

the activities of United States Government departments and agencies relating to the prevention of nuclear proliferation. It covers activities between January 1, 1994, and December 31, 1994.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 6, 1995.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. BOB FRANKS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Hon. BOB FRANKS, Member of Congress:

SEVENTH DISTRICT, NJ,
May 24, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my office has received a subpoena issued by the Municipal Court of Manville, New Jersey.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB FRANKS,
Member of Congress.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Banking and Financial Services; Committee on Commerce; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on National Security; and Committee on Science.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman is correct. The Democrat leadership has been consulted and agrees with all of these requests.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1561, AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 156 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 156

Resolved, That when the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union resumes consideration of H.R. 1561 pursuant to House Resolution 155, consideration for amendment under the five-minute rule may continue beyond the initial period of ten hours prescribed in House Resolution 155 for an additional period of six further hours. Consideration for amendment may not continue beyond such additional period. During further consideration for amendment only the following further amendments to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified and amended, shall be in order—

(1) pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate;

(2) amendments printed before May 25, 1995, in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII;

(3) amendments en bloc described in section 2 of House Resolution 155, but only if consisting solely of amendments so printed before May 25, 1995, in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII or germane modifications of any such amendment; and

(4) one amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on International Relations after consultation with the ranking minority member of that Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, as most Members know, this rule is the product of an emergency rules committee meeting held the day before the House adjourned for the Memorial Day recess. At that time, H.R. 1561 had been under consideration for almost 12 hours and a host of amendments were still pending—amendments offered by Republicans and Democrats. Using past precedents on similar bills as our guide, we had hoped that the original allotment of 2 hours of general debate and 10 hours of open amendment process would be sufficient, if properly managed, to allow a full and free debate on all the major issues at play in this important foreign policy bill. Looking back at the rules granted for foreign aid authorizations during past Congresses, where 1 hour of general debate and amendment time caps of 8 to 10 hours were standard, we felt that our formula would be sufficient.

Clearly we underestimated Members' interest in extending debate on several standard issues along the way. That's somewhat understandable, partially because we have so many new Members and these programs have not been

properly reauthorized since 1985. So, when it became clear that more time would be needed on this bill, our leadership attempted to work out a compromise with the minority to allow the extension of debate by unanimous consent. Unfortunately, some Members of the minority were not interested in that type of bipartisan cooperation. Hence the emergency rules meeting that produced this rule, a rule which responds to Members requests to add debate time, hopefully for some important points.

I commend Chairman SOLOMON for his flexibility and his efforts to work this out in a congenial manner—and I do believe this rule leans over backwards to provide a fair solution. Under this rule we will have an additional 6 hours of open debate, with Members having the opportunity to offer any amendment that was properly prefiled by May 24. In addition, this rule allows the chairman of the international relations committee, in consultation with the minority, to offer one amendment that was not prefiled but is otherwise in order under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, as we gear up for the appropriations cycle in the immediate months ahead it is crucial that we complete our work on H.R. 1561, and I am pleased that our rules committee was able to develop a plan to ensure that the major issues properly managed can be dealt with in a reasonable period of time without jeopardizing that legislative schedule. I say "properly managed," because under this type of fair open rule, there is always a possibility for some abuse of allotted time by some Members who for whatever motive choose to indulge in dilatory tactics. Nevertheless, I urge support for this good workable, fair rule.

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

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding.

Under the rule, can the gentleman tell me, at the end of the 6 hours, if there are still pending printed amendments, will they be allowed to be offered without debate?

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, my understanding is that we have used that provision up in the first rule, so we will have to complete all of the business in the time left for debate; that is, the 6 hours plus, I understand, with some 25 or 35 minutes of carry-over. I am not sure what the exact number was. It is at that time we will be finished with the debate.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield further for a question, does that mean there are 35 minutes remaining under the old rule? Is that correct?

Mr. GOSS. I cannot confirm that. I believe approximately.

Mr. HOYER. Approximately a half an hour?

Mr. GOSS. I believe it is in that order.

Mr. HOYER. At the end of that half hour, would it be in order for anybody to offer an amendment without debate?

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, my understanding of the rule, as it was originally filed before we had the second rule, was keyed to a time specific on a certain date for that provision. So, therefore, that provision is not available, and all Members need to be advised that the rule, as I explained it in my statements, would be the way we carry on, and after the 35 minutes or 30 minutes has gone plus the 6 hours of debate, that is the end, subject to the other parts of the rule.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his clarification.

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

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

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 156, the second rule limiting debate on H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interest Act of 1995. While this rule does provide an additional 6 hours of debate for previously printed amendments, capping time on a bill of this magnitude is unnecessary and impedes the proper legislative process. As my colleague on the other side of the aisle well knows, an additional 6 hours will only slightly improve a bad situation. We have 90 amendments remaining. The 6 hours allowed under this rule will not provide enough time to debate many of these amendments, especially because voting time is counted under the time restriction. Under this rule, only a handful of amendments will be likely to receive consideration.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my May 23 speech on the first time limit rule, the bill before us is a mixture of foreign policy initiatives and reorganizations that could change and weaken the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. In the few days following the bill's original consideration we have seen major developments around the world, including an escalation of hostilities in Bosnia. Yet this rule, which admittedly takes a step forward by providing some additional time, continues the pattern of shutting out amendments simply because 6 hours is not enough. Many of us argued against the first rule because it did not provide enough time. Here we have a second rule with the exact same problem. Again, we will be making substantive foreign policy decisions based on who is recognized before the time runs out.

In addition to the obvious procedural problems, this bill itself is seriously flawed. In addition to cutting funds in the wrong areas, it includes the elimination of three agencies, including the Agency of International Development [AID]. Yet no sound evidence exists to show this will save the taxpayers any money. The American people do not

want us to be ramming bills through for the sake of reorganization without any kind of cost analysis. I support the work of AID and believe, at minimum, we should seriously study the merits of reorganizing its functions before doing so in this bill.

Fortunately, this rule does make in order one amendment to be offered by the chairman of the International Relations Committee, Mr. GILMAN, even though it was not printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as required under the previous rule. There is an opportunity, therefore, for improvements to be made in the legislation.

I sincerely hope that funds for both development assistance and Africa in this bill can be restored, and the AID reorganization will be considered. The International Affairs budget represents only 1.3 percent of total Federal spending. It has already been cut by 40 percent since 1985. I am particularly troubled with the 34 percent cut in development assistance. While the bill earmarks \$280 million for the Child Survival Fund, the overall reduction squeezes necessary prevention efforts such as basic education, microenterprise programs, and self-help initiatives that have been proven to work. It makes no sense to have the United States functioning as the world's ambulance when famine and disaster occur in developing countries, when we could have prevented them.

In addition to saving lives, development assistance enables many countries to become self-sufficient enough to buy U.S. exports. Between 1990 and 1993, U.S. exports to the developing countries grew by \$46 billion, creating 920,000 new jobs in this country. It is in our economic interests to continue meeting our foreign assistance obligations.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has many, many flaws. However, it would be more palatable to many of us if it did not devastate development aid. This is not the time to turn our backs on the world's poor. I sincerely hope the overall spending priorities will be reworked.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, this rule simply does not provide enough time for us to handle this comprehensive, complicated piece of legislation. There are major reorganizations of agencies in this bill. There are also major restraints and new conditions our Government must follow when dealing with other nations.

Because of this time cap, I am going to oppose this rule and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on this restrictive rule.

□ 1300

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN].

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed rule for the final consideration of the American Overseas Interests Act should be adopted by the House.

This bill is a very important step forward in our goal to reform Government to make it more efficient and more effective.

To achieve this goal, the bill calls for the consolidation of three independent agencies—the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the U.S. Information Agency—into an enhanced Department of State.

The consolidation of three independent agencies into the State Department has been endorsed by five former Secretaries of State who argue that it will improve foreign policy by clarifying lines of authority and responsibility.

Secretary of State Warren Christopher also endorsed this concept earlier this year, but his proposal met strong bureaucratic opposition and was withdrawn.

But the fundamental soundness of the proposal led to the leadership in both the House and Senate international relations committees, to study it and include it in our 1995 reform efforts.

The bill also sets forth the spending priorities for our foreign operations during this time of fiscal austerity.

There are protections in this bill for our efforts to promote democracy and freedom in Cuba through Radio and TV Marti.

There is also a provision that supports our efforts to isolate the Castro regime by prohibiting aid to countries that provide economic aid or preferential trade benefits to the Castro regime.

The bill also sets out Congress' desire that a priority be placed on economic and other assistance to the developing countries in Africa.

While the Africa programs have had to bear a share of the overall effort to cut Government spending, they have been given more than they would have received under an across-the-board budget cut process.

This bill represents a fair and responsible approach to the management of Government programs in foreign policy.

Therefore I urge the adoption of this rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the former chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], who has been always a leader in this type of legislation, for his continuing hard work.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second rule we have granted for this bill. The first time around we said 10 hours was not enough. We said that the drop dead time was a lousy idea, and no one believed us. Now, here we are again, 2 weeks later, taking up rule No. 2 that still will not do the job. There are still

at least 99 preprinted amendments that we cannot possibly finish in 6 hours.

The floor schedule for this week is unusually light. There is no reason to shut down the amendment process, particularly when we are considering an issue as important as this one.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule. We have plenty of time. Let us open up this rule and give members a chance to fix this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KIM].

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this rule; however, as we debate this important legislation today, I think it is important that we address North Korea's denial of a bipartisan congressional delegation trip to North Korea.

For the first time in 40 years, we finally have a Republican Speaker of the House, and our Republican committee chairmen have requested that I pick a small delegation to North Korea. This is a bipartisan group of both Republicans and Democrats, yet the North Koreans denied our group's entry. We have contacted North Korea again for an August trip, yet we have not still received any answer yet. All this happened while the other Member of Congress have visited North Korea.

Ironically that Member was a Democrat.

This picking and choosing of Member visits is a discriminatory policy. This is simply unacceptable. This is an insult to the Speaker of the House, the House leadership, and to this Committee of International Relations.

This is the most serious insult in my opinion to the U.S. Congress. We should not tolerate these actions, otherwise the entire world will laugh at us, laugh at this Congress.

My original course of action was to offer amendment to this legislation boycotting congressional visit to North Korea until this issue is resolved. I can understand why they are afraid of my going up there, because of my unique background, but I understand that our chairmen prefer to dress this issue in conference if the North Koreans fail to change their position.

Again I would like to say for the RECORD this issue must be addressed during conference meeting.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform my colleagues that later this afternoon I hope to have the opportunity to offer an amendment to lift the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. Chairman, I do so knowing that difficult circumstances confront the United States as well as our allies. It is after all their forces that are still being held hostage by Bosnian Serb forces.

I think we all recognize that the U.N. peacekeeping forces went in to provide critically needed humanitarian aid.

But, it has ended up providing a cover, enabling the Serbs to continue the war largely without the credible threat of resolute military action by the United Nation or NATO.

The fact is there is no peace being kept. In this the United Nation has failed.

I am encouraged by the more forceful actions that are being planned by our allies, that is the plan to deploy a rapid-expansion force to protect UNPROFOR, thereby giving some muscle to those forces in Bosnia. I am also pleased by the statements coming from a number of our allies, notably president Chirac that France "refuses to yield to fatalism and irresponsibility."

My concern remains, however, that we are still confronted with a U.N. force that is mandated to be "impartial" in a war of aggression and a genocide that claims the lives of mostly civilians. It is an untenable position both from the members of UNPROFOR who must stand by and watch the killings, and the ethnic-cleansing, and for the nations who have failed to take the necessary action to protect the hundreds of thousands of victims from their persecutors. It is a position which states as its working premise to choose no sides to treat the aggressor and victim the same. Yet at the same time UNPROFOR watches in horror, the arms embargo has the effect of denying the right of Bosnians to defend themselves, their families, and their nation from a well-armed and well-trained military force that seeks to annihilate them.

Once this current crisis is resolved we must not allow the status quo to be reinstated. And what I mean by that is for a slightly reinforced UNPROFOR merely to go back to what it was doing, or I should say not doing.

This is a war between sovereign nations in the heart of Europe. It is a war that has been and continues to be the result of an illegal act of aggression by Serbia against the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is a war and genocide of a scale that we have not witnessed since World War II in Europe. And most tragically of all it is a war against a nation that stands for the very values which the United States, NATO and the U.N. security council espouse over and over again, and which Serbian policy is bent on exterminating.

□ 1310

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the United States must act to lift the arms embargo against the victims of a war of aggression not of their making. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise to express concern about this rule. This issue is a critically important issue. I believe that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the War Powers Act amendment, is also a critically important amendment, worthy of more than a few

minutes of debate on the floor of the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from Ohio is correct: If we are serious about being the policy makers and enunciating the policies that this Nation ought to pursue, I think the American public expects us to do so in a considered way, allowing full time for debate.

These are not unserious issues. These are not issues of little consequence. Indeed, the issue of which I speak speaks to the very essence of what America stands for, of what the United Nations stands for, and what NATO has pledged to protect: The opportunities of a people freely elected to be free from international aggression. That is what America stands for.

The gentleman who just preceded me spoke about the unwillingness of North Korea to allow a bipartisan delegation to come in and to talk and to see. The lesson that we learned in World War II and the lesson that we ought to be learning is that openness in foreign policy leads to international security on all sides.

I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that time is being limited; that in effect some of us are going to be, I think, prevented as I understand it from offering a critically important amendment that passed this House overwhelming 1 year ago, when we said then we ought to lift unilaterally the embargo imposed upon Bosnia and Herzegovina.

What does that mean in real terms? It means you have two people confronting one another in a war. One is heavily armed and one is very lightly armed, and we say we are neutral. We will not allow any arms to go in. We will not allow others to help the combatants.

What does that mean? That means by definition you have taken the side of the party that has been heavily armed, in this case the Bosnian-Serb aggressors who have succeeded to the Yugoslavian arms heavy weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I have had a discussion with the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. He is my good friend and I believe a supporter of this amendment. I do not want to speak for him. He and I have fought together on the side of preventing the genocide that has occurred in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

But I must tell my friend I am deeply disappointed we will not be able to, if that is the case, address this issue today. As a result, I will not support the rule, because I believe we need more time.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, just in response, of course we would like to be supportive of the gentleman's proposal. What we are concerned about is the limited amount of time in this measure to enable Members on both sides of the aisle to take up their amendments. I

hope the gentleman will be able to present his bill as a free standing bill shortly after the consideration of this measure so that the House will have a full opportunity to debate the gentleman's measure.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] who, as I say, is a very close friend of mine. We say that about most, but in this case it is really the case. He has always been fair, and he and I have always, since I can remember, fought on the same side of issues as they relate to justice and international fairness and opposition to human rights abuses.

I would say to my friend that I appreciate that effort and, obviously, if I am not successful today, I will work with the gentleman to bring that bill forward as quickly as we can.

But I say to my friend, it is unfortunate that we do not allow sufficient time on this issue, which is so timely. There is no more timely foreign policy issue that currently confronts the United States and its western allies than the issue of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as we all know.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will further yield, I want to assure him I will be pleased to work with him to bring this to the floor in a timely manner.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to congratulate the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for his very articulate presentation, and look forward to being able to deal with that issue in the very near future. I would point out there are some aspects to the American Overseas Interests Act that do deal with some of the problems, particularly this dual management problem with the United Nations, which I am sure every American—if they read about it in the paper this morning—is as outraged this morning as I am about, that we cannot defend our aircraft, but only expose our aircraft. Some of those problems that demand immediate attention are provided for here.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 156, the rule under which the House would be afforded an opportunity to devote an additional 6 hours to consideration of H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act.

As my colleagues recall, the initial rule under which this bill was brought to the floor provided for 10 hours for debate on amendments.

When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 24, 9½ hours of that time had been consumed. Nine

amendments have been disposed of out of some 75 that had been filed under the rule.

It was obvious that more time would be needed to enable the House to fully consider the measure. Moreover, an additional 25 amendments were filed so that when the House adjourned for the Memorial Day recess, there were 91 amendments pending—51 by Republicans and 39 by Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1561 is the first major challenge to the foreign policy status quo since the cold war began nearly 50 years ago—providing for the first major reorganization and consolidation of our foreign affairs apparatus in that period.

It also reauthorizes our foreign assistance programs and reduces current spending by nearly \$3 billion over 2 years—while redirecting and targeting our resources on high priority programs.

H.R. 1561 is about projecting American power and influence around the world at a cost of 1 cent on the Federal dollars.

It defends our national security—supports our trade and economic interests—provides for those who have been struck by disaster and cannot provide for themselves—and cuts duplication and waste in dozens of programs.

The administration opposes H.R. 1561 because it wants to maintain the status quo of the cold war period.

Mr. Speaker, when it's winter, we need the appropriate clothing to deal with the snow and cold—boots, gloves, and earmuffs—and a good snow shovel. But, when warm weather arrives, we discard the heavy clothing and put away the snow shovel.

Similarly—with the cold war over—it is now time to put away our cold war agencies and policies and retarget our priorities. H.R. 1561 does just that.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1561 provides the House with an additional 6 hours to consider the first major reordering of our foreign affairs operations since the cold war began, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield for a moment to the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM].

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. KIM earlier addressed the House with regard to his rejection of the opportunity to visit North Korea, is that correct, Mr. KIM?

Mr. KIM. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentleman would yield, I was dismayed by the North Korean Government's refusal to allow our good friend and respected member of our Committee on International Relations the opportunity to visit Pyongyang as an official of our Government. Along with the Speaker, I personally requested Mr. KIM to travel to North Korea. The House leadership and our committee support Mr. KIM in that endeavor. But we were rejected outright by the North Korean Government.

North Korea has yet to respond to Mr. KIM's third request to be allowed to be able to travel to North Korea in August. This rejection is an outright insult, not only to Representative KIM, but to our committee and the House leadership. I believe we should take this opportunity to send a clear message to the North Koreans that they must satisfy our demand that Mr. KIM be allowed to join a congressional delegation to North Korea.

The State Department must know that it is an appropriate solution, that an appropriate solution is needed and must be reached. I am prepared to address that issue during the conference on our bill to ensure that North Korea accepts all congressional visitors or faces some repercussion.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I would briefly conclude by yielding myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe truly that this bill, if it passes, is really a step backwards for the Congress and for the President of the United States. It ties the hands of the President, of any President. It abolishes departments and agencies by incorporating them under the arm of the State Department. Issues like AID and the Arms Agency and USIA, those issues have not even been debated on this floor of the House, and yet we are kind of confusing the whole situation by just kind of putting them under the State Department. Nobody knows what is going to happen. They are being put under the idea that in fact it will save money, but nobody has been able to prove that. We are doing that without debate.

The second thing is there is over 90 amendments left, with only 6 hours. I suspect that probably with the tremendous number of controversial issues that come up, we will only be able to address 4 or 5 amendments of all the 90 amendments that are previously printed in the RECORD.

So that rule is not a good rule. It is devastating to the whole process, and to the whole direction we are trying to give our President as far as being a leader in the world. This ties his hands.

The way the United States goes in the world, a lot of nations follow us. We have cut foreign aid since 1985 by 40 percent. But under this bill, there are further cuts that are devastating. There is going to be a 34-percent cut in development assistance, something that Americans have asked us for years to get involved. Why aren't we helping these people help themselves? But we are cutting the very thing that Americans want us to do.

The second thing is we are cutting the African Fund, where most of the humanitarian crises are going on today. So many of these cuts could be redirected in a better way.

I am not sure that this bill can be improved upon. There is a chance to do it. But the way the bill stands now, it is devastating, it ties the hands of the

U.S. Government, it is a step backwards, with substantial cuts in areas that for the most part are going to hurt a lot of women and children in poor nations, and it is not something that our Government, our Congress, ought to be behind.

For that reason, I hope that the Congress votes the rule down and votes the bill down.

□ 1330

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

I have no further requests for time. Before yielding back the balance of my time, I would just simply like to say that this act is called the American Overseas Interests Act. Usually the labels that we have on a lot of our legislation around here are somewhat grandiose. I think this label actually means something.

I think we are making a shift from what we used to call foreign aid to put the emphasis on something that is truly what are America's interests overseas. I think that is a major departure from some of the direction that we have been struggling with in the past 10 years or so here. It is one of the reasons why we have not gotten the bill through.

I think this is a new time, and I think that justifies in part this extra debate time which is really an extraordinary amount of time, almost 20 hours when we count the rules and general debate, that is an awful lot of time.

With regard to the observation of the gentleman from Maryland that there probably is no greater time or no more important thing right now than discussing Bosnia, there, of course is another avenue, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations has pointed out. And the thing about what goes on in the world is that every day there is always something new anyway that is very important for us, not that Bosnia is not critically important, but there will be other things that are critically important.

We have to make sure we have a process to bring those things forward. But the basis, the structure, the foundation of what we are trying to signal here in this legislation are American overseas interests and to provide for them appropriately, well aware of the message that we have had from our American constituency that says we have got to be a little bit more careful about how we spend our money, make sure it really counts for national security and true interests overseas and we are not in the business of being the world's policemen or the world's welfare source.

I think that this bill goes a long way in dealing with that.

The ranking Member and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], a wonderful man and a good friend, has said we need more time, more debate, and that we might not even have enough after this 20

hours. I do not know how much debate is enough debate on any particular bill, but it seems to me this is an extraordinary amount of time for a very important subject, where we are having a change of direction which is part of the change that was promised in the November 8 elections. I believe that we have got it pretty well covered now. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed until later today.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, will that vote be automatically called by the Chair?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct; the yeas and nays have been ordered, and it will automatically be called later today.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear, but was a time certain set for that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will be after the three fish hatchery bills, which are next on the calendar.

Mr. GOSS. I thank the Chair.

CORNING NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY CONVEYANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 144 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 535.

□ 1338

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 535) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas, with Mr. CAMP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this noncontroversial legislation.

H.R. 535 seeks to convey the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas. Mrs. LINCOLN, the sponsor of the bill, will fully explain the need for this legislation. Briefly, the State of Arkansas has been operating and maintaining the Corning hatchery since 1983. Arkansas has recognized the need to modernize the facility, but cannot obtain the necessary funding to do so because the State does not hold title to the hatchery. The Fish and Wildlife Service, which does hold title, fully supports the conveyance of the title to the State of Arkansas.

During our subcommittee markup, I offered an amendment—which was adopted unanimously—to expand the mission of the hatchery. In that way, the Corning facility would not be limited to fish cultures only and would be able to perform a broader range of fishery-related activities. In addition, the amendment ensures that if this property ever reverts to the Federal Government, it will be in the same or better condition as the time of the transfer. These changes are reflected in the bill pending before the House today.

I am confident that H.R. 535 as written will satisfy the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the State of Arkansas. I urge you to support H.R. 535 without amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey has said it all. This is a bill without controversy. It is very much like many others we have passed in years gone by. I must say for the life of me I cannot figure out what it is doing under a rule. If there was ever a bill that was ready for suspension, it would be these three. They are routine. They are without controversy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 535, a bill to transfer title of the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas.

The Corning hatchery, which has been operated by the State of Arkansas under a memorandum of understanding with the Fish and Wildlife Service since 1983, produces bass, bluegill, sunfish, crappies, and catfish for State fishery programs.

While the State has made minor improvements to the facility, it is now interested in making more significant capital investments and would like title to the property before doing so. This bill would give title to the State, while protecting the interests of the Federal Government by requiring that title revert to the Fish and Wildlife Service in the event that Arkansas no longer wants to operate the facility as a fish hatchery.

This is standard language we have used to transfer many facilities in the past. It is supported by both the State and the administration, and I urge Members to support it today.