ahead, and the Congress of the United States comes in with this provision in H.R. 7 and tries to dictate what that result would be.

Furthermore, this is just gratuitous advice, because NATO expansion cannot be dictated by a statute of the Congress. We short-circuit the partnership for peace initiative, which is supported by all of our allies today. That establishes closer military and political ties between NATO and the nations of central and Eastern Europe. We ought to let that evolve.

Now, there has been a lot of talk in here about this bill providing guidance to the President. This does not provide guidance to the President. This tells the President what to do. It mandates the President shall establish a program. That is not providing guidance. That is mandating. And you are telling the President to assist in the transition, and furthermore, you are not giving him any resources to do what you tell him to do.

That is no way to conduct American foreign policy. You are mandating an

ambitious program of military and economic assistance here. You are picking out winners and losers in this historical process that is going on. You are creating a dangerous gulf between our commitments on the one hand and the resources that we provide on the other hand.

We are extending U.S. security commitments under the plan you put into H.R. 7, and that is an unwise thing to do. I strongly support the Torricelli amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I would ask if the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] would engage in a brief colloquy with my regarding the U.S. policy toward NATO as spelled out in clause 4 of section 603, which is language I worked with the chairman and his committee to develop.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this provision addresses NATO's current lack of an airborne ground surveillance system to provide allied forces with essential, timely, and reliable enemy movement and targeting information.

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentleman would yield, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. In 1991, the United States recommended to NATO that it consider procuring an airborne ground surveillance capability to complement the air surveillance capability of the NATO AWACS fleet. The AWACS system has effectively provided our pilots with a map of the skies, however, it is not designed to observe real-time movement of ground forces on the battlefield at extended ranges. It is, therefore, in the best interests of the United States and the NATO alliance to expedite a program which will provide our ground forces with the same ability to see the battlefield that our pilots currently enjoy with the AWACS fleet.

□ 1250

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, is it not correct that the United States has already developed such a system which is called JSTARS and demonstrated its battle management capabilities during Desert Storm?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman is again correct. In fact, the JSTARS program has been nominated by our Nation as the best candidate to meet the needs of NATO. I am confident that the JSTARS program will provide NATO with a significant operational advantage that will strengthen the capabilities of our allied forces.

Mr. HAYES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, all sides including the administration, envision the eventual expansion of NATO. The problem is that the administration has been unwilling to spell out in clear terms what conditions candidates would have to meet. This ambiguity does not serve any good purpose and, in fact, plays into the hands of the Russians who want to block any expansion.

Let me remind Members and assure Members the bill does not mandate that the countries listed or any others would be invited to even join NATO. There is a separate process for that. The process for expansion is qualified by article 10 of the NATO treaty. There is a specific process for that. We are talking about a program to assist in the transition.

I urge Members to read on page 69 the kinds of things we are talking about that we would like to see happen: shared values and interests, democratic governments, free market economies, civilian control of the military, and so on and so forth.

Let us not just be passive and reactive. I believe we need to be proactive for the sake of security for Europe and for the rest of the world.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me and for his leadership in presenting this amendment, because I think that if it passes, it will vastly improve H.R. 872.

I am very, very concerned about the language contained therein, which would expand NATO membership. We must remember that NATO membership means that our security alliance would be expanded, that we would expand the guarantee of security to many more countries.

And this may be appropriate, as my colleague and friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] said, we all envision a time when that would happen. But right now, 16 governments are involved in any decision to expand NATO. The United States, we do not make this decision alone. The situation in Eastern Europe and in the New Independent States is a delicate one, the balance of which could be very disturbed by this legislation.

The administration's partnership for peace was designed to enhance the security of our allies in this region while providing incentives for reform for the new European democracies. If we move forward with these NATO provisions, we will run the risk of alienating the countries not named and the greater risk of developing a bunker mentality with Russia.

I urge my colleagues to support the Torricelli amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 872, which poses a significant threat to our national security. The bill before

us violates basic tenets of our national defense strategy; it abrogates international treaties; and, it violates the U.S. Constitution. The National Security Revitalization Act is fundamentally flawed. It is also dangerous.

H.R. 872 is dangerous because it would revive the old star wars project, an ineffective, unnecessary, and costly project which was, after significant public and congressional debate under previous administrations, deemed to be not worthy of funding.

The Congressional Budget Office [CBO] has estimated that the system proposed by the Republicans in this bill could cost \$29–\$30 billion over the next 5 years. Others have estimated that the costs could range as high as \$39 billion. In today's budget climate, funding one projects means not funding something else. If star wars goes forward, troop readiness and weapon modernization will be cut.

In addition, restarting star wars would actually make the world less safe. The passage of this bill could abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, threaten START II negotiations, and terminate existing Nunn-Lugar agreements to dismantle nuclear warheads with Russia, Ukraine, Byelarus, and Kazakhstan. These actions do not increase our security, they undermine it by threatening the real progress which is being made toward diminishing the threat of nuclear destruction.

H.R. 872 is dangerous because it would tie the hands of the President, any President, in international crisis when he or she determines it is in our national interest to place our troops under the operational control of another country, including NATO allies. My Republican colleagues must know that with this law on the books, President Bush would not have been able to deploy the troops he deemed necessary to carry out Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm against Saddam Hussein; President Clinton would not have been able to respond to Hussein's threats by deploying troops to Kuwait in 1994. For that matter, if constrained by this law, President Truman would not have been able to deploy troops to Korea in 1950.

This provision is unnecessary. Today, our forces always remain under the command of the President of the United States. We already apply the most rigorous standards when we pass even the most limited responsibility to a competent foreign commander—an action which has been done throughout this great Nation's history from the Revolutionary War through the Persian Gulf war. I frankly do not understand why my Republican colleagues, who have steadfastly defended the President's prerogatives for years, would choose to tie his hands in what is a very dangerous way.

H.R. 872 is dangerous because it undermines the very viability of international peacekeeping efforts. Many argue that the United States cannot and should not be the world's policeman. We cannot afford to intervene everywhere; we do not want to put American lives at risk. However, conflicts do not go away and in this post-cold-war world, there seem to be an evergrowing number of global hot spots. If we want to retain our role as the world's only superpower and if we do not want to be the world's policeman, it is critical for us to work to strengthen, not to weaken, multinational institutions.

If this bill passes, we are going in the wrong direction. The U.N. peacekeeping provisions contained in this legislation would cripple mul-

tinational efforts to address international crises. If we reduce our assessed peacekeeping dues dollar-for-dollar by the costs of peacekeeping operations which we conduct voluntarily and in support of U.S. interests, we would force the cancellation of peacekeeping activities, undermine U.N. peacekeeping efforts, and ultimately devastate the United Nations. If the United States changes the way it funds U.N. peacekeeping, other countries will follow suit.

As much as some would like to believe this country can survive in isolation, it cannot. If we pass this bill, we will be forced either to be the world's sole policeman or to ignore conflicts which could threaten our national security. I do not believe this choice is what the American people really want.

H.R. 872 is also dangerous because it unilaterally designates certain candidates for NATO membership. Sixteen governments are involved in any decision to expand NATO; the United States does not make this decision alone. The situation in Eastern Europe and the New Independent States is a delicate one, the balance of which can be disturbed by H.R. 872. The Administration's Partnership for Peace was designed to enhance the security of our allies in the region while providing incentives for reform for the new European democracies. If we move forward with these NATO provisions, we run the real risk of alienating the countries not named by the Republicans for NATO membership and destabilizing an already precarious region. These NATO provisions are imprudent also because it sends the wrong message to Russia. The last thing we need is for Russia to adopt a bunker mentality as the security guarantee is extended to all of their neighbors. Against what country.

H.R. 872 contains a number of other objectionable provisions, some of which are dangerous and some of which are just plain silly. One of the themes of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle has been that government should be downsized, reduced, and eliminated. It is therefore with some perplexity that I note the inclusion in this bill of an unnecessary and duplicative commission to review national security.

Why do people who claim to be opponents of government agencies, bureaucracies, and departments, propose to establish a brand new one, one which would duplicate services which are already being provided by the Secretary of Defense and Members of Congress?

American taxpayers already pay the salaries of people to review U.S. security needs. We have a Department of Defense and defense specialists in other Government agencies and here in Congress. But, this bill would spend an additional \$1.5 million of American workers' hard-earned dollars to copy what people in Government are already doing. This Commission does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, for all of the above reasons and others, I believe that the National Security Revitalization Act should be defeated. If it passes, U.S. national security will be weakened significantly.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations in a colloquy, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I wondered if the gentleman could succinctly tell us, does he have some estimation of exactly how much we would be spending in new foreign assistance to help these poor countries? Is there a dollar amount he has in mind?

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the President has to evolve a program and then send the program to us. We are not mandating.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, so in fact, we would be mandating a foreign assistance program without knowing a number?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield—

Mr. TORRICELLI. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would then answer, is there a reason, a theory in mind, why when each of these four countries is declining in their defense spending, spending less of their dollars, we would take the American taxpayers' dollars in foreign aid to substitute for their military spending? Is there a rationale there I am missing?

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his comment. We await the President's program before we can analyze what the costs would be.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, this is evidence that if one lives long enough, they can see anything.

The majority has come to this Congress to establish a mandatory foreign aid program at a time of enormous domestic problems and mounting deficits in this country.

They have done so claiming that our current program to help these same foreign nations is not working, even though it is only 90 days old. We have asked the President for 90 days to begin working militarily for NATO expansion with these countries. Now in our impatience we tell him on a mandatory basis, he must do so, that we do not know what it would cost. We overlook the fact that two of the four countries have former Communists running their governments. One is becoming an authoritative government. But we want to expand foreign aid to help them. Even though the same countries, every one of them, has a declining defense budget. But in our enthusiasm to help them, even when we do not have enough money for our own armed forces, we are going to throw our money upon them.

Mr. Chairman, the simple truth is, this has not been well thought through. We have a program that is working. We tell the President of the United States, you may have a program to help these countries if they are democratic, they are pluralistic, it would help the security interests of the United States, our NATO allies agree.

It is a good program. It is under way, and we should remain with it. Our differences indeed are narrow, whether we apply those criteria to those four countries, do so on a basis of the President's discretion or, in my judgment, have the largest mandatory expansion of the American foreign assistance program that I have ever witnessed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of this institution to vote for my amendment. It is consistent with bipartisan foreign policy, the actions of the 103d Congress, and indeed, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has pointed out, the Contract With America, which itself talks about a permissive expansion of our foreign assistance program, not a mandatory expansion.

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. I would just like to remind my colleagues, on page 108 of the contract, it says "the President is given authority to establish this program."

If the Torricelli-Roemer amendment is adopted, we say he "may establish" this program, not as the current language reads, he "shall establish" a program, which is mandatory. The other side even lists the countries that should be in NATO.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indian. I urge a yes vote. I thank Members of the majority party, the new members in the committee who voted for this amendment in committee.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, section 604(a) of H.R. 872 directs the President to establish a program to assist in the transition of full NATO membership of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia and any other country emerging from Communist domination that is designated by the President.

The author of this amendment, Mr. TORRICELLI and the administration opposes the mandatory establishment of this program. That is no surprise to me. This administration, and in fact, any administration, nearly always opposes congressionally mandated initiatives.

I am reminded of the Bush administration's vociferous objections to the establishment of the Nunn-Lugar program. And also to the establishment of the nonproliferation and disarmament fund which was a part of the Freedom bill.

In fact, I am quite confident that each and every Member here can point to examples of congressional initiatives which this and other administrations have opposed. It seems to me that if it is not their idea then it is not a good idea.

Permit me to explain why I think it is so important to direct that this program be established. The answer is quite simple.

It is clear that this administration wants to provide assistance to certain Central European countries. This administration has been trying to find a way for more than a year to make additional countries eligible for excess defense articles.

In fact, the administration recently briefed staff of the International Relations Committee about the President's fiscal year 1996 budget request for \$100 million for military cooperation with Central European states. We want to work with the President to support that assistance.

But I want to make clear that we want that done in a proper framework. The establishment of a program under this provision provides a framework for the Committee on International Relations to carry out its fundamental oversight responsibilities. It will provide us a framework for accounting purposes. It will provide us a framework for hearing purposes. I don't know why any Member would oppose that provision.

One final point and it is a key one, let me be clear that although section 604 directs that the program be established it does not in any way, shape, or form, mandate that the President provide assistance to these countries. Not one penny is earmarked in this legislation. The decision to provide assistance under this program is left entirely up to the administration.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Torrecelli amendment.

□ 1300

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 232, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

AYES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)

Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio

DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ensign
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake

Foglietta
Ford
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hayes
Hefner
Hinchev
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Klecza
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Laughlin
Levin
Lincoln
Lofgren
Lowe
Luther
Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy

McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roybal-Allard

Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—232

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis

DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Evans
Everett
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Flanigan
Kim
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson

Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari

| | | |
|------------|---------------|-------------|
| Moorhead | Rogers | Tate |
| Morella | Ros-Lehtinen | Taylor (NC) |
| Myers | Roth | Thomas |
| Myrick | Royce | Thornberry |
| Neal | Salmon | Tiahrt |
| Nethercutt | Saxton | Torkildsen |
| Neumann | Schaefer | Traficant |
| Ney | Schiff | Upton |
| Norwood | Seastrand | Vucanovich |
| Nussle | Sensenbrenner | Waldholtz |
| Oxley | Shadegg | Walker |
| Packard | Shaw | Walsh |
| Pallone | Shays | Wamp |
| Paxon | Shuster | Watts (OK) |
| Petri | Skeen | Weldon (FL) |
| Pombo | Smith (MI) | Weldon (PA) |
| Porter | Smith (NJ) | Weller |
| Portman | Smith (TX) | White |
| Pryce | Smith (WA) | Whitfield |
| Quillen | Solomon | Wicker |
| Quinn | Souder | Young (AK) |
| Radanovich | Spence | Young (FL) |
| Ramstad | Stearns | Zeliff |
| Regula | Stockman | Zimmer |
| Riggs | Stump | |
| Roberts | Talent | |

NOT VOTING—11

| | | |
|---------|---------------|----------|
| Becerra | Hastings (FL) | Stark |
| Clay | Lewis (GA) | Thornton |
| Ewing | McHugh | Wilson |
| Green | Roukema | |

□ 1318

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Lewis of Georgia for, with Mr. McHugh against.

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

Ms. HARMAN, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. COOLEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SKELTON: Page 73, line 15, strike the close quotation marks.

Page 73, after line 15, insert the following new paragraphs:

"(5) The number, types, and costs of NATO armed forces that would be required to defend the country and the number, types, and costs of United States Armed Forces that would be required as part of such a NATO force.

"(6) Whether the United States is prepared to provide a nuclear guarantee to the country.

"(7) The likelihood that the country may become involved in disputes or armed conflict with neighboring countries in the region."

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] will be recognized for 1 minute, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 1 minute.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would add a section to 604 requiring the President to assess the number, types, and costs of NATO

armed forces that would be required to defend the country and the number, types, and costs of U.S. Armed Forces; also whether the United States is prepared to provide a nuclear guarantee to the country; and also the likelihood that the country may become involved in disputes or armed conflict in neighboring countries in that region.

I would hope that the majority will accept this amendment. We have discussed it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the majority is prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment to title VI regarding NATO. The information requested from the administration will be useful to the committee and the Congress in determining just how fast and under what circumstances NATO should be expanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

The amendment was agreed to

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House today, it is in order for the consideration of the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

AMENDMENT, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the previous order, I offer an amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL: Page 23, strike line 12 and insert the following:

"(c) ADDITIONAL EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) EXCEPTION FOR AUTHORIZATION BY LAW.—

Page 23, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR NATO OPERATIONS.— Subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a proposed placement of any element of the armed forces in an operation conducted by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Page 31, strike line 8 and insert the following:

"(d) ADDITIONAL EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) EXCEPTION FOR AUTHORIZATION BY LAW.—

Page 31, after line 14, insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR NATO OPERATIONS.— Subsection (b) shall not apply in the case of a proposed placement of any element of the armed forces in an operation conducted by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. GILMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1320

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have been troubled by the fact that this bill would prohibit U.S. troops from serving under a military commander from a NATO country. The NATO alliance is

very, very, important and I think that that is really not what ought to be.

This amendment, and I thank the chairman of the committee, goes a step in the direction not quite as far as I would like it to go, but needless to say it goes a step in the right direction in saying that U.S. troops would be able to serve under a military commander of NATO, in a NATO operation.

I think that at a time when we are talking about expanding NATO we ought to respect it.

I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, that the process really is terrible, it is terrible because we have to operate under this majority-imposed ridiculous 10-hour constraint and it is terrible, frankly, because some people on this side of the aisle were unhelpful and less than frank with me in terms of helping me to bring my amendment for a vote. However, in the 10 or so seconds I have left, I want to say that the chairman has tried his best and I appreciate the fact he has worked with me to bring this amendment forward.

If we did not have something like this, we could not have had D-day, fought World War I or II or Desert Storm, and that is why I think the amendment is a step in the right direction.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] for a colloquy.

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. In view of the tremendous progress toward establishing democratic political institutions and market economies made by the Baltic States and their keen interests in NATO memberships, I want to clarify my understanding that this bill in no way compromises their opportunity for future NATO membership.

It is my understanding that today's bill includes language recognizing the transformation toward economic, political, and military reform in Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Hungary. These states have taken the necessary steps toward democratic reforms and I support the recognition of their efforts and continued U.S. assistance.

Mr. GILMAN. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman.

The expansion of NATO will foster continued economic growth and political stability in these regions. Moreover, the declining defense budgets of European and American forces necessitate expansion of the NATO security umbrella and the military cooperation it fosters.

It is also my understanding that this bill authorizes the President to designate "other European countries emerging from communist domination" who might receive assistance. Title VI of H.R. 872 specifically designates the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania

as eligible to be considered for future NATO membership. These countries will be required to continue to develop their democratic political structures, market economies, and military reforms while contributing to the security of the North Atlantic area.

To date, the Baltic States have made significant progress in these areas. Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania all have progressed toward democratic institutions by adopting Western-style constitutions and holding free and fair elections. In addition, these states have moved toward a market economy by following tight fiscal and monetary policies, creating strong currencies, and moving toward privatization of housing, small businesses, and industry.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania also constitute the Baltic Peacekeeping Battalion. This force is currently receiving assistance from the U.S. Military and should be operational for security and mutual defense by 1996. As members of the Partnership of Peace, these states hope to maintain cooperation in the areas of defense and peacekeeping while adopting NATO military hardware standards.

Further, the Baltic States have been admitted to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE] and the United Nations. Besides being members of the International Monetary Fund [IMF] and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development [EBRD], the Baltic States hope soon to be members of the European Union [EU], with which they have free-trade agreements.

I am pleased with the language of H.R. 872 regarding the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This provides the United States a historic opportunity to ensure future regional security by taking appropriate actions now. We can no longer adhere to lines drawn during the cold war. NATO expansion and admissions will lend stability to the entire region, promote U.S. interests, and provide security against a possible resurgence of nationalism.

I thank the gentleman from New York for entering into this colloquy with me and am glad that we were able to clarify this important issue.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the majority is prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment to title VI regarding NATO.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The minority leader is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in disappointment and sorrow that this bill which I think is terribly ill-advised will be passed by our House of Representatives.

I have served in this House for 18 years and I have witnessed the fiercest debates on both domestic and foreign policy. But I have seen that even though we have differed sometimes on foreign and defense policy, that for all

the time that I have been here and before, this has been a country, this has been a House of Representatives that could find its way to support a bipartisan internationalist foreign and defense policy for our country.

I think back to the 1920's when there were isolationists in both parties, but America finally rejected isolationism and fought World War II, and after World War II came together in the greatest act of compassion in the world, and sensibility, and supported the Marshal Plan. Republicans and Democrats together.

We formed the United Nations, whereas in the early part of the century we decided we did not want the League of Nations and backed out of the world after World War II and in a bipartisan way we created a multilateral action for world peace.

After the Marshal Plan and the United Nations, we fought a cold war for 45 years, and together, Republicans, Democrats, Americans, we stayed involved as the leader of this world and rejected isolationism, rejected pulling back into our borders, rejected the idea that we could be self-sufficient, alone in this world.

The crowning achievement of these years was no matter how much we squabbled about our internal domestic policies, when it came to the shores of the United States we came together, and we decided together with the American people what our policy would be.

I believe that if this bill passes today we put all of that history, all of that partnership, and all of that progress at risk.

When you try to politicize the actions of the United Nations and our relationship with the United Nations, when you strain to reinvent a cold war that no longer exists, when you politicize NATO and who should be in NATO, and who should be out, and who should decide it, when you politicize the decisions in NATO between the Congress and the President, and when you politicize arms control and try to reinvent nostalgically a weapon system that may have been appropriate 10, 15 years ago but is not appropriate to the threats we meet today, then you put at risk all of that progress, all of that achievement which is the crowning achievement of our country.

Theodore Roosevelt once said we have no choice, we the people of the United States, as to whether we shall play a great part in the world. That has been decided for us by fate, by the march of events. All that we can decide is whether we play it well, or ill.

□ 1330

My friends in the House, I think if this bill passes, we will play it ill and not well.

This bill is not about campaigns and about pollsters and what may achieve some more votes or some more popularity among some in the country or in the world. It is about our conscience. It is about our achievement together of a

foreign and defense policy that has made the American people secure. It is not about campaigns. It is about our conscience, and if we allow that conscience to be dictated by opinion polls, if we allow it to be bought and sold for votes, then God help this Congress and God help this United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, yes, this has been an important bill. It has been an important debate.

It has not been the most important bill, nor the most important debate on this Nation's role in protecting the peace and freedom and dignity of nations as well as ourselves across the globe. In the 10 years I have been here, I have seen more exciting debate. I have seen more fitful differences of opinion. I have seen more important and more immediate and more pressing issues with extraordinarily more sharply divided and heartfelt differences of opinion. The debate we had for so many years over Nicaragua, for example, comes to mind.

It has been a strange debate. People have been lining up in positions that we have not been accustomed to seeing them in over these past few years.

There is no need to hyperbolize this. This is not this Congress' last word. This is not the last word on defense of this session of Congress. There will be a defense authorization bill later.

What is this bill about today within this contract period? It's a course correction. It is a statement by this Congress that, yes, we, too, have heard the voices of the American people. These voices have said it is necessary to this Nation and to this world for this Nation to have a strong, independent, and able defense—first and foremost of its own national interest and then also, and importantly, the interest of peace and freedom across the globe. It is important that this Nation's strong defense be deployed when necessary in support of our NATO allies—and even to the U.N. peacekeeping efforts—but they must be deployed in a balanced, thoughtful way, and never, never when the interests of this Nation, nor the safety and security of this Nation's troops, are made subservient to some other cause.

It is a mid-course correction that recognizes that this Nation is and must be the world's champion for democracy, the world's guardian against tyrants, in concert with alliance with the United Nations at times, NATO at times, and other nations in the world and other theaters in the world.

It is a bill that says this Nation has a duty even in the post-cold-war era to recognize new and different kinds of threats and to be ready and able to change deployment schemes.

This is a good bill. It is a bill that has enjoyed the jurisdiction of three of

our most important committees. It has had thoughtful debate. It has had thoughtful markup. It does deserve our thoughtful consideration, and it does deserve our vote.

I am saddened to see even the intimidation by anybody in the debate that this is a political effort. This is a serious effort and an effort that has commanded the serious attention of the people on those committees that have taken their most serious professional commitment to the task. Their work product needs to be respected. Their motives need to be understood to be decent and honorable motives. The product is important to reaffirm Congress' standing with the American people, for us to say to America at this time, "Yes, we agree, and we understand what you have told us." The Nation has gone too far in the direction of globalism and has lost sight of its essential footing, and we intend to correct that before we go on to the larger task of this year's defense authorizations and appropriations bills.

I want to give my best regards to and appreciation for all three of the committees of jurisdiction. I want to thank everybody who has participated in the debate. I want to appreciate everybody for their different point of view at times, and ask my colleagues, vote for this product, reaffirm our standing with the American people.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in the words of our former President, here we go again. Believe it or not, after spending billions of dollars on a defense system with questionable results, the Republicans are now asking that we immediately build up a new arsenal to fend off who? Darth Vader? The star wars missile defense system made a modicum of sense when we were worried that the Soviet Union would launch missiles against us. But now, with the Soviet Union disintegrated and no other significant long-range ballistic missile threat existing, I cannot fathom why we should direct millions of Federal dollars toward this far-out defense system.

Thousands of families in my congressional district desperately need improved schools, housing, job training, and so forth. Over half of the public school buildings in Chicago were built before World War II and 15 percent were built before the turn of the century. And yet there is no funding for our children, our future? Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot accept the whimsy explanations offered by the other side of the aisle for promoting this over-the-top star wars system.

Even worse, Mr. Chairman, is that this bill calls for the reestablishment of the budget firewalls between defense and domestic spending. This means that should we one day realize that our priorities are completely distorted, our hands will be tied. Should we one day regret that we are spending billions of dollars to fight off fictional foes that never materialize, we will be hamstrung. When we finally take a look around and realize that teenagers are being shot in the streets, families are working full time and still aren't able to climb out of poverty and young children are attending pitifully under-funded schools with almost no chance to afford a college education, it will simply be too bad. We will not be able to redi-

rect our billion dollar star wars budget to here at home where it is needed the most.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill is heading directly for a Presidential veto because it completely destroys our current military operation system which allows the President to respond quickly to threatening situations. I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this ill-prepared bill and voting against H.R. 7.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, passage of the Durbin, Lipinski, Gilman, Knollenberg amendment will encourage stability in Central Europe. As written, H.R. 7 mentions only the visegrad nations. We need to make it clear that other European countries emerging from communist domination should receive assistance and be welcomed into NATO when they meet appropriate standards.

Expressing an interest in having these countries join NATO one day will create stability and provide for the growth of democracy and economic prosperity. We will be encouraging these countries to expedite the promotion of democratic principles within their respective governments. It follows that a less volatile political environment will provide fertile ground for foreign investors.

With the end of the cold war, the United States is the largest single investor in this part of the world. Our investment creates employment and encourages stability and the strengthening of democracy.

By assisting our friends in Central Europe, we will bring continued stability and prosperity in Western Europe, and thus secure United States interests in all of Europe.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman: Yesterday the House of Representatives reversed course on resurrecting the star wars anti-missile defense system, demonstrating clearly how out of step the Republican contract is with the views of the American public. This misguided effort to further bankrupt our defense coffers with wasteful spending simply reflects failed policies of the past rather than a fresh vision for the future.

Little acknowledgement is given in this measure for the changing world view we face and the types of regional conflicts likely to arise. With the end of the cold war we need to reevaluate the role of the United States as a world leader and the types of alliances that will support our efforts abroad. This bill chooses to relinquish our involvement with strategically important allies that in the past have fostered political and economic as well as military cooperation. An unfounded fear of United Nations control of American forces belies the fact that since World War I the President has only on occasion allowed purely operational control—not military command—of U.S. troops by a foreign commander.

Now more than ever the United States has an obligation and an opportunity to promote peace and democracy world-wide. This effort to hamstring and second guess the President's authority as Commander in Chief is not only short-sighted but dangerous. Asking the President to jump through hoops in order to execute vital military actions diminishes the U.S. stature as a world power and jeopardizes the effectiveness of our foreign policy.

Times have changed and a return to isolationism and a star-based missile defense system is a return to foreign policy based on fear rather than readiness. Let us take advantage of the fall of the Soviet Union to make the kind of changes which prepare us against the rede-

fined threats that realistically may occur. Allowing Congress to undermine the President's position as world leader subjects us to the kind of divisiveness that makes effective foreign policy decision-making impossible. While not every foreign policy decision may be universally supported, the current checks and balances serve adequately to preserve our ability to act responsibly when needed.

Now that we have shown the foresight not to once again take the path to frivolous defense spending with the reinvention of the star wars missile defense system, let us also reject a return to isolationist policy centered on imaginary fears and insecurity. Our true national security interest lies in our ability to assert our leadership and to focus our defense dollars on combat readiness. To be successful in dealing with the end of the cold war, we need to look to the future—not to the past.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong support for the provisions of the pending legislation which squarely addresses the issue of NATO expansion. At the outset let me dispel the notion that this section would somehow hamstring the administration's foreign policy—assuming it has one. Nothing in the National Security Revitalization Act mandates NATO membership for any country or group of countries. Changes in the membership of NATO are determined on the basis of consensus among the Alliance's member states as stipulated under article X of the North Atlantic Treaty, a point reaffirmed in the pending legislation and known to Members on both sides of the aisle.

The crux of the matter is how best to consolidate and build upon the fundamental political changes which have occurred in many of the countries of central Europe, the Baltics, and some of the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union. On the security front, a veritable no-man's-land has emerged between Germany and Russia following the demise of the Warsaw Pact, and the ensuing moves toward democracy and market economy by many in the region.

The Clinton administration, like the one before it, has been slow to move to fill this vacuum. Mr. Chairman, this has been a source of great consternation to the emerging democracies of the region, who rightly view it as a source of potential instability. I think my colleagues would agree that the Partnership for Peace initiative, launched by the administration a year ago, has failed to fill this void.

The National Security Revitalization Act provides a reasonable framework for addressing these concerns consistent with U.S. interests in ensuring stability in Europe. It lists a variety of criteria, such as respect for democratic principles and human rights enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act, against which to evaluate the suitability of prospective candidates for NATO membership. In addition, it establishes a program to provide the emerging democracies with the necessary tools to facilitate their transition to full NATO membership, which, as I pointed out earlier, will ultimately be up to the current members to decide.

Given the broad range of our political, economic, and security interests in Europe, strengthening new free markets and democracies in that region benefits the United States. Two of the most prominent members of the foreign policy establishment, Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski, are ardent supporters of the timely expansion of NATO.

Kissinger sees the existing vacuum as a threat not only NATO cohesion but the very existence of NATO as a meaningful institution. "NATO expansion," he observed, "represents a balancing of two conflicting considerations: the fear of alienating Russia against the danger of creating a vacuum in central Europe * * *." "A wise policy," he counsels, "would proceed with membership for the Visegrad countries [Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia] and reject a Russian veto." Dr. Kissinger concluded, "NATO cannot long survive if the borders it protects are not threatened while it refuses to protect the borders of adjoining countries that do feel threatened."

Brzezinski recently urged NATO to formally declare its "criteria for expansion and indicate which countries appear to meet them. This would end the counterproductive debates with Russia over whether NATO should expand. The longer this step is delayed, the more vociferous Moscow's objections are likely to be."

Mr. Chairman, this is precisely the purpose of title VI of the National Security Revitalization Act.

Rather than dodging the issue of NATO expansion, as it has largely done to date, the Clinton administration, should move on the membership issue before more time is lost. But that requires leadership. We must seize upon today's opportunities which could be gone tomorrow. A steady and deliberate course of action is one thing, obfuscation, which has characterized the Clinton administration's approach to date is another.

Russia, perhaps sensing a certain timidity within the administration, has sought to block NATO expansion. It is instructive to recall that the Soviet Union vehemently opposed German membership in NATO in 1955 and attempted to deny unified Germany's continued participation in the Alliance. A democratic Russia has nothing to fear from a defensive alliance founded on democratic principles. It would be foolhardy and dangerous, as Henry Kissinger rightly pointed out, to give Russia a veto over NATO expansion. And, as Dr. Brzezinski observed, failure to act now will only make matters worse.

Our approach to NATO expansion is steady and deliberate, not the sketchy and indecisive path proposed by some.

Some are critical of the fact that four countries—Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia—are mentioned as leading candidates for NATO membership at some point in the near future. This reference is a testament to the great strides which these countries have, in fact, made since the fall of communism. It neither ensures their membership nor precludes others from joining. It does not, as some claim, arbitrarily lock in advantages from some countries. Instead of fostering complacency in these countries as some warn, the reference should serve as an incentive for continued progress as those named should be subjected to more, not less, scrutiny as they move toward membership in NATO. The reference is simply an acknowledgement of the fact that reform in the region is uneven. Rather than serving as a discouragement, this should spur others to redouble their efforts if they are seriously interested in pursuing NATO membership.

Mr. Chairman, my endorsement of an expanded NATO should not be read as a failure to understand that each of the countries considered here has residual problems with its

transition to democracy. On the contrary, I believe that NATO membership, and the integration and cooperation with Western countries it entails, increases the opportunities for addressing outstanding concerns. There are, in fact, specific areas where I believe the United States should weight in to seek further reform. As Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I am very much aware of need for further progress in these and other countries in the region. I believe the Czech citizenship law, for example, is deeply flawed and should be amended; the newest Slovak government has signaled in word its commitment to continuing reform, but has yet to follow through in many specific areas where reform has been slow or altogether lacking thus far, and the Hungarian government would do well to lead by example in improving its relations with many of its neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, nothing in the pending legislation diminished the fact that each candidate will be individually judged on its own merits on a case-by-case basis.

It is also instructive to recall that this is not the first expansion of NATO. In 1952 Greece and Turkey acceded to the North Atlantic Treaty joining the 12 NATO countries in common security system. The Federal Republic of Germany joined the Alliance in 1955 and in 1982, Spain also became a member of NATO. Besides its contribution to collective security in Europe, NATO has served as an important vehicle for bolstering democracy among its members as these cases demonstrate.

Finally, critics assert that the course we have proposed could lead to instability in Europe. Mr. Chairman, one thing is clear: continued ambiguity and foot-dragging will not enhance European security but will, as Kissinger and Brzezinski point out, be counterproductive. The National Security Revitalization Act, provides a much needed action plan for seizing new opportunities as NATO and its members face new challenges.

Given the implications for our own national security, the future of NATO demands our immediate attention.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

This bill does not actually authorize any specific missile defense system. But this amendment seeks to tie our hands despite whatever technologies may develop. If there is a problem with a particular missile defense system, the normal authorization and appropriation process is the proper forum for this type of program restriction.

I am personally opposed to committing, at the present time, to a space-based antiballistic missile defense system because we are not at a point technologically where such a system makes sense. But it does make sense to continue doing the research necessary to develop this important defense option. I am committed to making the necessary funding investment to determine the feasibility of such a program.

This amendment is too restrictive and raises concerns about whether this option could be even explored. Congress needs to be very careful that we do not act in a precipitous way which would preclude this research option.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject the Spratt amendment.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support to Congress

reaffirming its commitment to a strong national defense.

The world is a changing place, Mr. Chairman. If you had told me 15 years ago that the Soviet Union would be dissolved and the Berlin Wall would vanish by the 1990's, I certainly would have had trouble accepting your claims. However, as time passed on during the eighties, our late nemesis, the Soviet Union, eventually splintered and the Berlin Wall was reduced to dust. Since the Soviet Union has been disintegrated, we have discovered other situations and crises in the realm of foreign affairs. Within the last 4 years, there have been crises with nations such as Kuwait, Bosnia, Somalia, Haiti, Korea, and Rwanda which have required the aid, in one form or another, of the United States.

This example alone should serve as a reminder to my colleagues that our planet is in a constant state of evolution and flux. Events happen which cause the world to be sometimes turbulent and volatile and it is up to our Nation to take the lead. With this in mind, it is important that our country stay in its position of strength and leadership within the world community while protecting our own national interests.

Mr. Chairman, I believe H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act, is a measure which our body should adopt to achieve these purposes.

The National Security Revitalization Act has been written to refocus the priorities of our military so it may keep in step with a world that is constantly changing.

H.R. 7 would direct the leaders of our Nation to address questions and situations which should have been dealt with during the past several years. For example, H.R. 7 would direct that the Department of Defense establish a comprehensive review of American defense needs by commissioning a bipartisan panel of independent defense experts to assess our Nation's military readiness, process and status of modernization, force structure, and strategic vision. Mr. Chairman, this commission will play a most essential role in maintaining our security needs which are so vital to our Nation's well-being.

This bill would also reassert our Nation's commitment to an effective national missile system to having the Department of Defense cultivate and create mature ballistic missile defense systems in the future. American intelligence officers such as Lt. Gen. James Clapper of the Defense Intelligence Agency and Adm. William Stuedeman, the Acting Director of the Central Intelligence Agency have alerted Congress to the possibility of a rogue regime possessing the capability of attacking the United States with ballistic missiles toward the end of this decade. With effective antimissile defenses, I believe we can ensure basic protection for the citizens of America. Mr. Chairman, there may be chronic opponents of defense spending who will complain that we are trying to create star wars II by implementing this part of H.R. 7. This is not true. What we are trying to do is build upon the technology we have now and the vision of Clinton Defense Secretary Perry who claims we can create a ground-based missile system by the end of the decade at a reasonable price over 5 years. I believe the Department of Defense should pursue this objective and I would support the Department's efforts.

H.R. 7 also addresses new guidelines for restrictions in regard to U.N. operations. In the past, the American Ambassador to the United Nations would make commitments to United Nations without either the House or Senate being consulted. Mr. Chairman, with H.R. 7, we state that before we send our troops under the command of the United Nations, the President must make it clear to both Houses that the U.N. operation is vital to our own interests, that the commander of the American forces be allowed to report to our own Nation's military authorities and decline to partake in actions which he may deem to be illegal, imprudent or beyond what the U.N. mission is supposed to do. Also, this bill also dictates that American forces will remain under American administrative command. Mr. Chairman, our troops have been trained by American commanders in the ways of American military procedure with the best American military equipment available. I feel that it is in the interests of our Nation, our soldiers, and even the U.N. operation to enact the certain amount of autonomy and the certain amount of legislative and executive responsibility as dictated by this bill.

I also want to point out that H.R. 7 would state that it should be the policy of the United States to include the former Soviet bloc nations Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia as full members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO]. Mr. Chairman, by allowing these countries to join NATO, we will be able to help them to continue their maturing into full-fledged democracies.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7 is not the ultimate panacea in regard to our foreign affairs and defense matters, as we will have to continue debate and consideration of these matters in our authorization and appropriation bills. Rather, I feel that it is a responsible first step toward a sounder foreign policy and a sturdier defense policy in a constantly changing world. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7 and oppose any amendments which can be deemed as weakening the bill.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, over the last several years, the world has changed dramatically, and with it, the role of the United States, as well as the activities required of the U.S. military to carry out that role. Since the breakup of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war, United States defense policy has shifted its primary, concentrated focus to a widely dispersed number of potential threats. At the same time, peacekeeping operations have greatly increased. Since 1988, the United States has entered into 21 new peacekeeping missions compared to only 13 missions in the previous 40 years. In light of these dramatic changes, it is necessary to redefine U.S. defense and foreign policy.

In my view, H.R. 7 takes a sound and balanced approach to clarifying the new U.S. position in the world. It calls for a commission to evaluate U.S. defense needs and assess force structure, readiness, strategic vision, modernization, and personnel policies, requires the President to identify our national security interests before deploying United States troops, wisely restricts the ability of the Commander in Chief to place troops under foreign control or command, promotes the expansion of NATO to include fledgling democracies in Central and Eastern Europe, and encourages the deployment of a workable national missile defense system.

I would like to draw attention to the provision that prohibits U.S. troops from being under U.N. or foreign command. The measure is vital to our goal of maintaining the integrity of our military force. As Speaker Gingrich noted: "We invest a lot of money in the best command and control, the best communications and the best training in the world * * *. When you take a unit from that level of speed and effectiveness and you reduce it by putting them under the command of somebody who has never practiced the tempo and complexity of American operations, you are raising the risk of young Americans getting killed * * *."

The missile defense provisions in the bill have precipitated a significant amount of debate, and, I'm afraid, a fair amount of misunderstanding. The original language in the bill states that "it shall be U.S. policy to deploy at the earliest practical date an anti-ballistic missile system" to ensure the security of the United States. Last night, the House properly rejected an amendment offered by Representative EDWARDS that would have prohibited the Department of Defense from deploying a missile defense system that included space-based interceptors. It is bad policy for Congress to tie the hands of DOD before giving the agency the time to make recommendations to Congress on how best to protect the American people. By rejecting this amendment, Congress has allowed for the opportunity for an analysis of the effectiveness and costs of both ground- and space-based systems before mandating which one should be deployed.

I opposed another amendment, offered by Representative SPRATT, for largely the same reasons. The amendment requires that operational readiness and modernization of existing forces take fiscal priority over developing and deploying an effective theater missile defense. Modernization of defenses is absolutely necessary to maintain a reasonable level of readiness in the face of ever-improving offensive systems in regions of potential conflict, such as North Korea and Iraq. The Spratt amendment will tie the hands of our military in ensuring such readiness. Unfortunately, the Spratt amendment passed by a narrow margin of 218-212.

I should note that two important amendments were passed en bloc Wednesday night that I believe removed a flaw in an otherwise sound approach to national security. These amendments removed from H.R. 7 language that prohibits the use of defense funds to pay the cost of participating in the U.N. peacekeeping missions unless such action is specifically authorized by Congress. I believe this provision imposes unfair and counterproductive restrictions on the President as Commander in Chief, violating his constitutionally granted powers. In certain situations, I believe it has been in our interests to move from unilateral occupation to a U.N. operation. For example, at the end of this month it is my understanding that in Haiti the United States command will become a U.N. peacekeeping operation. We do not want to continue to occupy Haiti. The shift to the United Nation is in our national interest and gives us a way out. The Bereuter amendments remove language in the original bill that would have given the administration an incentive to maintain the unilateral U.S. mission instead of moving to a more sensible, cooperative effort with the United Nation. I am pleased that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle were able to come to

agreement on this issue and eliminate this inadvertent but realistic effect of this bill.

In the end, I believe H.R. 7 successfully enhances the national security of the United States in a balanced and appropriate manner. It affirms our commitment to a strong, modern defense force and properly limits our role in United Nations operations. I commend Chairman SPENCE and Chairman GILMAN for their good work on this legislation.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member would take this opportunity to explain the two Bereuter amendments to title V of H.R. 872, the National Security Restoration Act, that were accepted under unanimous consent during yesterday's debate.

The first of these amendments addresses concerns raised about section 508 of the bill. This amendment deletes language that would prohibit the President from spending Department of Defense funds on any operation that was authorized by the U.N. Security Council unless Congress specifically authorizes the use of funds for that purpose.

This body should know that section 508, as drafted, would be an extraordinary limitation on the President as Commander in Chief. This limitation has its origins in what many on our side of the aisle view as legitimate concerns about the judgment of the current Commander in Chief, but that does not, ipso facto, mean that this body should limit the prerogatives of the Commander in Chief. If enacted, this statute would limit the actions of any future administration—Republican and Democrat alike.

There is a need to separate our understandable frustration about some policy decisions made by this administration from the act of legislating restrictions.

Constitutional questions have been raised. Can the legislative branch limit the actions of the President as Commander in Chief by withholding funds until a specific authorization has been approved? for decades, Members on both sides of the aisle have complained about constitutional infringements through the War Powers Act and the Boland amendments. This body should be very careful about placing further limitations, however well intended.

This body needs to be aware that crises do occasionally occur when Congress is not in session. The President still must have the flexibility to act as Commander in Chief after this body has recessed.

Lastly, section 508 reflects a genuine and bipartisan indignation regarding the manner in which this administration went to the U.N. Security Council for approval of nonemergency peacekeeping operations in Haiti without coming to Congress for prior approval; nor did the Clinton administration come to Congress when they escalated the humanitarian operation in Somalia into a peace-enforcement operation. But we should remember that this provision is not central to the Contract With America.

Members on this side of the aisle should recall that section 508 is not a part of the contract document that many House Republicans signed. The important peacekeeping provisions of Contract With America deal with: maintaining U.S. command of U.S. troops; making sure the United States is no longer to be grossly exploited through exorbitant assessments; and ensuring that the United States reimbursed for all of incremental costs in our peacekeeping expenditures.

We should not permit the very good peacekeeping provisions in this legislation to be obscured by raising this an unnecessary constitutional question. Failing to address this issue would leave the administration with a legitimate excuse for challenging the constitutionality of this legislation and thereby justifying a Presidential veto.

The second amendment that was approved under unanimous consent addresses this Member's concern regarding the level of reimbursements that nations should receive for peacekeeping activities.

This Member raised the issue in committee, seeking at that time to set U.S. policy on this matter. While both majority and minority generally expressed sympathy for my concern, this Member was persuaded by the argument that it was not yet time to establish a new U.S. Government policy on reimbursement matters.

But the problem remains. It is only proper that Congress understand the full extent of the problem. Hence, the reporting requirement.

We know how much the United Nations pays nations who supply peacekeepers—slightly over \$980 per month for enlisted, and around \$1,300 for officers. It is also clear that some of the lesser developed nations that provide a higher proportion of the peacekeeping troops in many U.N. operations are paying their troops far less than this amount—sometimes less than 10 percent of the U.N. personnel payments—in other words a 1,000 percent mark up.

The personnel payments, of course, don't go to the individual soldiers—but, yes, you guessed it, to the treasury of the country sending that underpaid soldier.

It might be one thing if these nations were plowing their reimbursements back into their military to augment training. But this does not appear to be the case. Rather, it would seem that this is a case of take the money and run. This is a poor reason to be involved in peacekeeping operations.

We also have indications that the civilian managers and general-purpose police officers, international cops on the beat, attached to peacekeeping operations from some accounts are making obscene amounts of money—over \$100,000 per year.

The International Relations Committee has heard tales, which I have reason to believe are accurate, of mid-level civilian employees making six figure salaries, with an extraordinary package of perks that would make even the most jaded individuals blush.

Regrettably, I have concluded that it is premature, in H.R. 7, to set U.S. policy on these issues until this body has the facts, but it is entirely appropriate to expect to receive the facts so that we can strenuously demand reforms. This amendment requires the Secretary of State to present these facts.

The United Nations probably may object to supplying some of this information. After all, some at the United Nations and certainly some member nation may find it to be in their interest to keep us in the dark as to how our peacekeeping dollars are being spent.

But the United States—indeed any nation—should be able to get such information from the United Nations.

Again, this amendment is a vehicle to require this information and to ask our Government to recommend the kind of reforms it will push in the United Nations or which we in the Congress can demand next year.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will vote against this bill because it infringes on the constitutional authority of the President to use the military command and control structure that is essential to our Nation's strategic interests.

The bill's provision prohibiting the President from deploying U.S. troops in peacekeeping operations without an explicit authorization by Congress for such purpose is unacceptable and quite possibly unconstitutional. Under such a provision, President Bush would not have been able to deploy troops and equipment to Operation Desert Storm, President Clinton would have been blocked from deploying troops to Kuwait in 1994 to stop an Iraqi threat, and even President Truman would have been prevented from sending troops to Korea in 1950. Such prohibitions would not have been in our strategic interest.

By dictating how the President should conduct foreign policy, the bill both micromanages U.S. actions and denies the President the flexibility needed in times of crisis.

In the post-cold-war world, it remains essential that the President retains his authority to establish command arrangements best suited to meet the needs of future operations. U.S. troops will always and ultimately be under U.S. command as per the Constitution. No Presidential action can change this fact. This bill undermines the power of the President as Commander in Chief, and I cannot support it.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7 is bad legislation and should be defeated. In the stated opinion of DOD, H.R. 7 is "dangerous, wasteful, and unconstitutional." It is a Republican tactic to provide "defense welfare" for military contractors who seek lucrative Government contracts.

H.R. 7 is dangerous because it sacrifices American military readiness for star wars. It is a wasteful Republican effort to spend \$30 to \$40 billion on star wars at the price of military readiness. These billions of dollars should be spent to make life better for American families and for decreasing the deficit. H.R. 7 is a Republican boondoggle.

H.R. 7 is unconstitutional because it limits the ability of the President of the United States to fulfill his constitutional role as Commander in Chief of our military forces. It restricts his ability to utilize troops in a most effective manner by limiting the amount the United States can spend on operations with the United Nations. H.R. 7 cripples U.N. peacekeeping and destroys the idea of collective security. If H.R. 7 had been law during Desert Storm, America would have been prevented from successfully deploying necessary troops.

If America insists on spending countless billions on star wars at the expense of our troops, if America retreats from global economic and military cooperation, if America refuses to feed, educate, and house her own troops and citizens at risk—the children, the sick, and the elderly—a bankrupt America will fall into economic and social ruin.

For years, respected Members of Congress, such as former Congressman Charles Bennett who represented Jacksonville, have opposed funding for star wars. These Members believed that troop readiness was a top priority. Their efforts were focused on conventional warfare requirements and on providing all that was necessary for our troops to perform their duties with excellence.

Today it is shameful that many U.S. troops live in substandard housing and use food stamps because they cannot stretch their pay to cover even the most basic needs for their families. This does not contribute to military readiness.

We in Congress should demonstrate our interest in funding military programs that benefit our troops and our military families. We want our military dollars spent to keep our troops ready in every way.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act of 1995. While I am aware of the current fashion in the Congress to increase defense spending at the expense of our domestic programs, I am also mindful of my duty as a Member of Congress to act in the best interest of the people I represent and in the best interest of the U.S. Constitution I have sworn to uphold. This shortsighted and rushed legislation will not only try to resurrect cold war programs long not needed, but will endanger the delicate balance of domestic and defense spending.

The National Security Revitalization Act of 1995 that we are considering here today is completely out of balance. H.R. 7 seeks to isolate the United States by restricting America's role in peace keeping operations, and misguidedly redirects billions of dollars to a star wars missile defense system whose time passed with the end of the cold war. It would be an abdication of congressional responsibility if we support this legislation at the expense of our most important efforts to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that our military is by far among the world's best. This was demonstrated by our leadership of international forces during the war in the Gulf. Over the past 20 years, our military has undergone a massive undertaking to build a defense infrastructure which has allowed us to effectively provide an international show of strength.

While I believe that we must maintain a strong military presence in an era of low intensity global conflicts, I am an avid believer that a healthy balance must be reached between domestic and defense spending. The importance of striking this balance is especially true in light of recent world events such as the end of the cold war. Because of these changes in world politics, the United States is faced with an unprecedented opportunity to redirect funds to relieve problems here at home.

Contrary to the arguments that have been made by the supporters of H.R. 7, President Clinton has proposed a budget that reasonably addresses the defense needs of this Nation. President Clinton's fiscal year 1996 defense budget, which is strongly supported by the Pentagon, has two key initiatives: Enhancement of military readiness, and improvement of quality of life for our men and women in uniform and their families. The ironic truth about H.R. 7 is that it will actually weaken our national defense. The bill directs massive amounts of defense dollars to a star wars missile defense system that will certainly undermine the more legitimate funding goals outlined in the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been in favor of a balanced approach to our domestic and foreign affairs interests, and the Constitution's separation of powers. H.R. 7 requires that U.S. Forces may not be placed under control

of any foreign commander. Such actions would effectively end U.S. involvement in multilateral peacekeeping operations. This is contrary to the principle of separation of powers and the clear language of the Constitution. The Constitution permits the President as Commander in Chief of the U.S. Armed Forces the power to place U.S. Forces under the operational control of other nations' military leaders for United Nations operations.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for me to point out that under the current congressional leadership, U.S. policy has taken a direction that will adversely affect the essence of each and every one of our lives. The majority party's plan ignores quality of human life questions, and in order to finance additional military spending, we have been expected time and time again to sacrifice already substantially depleted health, housing, education, and employment budgets.

As opposed to spending billions of dollars to immunize American children, revitalize our urban centers, provide jobs to the jobless or homes for the homeless, this bill seeks to divert funds from these essential services to fund star wars and other unworkable initiatives. H.R. 7 is an essential part of the Republican strategy to force through a series of bills that will gut the chances for many Americans to live the American dream.

A review of the Contract With America's plan to slash domestic discretionary programs reveals that many programs serving the most needy will be cut. Legislation such as H.R. 7, would result in defense spending on Reagan era star wars gimmicks. This misdirection of funds would greatly harm the American people, the strength of our Nation's defense and the future of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to say that while the pursuit of peace is a noble and necessary objective, it is no easy task—especially when certain Members of Congress are determined to promote antiquated notions left over from the cold war. This legislation clearly reflects the new majority's desire to sacrifice the domestic interests of the American people in pursuit of isolationism and star wars.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act. I think this legislation is an important step toward restoring America's reputation as a superpower. In addition, this legislation preserves our ability and reaffirms our intent to defend America's national security interests around the globe.

Mr. Chairman, I am especially glad that H.R. 7 includes language restricting the placement of U.S. troops under the control of foreign nationals acting on behalf of the United Nations. The language included in H.R. 7 is almost identical to a bill I introduced last year (H.R. 3334), and reintroduced again this year (H.R. 631).

I strongly believe this legislation is necessary in order to counter the Clinton administration's proposed policy directives that would allow U.S. military forces to be placed under foreign command, on a regular basis, for U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Mr. Chairman, the people in my district, especially the war veterans, demand that when we send our young men and women overseas to battle that they will do so under the American flag, not the blue helmet of the United Nations.

Some argue that this legislation will hamstring the President's ability to act as Commander in Chief. This is simply not true. My proposal, included in H.R. 7, requires the President to certify to Congress that such foreign operational control is necessary to protect vital national security interests of the United States. The President must provide Congress with a report setting forth the following: a description of the interest that requires placing U.S. troops under foreign operational control; the mission and objectives of the U.S. Armed Forces, and an estimate of the duration they will serve under such foreign operational control; the expected size and composition our forces involved; the cost of U.S. participation in the proposed operation; the precise command and control relationship between the U.S. forces and the United Nations; and the extent to which the U.S. forces will rely on non-U.S. military forces for security and self-defense and an assessment of the ability of those forces to provide adequate security to the U.S. forces involved.

In addition to being unconstitutional, Mr. Speaker, putting U.S. troops under U.N. control can be very dangerous as the Clinton administration learned in Somalia.

Last, I would include a letter I received from the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Allen F. "Gunner" Kent. His outstanding organization supports inclusion of my proposal in H.R. 7, as do millions of people across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, February 2, 1995.

Hon. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DOOLITTLE: On behalf of the 2.1 million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S., I want to endorse your proposed legislation, H.R. 631 which would limit the placing of U.S. military forces under command of foreign officers acting for the United Nations.

At our 95th National Convention last August, this issue was considered and the delegates overwhelmingly approved VFW Resolution 437 opposing U.S. forces under foreign command. I have enclosed a copy of this resolution for your information and use.

Also I would urge you and the Congress to examine Presidential Decision Directive 25 to determine if Constitutional authority has been misused and if so, to find an appropriate remedy.

If the VFW can be of any assistance or support in moving H.R. 631 to passage, please feel free to contact our Washington Office Executive Director Bob Currie at the earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,
ALLEN F. "GUNNER" KENT,
Commander in Chief.

Enclosure.

RESOLUTION NO. 437—OPPOSE U.S. FORCES
UNDER FOREIGN COMMAND

Whereas, Presidential Decision Directive 25 states as follows: "The President retains and will never relinquish command authority over U.S. forces. On a case by case basis, the President will consider placing appropriate U.S. forces under the operational control of a competent U.N. Commander for specific U.N. operations authorized by the Security Council;

Whereas, if U.S. military forces were to be placed under foreign command (as they now are in Macedonia) they could be removed

from their primary missions of defending the United States, its citizens and its territory;

Whereas, by permitting U.S. military forces to operate under the orders of any international organization, these forces could find themselves executing military operations which are not in the national interest of the United States; and

Whereas, we believe the American people will not support the deployment of American soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and Coast Guardsmen in dangerous, life-threatening missions that do affect the security of the United States, its citizens or its territory; Now, therefore, be it:

Be it resolved, by the 95th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that we oppose any play or directive placing U.S. military forces under the command of foreign military officers including those who are operating exclusively under orders from the United Nations; and

Be it further resolved, that Congress be urged to examine Presidential Decision Directive 25 to determine if any constitutional authority has been misused, and if so, to find an appropriate remedy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, recent events in Somalia and elsewhere have raised serious questions about when, if ever, members of the United States Armed Forces should be commanded not by fellow Americans but by officials of the United Nations. The surrender of command and control may set a precedent for further diminution of American sovereignty, at a time when most Americans believe that too many decisions affecting their lives are already made by unaccountable institutions in faraway places.

I share these concerns. They are reflected and addressed in sections 401 and 402 of the National Security Revitalization Act, relating to command and control of U.S. forces.

Let us make some crucial distinctions.

First, this legislation would not interfere with U.S. participation in multinational military efforts. Such efforts have a long and honorable history in U.S. foreign policy. For instance, in World War I some 2 million Americans served under the ultimate direction of a great French general, Marshall Ferdinand Foch. In World War II, American units worked under British commanders in Italy, in Normandy, and in the China-Burma-India theatre of operations. In the post-war era several multilateral peacekeeping operations, including some under United Nations auspices, have included U.S. Armed Forces under the temporary and limited operational control of foreign officers. It is a dramatically different matter however, to take the step that has been the subject of recent discussion: that the United States should contribute its soldiers to a standing U.N. army whose commanders, whatever their own national origins, are part of the command structure of the United Nations itself.

It is important to note that sections 401 and 402 allow the President substantial flexibility to act in the national interest. They do not absolutely prohibit the President from placing U.S. forces under the command or control of foreign commanders in U.N. operations, or even under the command and control of the United Nations itself. Rather, they simply require the President to explain the necessity of such arrangements, and to assure the Congress that United States officers involved in the operation will retain sufficient authority to protect their forces and to prevent them from being used illegally or inconsistently with the terms of the

U.S. mandate. The requirement of advance certification by the President may be waived in an emergency. Finally, the requirements of sections 401 and 402 did not apply at all to specifically authorized by law. So, in effect, Congress can waive the reporting requirements of sections 401 and 402 whenever it discerns an emergency that makes this prudent.

The role of U.S. troops in U.N. operations is steadily expanding. A year ago we had 15 troops in the post-Desert Storm U.N. peacekeeping operation in Iraq, 29 in the Western Sahara, 647 in former Yugoslavia, 33 in Cambodia, and almost 2,000 in Somalia. Some of these operations have prevented bloodshed. The Somalia operation, which began as a genuine peacekeeping effort, was somehow allowed to become a war. It then claimed the lives of 26 Americans.

Sections 401 and 402 achieve a balance between the need to protect U.S. sovereignty and the need to give the President the necessary flexibility for handling international crises. Section (a) creates a presumption against the legality of placing any elements of our Armed Forces under the command or control of a foreign national acting on behalf of the United Nations. But this presumption is overcome if the President invokes the certification process that is announced in section (b), and for which section (d) gives the substantive requirements. The President is given 15 days before the start of the operation in question to certify to Congress that the operation is necessary to protect our national security interests, and that the arrangements of the operation are such that U.S. sovereignty will be protected. Furthermore, as I noted a moment ago, even this reasonable requirement does not apply when the operation in question is already authorized by law, or when the President certifies that he is acting in response to an emergency that precludes compliance with the 15-day rule just mentioned. In an emergency situation, the certification requirement detailed in section (d) is postponed until 48 hours after U.S. participation in the U.N. operations begins.

Section 402 amends the United Nations Participation Act so that U.S. participation in Security Council "special agreements," as set forth in chapters VI and VII of the U.N. Charter, is subject to the same certification requirements as in section 401.

There must be clear rules governing the exposure of U.S. service personnel to mortal danger. Such exposure should be related to U.S. interests, and the extent and urgency of those interests should be determined by officials who are accountable to the people of the United States. This is not just the principle of sovereignty; it is also the principle of democracy. Sections 401 and 402 are designed to uphold these principles. They would prohibit commitments of U.S. troops only in cases where the President of the United States cannot or will not articulate to the Congress the justifications and the limitations of such commitments.

At U.N. headquarters in New York City, the flags of all the member nations fly proudly over First Avenue. No national flag is higher than any other, signifying that despite diversities of power, wealth, and territory, the principle of sovereignty means that every nation may deal equally with every other under international law.

One flag in front of the U.N. building does fly higher than the national flags: the flag of the United Nations itself. This signifies that in joining together to form the United Nations, the sovereign member states have recognized that the ideals of human rights, peace, and cooperation for which the United Nations stands may in some circumstances transcend national sovereignty itself.

Even a limited surrender of sovereignty, however, is fraught with risks. One of those risks is that this great international body whose flag flies higher than the others may someday cease to be the instrument of its member nations and become instead master of their policies—and increasingly of their destinies.

American participation in multinational military operations is, has been, and will remain a sound policy option for particular cases. But American participation in the standing armies of another power—especially a power that claims to supersede that of the United States—is an abdication of our sovereignty and a threat to the democratic values that our sovereignty ultimately protects.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7), to revitalize the national security of the United States, pursuant to House Resolution 83, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit with instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SKELTON. Absolutely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SKELTON moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 7, to the Committee on National Security with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike out the last section of title II (relating to the ballistic missile defense as a com-

ponent of military readiness) and insert the following:

Section 204. Readiness Certification.

Of the total amount of funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996, the amount obligated for national missile defense programs may not exceed the amount made available for national missile defense programs for fiscal year 1995 until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the Congress that the armed forces are properly sized, equipped, housed, and structured and are ready to carry out the assigned missions as required by the national military strategy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with this motion to recommit with instructions with a heavy heart. I do so with the background, Mr. Speaker, of having stood with my friends on the other side of the aisle, lo, those many times in the cause of national defense. I stood with those on the other side of the aisle concerning the Nicaragua crisis. I stood with those on the other side of the aisle in the gulf war issue that was so important to our then President George Bush and to the American people and to freedom throughout this globe.

I find, though, there are parts of this bill I would individually vote for; the part concerning the command and control of American troops is to be commended, but the weight of this bill overall, Mr. Speaker, causes me to offer this motion to recommit.

□ 1340

This motion to recommit is in favor of the troops. This morning we had the sad news of 4 soldiers giving their lives in training in Eglin Air Force Base in the Ranger course. The job that we call those in uniform to do is a dangerous job. This is a motion to stand by those young men and those young women from whom we ask so much and who should be given the very best of our efforts.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Montgomery/Skelton language that states that the Secretary of Defense must certify to us, to us the Congress of the United States, that the Armed Forces are properly sized, equipped, housed, structured, and filled with readiness to do the job that the Commander in Chief and our national interest requires of them. This is putting the troops first. This is saying to those young men and women in uniform, "We care for you. We want to stand by you."

This does not cut off national missile defense programs, it allows for the year 1996 to have a \$400 million program, where we make sure that those troops are ready and able to do their job.

My case was made by my friends on the other side of the aisle when they said that we are not ready. My friend from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] spoke eloquently of the need for readiness. That was my speech. That was my point. That is what we need to do

to stay ready. We never know how much. It was Winston Churchill who once said that war comes very suddenly. This past year we came within an eyelash of having armed conflict three times, once involving North Korea, once involving Haiti, and one with Saddam Hussein. These young men and young women we send in harm's way should be fully ready and every penny should go toward their training, readiness, their quality of life. We should not, as we have seen, have young men and young women on the rifle range, who do not have enough bullets to fire, cancel training so that they are not able to fulfill their duties.

In Europe we learned just a few weeks ago that the Army had taken from its training account in Europe \$300 million to put in the maintenance account. That is a lack of readiness. We need to pay attention to that and not offer these dollars up to something in excess of what we can fairly spend.

I ask everyone here, Mr. Speaker, to vote for this motion to recommit. It will send the message to the young men and young women we are so proud to call Americans, those in uniform that "we want you to get the best training, the best possible advantage should you have to walk onto that battle field." And if there is a lack of training, if there is someone that is injured or sadly loses his or her life because of lack of readiness, let it not be a reflection of today, let us stand with them, let us work with them, let us vote to recommit this with the instructions on the Montgomery-Skelton language. It is the least we can do for those fine young Americans.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from South Carolina opposed to the motion?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion and vote "yes" on final passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, last evening we voted twice on this particular amendment. It was defeated on both occasions. We need not say anything more about that.

I want, just for a minute, Mr. Speaker, to tell this body that in referring to this legislation we are responding, as I have said earlier, to the concerns of the American people. In putting together this contract, we listened to the American people and the concerns they have concerning a number of issues, and then we proceeded to put those things down in the form of a contract.

The American people, for instance, are concerned about the state of our defenses. They think we have cut too much from our defense, readiness is suffering, modernization needs to be fixed, a number of things. We are responding to those concerns because we entitled this legislation the revitalization or the restoration of national security.

The people of this country are outraged when they find that we have no defense against ballistic missiles, protecting them and their families from certain death. They want to know who is responsible for leaving them unprotected. But most of all they want it fixed, and we are trying to fix that for them in this contract, this legislation.

Again, I repeat, we are responding to the concerns of the American people. The American people are concerned about the fact that this administration had a threat assessment conducted after the fact, called a Bottom-Up Review, which is not sufficient. And even if it were, it is underfunded. And so they want to have a new threat assessment of the threats we are facing in this world.

So we are proposing a bipartisan commission advise us as to the course of action to take. Again, we are responding to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit and I urge my colleagues to defend this motion and to support this vitally important legislation which we have fully debated in the International Relations Committee and on the House floor over the past 2 days.

Our committee held numerous briefings and hearings on the issues we have debated today.

Contrary to some of the assertions made in this debate, this bill does not end our support for the United Nations and it most certainly does not end our support for the United Nations and it most certainly does not signal a retreat from our security commitments and our international obligations around the world.

The provisions in this bill simply reaffirm that our foreign policy and our role at the United Nations and in all U.N. peacekeeping operations must serve our national interests.

The bill for example, ensures that we receive credit for our ongoing and extensive support for the U.N. peacekeeping operations around the world.

Presently, we are spending several billions a year on direct and indirect costs in support of these peacekeeping operations. To the extent that the Department of Defense is spending a disproportionate share of its declining resources on U.N. peacekeeping we should be recouping some of those costs against our U.N. peacekeeping assessments.

This bill does set strict limits on any U.S. troops serving in U.N. operations and promotes the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Our provisions on NATO will ensure that all countries in Europe deemed eligible to be included in an expanded

NATO will be given the political support and the military assistance they need to join this transatlantic security alliance. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this bill which provides a strong national defense and a clear foreign policy road map for our Nation.

□ 1350

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. 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 197, nays 225, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—197

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Flake | McKinney |
| Ackerman | Foglietta | McNulty |
| Andrews | Ford | Meehan |
| Baesler | Frank (MA) | Meek |
| Baldacci | Frost | Menendez |
| Barcia | Furse | Mfume |
| Barrett (WI) | Gejdenson | Miller (CA) |
| Beilenson | Gephardt | Mineta |
| Bentson | Geren | Minge |
| Berman | Gibbons | Mink |
| Bishop | Gonzalez | Moakley |
| Bonior | Gordon | Mollohan |
| Borski | Gutierrez | Montgomery |
| Boucher | Hall (OH) | Moran |
| Brewster | Hamilton | Morella |
| Brown (CA) | Harman | Murtha |
| Brown (FL) | Hayes | Nadler |
| Brown (OH) | Hefner | Neal |
| Bryant (TX) | Hilliard | Oberstar |
| Cardin | Hinchey | Obey |
| Chapman | Holden | Olver |
| Clayton | Hoyer | Ortiz |
| Clement | Jackson-Lee | Orton |
| Clyburn | Jacobs | Owens |
| Coble | Jefferson | Pallone |
| Coleman | Johnson (SD) | Parker |
| Collins (IL) | Johnson, E. B. | Pastor |
| Collins (MI) | Johnston | Payne (NJ) |
| Condit | Kanjorski | Payne (VA) |
| Conyers | Kaptur | Pelosi |
| Costello | Kennedy (MA) | Peterson (FL) |
| Coyne | Kennedy (RI) | Peterson (MN) |
| Danner | Kennelly | Petri |
| de la Garza | Kildee | Pickett |
| Deal | Kleczka | Pomeroy |
| DeFazio | Klink | Porter |
| DeLauro | LaFalce | Poshard |
| Dellums | Lantos | Rahall |
| Deutsch | Laughlin | Rangel |
| Dicks | Leach | Reed |
| Dingell | Levin | Reynolds |
| Dixon | Lincoln | Richardson |
| Doggett | Lipinski | Rivers |
| Dooley | Lofgren | Roemer |
| Doyle | Lowey | Rose |
| Durbin | Luther | Roybal-Allard |
| Edwards | Maloney | Rush |
| Engel | Manton | Sabo |
| Eshoo | Markey | Sanders |
| Evans | Martinez | Sawyer |
| Farr | Mascara | Schroeder |
| Fattah | Matsui | Scott |
| Fazio | McCarthy | Serrano |
| Fields (LA) | McDermott | Sisisky |
| Filner | McHale | Skaggs |

Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda

NAYS—225

Allard
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combust
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox

NOT VOTING—12

Becerra
Chenoweth
Clay
Green

□ 1408

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Pombo
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Welder
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

On this vote:
Mr. Lewis of Georgia for, with Mrs. Chenoweth against.
Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. McHugh against.
Mr. JACOBS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."
So the motion to recommit was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1410

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). The question is on the passage of the bill.
The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 181, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

AYES—241

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combust
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn

Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hillery
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim

Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder

Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich

NOES—181

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra
Chenoweth
Clay
Green
Hastings (FL)

Johnston
Lewis (GA)
McHugh
Petri
Schumer

Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Welder
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tejeda
Thompson
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

□ 1425

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mrs. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Johnston of Florida against.
Mr. McHugh for, with Mr. Stokes against.
Mr. Petri for, with Mr. Lewis of Georgia against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. 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 just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 7, NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 7, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical, clerical, grammatical, and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, H.R. 7.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 10

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEJEDA] be removed as cosponsors from the bill, H.R. 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 450, THE REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight have until midnight tonight, February 16, to file a report on H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995.

It is my understanding that this request has been approved by the minority leadership.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 831, PERMANENT EXTENSION OF THE HEALTH INSURANCE DEDUCTION FOR THE SELF-EMPLOYED

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-38) on the resolution (H. Res. 88) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 831) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, to repeal the provision permitting nonrecognition of gain and sales and exchanges effectuating policies of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROCEDURES AND DEADLINE FOR PRINTING OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 450, THE REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee plans to meet the week of February 20 to consider a rule for H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995.

The Rules Committee anticipates reporting an open or modified open rule for the bill. The rule will likely accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, though this would be optional and not mandatory.

If Members wish to avail themselves of this preprinting option, amendments should be titled, "Submitted for printing under clause 6 of rule XXIII," signed by the Member, and submitted at the Speaker's table. Amendments must still be consistent with House rules since neither the rule nor printing in the RECORD will afford any special protection against points of order for such amendments.

It will not be necessary for Members to submit their amendments to the Committee on Rules or to testify on them.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my request is to inquire about the schedule for next week.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

With respect to next week, Mr. Speaker, the House will not be in session on Monday, February 20.

The House will be in session on Tuesday, February 21. Subject to unanimous-consent request, the House will

meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. At 5 p.m., we will take up the rule for H.R. 831, the Permanent Extension of the 25 Percent Health Insurance Deduction for Self-Employed Individuals. We will then move into general debate and complete consideration of the bill. This is important, Mr. Speaker: We expect no votes until 5 p.m. on Tuesday. However, we will complete consideration of H.R. 831 on Tuesday. Members should be advised that the House may work late on Tuesday night.

On Wednesday, February 22, the House will meet at 11 a.m. for the legislative business. We will take up the rule for the Department of Defense supplemental and the rescission package which accompanies it, and then move into general debate. We will complete consideration of the two bills and then possibly take up H.R. 830, the Paperwork Reduction Act, subject to the House's approval of a rule. Members should be advised that the House may work late on Wednesday night.

On Thursday, February 23, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business, and pending the outcome of the previous day's action on H.R. 830, we will take up the rule for H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995, and then move into general debate on the measure.

On Friday, February 24, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. At that time we will complete consideration of H.R. 450. It is our hope to complete legislation by 3 that afternoon.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, perhaps I could ask a few questions.

First on staying late. The gentleman said perhaps on Tuesday and on Wednesday. By "late," can you give Members a sense of about what time?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, these things are always problematic. But I think I generally hope when I say "late," that I mean around 9 p.m.

What we try to do is measure the rate at which we are getting the work done, juxtapose that against what must need be done the next day, and then set a mark as early as we can that will assure us to be able to complete the next day's work. But by "late," I hope that I can always have some confidence that that means 9. As the gentleman knows, that has not always worked out that way.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Can the gentleman say that he expects to start amendments on H.R. 450 on Thursday? Do you intend to get to the amendments on that bill on Thursday?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, the answer is yes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. The other question really involves the rules and maybe the distinguished gentleman from the Committee on Rules could be involved in this discussion.

We last week met with the requirement to deal with an open rule but in

a constrained time period of 10 hours. I don't want to go over that debate again. I think we have well covered that from both viewpoints. But I guess I am asking what we can expect on the rules next week.

What kind of a rule would the gentleman expect on the defense supplemental and the rescission bills? Will they be governed under one rule and will that rule be open and be time limited? And the rule on the regulatory transition moratorium, would that be an open rule and would it be time limited?

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield, the two rescission bills, we have not put out a rule as the gentleman knows and we will not be doing that until a rule meeting that I will call sometime late Tuesday afternoon or evening. We would probably have a time constraint on that.

The rule that we will be putting out as far as the regulatory reform, we have not discussed that yet. I assume there would be an open rule with time constraints, again because of the problem as we approach the April 8 date. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] our majority leader, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] our Speaker, have said we have to stick to the schedule to make sure we are going to get the Members out by that 3-week break period.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Reclaiming my time, you are saying in both the case of the supplemental and the rescission bills and the case of regulatory transition, you are anticipating, and I understand you have not done it yet, but you are anticipating open rules with time restraints?

Mr. SOLOMON. That is what we have in mind. Again, with consultation with the minority, we will keep in touch with you and make that determination early next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Finally, maybe I did not hear it. I was asking about whether the defense supplemental and the rescission bills would be governed under one rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes, they will. They will be brought to the floor under one rule, and debated the same day.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

Mr. KANJORSKI. For purpose of inquiry to the majority leader, Mr. Leader, as you know last week I expressed my great concern about having mark-ups on very important bills in the committee and having amendments on the floor to legislation going at the same time and I felt that we were losing the benefit of the deliberative nature of the House of Representatives.

I have conceded as I have indicated before that we will probably suffer that as long as we are under the constraints to accomplish something for public relations over 100 days as opposed to substantive legislative purposes.

Knowing that to be the case, however, the rumors circulating in the House, it is the intention of the major-

ity to interfere with what I call communications of representatives with their district, in that you intend to hold the House in session on Saturdays during the month of March. Is that correct?

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

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

Mr. ARMEY. Let me begin by observing that the gentleman's point is taken.

Mr. Speaker, we are working on a March schedule. We have a great deal of work to do and we have, as you know, a very compressed time period in which to do it. We are working on a March schedule. We are trying to consult with everybody and take into consideration a very wide range of concerns, not the least of which are the physical demands of the schedule on our Members. We have every hope and intention of avoiding working on weekends, Saturdays and Sundays in March, or for that matter we would hope at all.

Clearly it is our hope and our design to avoid that. We think that is possible and I am very optimistic.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KANJORSKI. That is not quite the Shermanesque statement I had hoped to get from the majority leader. It seems to me the majority leader is saying that the 100 days is more important than allowing the membership to communicate with our constituents. We have given up the thought process in the House, we have given up our deliberative activity in the House. I do not think it is fair to the American people or the traditions of this institution to give up the ability to communicate with our constituents on weekends.

Is there some magic in this 100 days that we could not continue and not have a 3-week break in April, and make it a 2-week break or a 1-week break so that we could continue over the period of March and April to communicate with our constituents?

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARMEY. Again the gentleman's point is taken.

I can only tell the gentleman, we have made it very clear, we have a contract, we feel strongly about our commitment. We are certainly committed to doing a big job, a big change. We know it is hard work. We intend to keep that commitment.

The gentleman should be advised that it should hardly come as any new news to anyone that these circumstances are existent and they will be met.

We intend to meet the completion of this legislative agenda in the appointed time with all due respect and with

every bit of sensitive consideration for the needs of the Members.

□ 1440

And we will do the best we can do to get that done. And again, I do the best, if the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, I do the best I can to control what I can control and to deal with what I cannot control.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Just a final request.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I indicated about 2 weeks ago on the floor that I do not think there is going to be any surprise that the majority entertains a majority of approximately 240 votes more or less, and that all of the legislation the majority wishes to adopt in the House of Representatives will be able to be completed and concluded to its intentions.

It seems to me that rather than now interfere with our relationship and our communications with our constituents, since the debate process really is not for the purposes of communicating with our constituents, or educating our constituents or ourselves for that matter, why do we not just move along with the 100-day contract over the next 2 weeks, bring it in under an hour closed rule and have it adopted so that we can get this foolishness out of the way and get on to the serious substantial business of the House of Representatives.

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

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

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman could get his leadership on his side to endorse his procedural recommendation, I would be happy to take it under consideration.

CONTINUATION OF ORDER OF THE HOUSE RELATING TO MORNING HOUR DEBATE AND SPECIAL ORDER SPEECHES UNTIL MAY 12, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of January 5, 1995, relating to morning hour debates be continued through May 12, 1995, with the understanding that the format for recognition for special order speeches first instituted on February 23, 1994, be continued for the same period.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER AND ELECTION OF MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

U.S. CONGRESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 15, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House, Capitol Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As of this date, I here-
by submit my resignation as a member of the
Veterans' Affairs Committee for the follow-
ing reason.

Due to the time restraints and heavy work
load associated with Banking and Financial
Services, along with the Science Commit-
tees, I do not have adequate time to meet
the demanding work load associated with the
duties required of the Veterans' Affairs Com-
mittee in a satisfactory manner.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your time and
consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

STEVE STOCKMAN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without
objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, by direc-
tion of the Republican Conference, I
offer a privileged resolution, House
Resolution 89, and ask for its imme-
diate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as fol-
lows:

Resolved, That the following named Mem-
ber be, and is hereby, elected to the Commit-
tee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Rep-
resentatives: Representative Dan Schaefer of
Colorado.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE AP- POINTMENTS, NOTWITHSTAND- ING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that notwithstanding
any adjournment of the House until
Tuesday, February 21, 1995, the Speak-
er and the minority leader be author-
ized to accept resignations and to
make appointments authorized by law
or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the Presi-
dent of the United States was commu-
nicated to the House by one of his sec-
retaries.

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, our
Contract With America states the fol-
lowing:

On the first day of Congress, a Re-
publican House will: Require Congress
to live under the same laws as every-
one else; cut committee staffs by one-
third; and cut the congressional budg-
et. We have done this.

It goes on to state that in the first
100 days, we will vote on the following
items: A balanced budget amendment—
we have done this; unfunded mandates
legislation—we have done this; line-
item veto—we have done this; a new
crime package to stop violent crimi-
nals—we have done this; and national
security restoration to protect our
freedoms—we have done this.

In the next 50 days or so we will pass
welfare reform to encourage work, not
dependence; family reinforcement to
crack down on deadbeat dads and pro-
tect our children; tax cuts for families
to lift Government's burden from mid-
dle-income Americans; Senior Citizens'
Equity Act to allow our seniors to
work without Government penalty;
Government regulatory reform; com-
monsense legal reform to end frivolous
lawsuits; and congressional term limits
to make Congress a citizen legislature.
This is our Contract With America.

AMERICA NO LONGER NEEDS STAR WARS

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given
permission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend her re-
marks and include extraneous mate-
rial.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, many
Congressmen more senior than I have
expressed concern that a topic as seri-
ous as the revision of the laws and pro-
cedures governing the national secu-
rity of the United States deserved more
than a day and a half of debate. I agree,
and last night, after I was recognized
to offer an amendment, I was cut off
and not allowed to do so.

Consideration of my proposal was
prohibited by the majority, but I want
to let the American people know what
my proposal was.

Many people back home in my dis-
trict have expressed total amazement
to me that we would even consider re-
sumption of the star wars missile de-
fense program. We all remember when
the Berlin Wall fell and the cold war
ended. In light of that fact, why would
we want to spend \$30 to \$60 billion on
star wars now? We've already spent \$30
billion and we have nothing to show for
it.

With the cold war over, it is time
American families get something con-
crete and useful for their tax dollars.

For the same amount of money that
we would spend on star wars, we could
extend the school day to 5 p.m. for

every child in America. That would be
useful to the families that I represent
and to families across the country.
Working parents could stop worrying
about their kids at loose ends, unsuper-
vised from the time school is out until
their weary parents return home from
work.

And wouldn't this help our country
immeasurably? We will not be competi-
tive in the global economy unless to-
day's children become the best edu-
cated and most productive work force
of the future.

We should take the money we would
spend on star wars and extend the
school day in America to 5.

We do not need star wars—but we do
need today's children to become the
rocket scientists of the future.

I include for the RECORD a copy of my
amendment, as follows:

Amendment to H.R. 872, as Reported Offered
by Ms. Lofgren

Page 11, line 12, strike "Title II—Missile
Defense" and all that follows through page
13, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof the fol-
lowing:

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF SCHOOL DAY
FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION IN AMERICA.

SEC. 201. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the increasing prevalence of single par-
ents and families with two working parents
has forced many of our Nation's children to
be at home without supervision after school;

(2) performance of our Nation's school-
children must increase markedly in the fu-
ture for our country to be competitive in the
global market;

(3) our economic competitors have signifi-
cantly longer school days, allowing for
greater learning and educational experiences
for a child, and making for a higher level of
literacy and education in the general popu-
lation; and

(4) our nation's priorities should focus on
the needs of children and of working fami-
lies.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL DAY.

(1) To remain eligible for funding pursuant
to the Elementary and Secondary Education
Act a school must institute a policy whereby
its school day will last until 5 o'clock p.m.,
local time.

(2) In instituting a policy extending the
lateness of its school day, no school may
begin its school day later than 9 o'clock
a.m., local time.

(3) The Secretary of Education shall estab-
lish a formula grant program to provide
funds to States to carry out section 1 above.

SEC. 203. FUNDING.

Notwithstanding any other provision of
this Act, of the funds available to the De-
partment of Defense, \$49,000,000,000 shall be
made available to the Department of Edu-
cation to carry out this title.

ANOTHER HOLE PUNCHED IN THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, as
Members know, the country voted in

November for the Contract With America, and I carry with me on a regular basis a copy of the contract. And as we begin to get them completed, I try to have a hole punch here.

No. 6 was strong national defense. We need to ensure a strong national defense by restoring the essential parts of our national security funding. I am delighted that by a bipartisan vote we in fact passed this today.

This is the third part of the contract we have completed, and so I am going to symbolically put a hole in my laminated copy of the contract.

We will be back next week to do another one.

OPENING DAY OF SPRING TRAINING

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is official—with or without the first-string players, spring training is now underway in Florida and other warmer climes across the country. This morning's national news featured reports from my home district cities of Fort Myers and Port Charlotte—reports tinged with regret and resentment about the lost opportunities and lost dollars caused by the protracted baseball strike. Americans really are fed up with the fighting and all agree it is time for both sides to come back to the bargaining table and resolve their differences to save the season. But most still think it would be a mistake for Congress to interject itself into this dispute and impose a settlement. I agree—but I believe there are legitimate issues to discuss about whether the antitrust exemption has outlived its purpose—and Congress is reviewing that issue. But in the meantime, we all ask players and owners—can't we just play ball?

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, before we leave town for Presidents Day, I just want to reflect on all of the successes we have experienced since we convened the 104th Congress on January 4.

Cutting congressional budgets and staff, making Congress live under the same laws it passes on the private sector, passing a balanced budget amendment, stopping the practice of unfunded mandates, giving the President a line-item veto, passing a tough crime package, and most recently, today, passing a strong national defense bill.

□ 1450

Mr. Speaker, what we have seen in the past 44 days is not only historic but phenomenal. Through the Contract

With America, Republicans are proving that hard work can, indeed, produce real change.

As we approach our 50-day mark, let me assure you that the Republican majority will continue to keep our promises with the people by bringing to the floor regulatory reform, welfare reform, term limits, legal reform, tax cuts for middle-income families, and a senior citizens' equity bill.

WE ARE KEEPING OUR PROMISE

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we made a promise, we signed a contract, and we kept our promise—it is as simple as that.

We just passed the National Security Revitalization Act, a component of our Contract With America. In fact, in the past 44 days, we have been keeping a lot of promises. Congressional reform, a congressional accountability act, a balanced budget amendment, unfunded mandates reform, and a strong crime package. We are working hard to produce real change in Congress and America.

But our hard work does not stop here. After the President's Day recess, we will be bringing to the floor legal reform, regulatory reform, term limits, tax cuts for middle income families, a senior citizens' equity bill, and welfare reform. We are on the road to restoring the long-lost credibility and trust people have in their elected officials.

The Republican majority is moving forward. We are making Government smaller, less costly, and more accountable to the American people. I am proud to be a part of this historic time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1995, TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1995

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, February 17, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 21, 1995, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT RELATING TO ACTIVITIES AND COSTS PURSUANT TO DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY UNDER INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS ACT FROM SEPTEMBER 29, 1994 TO NOVEMBER 14, 1994—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-36)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United

States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On September 29, 1994, in Executive Order No. 12930, I declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act [IEEPA] (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States posed by the continued proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and their means of delivery. Specifically, this order provided necessary authority under the Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative [EPCI], as provided in the Export Administration Regulations, set forth in Title 15, Chapter VII, Subchapter C, of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 768 to 799 inclusive, to continue to regulate the activities of United States persons in order to prevent their participation in activities that could contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means.

I issued Executive Order No. 12930 pursuant to the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, including the IEEPA, the National Emergencies Act [NEA] (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code. At that time, I also submitted a report to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of the IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)).

Executive Order No. 12930 was revoked by Executive Order No. 12938 of November 14, 1994. Executive Order No. 12938 consolidates a number of authorities and eliminated certain redundant authorities. All authorities contained in Executive Order No. 12930 were transferred to Executive Order No. 12938.

Section 204 of the IEEPA requires follow-up reports, with respect to actions or changes, to be submitted every 6 months. Additionally, section 401(c) of the NEA requires that the President: (1) within 90 days after the end of each 6-month period following a declaration of a national emergency, report to the Congress on the total expenditures directly attributable to that declaration; or (2) within 90 days after the termination of an emergency, transmit a final report to the Congress on all expenditures. This report, covering the period from September 29, 1994, to November 14, 1994, is submitted in compliance with these requirements.

Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12930, the Department of Commerce has continued to administer and enforce the provisions contained in the Export Administration Regulations concerning activities by United States persons that may contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and missiles. In addition, the

Department of Commerce has conducted ongoing outreach to educate concerned communities regarding these restrictions. Regulated activities may include financing, servicing, contracting, or other facilitation of missile or weapons projects, and need not be linked to exports or reexports of U.S.-origin items. No applications for licenses to engage in such activities were received during the period covered by this report.

No expenses directly attributable to the exercise of powers or authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order No. 12930 were incurred by the Federal Government in the period from September 29, 1994, to November 14, 1994.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 16, 1995.

REPORT RELATING TO ACTIVITIES AND COSTS PURSUANT TO DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY UNDER INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS ACT FROM NOVEMBER 16, 1990 TO NOVEMBER 14, 1994—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-37)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On November 16, 1990, in light of the dangers of the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons, President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12735, and declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.). Under section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), the national emergency terminates on the anniversary date of its declaration unless the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice of its continuation.

On November 14, 1994, I issued Executive Order No. 12938, which revoked and superseded Executive Order No. 12735. As I described in the report transmitting Executive Order No. 12938, the new Executive order consolidates the functions of Executive Order No. 12735, which declared a national emergency with respect to the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons, and Executive Order No. 12930, which declared a national emergency with respect to nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and their means of delivery. The new Executive order continued in effect any rules, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action taken under the authority of Executive Order No. 12735.

This is the final report with respect to Executive Order No. 12735.

This report is made pursuant to section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act regarding activities taken and money spent pursuant to the emergency declaration. Additional information on chemical and biological weapons proliferation is contained in the annual report to the Congress provided pursuant to the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991.

The three export control regulations issued under the Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative are fully in force and continue to be used to control the export of items with potential use in chemical or biological weapons [CBW] or unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction.

During the final 6 months of Executive Order No. 12735, the United States continued to address actively in its international diplomatic efforts the problem of the proliferation and use of CBW.

At the termination of Executive Order No. 12735, 158 nations had signed the Chemical Weapons Convention [CWC] and 16 had ratified it. On November 23, 1993, I submitted the CWC to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. The United States continues to press for prompt ratification of the Convention to enable its entry into force as soon as possible. We also continue to urge those countries that have not signed the Convention to do so. The United States has remained actively engaged in the work of the CWC Preparatory Commission headquartered in The Hague, to elaborate the technical and administrative procedures for implementing the Convention.

The United States was an active participant in the Special Conference of States Parties, held September 19-30, 1994, to review the consensus final report of the Ad Hoc Group of experts mandated by the Third Biological Weapons Convention [BWC] Review conference. The Special Conference produced a mandate to establish an Ad Hoc Group whose objective is to develop a legally binding instrument to strengthen the effectiveness and improve the implementation of the BWC. The United States strongly supports the development of a legally binding protocol to strengthen the Convention.

The United States maintained its active participation in the Australia Group [AG], which welcomed the Czech Republic, Poland, and Slovakia as the 26th, 27th, and 28th AG members, respectively. The Group reaffirmed members' collective belief that full adherence to the CWC and the BWC provides the only means to achieve a permanent global ban on CBW, and that all states adhering to these conventions have an obligation to ensure that their national activities support these goals.

The AG also reiterated its conviction that harmonized AG report licensing

measures are consistent with and indeed actively support, the requirement under Article I of the CWC that States Parties never assist, in any way, the manufacture of chemical weapons. These measures also are consistent with the undertaking in Article XI of the CWC to facilitate the fullest possible exchange of chemical materials and related information for purposes not prohibited by the Convention, as they focus solely on preventing assistance to activities banned under the CWC. Similarly, such efforts also support existing nonproliferation obligations under the BWC.

The United States Government determined that one foreign individual and two foreign commercial entities—respectively, Nahum Manbar, and Mana International Investments and Europol Holding Ltd.—had engaged in chemical weapons proliferation activities that required the imposition of trade sanctions against them, effective on July 16, 1994. A separate determination was made and sanctions imposed against Alberto di Salle, an Italian national, effective on August 19, 1994. Additional information on these determinations will be contained in a classified report to the Congress, provided pursuant to the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991.

Pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, I report that there were no expenses directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency in Executive Order No. 12735 during the period from November 16, 1990, through November 14, 1994.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 16, 1995.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

FACTS THAT ARE MISUNDERSTOOD WITH REGARD TO H.R. 7

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, the people in my district in California do not have any luxury to subscribe to the Washington Post and the Washington Times, which have extensive coverage of what is happening inside the Beltway.

There is a lot of rhetoric, especially about the U.N. peacekeeping mission. This bill that we just passed, H.R. 7, which is named the National Security Revitalization Act, the people are saying if this is passed, that will be the end of the U.N. peacekeeping mission.

I would like to clarify this. I would like to urge all my people in my district, people in California, to contact Mr. Clinton not to veto this important bill.

Let me tell you what this really truly says. In the last year, 1995, fiscal year, our administration came to Congress to ask for \$533 million for the U.N. peacekeeping mission, just peacekeeping. That is our assessment. At 6 months later, they come back asking an additional \$672 million. Adding it together, our assessment was actually \$1.2 billion last year alone, cash assessment to the United Nations.

This year our administration asked again for only \$445 million.

Now, who is trying to fool who this time? This is a very unrealistic request to try to trick the system by grossly underestimating our peacekeeping assessment numbers so that the overall budget looks smaller. I can bet you that they are going to come back halfway through this year asking another \$1/2 billion.

Anyway, in addition to \$1.2 billion we paid to the United Nations, we also paid an additional \$75 million last year as a gift, as a gift, voluntary gift. This year they are asking an additional \$100 million as a voluntary gift.

It is beyond my comprehension why we are paying gifts in addition to \$1.2 billion.

The U.S. Government gets no credit for these voluntary contributions.

Let us talk about other countries. How much do they pay? Ninety countries. How much do they pay? Ninety countries pay less than one-hundredth of 1 percent, 0.01 percent, nothing; 90 countries pay less than that. Only 10 countries pay more than a lousy 1 percent. Let me repeat only 10 countries in the world pay more than 1 percent on this U.N. peacekeeping mission.

How much do we pay? Thirty-two percent.

□ 1500

We used to pay only 25 percent. What happened? Because Russia dissolved and were unable to pay, we have to pick up the tab. Is that not ridiculous?

We are paying 32 percent while only 10 countries pay more than 1 percent. Now, that means we are paying more than 3½ times more than the second largest contributing nation, which is Japan. Japan pays 12.5 percent. Not to mention the gifts and not to mention the in-kind contributions.

Let me tell you what it is. We spent \$1.7 billion in-kind contributions to support of this U.N. peacekeeping mission. What are they? Let me give an example: Sending military forces to Somalia, millions and millions of dollars is what it cost us. Also the airlift of supplies to Bosnia.

We are now involved in 13 different places on peacekeeping and humanitarian support in this world.

Altogether we spent \$1.7 billion in addition to the \$1.2 billion cash assessment, in addition to the gifts.

Now, this \$1.7 billion we spent as in-kind contributions was not credited to us. Added altogether we are about \$30 billion a year that we are donating to the United Nations under the name of peacekeeping mission.

Now, what this bill will do, let me explain: Under section 509 it says the United States shall not pay more than 25 percent. Is that not fair?

Second, section 506 says that all the in-kind donations shall be credited, credited to the United States. That is exactly what it says.

Section 507, no more voluntary gifts unless it is some kind of emergency or national security interest.

Finally, section 511 says U.N. management must be reformed. You cannot just go around and asking us for money like we were a bottomless pit. They have to reform, they have to shape up. That is what this bill does, asking the U.N. to shape up. We are asking them to hire an inspector general so they can audit the books and find out exactly who pays what and how much.

We are not against peacekeeping. I understand we all believe in human rights, but, by golly, it has to be fair. This bill provides for a more equivalent sharing of the real cost of such activities, something that all the American people deserve. That is what it is all about. We are not talking against peacekeeping. It is about time for us to get a fair share and a better accountability.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FOREIGN COMMAND OF U.S. TROOPS

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

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, one of my staff was in a grocery store, local grocery store, just a few days ago and happened to be in the toy section of the store and lo and behold here is what he found and picked up. These are little toy soldiers, just like we used to play with when we were little boys and girls. It says "U.N. troops."

Mr. Speaker, how far have we gone? How far has this madness gone? It used to be, when I was a little boy, I would play with my G.I. Joe. They were American soldiers we used to play with. They were not United Nations troops.

I think maybe the reason these kinds of toys are being marketed now is because maybe it is becoming acceptable that we no longer have our sovereignty any more, we no longer have control. We have given control of U.S. troops, our young men and young women, put

them in harm's way, put them under the direct jurisdiction of the United Nations.

In fact, in 1988, there were only 5 peacekeeping operations being operated by the United Nations across the world. Today the United Nations supports 17 peacekeeping operations. More and more, these missions involved internal unrest, including ethnic clashes as opposed to conflicts between nations.

Mr. Speaker, today is a landmark day. We passed a wonderful piece of legislation that redirects our attention, that refocuses our priority on America, on America's vital interests, what is beneficial to this country and not the world at large.

This is a wonderful day, and I think it was one of the most impactful bills, but unfortunately the media out there has decided to neglect any discussion of this bill. I will not comment as to why. But I will comment that these toy soldiers, they are meaningless, you can throw them away, they can end up in the wastebasket, it does not matter. But young men and young women, their lives do matter. When they are fighting on foreign soil, we have an obligation in this body to be sure they are standing up for our interests, our vital national security interests, and not for some utopian concepts of peacekeeping in areas that we really cannot keep the peace.

This bill, H.R. 7 that we just passed, is very impactful in that it restricts the deployment of U.S. troops to missions that are in our interest. It demands that U.S. troops be commanded by U.S. commanders, not by U.N. bureaucrats.

It reduces the cost to the United States for U.N. peacekeeping missions and demands that the United States Representatives to the United Nations press for reforms in the management practices of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I have also got to mention that I believe we have got to keep our eye on that one big ball that is out there, that \$5 trillion Federal debt that we have. Not only do we not have human lives to waste abroad for needless causes, but we do not have the capital as well. We have a debt to pay off. As Mr. KIM pointed out adequately, we have paid a disproportionate share of the cost of peacekeeping. We pay 33 percent. The next highest country, Japan, pays in the neighborhood of 13 percent. That is unreasonable.

We pay 25 percent of the costs for upkeep and maintenance of the United Nations. If we were getting what we paid for, it might be a different story. But I do not think we are.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate this body for doing some wonderful work today, and, hopefully, the measure will pass the other body and President Clinton will get significant support from the people out there, the voters, calls from the real people out there, the voters, calls from the real

people out there who do not want their young people's lives wasted in the future needlessly.

Maybe these soldiers, these toy soldiers, it is okay to risk their lives because they do not mean much, but our young men and women, they do matter.

President Clinton, please do not veto this legislation.

WITH APOLOGIES TO DR. SEUSS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, during much of the debate on the defense bill just passed, I listened either here in the Chamber or watched it on television from my office and spent some time between debates composing a little doggerel.

With apologies to Dr. Seuss, I would like to share it with you:

On the eighth of November, Election Day last fall.

The voters decided to take a look over the wall.

At first, Democrats stood silent, but finally we said,

With a very sad shake of our collective head, "On this side of the wall we are all Dems,

But on the far side of the wall live the them.

But the voters said it's high time we knew, What kind of things the them would do.

Even after 40 years, the wall isn't so high.

Why, the voters can look the them square in the eye.

And when the them came close, the voters heard 'em say, "Star Wars, Star Wars, it's up, up and away."

And at that very instant, voters remembered the reason they had stayed on their own side of the wall season after season.

The them love to spend and spend, but only on weapons that skewer.

Not Head Start or Pell grants or highways or sewers.

So, on tiptoe the voters stand quizzically watching the them,

As the them dash about in their 100-day fit, So, on 101 they can at last sit.

And the voters note that the them look frightfully mean,

As they try to spend billions on their Star Wars machine.

Voters had walked to the wall with great vim and vigor,

Only to find the them as always with their hands on the trigger.

For 2 more years the voters will watch and the voters will wonder,

Why the them spend tax money that might blow the world all asunder.

At the end of the time, the voters will step back from the wall,

Hoping a little look didn't hurt much after all.

And then they will remember when all is said and done,

These are the very same them that scared the voters back in 1981.

□ 1510

FRIVOLOUS LAWSUITS IMPACT AMATEUR SPORTS, LEGAL REFORM NEEDED

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest an editorial found in Monday's Wall Street Journal article by Creighton Hale.

Mr. Hale is the CEO of Little League Baseball and he made a very good case for the need for legal reform.

One example he gave was this:

Imagine the situation: The batter hits a pop fly to center, but your centerfielder is playing the position for the first time. He moved there because the regular kid has the flu. The pop fly hits him in the eye.

As the coach, what do you do?

Pull the infield in and play for the plate?

Call time and head for the pitcher's mound?

How about try calling a lawyer?

You see, in a real life case similar to the one just described, the centerfielder's parents filed suit against the coach who stationed their child under the ill-fated pop fly. They sought compensation for pain and suffering, as well as punitive damages.

In another case described by Mr. Hale was litigation that resulted from two boys colliding in the outfield.

They picked each other up—and then sued the coach.

Another player sued when a stray dog intruded on the field of play and bit him.

And in one of the most outrageous cases I have heard of a woman won a cash settlement when she was hit by a ball that a player failed to catch.

The irony here is that the player was her own daughter.

The Little League has seen its liability insurance skyrocket 1,000 percent over a 5-year period. From \$75 per league annually to \$795 per league.

We, in effect, have asked little league coaches to take on major league liability risk.

Our legal reform umbrella must cover civil defendants of all stripes whether it be the Little League team that plays in the park down the street or the large corporation that employs the little leaguer's parents.

Frivolous litigation has reached the point that we cannot even measure it with dollars anymore.

Already the special interests are mobilizing to stop any attempt to help the Little Leaguers and Girl Scouts.

George Bushnell, president of the American Bar Association, has resorted to name calling.

The rules of this body will not even allow me to repeat what he called congressional Members who would dare attempt legal reform of this nature.

I say we have struck a nerve.

We are not here to pander to the special interest within the legal community.

Rather, we are here to enact real legal reform for the American people.

And reform we shall have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. RIVERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE SO-CALLED PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

The SPEAKER per tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Personal Responsibility Act.

For years now, Mr. Speaker, Democrats, Republicans, welfare recipients, and Americans on opposite ends of the political spectrum have all agreed on two things; No. 1: The welfare system is broken, and No. 2: We as Americans must change welfare as we know it.

This bill as I read it, Mr. Speaker, fails in several ways to address the problem.

First, the bill erroneously assumes that the problem with welfare is that these people just do not want to work.

The reality, however, is that 70 percent of those who receive welfare benefits are children. The remaining 30 percent are the mothers of these children and disabled persons.

Second, and most importantly—this body, as it has done in the past, is attempting to base new public policy on the same false premise—that these people just do not want to work! Therefore, to encourage them to work—cut them off.

The reality, Mr. Speaker, is that the problem with welfare is this body's total abdication of its responsibility to deal openly and forthrightly with the cause of welfare—the lack of a real job paying a livable wage.

If we did address this problem openly, Mr. Speaker, we would find that what

most welfare recipients want is an opportunity to work—not a welfare check!

This bill, Mr. Speaker, does nothing to empower people. It does nothing to address those very important secondary impediments to welfare mothers going to work, the need for day care for their children so they can go to work, and the need for health care for their children.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the bill fails to invest the resources in job training and education necessary to equip welfare mothers to compete for the jobs that are available.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only thing this bill guarantees to our children, is that once their parents have used their allotted benefits—that's it! There is no other safety net for these families or their children.

No matter what happens to the Nation's economy or the economy of your State, no matter what happens with your personal circumstances, regardless of your efforts to secure employment, that is it—no more benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would abolish the entitlement status of those essential programs that protect our children from hunger and homelessness.

What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that no longer are poor children guaranteed that they will grow up with a roof over their head and food in their mouths.

In fact what our children are guaranteed, Mr. Speaker, is that their basic health and nutrition needs will now be subject to individual State priorities and each new Congress views about their mothers and their willingness to work.

What we have done in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to decide that welfare and single mothers and their children are the root of all evil in this society and if we are to ever balance the budget we must get these pariahs off the rolls.

The reality, Mr. Speaker, is that 70 percent of all welfare recipients are off welfare in 2 years and only 12 percent of all welfare recipients stay on welfare more than 5 years. So why this body would base welfare policy on the 12 percent of people who have not, will not or cannot get off welfare is beyond me.

This bill would require, or as we like to say in Washington—mandate—that States deny AFDC permanently to families where the children were born after this bill's passage to unmarried mothers younger than 18. States would also have the option to deny assistance to children born to unmarried mothers younger than 21.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would allow States to eliminate all cash benefits to families who have received aid for 2 years and—permanently—bar such families from any future aid if the parent had participated in the work program for at least 1 year. After 5 years, States would be required/or mandated to terminate permanently the family from cash assistance.

The State even if it wanted to continue cash payments would be directed by Washington to deny this benefit.

In both of these cases, Mr. Speaker, the Contract on Americans would allow children and families to be left without any cash help or a public service job even when the parent was willing to work but unable to find private sector employment.

An even more ominous provision in this assault on America's children, Mr. Speaker, would take the savings generated by denying assistance to unmarried teens and their children, and use those same funds to build orphanages for those children or group homes for those children and their teen parents rendered destitute by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is open season on poor American children and the people sent here to protect them are running roughshod over them with careless indifference or conscious disregard.

My district, Mr. Speaker, has 61,000 children living below the poverty line. I am not interested in orphanages and group homes, I am interested in jobs that will employ the parents of these children.

What is required, Mr. Speaker, is an honest appraisal, free of finger pointing, free of race baiting, free of vitriolic attacks on lobbyless women and children, and most important, Mr. Speaker, a real commitment to creating jobs.

□ 1520

An even more ominous provision in this assault on America's children is that it would take the savings generated by denying assistance to the unmarried teens and their children. As we debate this issue coming up next week on the floor of the House, let's take a hard look at the Personal Responsibility Act and hold it responsible.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE FROM TODAY UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT AND ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM TODAY UNTIL WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 30) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 30

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, February 16, 1995, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 21, 1995, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, February 16, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon, or at such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, on Wednesday,

February 22, 1995, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly exciting to see what has been happening in this town since January 4. It seems for the past 40 or so years we have had an institution in Congress that was not responsive to the needs of Americans across the country; that did not seem to care about what was going on in the lives of middle class Americans, from Maine to California, from Florida to Washington State. In fact, things had gotten so bad that just a few months back only 18 percent of Americans thought Congress was doing a good job.

Today, only a month and a half after the 104th Congress convened on January 4th, almost 50 percent of Americans now believe Congress is doing a good job and we are on the right track. And for good reason. Look what has happened.

Of course, there are things we have not addressed yet. There are problems we have not had time to work out. But let us look at what we have done in just a few short weeks.

We have undertaken real institutional reform, reform that all Americans are in favor of, even the most simple basic reform that Congresses in the past have ignored. They have not listened to what Americans have wanted.

We started with the Shays Act. The first day it was passed, and it is an act that makes Congress abide by the same rules and regulations that they force on individuals, on families, on businesses, on States, on the rest of America. I cannot tell you how many times I heard people across my district and across the country pound their fist into their hands, angry, saying why can they pass laws, and then conveniently exempt themselves from it? What makes Congress and the Members of Congress feel so arrogant that they somehow believe that they are above the law? Why does Congress not do what the overwhelming majority of the American people want them to do. Is this not a representative democracy?

Well, the 104th Congress answered the call quickly, and before we were out the first day, we passed the Shays Act, which pushed forward a very simple proposition, and that is Congress abides by the same laws that the rest of us have to abide by. That was a great first day.

But if that was the only thing we had done the first day, it would have been an unqualified success. But we went further. We also cut staff by one-third. Committee staff was cut by one-third. And we did more than that. We cut congressional staff. Members now were restricted by the number of staff they had working in their offices and back in their individual districts.

We have recently passed regulations that will cut franking by one-third. It is a reform that Americans have called for, for years, and it is a reform that the 104th Congress answered.

We also finally put term limits on committee chairmen. So many people were disgusted with what they saw in the last few Congresses, by the power amassed by the Dan Rostenkowskis of the House, and the people said enough is enough. And once again the 104th Congress answered the people's call and put term limits on committee chairmanships.

But they went a step further. They even put term limits on the Speaker of the House, something that is absolutely unprecedented.

You hear so much from the other side of the aisle, trying to build up these monsters and trying to vilify Members of the 104th Congress. Some have even suggested that our Speaker is setting up this strong Sam Rayburn style speakership, as if he is power hungry. The fact of the matter is Sam Rayburn would have never agreed to put term limits on himself. We have leadership that is moving forward, we have got Members on both sides of the aisle that are moving forward toward institutional reform. And I for one say it is about time.

I know, because this time last year, I was not a Congressman, I was not a State senator, I was not in the State legislature, I was not a county commissioner or a city councilman. I was a citizen. I was a citizen who decided I was sick and tired of what was going on in Washington, DC, and I wanted to be part of a real and dramatic change.

As the election returns came in November 8, 1994, it became clear to everybody across the country that there were a lot of citizens like myself that had gotten off the couch. They did not have special interests behind them; they did not have power brokers behind them; they did not have powerful party leadership behind them. They only had simple ideas behind them. They only had reform on their side. And in 1994 when all Americans got up off the couch and said enough is enough, the ideals that we put forward in our campaign was enough. People called for reform, we got elected, we came to this

Congress, and we have put forward great reform.

We also passed a limitation on tax increases. We have to have a three-fifths supermajority now to pass any tax increases on middle class citizens across this country. Let me tell you something: That is incredibly important, when you consider that in 1993 the 103d Congress ignored their constituents and ignored Americans from coast to coast and passed the largest tax increase in the history of this country by one vote.

We now require a supermajority, and because of it, the taxpayers have received what I call a taxpayer protection plan, to make sure that Congress stops stealing money from citizens across the country to feed their own special interest pork-barrel projects. And that was a great step forward, when you consider that the average American spends 50 percent of his or her time working to pay off taxes, fees and regulations imposed on them by Government.

Think about that. When you go to work on Monday morning, you are going to work for the Government to pay off taxes, fees and regulations. When you go to work Tuesday morning, you are still working for the Government.

□ 1530

When you go to work Wednesday morning, you are still working to pay off taxes, fees and regulations put on you by the Government. It is not until you come back from lunch on Wednesday afternoon that you actually start putting money into your own pocket, into your own savings account for what you need to get by.

Let's put it another way. None of us will be working for ourselves until July 1. We will be working to pay off taxes, fees and regulation put on us by the Government until July 1. That means we all have more months to work to pay off taxes, fees and regulations put on us by the Government. Before we are able to put aside 1 cent for ourselves, before we are able to put aside money to pay off our cars, or to pay off our mortgage, or to put money aside for our children's educational plans or, heaven forbid, until we can put aside any money for retirement.

Our tax system is a system that punishes productivity. It is a system that tells individuals and businesses and families, "The harder you work, the more you're going to be punished."

We finally put in a taxpayers' protection plan. Our leader now is talking about a flat tax that will tax all Americans evenly and fairly at the same percentage rate to make sure that you are not punished, that you do not pay at a higher percentage if you dare to be productive, if you dare to invest, if you dare to do things that this country was founded upon.

We are finally moving toward encouraging hard work and productivity and personal sacrifice. I say it is about

time, and I am honored to be a part of that process. Again, it is something that we have already passed in this 104th Congress.

We passed a line-item veto. That is something that President Ronald Reagan had been calling for for years. That is something that the American people have been calling for for years. Look at the polls in the USA Today and in Time and Newsweek and these other magazines. They all say an overwhelming majority of Americans have supported a line-item veto so the President can look through these huge budgets filled with pork and be responsible and cut out line items of wasteful spending. It is about time.

Again, it is something Americans have wanted this Congress to do for a long time, and yet it is something that was ignored until the 104th Congress came to town and we have passed it.

Some people have said, "Well, a line-item veto is great, I was for it when Ronald Reagan was President, I was for it when George Bush was President. But now that Bill Clinton is President, I don't know if I'm for the line-item veto anymore or not."

Let me tell you something. It does not matter who the President is. It finally brings accountability to the process.

For too long we have had people on both sides of Pennsylvania Avenue pointing at each other. We have had people from the White House blaming the Congress, saying, "Hey, they've never sent us a balanced budget." The same thing was argued the other way around.

Finally the buck stops at the White House, and we have something in place where the President will finally not be able to blame Congress or blame anybody else if these pork-barrel projects go through. He simply takes out his pen, lines through the appropriation, and we have accountability in the budget process, and we have it because the 104th Congress also passed it.

We have a balanced budget amendment that is passed from this House and is now over in the Senate. That is another thing that Americans have been for for years and another thing that Congress has ignored.

I have got to tell you when you start lining up all these things that Americans have been for and you start realizing that Congresses in the years past have covered their ears and shut their eyes and pretended that Americans did not count, that they were above the law, that they were above public opinion, that they were above being in a representative democracy, a constitutional republic, you can now see why the revolution took place.

People demanded accountability. Republicans and Democrats and Independents demanded accountability. The Republican Party has come to town and with the help of people on both sides of the aisle and Independents across the country, we have passed these reforms

through. But this is not simply a Republican revolution.

In my district, 60 percent of the people who voted in the 1994 election were Democrats. Sixty percent. I am a Republican. Yet I received 62 percent of the total vote. That is overwhelming. It is overwhelming because it shows that the issues that unite Americans are not about whether you are Republican or Democrat or conservative or liberal or independent. It is about accountability. It is about listening to Americans and voting your conscience and voting the way Americans want you to vote, the way that our Founding Fathers wanted us to vote. We have done it. We did it today on H.R. 7. We have taken a crucial step forward in once again making our shores safe and our military strong.

There is no doubt we have had the strongest military in the history of the world. But unfortunately we have continued cutbacks. Many believe now that we are close to having a hollow force. Beyond that, there has been another danger. There has been a danger of shifting control from U.S. military men and women, from our generals and admirals and our Commander in Chief to the U.N.

Just think about it. Think about the fact that we have men and women who may go into combat, and when they go into combat, they will not be fighting under American generals or American admirals.

Is there a problem with having them under the U.N. flag? Is there a problem with our service men and women serving under foreign leaders? Yeah, there is.

Our troops fight to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States of America. There is a real problem when the Constitution is bypassed in military exercises. I want to point out what happened in Haiti a few months back.

We had a President who wanted to push for an invasion of Haiti, but he could not get it passed through Congress. He could not garner the sufficient support in this constitutionally elected body to have support to send men and women, mothers and fathers to Haiti into a conflict where they could die.

Our Founding Fathers knew how important it was that our President could not send Americans into war without approval of this Congress. But what did the President of the United States do when he could not do it through constitutional channels, through the Congress? He went to the United Nations. There is a real problem with that as far as I am concerned. It usurps essential powers that were given to this Congress over 200 years ago by the Founders of this great Republic.

You need to go through a democratically elected body if you are going to put Americans' lives at risk. H.R. 7 finally steps up to the plate and puts an end to some of this madness. It is a first step down a road where we will fi-

nally consolidate power where it needs to be, and, that is, with American generals, admirals and our Commander in Chief.

But there is more than the U.N. We have the Mexico problem. It does not matter where you stand on Mexico, you have got to look and see what the President did, and it has to cause you a great deal of concern. Because just like in Haiti, when he could not get approval in Congress, he wanted to push this Mexican bailout plan, this loan guarantee. He said he was going to get it approved in Congress. He could not get it approved in Congress, so what did he do? He bypassed Congress again, as if we do not matter, as if the 250 million or so Americans that this institution represents are somehow irrelevant. Instead he turned and used a fund that was set up to keep the dollar strong across the world.

□ 1540

But he did not use it for the dollar. He used it to prop up the peso. It certainly violated the spirit, if not the actual letter of the law, and I would encourage the President of the United States to read his Constitution and once again bring these matters to an elected body so they can be debated and discussed the way they need to, before they are implemented.

H.R. 7 also helps answer a big lie that has been spread, and let me tell you what the big lie is. The big lie has been spread over the past 5 years that somehow this country is safer today than it was before the collapse of the Soviet empire. Even though it sounds great, even though we hear about the demise of the Evil Empire and that somehow is supposed to make us feel that we are in a safer world today, the facts point out something very different.

The fact of the matter is there are still nuclear missiles in Russia, they are still pointed our way, but there is a big difference between now and 5 years ago. Now we have madmen like Zhirinovskiy, a neo-Nazi ascending to power in the former Soviet Union. He is a man who is so unstable that he threatened to nuke Germany after he ascended to power because they would not let him in their country.

We have got economic and political and military and social chaos in the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union. We cannot afford to let down our defenses because Boris Yeltsin may be in power today, but all indications show that a very powerful totalitarian force could easily overtake the former Soviet Union again and launch us into another cold war.

It is constitutionally our first responsibility as a Government, as a Federal Government, to protect the men and women and children in this country from foreign attack. And that is what H.R. 7 does.

Another fact that concerns all of us, or should concern all of us, is the growth of China. In the 1980's, China was the second fastest growing economy in all of Asia, a region that is

booming economically. In fact, last year China's economic growth grew at a staggering 19-percent clip, and make no mistake of it, China is using this new-found economic prowess to develop, build, and export weapons technology to Third World countries. We have got to keep our guard up.

And we have got to keep our guard up because a recent Foreign Affairs article, which I do not subscribe to everything I read in Foreign Affairs, that is for sure, but a recent Foreign Affairs article stated that in 5 years over 20 countries are going to have intermediate missile range capability, and they are not going to be the select nuclear club that we used to have: the United States, England, France, China, India; it is going to expand and all of a sudden we might find 5 years down the road that people like Saddam Hussein and Qadhafi and our North Korean leaders will have this weapons technology and the ability to launch those weapons across continents.

Let me tell you something. The world is more dangerous today than it was 5 years ago, and anybody who tells you anything different is either ignorant of the facts that are out there to be read and studied or else they are glossing over the truth for their own political reasons.

We live in a dangerous world, and H.R. 7 was the first step to answer the call of all Americans across this country who said do not let our forces become hallow like they were in the late 1970's.

We are rebuilding this country because our children's lives are at stake. We have welfare reform coming up, something that all Americans or a majority of Americans have supported for a long time. And more importantly, we are not only talking about these basic reforms in the Contract With America, we are talking about moving beyond those reforms and restructuring the way this government works.

But I want to ask before we talk about our next step, let us examine what we have done in 50 days. Let me read through this again because it is absolutely incredible. In 50 days or less we have made Congress accountable by making them abide by the same laws that all Americans have to abide by. We have cut committee staff by one-third. We have cut congressional staff. We have cut franking by one-third. We have put term limits on committee chairmen, we have put term limits on the Speaker of the House. Actually the Speaker put term limits on himself and adopted that.

We have passed three-fifths tax limitation. I call it the taxpayer protection plan. I do not care what you call it; what it does is it guarantees this Federal Government is not going to be reaching in your pocket for the next 2 years, and when we pass the rest of the three-fifths balanced budget amendment next year we will be protected for years to come.

We have passed line-item veto, we have passed a balanced budget amendment, and we have passed H.R. 7, an act that will once again keep our military strong and guarantee us that we will be able to answer the challenges that are facing us in this extremely dangerous world.

This past week Members of the freshman class stepped forward, some have called us new Federalists and they have called us new Federalists because we have read the Federalist Papers. We have read the writings of James Madison, Alexander Hamilton and John Jay and other Founding Fathers, and we are committed to return this government to be the type of government our Founding Fathers intended it to be.

I am moved by the words of James Madison who over 200 years ago as he was framing this Constitution wrote, "We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government." Did you hear that? "We have staked the entire future of American civilization not upon the power of government, but upon the capacity of each of us to govern ourselves, to control ourselves, and sustain ourselves, according to the Ten Commandments of God." That was James Madison, a man who helped frame the Constitution. And it was Thomas Jefferson who wrote the government that governs least governs best.

And our own tenth amendment, our own tenth amendment, the poor, forgotten tenth amendment says all powers not specifically given to the Federal Government are reserved to the States and to the people. Think about that. Read through your Constitution, I urge all of you. I carry a Constitution. Get a hand copy of the Constitution. If you do not have it call my office, again Congressman JOE SCARBOROUGH. We will get you a copy of the Constitution. Read through it and read the 10th amendment and circle it and look through that Constitution and see what the Federal power is empowered to do and what it is not empowered to do. And if you force your representative to live by the words of the 10th amendment, to live by the constraints of the 10th amendment, then this Federal Government will once again be accountable.

We have started down that path. We need to continue. We need to be constitutionally accountable, and that is what the new Federalists, that is what freshmen reformers have been intending to do this past week when we announced bold proposals to move this Congress forward towards a 10th amendment vision.

I would like to recognize for a few minutes a man who helped lead a very critical portion of the new Federalists agenda, and that is the Honorable SAM BROWNBACK from Kansas. SAM.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me for a moment. I would just like to talk to Members, the Chamber and those

listening about what we did this past week. It was on Wednesday we came forward with a proposal announcing task forces that would develop the proposals to eliminate 4 Cabinet-level agencies, the agencies of Commerce, Education, Energy, and HUD.

□ 1550

And the proposals are that we would look at these agencies and we would ask the questions: Do they perform essential functions? And if not, can they be eliminated? Can we get many of these solutions and these issues back to the people? Can we give these things back to the people, back to local units of government? Can we consolidate some of these functions? Can we eliminate others? And getting back to what the Founding Fathers had envisioned for our Nation.

It is interesting to me to note Alice Rivlin, the current Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in a 1992 book, said she does not think the Federal Government ought to be involved in education. It should not be involved in economic development. It should not be involved in some of these centralized planning functions that are taking place. And that is what we are talking about here.

You know, most of these Cabinet agencies, three of the four, were created since 1965. Housing and Urban Development was created in 1965. Energy and Education were created in the late 1970's. They were created at a time when we had a crisis. In the urban areas in the mid-1960's, we had a crisis in urban America.

What was our solution in that time period? Our solution was let us build a government bureaucracy. We built one. In the late 1970's we said we have a crisis in energy. What is the solution? Let us build a government bureaucracy. We have a crisis in education. What was the solution? Let us build a government bureaucracy.

So we focused centrally in Washington for all the solutions to these problems, and we put our energy and our focus and our efforts and intensity here when the problem was out there, and our urban cities were decaying in New York and in Washington, DC, as the city, not the capital, and in Los Angeles and in our classrooms is where the problem was. It was not we needed more bureaucracy. It is we needed more help in the classroom, and we needed to liberate and free people.

In housing areas, the problem was not the need for a centralized planning agency. The need was for more housing in communities and to free people up to be able to deal with the problems they had in their communities.

We say these experiments have not worked, that centralized planning, whether in the former Soviet Union or in the United States of America, does not work in a large, diverse nation like the United States.

We think that these agencies, that four things will guide our purposes in developing the proposals to eliminate

these four agencies. No. 1 will be to privatize. Wherever we can privatize functions and get them out to the private sector, we will do that in the efficiency of the private sector.

Second will be localize. Anytime we can send these issues to the States or local units of government to handle, closer to the people, closer to the people, that is what we will do.

We will consolidate. Where two agencies grew that we will have one in the future so we can consolidate a number of these functions and that we can eliminate whatever functions are outmoded, outdated, or antiquated, that those would be eliminated.

So at the end of the day that we empower people, we empower communities, we empower the States to be able to really deal with these issues, and we think that is where actual solutions will occur. That is where homes are built. They are built across this Nation. They are not built in bureaucracies in Washington. Kids are taught in classrooms across this Nation. They are not taught in a bureaucracy in Washington. Energy is dealt with in the marketplace and by individual decisions, by 250 million Americans. They are not dealt with by a bureaucracy in Washington.

We will free and liberate people. We will be realigning the relationship of the Federal Government to the people, and it will be a very powerful thing for growth and for actually dealing with our problems, for actually accomplishing solutions to our problems, and it is desperately needed.

You quote one of the early Federalists. I quote Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson was quoted a saying that moments for great innovation in history are few and far between. We stand at one of those moments of great innovation in the history of this country, of the ability to realign the relationship of the Federal Government to the people, of making the Federal Government the servant once again and not the master of the people. We are supposed to be able to help and encourage, not to direct, command, and control, and that is what we seek to do, and we will be a better country, and we will be a growth country. It will be a better society. It will be a government for the people, not commander of the people. And that is what we seek to do. We will be developing our plans and proposals, bringing those out sometime in the springtime.

I would encourage the American people to contact their Congressmen if they are interested and encouraged about that. It has been interesting to me, the early feedback we have received has not been you cannot do that; it has been, "Well, would you look at the other agencies? What about the Department of Labor? What about some of the other agencies?" I think that is very encouraging to open the floodgate of ideas and liberation for the people in this country and get the Federal Government back to its core

functions that it should do rather than all the far-flung areas.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. You mentioned something very interesting. You kept talking about these different agencies and you kept saying it does not work. I never heard you say it is about ideology or some right-wing radical philosophy. I did not hear that at all.

It reminds me of when I wanted to get involved with this. It was not about any deep-seated philosophy or any philosophical ax I had to grind. It was about what works and what does not work.

I have got a 7-year-old boy that is in public schools, and I am very concerned about what type of educational system he is going to be growing up in. You look at the statistics of what has happened since the Department of Education was established in 1979, and every single statistic points to a decay in educational standards across this country. The Department of Education has been an absolute and total abject failure.

You know, they only provide 8 percent of funding to local schools, and yet they dump on them 55 percent of their paperwork. And people talk about, well, what is the problem with having this bureaucracy; gee, it is a great symbolic gesture. It is robbing money from my child, from your children, and from children all across the country.

A perfect example I read on the front of USA Today about a week ago the Department of Education has cut funding by \$100 million for the upkeep of public schools to make them safe across the country, by \$100 million, and yet at the same time, they are increasing funding on their own infrastructure, their own bureaucracy down the road by \$20 million.

So let us get this straight, they take your money and my money and our constituent's money, tax money, they send it up to Washington, they put a brokerage fee on it. Of course, everybody takes their little chunk of the pie out of the brokerage fee, and then they claim to send it back to the States.

But now it has gotten so bad they say, "We are not even sending the \$100 million to the States for upkeep of schools to make them safe. Instead, we are cutting that out, and we are going to spend \$20 million of those dollars fixing up our bureaucracy in Washington, DC."

Now, that is a sham. That does not work, and it is about what does not work.

You know, Peggy Noonan, who was Ronald Reagan's speech writer, talked about an encounter she had with the President in the early seventies when he was then Governor of California, and she asked the President, she said, "How could you be a conservative?" because she had just gotten out of college, and she was a liberal. I do not know if you would call Peggy Noonan a hippie. I do not know if she is ever capable of being a hippie. Peggy Noonan

said, "Mr. Reagan, how can you be a conservative? Why aren't you a liberal?" And Ronald Reagan said, "Because it doesn't work." And that is the truth. It does not work.

This is not about ideology. It is about what works.

Mr. BROWNBACK. If the gentleman will yield further, and that is absolutely what it is. It is not about the ideology or the left or right or center or the middle or whatever the case might be. What this is about is what has failed.

I do not think that we can stand here and at all say to the American people, "Look, we have not tried this. We have not tried centralized planning from Washington on these areas." We have. We have tried it up to 30 years in HUD. We tried it for 15 years in these other agencies. It has not worked. It does not work.

The American people want to be liberated, and I will tell you what will happen when that does occur. If we say, as far as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, look, we are not going to do this in Washington anymore. We have got some funds we are going to block grant to the States, local units of government. We want it generally used for housing, "but you figure out your problems." There will be thousands of different solutions that will come forward because we have millions of different people and thousands of different ideas and how we solve it; Topeka, KS, is different than they solve it in New York City or Austin, TX. It is just we are different people in a different nation, a diverse nation, and will come up with different solutions, because one size does not fit all in America, and the same will work in education. People were saying, well, if we do not have somebody in Washington looking out for our children, well, what is going to happen to them in education. I think what will happen to them in education is things will get better, because parents care more for their children than somebody running a government agency does, and people on a local school board know those families much more than somebody working in a government office building in Washington.

One final point, and then I will yield back the rest of the time.

□ 1600

The final point is that there are a number of good people that work in government, and that is what Jack Kemp said at our press conference, who was the former Secretary of HUD, who is also on board in supporting us. We have former cabinet secretaries of all these agencies working with us to dismantle all these agencies. They run them. They know they do not work.

Jack was saying, "Well, these are good people; there's just too many of them, and we shouldn't be doing this. It should be happening out in the communities and the individuals," and that is what we are about, having people doing these things to where the an-

swers really occur and not just command and control out of Washington.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. You know, again you talked about Jack Kemp and saying that they are good people. I have been asked the question of what is going to happen to all these good workers, especially in the education field because that is what I do. That is a task force I am heading up, the education task force.

I was also struck by Jack Kemp's comments, and I thought, and again getting back to the fact this is not ideological, this is not a battle over ideology. It is a battle over what works and what does not work.

Well, Mr. Kemp's comments remind me of the Alice Rivlin book you cite, and I read the book and I know you have, and I certainly hope the President of the United States reads Ms. Rivlin's book and follows her suggestions because they are great suggestions. But Ms. Rivlin talked about the drain, the talent drain, the brain drain, that this huge bureaucracy has caused, that from 1932 to 1980, when we had this explosion of growth in the government, not only does that suck up all the money across the country to Washington, it also sucked up all the talent we have, extremely talented people working in Washington, DC.

So what happens when we downsize these agencies, when we do away with these bureaucracies that are preventing them even from showing their true talents, stifling them, that are handcuffing them? What happens? They go home, and they enrich their communities, and they enrich the neighborhoods from whence they came. Washington, DC, does not need another bureaucrat, but that bureaucrat in Washington, DC will be a productive member of the community, and that is something Alice Rivlin wrote about in her book. She said, "So much of the talent is now concentrated in Washington, we need to spread it across the country, just like we need to spread the money back across the country and send it back to the people, send it back to the communities, because our Founding Fathers intended us to be a Nation of communities and not a Nation of bureaucracies."

And I am just struck. Let us talk about some of the people briefly that are supporting this. The gentleman mentioned Jack Kemp. We have mentioned Alice Rivlin. I know Leon Panetta once endorsed abolishing some of these agencies.

Who are some of the others?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Secretary Mossbacher that used to run the Department of Commerce was there at the press conference endorsing this. Don Hodel, who used to run the Department of Energy I talked to today is strongly supporting us. Henson Moore that used to be the secretary in command at the Department on Energy, I visited with him today and working with him on this particular project as

well. Those are people both at HUD and Energy. At Education, Dr. Bennett and Lamar Alexander have publicly endorsed doing away with the Department of Education as a way we can create better education and innovation across the country. They both have publicly endorsed this as well in that field.

So, you have got secretaries in Commerce, in HUD, in Energy, in Education, all saying "Look, folks. We tried it. We tried it hard. We tried it with billions and trillions of dollars. Centralized planing in the Soviet Union, former Soviet Union or the United States, doesn't work. You got to get it back home, and this is the way you do it."

And we are just starting, and I hope the American people lean in toward this concept and help us move this on forward to get the government back out to the people.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If I could, and I know the gentleman needs to be going on, but could you just tell me if your experience coming to Washington, DC was the same as mine because I know we were both citizens and removed from this process, but were you not filled with the sense of awe when you came up here and saw freshmen, and sophomores, and so-called old bulls that all want to move in this direction of reform and bringing power back to the States? I never in a million years expected to find so many allies in this cause to downsize the Federal Government, and it just amazes me that we have done more in 50 days than the past Congresses have been able to do in the past 50 years as far as institutional reform, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWNBACK. That is obviously the case, and that is what I am getting as well, and we had at that same press conference the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], all of which acted as if their soul was having a chorus of angels singing to it, but they were ecstatic that here were people willing to stand up and say, "Enough is enough. We tried it. It doesn't work. It's time to try something else."

And then they were all saying that, and that is what I continue to get from people all across the Government and across the Nation. Look, we have tried it, and we have really tried it. It is time to move on, and let us try something different that we think really can work and can be liberating to the people across the country, and you are seeing it take place from this freshman reform group, 73 of us coming in strong at this time, many of us elected on the type of agenda I was, reduce the Federal Government, reform the Congress, return to the basic values that built

the country, those being the watch words for us.

And I cannot help but think the original Federalists are saying, "It's about time."

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. It is about time, and I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] for his leadership in this area because it is long overdue, and I hope this Congress will move forward, and more than that I hope that the American people that stood up and said, "Enough is enough," on November 8 will continue to take a proactive role and say, "We're not going to sit back anymore; we are going to change this Government," and they will continue to use whatever means possible, whether it is the fax machine, or talk radio, or mail, or e-mail, or the town hall meetings that we are all doing. I hope they will continue to use that and put external pressure on this institution and their own Representative to say enough is enough.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. I wanted to jump in the conversation for a moment because you are hitting on, I think, a nerve out in America. What I found when I went home, the average citizen, not the political pundit, not the editorial writer, the citizen I saw at the south Florida fair came up to me and said, "Keep doing what you're doing. Make Government more accountable." They had their little children with them, and the detailed stories of trying to get information out of the school board or trying to call Tallahassee for information about their student's performance, their child's performance. It was unavailable.

So what I am hearing from the citizenry out there:

It's not about being a Republican or Democrat. It is about being American, about making a Government work.

I served with you both on the restructuring, if you will, of some of these agencies; I am on the Energy Committee, the subcommittee, working on reform. It is ironic in one of the committees the other day I am reading the material about the Energy Department and how they have a clean coal study, and this clean coal study is to allow us to use a variety of fossil fuels to diversify away from just gas, and oil, petroleum, to use coal. Well, clean coal, we are spending millions of dollars on technology to make it available and efficient. At the same time in my district in Florida Carol Browner, who is at EPA, has canceled the program to build a clean coal facility in Okeechobee, so you have one agency making rules saying, "We want to have this technology," and one agency of the same branch of the Government appointed by the same President of the United States and saying, "No, but we don't want to do that."

So the dilemma here for all of us as new Representatives, as freshmen of the 104th Congress, is to figure out how

we break down the difficulty that every American faces when they approach Government.

I did not know this job when I came was about running interference for constituents and problems that they were having with agencies regarding laws that we have created. That was not the job that I ran for, to really be a clerk, if you will, of taking their complaints, and running to an agency and saying, "The law that was passed in the 103d, 102d, 101st Congress is now having this onerous burden on business, on the human race."

□ 1610

That is what it has become. So the effort amongst us as freshmen and sophomores and all the Members of the 104th Congress is really about making Government more efficient.

I want to make one other comment, because the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] did such a tremendous job in explaining the issue that is so important on national security. I think probably one of the most passionate speeches I heard on this floor was Mr. DELLUMS from California, about ideas, about making America work, about making our interest, our national interest a priority to this Congress. So I thank the gentleman from Florida, because I think he has capsulized what the debate on national security was about. That is what we are here for in the 104th Congress.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. You bring up Mr. DELLUMS. You talked about your surprises when coming to Congress. I am going to tell you one of my surprises coming to Congress. I had campaigned, I am from northwest Florida, we believe in a very strong national defense down there, and RON DELLUMS has been perceived as a super liberal. And somebody during the campaign, quite frankly I heard a lot of questions about it. People said what is the deal with this RON DELLUMS guy? When I came up and started talking to people on the Committee on National Security, I would be talking about him, and I was amazed that these hawks that were always on the opposite side of RON DELLUMS it seemed like on every issue, spoke in the most glowing terms of Mr. DELLUMS because he is a very articulate speaker, he has very deep convictions, and he says what he means.

That is what I was alluding to before, we can have disagreements on issues, we can disagree on the best way to have welfare reform, we can have disagreements on what is the best way to protect our shores. As long as we keep the debate at the level that Mr. DELLUMS always keeps the debate and other Members on our side of the aisle always keep the debate, we will be fine. Because in the end it is not about an ideological argument. It is not about who is going to win, whether Bill Buckley or Mike Kinsley or whoever is on whatever side of what issue as a commentator. They can do that on TV and they can yell at each other and get

high ratings. But we have to hold ourselves to a higher standard. We need to be interested in what works.

Let me tell you, the reforms we have undertaken in the first 50 days have worked, and have put this country back on track for the first time in a very long time. I am hearing that where I am going, and you have alluded to the fact that you are hearing about that where you are going. Are all the constituents you talk to, are they all in one accord about that?

Mr. FOLEY. I don't know if they agree philosophically on everything we are doing, but they agree there is a serious problem. On welfare, they know there is a problem. They know it is not working. They know if you spent \$5 trillion and the poverty level is higher than it was when the war on poverty was enacted, they know there is a significant difficulty.

You were talking about education with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK]. In Tallahassee, as the gentleman knows, we have a 17-story building designed by I.M. Pei, the internationally renowned architect. That building is as out of character with the landscape of Tallahassee as anything I have seen. It is not about ideas, it is people in that building who have never taught a classroom. That is a fundamental problem with the Department of Education in our State, that people are processing papers about our children. But the results never change for our children. The hands-on experience of the classroom will never get any better if we run it from our capitals of Tallahassee and Washington.

What I am hearing from people again is the fact that they feel that this is the greatest Nation on Earth, but they want to have pride in the people they have sent here. They do not want us yelling across the aisle and screaming at a Democrat. As Mr. DELLUMS said, it is about ideas. I will challenge you on your ideas, on your convictions, on what matters for this Government, but I will not challenge you personally.

What I am hearing when people call when we have been on C-SPAN and have been talking about the very issue of the day, they are delighted we are responding to what is their opinion. Mr. SCARBOROUGH, as you know, we have been accused with the contract of propaganda, of Republican stream-rolling everybody on ideas.

The premises of the contract, the 10 points of the contract were designed from surveys throughout America of what people were asking for, about term limits, about a balanced budget. These are not ideas we sat around at Republican party headquarters and thought up ourselves. This is the American public saying these are the changes we want. We are acting. We are working on an agenda. There is considerable reason for disagreement on some of the premises, but we are working in a collegial body that makes this body so effective and efficient.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Reclaiming the time, anybody who has seen the Department of Education in Tallahassee, as I know you have, knows that that is enough of a bureaucracy for our children in the State of Florida, and I have got to tell you it is a duplication of services, not only in Florida, but all across the country.

It is the same thing with a lot of other departments. We do not need two departments of education to teach our children. We need to free up tax dollars for individuals across this country that educate their children and once again give them choice and give them freedom to have their children taught in the way that they want to have them be taught. And if we listen to the ideas of Madison and Jefferson and the Founders of this great Republic, and if we once again look at the 10th amendment that once again says all powers not specifically given to the Federal Government in the Constitution are reserved to States and citizens, if we follow that path, we will once again become the type of nation we were intended to be, and that is a nation of communities, a nation of families, and a nation of individuals who once again take control of their own lives and can decide the way they want their community to be run, the way they want their family to be protected and taught, and the way they want their own life to be run.

It is a very constitutional premise, and I for one am honored and feel very privileged to be part of this process and to be part of the 104th Congress that actually dares to debate the great issues of the day. If we continue to do this, the second 50 days of our 100-day plan, and of the next 2 years, then this country will see change like it has never seen change before, and citizens across this country, men and women, will be empowered, and once again will have confidence in their country and believe that their elected leaders came here for a reason, and that reason was to serve.

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

A DISCUSSION OF THE CRIME PROBLEM IN AMERICA

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to request the House for 5 minutes and revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for giving me an opportunity to proceed ahead.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Pensacola [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] for his brilliant testimony before the House and his compassion with which he has brought his efforts from the great State of Florida to this body.

But I want to spend a moment of the discussion on crime. We have had a great deal of debate over the last week and a half on an issue that plagues America, and that is the crime in our country. A murder is committed in the United States every 21 minutes, a rape every 5 minutes, a robbery every 46 seconds, an aggravated assault every 29 seconds, a burglary every 10 seconds, and a larceny theft every 4 seconds.

That is a sad commentary on our country. That is a sad part of America's heritage that we must change.

On average, violent offenders are released from prison, receive a sentence and serve an average of 7.8 years, but they only serve 3.1. More than 40 percent of murderers released from State prisons are arrested for a felony or serious misdemeanor within 3 years. A 40-percent recidivism rate. More than 20 percent are arrested for violent crimes within 3 years, and 1 in 15 is arrested for another homicide. At least 30 percent of murders are committed by people on probation, parole, or bail.

Another sad commentary is violent crimes by juveniles. Of those arrested for violent crimes between 1987 and 1992, 29 percent were under the age of 19. Between 1985 and 1991, the number of 15-year-olds arrested for murder jumped 217 percent. We had the sad tragedy in Florida of a British tourist being killed. The perpetrator, alleged perpetrator, of that crime had been arrested 53 times. Fifty-three times he had been arrested. Sadly enough, the person was 13 years old that is accused of committing the murders on those British tourists.

□ 1620

How are we going to change the statistics in our country? How are we going to ensure that our young people are safe on our street? How can we look at our families and our communities across America and give them some assurance that they can walk to the mall in their local communities, that they can take the dog out for a walk? That they can feel comfortable going to their car in a parking garage in an office structure throughout our cities? How can we be as certain of that safety for America?

We have enacted some very, very strong issues this week on the floor:

H.R. 3, Victim Restitution Act. I told you on the floor of what happened to me when my home was broken into years ago, and the young fellow, the juvenile, had been arrested 17 times, 17 separate occasions. The father came to the courtroom and said, "Your honor, we're trying, our son's a good boy." And each time the judge would allow probation for the child who had robbed 17 homes.

On this particular occasion, the judge looked down from the bench, the father started that same excuse, the judge looked down and said,

Let me make you a deal, sir. Mr. Foley has lost \$3,000 because of your son and he can't seem to remember where the merchandise is

from his home. I'll make you a deal. You be here with a check made payable to the clerk for \$3,000 by noon tomorrow. If you're not here at 12:01, there will be a bench warrant issued for you and your son and I'll put you both in jail until you decide who's going to be boss of the family.

With that the father hits the kid in the head and said, "Look what you got me into." It took money out of the father's pocket to make him recognize he was responsible for his son.

That is what we are doing with victim restitution, making the victim whole from their tragedy, from their loss, having the criminal repay not only their debt to society by serving time but paying the victim back for their losses.

The Criminal Alien Deportation Act is something very important to me, because 5,500 people that are locked in the prisons of Florida are illegally in our country. The bill we passed last week will allow for deportation prior to their sentence completion back to their countries.

What do we do now? We allow them to serve the time in jail, then we release them and give them a hearing date to come back for a deportation hearing. They are criminals, they are not returning to a courtroom to be deported out of this country. They disappear; 48,000 failed to appear last year alone under that scenario.

Our bill provides that they can be deported from inside the jail cell to their countries, not allowed to roam the street, not allowed to commit other crimes. That is going to make big headway in the problems in America. It will also open up beds so that we can keep the rapists and murderers out of our prisons.

Local government law enforcement block grants, sending the money to the States and allowing them to decide what is the most important crime-fighting mechanism within their community.

These are a number of the things that we enacted this week. But something strikes me that we did not discuss what we need to discuss in America and we need to discuss it forcefully, is the protection of our children from sexual exploitation and sexual violence.

Sean from my office told me that there is an incident that is going to be reported tomorrow morning in the paper in our community about child pornography and the people that were involved. Once again we read in the headlines of another child dying or being abused or used in such a nasty and disgusting way that we allow our children to fall prey to these types of people.

These are the things that we must fight as Americans. We must protect our children from sexual violence, sexual abuse. We need to act together as a Congress to make certain that the children today and in the future know that they are safe, know that they will not

be abused and feel comfortable in this great country of ours, in America.

FEDERAL FOOD ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 40 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, there is a provision in H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995, that is irresponsible. As written, that provision would convert Federal food assistance programs into block grants. Block grant funds are free funds to State and local governments. They may not be used as intended. This irresponsible provision thus puts at risk various nutritional programs, such as food stamps, school breakfast and lunches, Meals on Wheels, and the Commodity Supplemental Program.

When H.R. 4 comes to the floor, I will offer an amendment to restore the Federal food assistance program. The block grant proposal does not take into account increased school enrollments, changing economic conditions, and national food nutrition standards. Confronting hunger in America is a serious matter. It should not be left to artificial time pressures and blind budget bludgeoning. It is not responsible to put the health of our seniors and children at risk. I invite my colleagues to join me in amending H.R. 4 to make it responsible on the issue of hunger. I will say more about that later. On the first day of this, the 104th Congress, I pointed out to my colleagues, that as we begin our work this year, we must remember that our first responsibility is not to the parties to which we belong, but to the people we represent.

It is for that reason that I supported many of the early votes on reform and several parts of the proposed rules package put forth by the new majority party. I believe the majority structured some important changes to the way we function, and those changes should not have been rejected by Democrats simply because they were offered by Republicans. At the same time, I reminded my colleagues that we must be forever mindful that no Member in this Chamber has a premium on what's best for this Nation. We all have a Contract With America. What makes us a great Nation is the compassion we show for those who live in the shadows of life. We are strong because historically we have been able to make a place for all who live here, including those least able to help themselves—the young, the poor, the disabled.

In this time of increased scrutiny, we must examine each and every program, but we must also consider each and every person affected by our changes. We must ask the question: Who is helped and who is hurt? And, at the end of each day, we must be honest about whether our actions helped the many in need or the few in clover. President

Kennedy said it best, 34 years ago, when he stated, "A country that cannot help the many who are poor cannot help the few who are rich." The contract to which each Member is bound, is to work in the best interest of the American people. On election day, we offered our services to this great country, and voters accepted our offer, from Rocky Mount, NC, and across the United States.

We all have a Contract With America. That contract involves being open to the challenge of change. We, in the Congress, must get beyond partisan politics and move to the high ground of principle. This is a new day and a new time. There are problems which we face that transcend party and politics. Teenage pregnancies stifle an entire community. Violence of any kind, whether driven by drugs or propelled by deep philosophical differences, can not and must not be tolerated. Economic justice must ring true this Congress. No child and no senior citizen should face hunger in this land of plenty.

If welfare reform is to have any significance, we must combine with it a meaningful jobs program. And, welfare reform without minimum wage reform is no reform. With a meaningful jobs program, there would be less urgency for another crime bill. Instead of calls to take back our streets, there should be calls to give our streets back to the average, hard-working, God fearing citizen. Unfortunately, on this issue, Congress has failed to heed the call. Last week and this week, the majority pushed through radical changes in our law enforcement system. They sliced fourth amendment rights, eliminating habeas corpus protections, cut prevention programs, community cops program eliminated and put money in to build more jails. It is a sad and difficult time for our Nation.

I too believe we can make our Government smaller, yet more efficient and more effective. That is why I applauded and supported several of the reforms offered by the majority. But, real reform must include an end to gag rules. There are important amendments that those of us in the new minority party have wanted to offer, amendments designed to improve and perfect the legislation presented. But Members have been muzzled by a majority determined to press their 100-day agenda under any and all circumstances. I will continue to stand up as part of the loyal opposition when I believe pomposity, audacity, and duplicity confront us. No party or person has an exclusive on such things as family values and personal responsibility. Those are standards I absolutely hold dear. And, no party or person should be able to take the right to speak from any of us. Too many have sacrificed for that precious liberty. Let no one forget. We all have a Contract With America. That is why I support the call of President Clinton for an increase in the minimum wage by 90 cents, over the

next 2 years. This increase would raise the minimum wage from its current level of \$4.25 to \$5.15. This is a much-needed increase.

There has been much talk about welfare reform recently. I support welfare reform. The current system does not work well, and it does not promote self-sufficiency. Reform, however, does not mean change for the sake of change. Reform means change for the sake of improvement. As we move to reform the welfare system, we must make sure that we make a better system, not just a different system. Welfare reform without wage reform will not work. The gap in income is growing between those who have a lot of money and those who have a little money. That is unacceptable. According to *Business Week* magazine, the income gap "hurts the economy." Almost half of the money in America is in the hands of just 20 percent of the people. That top 20 percent is made up of families with the highest incomes.

The bottom 20 percent has less than 5 percent of the money in their hands. A modest increase in the minimum wage could help the bottom 20 percent, and, it will not hurt the top 20 percent. Without an increase in the minimum wage, those with little money end up with less money. That is because the cost of living continues to rise. By 1993, families in the top 20 percent had an average income of \$104,616. Families in the bottom 20 percent in America had an average income of just \$12,964.

That is a gap of more than \$90,000. That amount of money makes a big difference in the ability of families to buy food and shelter, to pay for energy to heat their homes, and to be able to clothe, care for, and educate their children. That amount of money makes the difference between families with abundance and families in poverty. An increase in the minimum wage won't provide abundance, but it can raise working families out of poverty. As income dropped for low income families during the decade of the 1980's, costs escalated. While the income for the bottom 20 percent was declining, the rate of inflation for food, shelter, heating fuel, clothing, transportation, and medical care, was increasing. In other words, the cost of bread, milk, eggs, a place to sleep, heat, clothing to wear, a bus ride, and a visit to the doctor went up, as the income of poor people went down. The rate of inflation for each of those items increased, on average, 60 percent, with a low of 36 percent and a high of 117 percent. Despite these spiraling prices, Congress did not take any steps to increase the minimum wage, and poor people, the bottom 20 percent of America, became poorer. That deep valley remains with us today.

The bottom 20 percent of our citizens can have a full-time employee in the family, working at least 40 hours a week, and still not be able to make ends meet. The earnings of that family could place them below the poverty

line. It makes little sense to discuss welfare reform when working full time does not make a family any better off than being on welfare full time. Work should be a prize. It should not be a penalty. Work is a penalty when, despite an individual's best efforts, living is an unrelenting, daily struggle. Work is a prize when enough is earned to pay for essentials. Other nations, around the world, have been faced with the gap between high- and low-income workers. Those that have been able to close the gap are the nations that have enacted minimum wage increases for their workers.

We can learn from the experience of Germany, Japan, and France, for example. It should be noted that 62 percent of all minimum wage workers are women. Welfare reform, in the absence of minimum wage reform, will hurt women in a lopsided way. The Contract With America proposes to put 1.5 million welfare recipients into below minimum wage jobs by the year 2001. Most of those will be women. The number of working poor increased by 42 percent between 1980 and 1992. Many of those were women. In fact, income inequality in America is higher than it has been since 1947. Forty-eight percent of all poor children have parents who work full time. In addition, a recent study indicates that job growth in America is lowest where the income gap is widest. Closing the gap helps create jobs rather than reduce jobs.

Those who argue that an increase in the minimum wage will cause job losses, fail to look at the facts. First, no increase has caused job losses. But, more importantly, other recent studies have shown that an increase in the minimum wage tends to cause an increase in jobs, rather than a loss of jobs. The States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, subject of one of those studies, provide a classic example. New Jersey raised its minimum wage to \$5.05. Pennsylvania kept its minimum wage at the required level, \$4.25. Jobs increased in New Jersey. There were no job increases in Pennsylvania. I want my State of North Carolina to benefit from the New Jersey example. Indeed, a recent survey of employment practices in North Carolina, after the 1991 minimum wage increase, found that there was no significant drop in employment. The survey also found that there was no measurable increase in food prices. In addition, the survey found that workers' wages actually increased by more than the required change.

There are an estimated 117,000 minimum wage workers in North Carolina. Those workers are not just numbers. They are people, with families and children. They are farmers and food service workers, mechanics and machine operators. They are in construction work and sales, health, and cleaning services, and a range of other occupations. Their families helped build America, and they can help rebuild it. They do not need charity, they need a

chance. A chance is a reasonable increase in the minimum wage, as proposed by the President. We should reward work. The economy is hurt by the income gap between the rich and the poor in America. If we want to help the economy, help women achieve a level of equality, help our children and help all Americans achieve a better quality of life, we should pass a bill to increase the minimum wage. The best welfare reform is minimum wage reform.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to turn to the primary topic of my discussion for today. As I indicated at the outset, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 [PRA], a part of the Contract With America, would convert all Federal food assistance programs into block grants. I have many concerns with that proposal. My concerns are:

First, providing for block grants for the various nutrition programs would require the development of a formula for the distribution of the block grant funds. Is there a way to develop a formula that is fair and works?

Second, Federal food assistance programs would be cut by \$17.5 billion in the first 4 years under the Contract With America. Can those programs sustain such cuts and be effective?

Third, according to a Department of Agriculture study, the formula proposed by the Contract With America resulted in big winners and big losers. Is it possible to develop a formula that meets the needs of the intended beneficiaries?

Fourth, under the block grant program, States could use food assistance funds in any way, including cash grants and for purposes other than food purchases. I have two concerns about that: Won't the use of cash grants make fraud and abuse easier and won't allowing the cash grants to be used for purposes other than food purchases defeat the intent of the program?

Fifth, a major limitation of a block grant program is its inflexibility, particularly when the economy changes. How would such a program compare to the existing Food Stamp Program and other programs, like school breakfast and school lunch?

Sixth, in North Carolina, the nutrition programs serve as an economic stimulus and stabilizer for the State, especially for the farm community. Have changes to these programs taken into account the negative impact such changes might have on State and local economies?

Seventh, what will happen when States use up funds that have been provided under a block grant program?

Eighth, elementary and secondary school enrollments are expected to rise by 8 percent over the next 5 years. What will happen when school populations grow, and the money runs out?

Ninth, will we have waiting lists and lines of people who may have missed an opportunity to participate in a program?

Tenth, can we truly expect administrative savings through block grants

when the various nutrition programs are so different that they will need to be administered separately?

Eleventh, the WIC Program has worked and worked well. Why are we trying to fix something that isn't broke?

Mr. Speaker, the Children's Defense Fund has prepared an excellent briefing book on welfare reform, which was published in January of this year. I want to especially draw my colleagues' attention to the section of the briefing book entitled, "Why Safety Net Entitlements Must Not Be Converted Into Block Grants." Let me share with you the findings of the Children's Defense Fund from that section:

WHY SAFETY NET ENTITLEMENTS MUST NOT BE CONVERTED INTO BLOCK GRANTS

A number of proposals are being circulated that would transform key means-tested "entitlement" programs (food stamps, school lunches and other child nutrition programs, Medicaid, AFDC, and Foster Care and Adoption Assistance, among others) into block grants. Such a transformation of these key safety net programs would do incalculable damage to America's children and families, states' finances, and the nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, we must reform our welfare system but we should improve the system for the people and the Nation. We should do more than slogans.

□ 1640

Mr. Speaker, yes, we should reform our welfare system, because our welfare system is not working. But we should not reform the system just for change itself. We should reform the system to make it a better system.

We are called on to have a contract with our citizens that we represent. We were called to be faithful to our promise that we would obey the Constitution. I urge us to go beyond slogans, just slogans. Personal responsibility also takes in responsibility from this Congress. We have a responsibility to make sure these programs are administered efficiently as well as effectively.

Slogans will not feed the poor. Only our working to make sure these programs work will. And I urge my citizens, I urge my colleagues as well as citizens, to understand the nutrition programs have worked well for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. DORNAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RECESS

Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1654

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GOSS] at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 86-380, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. KEMPTHORNE to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, vice Mr. Durenberger.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCHUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for after 12:30 p.m. today, on account of official business at Fort Drum, NY, with the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff;

Mrs. CHENOWETH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today after 1:30 p.m., on account of family illness;

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business;

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. HALL of Texas.
Mr. ROHRBACHER.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
Mr. WARD.
Mr. CALVERT.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. HOKE.
Mr. LUCAS.
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.
Mr. WYDEN.
Mr. LARGENT.
Mr. BRYANT of Texas.
Mr. WILLIAMS.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. SHUSTER.
Mr. BONILLA.
Mr. SAXTON.
Mr. HAYES.

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

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WILLIAMS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. RIVERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TUCKER, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SALMON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. HAMILTON, in two instances.

Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. JACOBS, in two instances.

Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. BARCIA.

Ms. ESHOO.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

Mr. OLVER.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mrs. THURMAN, in two instances.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Mr. MFUME.

Mr. STOKES.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. MOAKLEY, in two instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

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

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. GILMAN in four instances.

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. NEY.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. HORN.

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. SAXTON.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 30 of the 104th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m., Tuesday, February 21, 1995, for morning hour debates.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 30, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 21, 1995, at 12:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

379. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on abnormal occurrences at licensed nuclear facilities for the third quarter of calendar year 1994, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5848; to the Committee on Commerce.

380. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the January listing of new investigations, audits, and evaluations; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. QUILLEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 88. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 831) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, to repeal the provision permitting non-recognition of gain on sales and exchanges effectuating policies of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-38). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLINGER: Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. H.R. 450. A bill to ensure economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104-39 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. GILCREST):

H.R. 971. A bill to ensure that homeowners receive adequate notice of and opportunity to comment on activities likely to adversely affect the value of their home; and to create procedures for homeowners to receive financial compensation for development which produces pollution and other impacts adversely affecting the value of their homes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. MAS-CARA):

H.R. 972. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the exclusion from gross income for veterans benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the statute of limitations shall not bar a claim for credit or refund based on a retroactive determination of an entitlement to receive military disability benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. ROTH):

H.R. 974. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore a 100 percent deduction for business meals and entertainment and the deduction for the travel expenses of spouses and others accompanying the taxpayer on business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER of Louisiana:

H.R. 975. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to make optional the provision of nonemergency medical transportation services under the Medicaid Program and to deny Federal financial participation for such services; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 976. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent price gouging during disasters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 977. A bill to amend the Goals 2000; Educate America Act to eliminate the National Education Standards and Improvement Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. BLUTE:

H.R. 978. A bill to amend the formula for determining the official mail allowance for Members of the House of Representatives; to amend the provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to the franking privilege for Members of Congress and provide that the provisions of law preventing Members from sending mass mailings within the 60-day period immediately before an election be expanded so as to prevent Members from mailing any unsolicited franked mail within that period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWDER (for himself and Mr. HANSEN):

H.R. 979. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to submit to Congress a report regarding the management of the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program and to require that additional emergency warning sirens be provided for communities near chemical stockpile sites; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself and Mr. GIBBONS) (both by request):

H.R. 980. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for the middle class; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 981. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the eligibility criteria for the earned income tax credit, to improve tax compliance by U.S. persons establishing or benefiting from foreign trusts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MINGE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 982. A bill to reconnect welfare families to the world of work, make work pay, strengthen families, require personal responsibility, and support State flexibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Commerce, Agriculture, Banking and Financial Services, the Judiciary, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DeFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FURSE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SABO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 983. A bill to further establish the ballistic missile defense policy of the United States; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. GORDON:

H.R. 984. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Stones River National Battlefield in Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LARGENT (for himself, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. COBURN):

H.R. 985. A bill to provide tax incentives to encourage production of oil and gas within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H.R. 986. A bill to establish a program to provide child care through public-private partnerships; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. POSHARD):

H.R. 987. A bill to encourage production of oil and gas within the United States by providing tax incentives and easing regulatory burdens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Resources, the Judiciary, Commerce, Science, Government Reform and Oversight, and International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 988. A bill to reform the Federal civil justice system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BONO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. GALLEGLEY):

H.R. 989. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to the duration of copyright, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 990. A bill to require the National Park Service to encircle the Washington Monument with the flags of the individual States; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 991. A bill to provide for the termination of further production of the Trident II (D-5) missile; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. WYDEN:

H.R. 992. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to require the Secretary to reauthorize participating retail food stores and wholesale food concerns biennially; to require such stores and such concerns to provide documentation to the Secretary for approval and reauthorization; to provide for the forfeiture of proceeds and property resulting from certain violations of such act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution for the adjournment of the two Houses; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should support the efforts of Greece, in its negotiations with the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, to find a solution which promotes a solid, cooperative relationship between these two neighboring countries and that the United States should not establish formal diplomatic relations with the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia until this relationship is established; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Res. 87. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on House Oversight in the 104th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H. Res. 89. Resolution electing Representative Schaefer of Colorado to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KASICH:

H. Res. 90. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the

Budget in the 104th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 56: Mr. WELLER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BASS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 159: Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 163: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 217: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 221: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

H.R. 227: Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 324: Mr. KLINK, Mr. TUCKER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. THOMPSON, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 328: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 335: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 357: Mr. MASCARA, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WISE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 370: Mr. HILLEARY and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 373: Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 438: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. COX, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 491: Mr. RADANOVICH and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 517: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 526: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MINGE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. EWING, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 534: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 549: Mr. QUILLEN and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 553: Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 559: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 612: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 645: Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 674: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 677: Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 710: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 734: Mr. SHAYS and Ms. PRYCE.

H.R. 739: Mr. CRANE and Mr. COOLEY.

H.R. 783: Mr. ORTON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. TEJEDA, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 789: Mr. QUINN and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 791: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WELLER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. BONO.

H.R. 809: Mr. EVANS and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 841: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 866: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 949: Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 958: Ms. HARMAN, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HAYES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FARR, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. REED, Mr. PARKER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. NEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. REGULA, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HOKE, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. DURBIN.

H. Res. 80: Mr. MYERS of Indiana.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 10: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. TEJEDA.