



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1995

No. 93

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

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

May we remember each morning, O loving God, to be grateful for all Your good gifts to us and to all people and remind us during all the hours of the day to have hearts of thanksgiving. At our best moments we know that the gifts of thanksgiving and gratitude are at the center of our humanity and Holy Scripture commends these virtues as marks of a healthy life. With all the duties that are before us and with all the responsibilities that never quite get done, we pray that we will never forget the practice of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving. May we not neglect to begin each day and to commence each responsibility with grateful hearts and sensitive spirits. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HEFLEY 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) "Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002", and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GREGG, Mr. EXON, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. SIMON, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that there will be twenty 1-minutes on each side.

WHITE HOUSE DEMONSTRATION WILL DRAMATIZE NEED FOR ADMINISTRATION SANCTIONS ON CUBA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today at noon the Cuban-American community will hold a rally in front of the White House to protest the immoral policy of the Clinton administration of repatriating freedom-seeking

Cubans who escaped their homeland for liberty in the United States.

Through the accord, the Clinton administration once again has shown its foreign policy ineptitude, and specifically its lack of vision and effectiveness toward the formulation of a clear Cuba policy. Instead of supporting the desires for freedom for the Cuban people, the President has preferred to accept the empty promises from the ruler of a totalitarian state who promotes terrorism, and is about to finish construction of a potentially dangerous and unsafe nuclear powerplant just a few hundred miles from our shores. Yet, we hear only silence from the administration on these illicit acts by the Cuban dictator.

I hope that the President takes a look from the White House at today's demonstration, so he can listen to the voices of those Cubans who were forced to leave their country in search of freedom, and from those who suffered from the oppressive hand of the Cuban dictator. Maybe then the President will realize the diabolical consequences of his failed policy and join us in implementing new sanctions against the Cuban tyrant.

WHAT MASSIVE REPUBLICAN BUDGET CUTS MEAN TO RURAL MISSOURI

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans say "Listen to me, listen to my words, but don't watch what I do." What I am alluding to is a budget, a Republican budget that passed the House and also the one that passed the Senate, with massive cuts in Medicare and Medicaid in order to give tax relief to the wealthy.

□ 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

H 5693

What do these massive cuts for Medicare and Medicaid mean to rural Missouri, where I am from? It means loss, a huge loss in revenues for my hospitals. It means many of my senior citizens who are on a low income and Social Security will have to pay money they do not have in order to give tax cuts of \$20,000 for those who earn over \$250,000 a year. That is not right. That is not fair. That is mean-spirited.

We need rural hospitals in rural Missouri. We do not need them to be shut down because they want to give tax cuts to the wealthy. Mr. Speaker, think twice before you act.

HYPOCRISY ON ETHICS COMPLAINTS REGARDING BOOK ROYALTIES

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I listened yesterday with interest as the whining and moaning voices from the other side of the aisle criticized the Speaker of the House. What were they criticizing him for? He wrote a book. He was doing a book tour. Actually, he might get paid for that book. They acted like there was something unusual or unethical about what he was doing.

I would just ask, Mr. Speaker, where were those same voices in 1990, when Senator GORE received \$33,300 in book royalties? Where were they in 1991, when Senator GORE received \$66,700 in book royalties? Where were they in 1992, when Senator GORE took a 35-city book tour and received \$546,260 in book royalties? Where were they in 1993, when Vice President GORE received \$310.84 in book royalties?

There is a difference, however, Mr. Speaker. Senator GORE received a \$100,000 advance. Speaker GINGRICH received \$1. Stop the hypocrisy; it does not play well.

EXPRESSING PRIDE IN CAPTAIN O'GRADY AND HIS MARINE RESCUERS

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, Americans awakened today to good news, the rescue of Capt. Scott O'Grady, the F-16 pilot whose plane was shot down last week by rebel Serbs over Bosnia. The successful mission was performed by the Marine Expeditionary Force, commanded by Col. Marty Berndt.

I share the pride in Captain O'Grady and the rescuing Marines that was so eloquently expressed earlier this morning by the President, our NATO Commander, Admiral Leighton Smith, and members of Captain O'Grady's family.

I had the pleasure, Mr. Speaker, of congratulating Colonel Berndt by telephone just a few moments ago. He was personally along on the rescue mission.

I have visited our troops participating in Operation Deny Flight, which includes an A-10 reserve wing from Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri.

All Americans should be grateful for the courage and for the dedication to this dangerous mission. We must also continue to support those who risk their lives every day in training and combat, in peace and war. All Americans, Mr. Speaker, are proud of Captain O'Grady, the rescuing marines, and all who wear the American uniform.

GOOD NEWS

(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, I would like to continue on in the sentiment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] who has so eloquently expressed our pride this morning in our military. Indeed, it is a great pleasure to wake up to good news in the midst of all the trouble that we are experiencing in the Bosnia area.

According to the morning news reports, and as has been confirmed now, the American pilot downed in Bosnia has been rescued by American marines, and is safe aboard a United States ship. I am sure every American's heart sings to hear that news. This was a very risky rescue mission. It was extremely dangerous. It was no easy thing to do.

It took a lot of courage and professionalism, but the professionalism, team spirit, and perseverance of our military personnel, coupled with the grace of God, saw those marines through, and helped bring our young pilot out of danger, back to his family, and back to our shores.

With the commemorations of Memorial Day still fresh in our minds, this feat of bravery reminds us again the risks and sacrifices our men and women in uniform take every day. We wish the pilot and his family well, and we thank all the families of those brave young men and women who serve in our Armed Forces. They are always there when we need them. Thank God for them.

A SALUTE TO MARINE CAPT. SCOTT O'GRADY AND HIS RESCUERS

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to pay tribute to a remarkable act of courage that has taken place in the war-torn land of Bosnia.

I am talking about the rescue of Capt. Scott O'Grady, who had been missing for nearly a week, since his F-16 jet was shot down by the Bosnian Serbs.

Many had almost given up hope of Scott's return. But for 6 days, he survived on his own in the woods—and

stayed out of enemy hands—because of what one marine colonel called his "guts and his training."

That is when an outstanding team of marines, led by Col. Martin Berndt, responded to his radio call, and braved fire from Serb forces to bring this American patriot back home.

Mr. Speaker, there are no words to express the gratitude of each and every American to Captain O'Grady, who placed his life on the line in the service of his country.

His valor, his perseverance, his cunning and skill in the toughest of circumstances are a tribute not just to the U.S. Marine Corps, but to America's fighting spirit itself.

As for his rescuers, I think it should be clear today that, as much as we need our weapons systems—as much as we need the sophisticated technology that keeps our troops safe and helps them do their jobs—the heart of our Armed Forces is the drive, the dedication, the determination of our men and women in uniform to do their best for America.

On behalf of every Member of this Congress, I salute them—I thank them—and I am grateful for the gift of Captain O'Grady's return to family and country.

PUT THE TAXPAYERS' INTERESTS FIRST: SUPPORT THE AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will have an opportunity to vote for a foreign aid bill which, for the first time in nearly a half-century puts the interests of the American taxpayer first.

H.R. 1561 eliminates three major Government agencies and more than 20 low priority programs. It cuts \$3.7 billion from current spending over the next 2 years and it calls for savings of \$21 billion over the next 7 years.

The American Overseas Interests Act finally brings an end to the foreign policy status quo. It concentrates our limited resources on helping our friends to help themselves, it improves our global antiterrorism efforts and it strengthens our hand in the area of international narcotics control.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman GILMAN and the International Relations Committee have crafted a good bill—a bill which protects the interests of the American taxpayer and brings an end to the foreign aid status quo. I urge my colleagues to support the American Overseas Interests Act.

OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, when is a spending cut a spending cut?

Today, as we are considering the Overseas Interests Act that recognizes that we have won the cold war, we will answer that question.

The bill we are considering today reduces, diminishes, lessens, curtails, lowers and yes, cuts foreign aid. It concentrates on cutting aid to countries that do not support us in the United Nations. It punishes the countries that supply weapons to terrorist states. It refocuses our efforts on the countries that do support American interests overseas.

The new majority in this Congress are serious about cutting spending and eliminating agencies in this bill. We save the taxpayers \$21 billion over 7 years. That is a cut. We eliminate three major agencies in the first major restructuring of our foreign affairs operation in 50 years. That is a cut.

When is a spending cut a cut? It is today, when we debate and continue discussion on the Overseas Interests Act.

TWO WEEKS' DEBATE ON MONEY FOR FOREIGN AID, BUT NO FUNDING TO SOLVE AMERICAN PROBLEMS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, let us see if I can understand this. There are 25,000 murders a year. We have a Tax Code that is literally killing us. The IRS keeps ripping us off. We have parents without children, Social Security being raided, Medicare almost broke, a record number of school dropouts, workers losing their pensions, losing their health insurance benefits, workers losing their jobs, massive budget deficits, huge trade deficits, and, Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has been debating foreign aid for 2 solid weeks.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. Is it any wonder why America is so angry with their Government? While we debate foreign aid and more money for overseas, America is going to hell in a handbasket. Think about it.

CONCERN FOR THE REPUTATION OF THE HOUSE RAISED BY UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS ON SPEAKER'S BOOK DEAL

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of concern for the reputation of this institution. It is devastating when the Speaker of the House of Representatives does not stand by his words. NEWT GINGRICH announced earlier this year that he would not sign his book deal with Rupert Murdoch until the Ethics Committee had approved the contract. The jury is still out. And what has the Speaker done?

He has ignored the Ethics Committee and signed the contract anyway. Maybe the Speaker knows something that we do not know. Is it because every single Republican on the Ethics Committee has a conflict of interest in the Speaker's case? Is it likely that they cannot be credible as judge and jury?

Mr. Speaker, how can NEWT GINGRICH make such an outrageous claim, that if the Ethics Committee has not finished its deliberations, then he will assume that no rules have been broken. The Ethics Committee clearly said to the Speaker not to make such an absurd assumption. Once again, the Speaker has demonstrated that he will not allow the Rules or the Ethics Committee to stand in the way of his multi-million-dollar book deal. Is this the same person who led the call for an investigation of the former Speaker of the House, Jim Wright? I ask today, out of fairness to the American people, appoint an outside counsel. What's good for the goose is also good for the gander.

TIME FOR THE ETHICS COMMITTEE TO THROW OUT RIDICULOUS CHARGES

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman who spoke just before me brought up, because of an opportunity to respond to what the Ethics Committee is not willing to do. The fact of the matter is the Speaker did submit a contract for its review. The only role that the Ethics Committee has in this is to determine whether the contract is too generous. In fact, any Member can write a book in this House without having approval, but if the contract is too generous, such as Speaker Wright's, where he got 55 percent royalties, it becomes a gift.

The same contract that the Speaker submitted before two times and was approved in 3 weeks was submitted this time. It is not being approved by the Ethics Committee because the Democrats refuse to approve the very same contract that AL GORE got approved, that the gentleman from Michigan, DAVID BONIOR, got approved.

As a matter of fact, one of the ethics charges is that he used an 800 number on the floor of the House. So did 11 others. Do we discharge that complaint, or do we file complaints against the 11 others? One of the charges is that a cable channel carried his course. Every one of the Members plays on the cable channels for free. Do we level charges against each of them? It is time for the Ethics Committee to throw out these ridiculous, frivolous charges.

PRESIDENT CLINTON COMMENDED FOR VETOING RESCISSIONS BILL

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

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend President Clinton for his leadership in vetoing the mean-spirited rescission bill that passed this body. It is unbelievable that our President has to use his first veto on a bill to stand up for our children and our future. Investing in our children with programs like Goals 2000, Safe and Drug Free Schools, AmeriCorps, and School to Work Programs promote the betterment of our country.

Drastically reducing funds which go toward educating our children sends a bad signal to the rest of the world, telling them, we do not want to be competitive in the next century, we do not want to train our children to be the best that they can be, we do not want drug education in our schools. We need to stop this nonsense of cutting \$16 billion in domestic aid that affect our children at home and turning around to authorize \$16 billion for foreign aid for people abroad. Again, I commend President Clinton for vetoing this ill-advised rescissions bill.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE TAX SAVINGS BILL

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, featuring interactive dialog with John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, and Richard Nixon, "Forrest Gump" proved that to star in a movie, one not only does not have to be an actor, but through modern technology, you do not have to be alive anymore, either.

Yesterday, by vetoing the \$16 billion tax savings bill, the Clinton administration proved a similar phenomenon: That is, even a dead presidency can continue to enhance its reputation as a big spending friend of bureaucracy long after its political life has expired. That is right. Without asking anybody, Mr. President just went ahead and vetoed.

For a short while, he will be the hero of the big spenders in Washington and the bureaucracy, but the American people will demand: If not these cuts, which cuts; if not this rescission, which rescission; if not these programs, which programs?

If you want relevancy, Mr. President, join the debate. Show us where you want to save the taxpayers' dollars.

1020

MEDICARE

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take strong exception to the Republicans' proposed massive Medicare cuts.

These cuts will force senior citizens in my district and around the country to pay \$3,500 over 7 years. Many seniors will have to make hard choices between food on their table or the medical attention that they desperately need to survive.

Slashing Medicare will not only hurt seniors, it will hurt all Americans. Medicare cuts will hurt many hospitals that rely heavily upon Medicare reimbursement.

Republicans argue that these cuts are necessary to save the system. However, the very same Republican budget that cuts Medicare contains a \$288 billion tax giveaway for the most affluent Americans.

Senior citizens have worked hard and contributed all their lives to this country. They deserve affordable health care. Let us end these shameless cuts and consider real health care reform.

REPUBLICANS FIGHTING FOR SENIORS

(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, the fact is that the Republicans have in fact looked at the problem and seen that the Medicare trust fund will go out of business by 2002. We will have no Medicare. But under our proposal, there is an increase from \$4,700 to \$6,300 for the Medicare recipients.

This is not a cut. Only in Washington, DC can an increase be a cut.

Working in a bipartisan fashion, we want to make sure our seniors are protected.

Not only are we going to protect Medicare but we are making sure that Social Security is off the table. More importantly, we just recently rolled back the 1993 increase in Social Security taxes and we allow seniors under 70 years old not to be capped at \$11,280 for income but be able to make up to \$30,000 a year over the next 5 years without deductions from Social Security.

We are fighting for senior citizens. We ask that everyone join together and work with us so that we can make sure that Medicare is preserved, protected, and improved.

CALL FOR AN OUTSIDE COUNSEL IN SPEAKER'S ETHICS CASE

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of our House is an intelligent person. He is a student of history. He has been a professor of history and indeed he has helped write a lot of recent history. He knows well the historical precedent to avoid even the semblance of conflict or impropriety.

Now the House and the House Ethics Committee faces an important question on ethical violations—

Questions concerning the activities of GOPAC under the control of the Speaker; questions concerning possible conflicts of interest with a book deal and a publisher who might have involvement and interest before this body.

Despite promises that the Ethics Committee would approve any signing of a book deal, the Speaker went ahead and signed it, anyway, and then received a letter from the Ethics Committee saying you should not make any assumptions about our signing or approving that conduct.

In previous high-profile cases, 22 out of 46 since 1968, an outside counsel has been appointed including for the most recent Speaker under investigation, Speaker Wright. Today the Ethics Committee is deadlocked on partisan lines.

Historical precedent is clear here—avoid even the semblance of a conflict. I would urge the appointment of an outside counsel.

THE ANSWER IS NO

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1992, on "Larry King Live," then-candidate Bill Clinton said, "I will present a 5-year plan to balance the budget."

About 3 weeks ago, President Clinton said that he would balance the budget within 10 years. What do we have today? We have got nothing. It is 3 years later from the original promise and the American people are still waiting to hear from this President on a balanced budget.

Two nights ago on "Larry King Live," the President once again artfully dodged Larry King's question about the lack of any attempt by the administration to balance this budget.

We have got to balance the budget in this country. We have a huge problem in this country that is accumulating at a rate of \$33 million an hour.

What does our President do? He goes out and vetoes the first serious attempt in a long time to cut spending.

Does he have an alternative? The answer is no.

Can he balance the budget in 5 years? The answer is no.

Can he balance the budget in 10 years? The answer is no.

Is he even going to try? The answer is no.

Mr. Speaker, it is up to us, the Republicans in the U.S. Congress, to balance this budget.

EDUCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS BRIGHTEN WITH PRESIDENT'S VETO OF RESCISSIONS BILL

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to commend President Clinton for vetoing a bill that took food out of the mouths of children, heat out of the homes of the elderly, and trees out of national forests.

The bill cut student loans and summer jobs for young Americans trying to do something with their lives. It used money for those programs to provide timber barons with massive Government subsidies. This is a clear-cut case of clearcutting.

The new majority has taken a chain saw to education funding and to our disappearing natural resources. But the President's pen was mightier than the chain saw.

His first veto was a defining one. He stuck up for education and the environment.

The Republicans stuck up for corporate welfare and environmental destruction.

Mr. Speaker, the new majority has passed some awful legislation. I hope the President's veto pen has plenty of ink.

THE TRUTH

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, one after another after another of our liberal colleagues take to the well to carp, to moan, to deceive and to distort. * * * They can say the most outlandish things with such ease, you would swear that it was Mephistopheles himself that was up there speaking.

For instance, they say that Republicans are drastically cutting Medicare. It is not true and they know it. Far from cutting Medicare, Republicans are strengthening the program and saving it from certain bankruptcy as said so by the trustees of the program itself. * * *

It is there. Why are my—

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the gentleman's words be taken down. Twice during this time, he called the Members of Congress liars and I would like to have those words taken down or an apology issued.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman will suspend and the Clerk will report the words.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, if the appropriate rule with respect to accusations of untruths arise, does it require

you specify a certain Member of Congress? In other words, must it be specific as to a certain Member?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not issue an anticipatory ruling. The Chair will wait until the words of the gentleman have been reported by the Clerk.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman raises an important point which I would like to frame as an inquiry in the same vein. When would be the proper time to do that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At the conclusion of the disposition of the Clerk reporting the words of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

□ 1025

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if we could also make sure a sentence before the term "liar" or "liars" is used so we can see the total context, if that is possible.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, while the gentleman's words are being taken down, where is the gentleman supposed to be? Where is the gentleman supposed to be while his words are being taken down?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is required to be seated.

Mr. VOLKMER. He has not been seated, he has been speaking with the Parliamentarian.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio will please be seated.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HOKE. To request unanimous consent that the word "lies" be stricken and to proceed.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri will proceed with his reservation.

Mr. VOLKMER. At this time will the gentleman apologize for using the words to this House?

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, my understanding with respect to this—having—

May I answer the question?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Regulate order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOKE. My understanding is that references in general to the entire group, either of Republicans or Democrats, with respect to that word are in fact in order. But I am willing to withdraw that word, and if we are going to move in a different direction with respect to that, I have no problem with it in the future. But, and so I feel per-

fectly, so I think the proper thing to do is to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the word.

Mr. VOLKMER. Will the gentleman also issue an apology—I am reserving the right to object—to this House for using that word in the House?

Mr. HOKE. The word, that word has been used many times in the context of general spoken admonition to an entire group by both sides. If we are going to go in a different direction, that is fine with me.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve the right to object, could we possibly have the words read to the House, both the sentence before, and frankly in two cases during the 1 minute of my colleague I heard the word "liar." I would like to hear both of them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Chair's understanding that the Clerk has been transcribing that for some time now. Does the gentleman continue under his reservation?

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield under his reservation?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, my concern, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio, is yes, there is in the precedent a general application of the word. However, then you get down to the question, and this is what I would propound to the Chair at the appropriate time, you get down to making it more and more specific. In this case several Members on this side of the aisle had risen to make certain statements about Medicare. I think it can be reasonably inferred that the gentleman's remarks went directly to them, not to a body at large, and that is why the apology is sought.

Mr. HOKE. Well, I would disagree with you. I think when the words are respoken or reread you will see that the words are very general in nature; they have to do with liberal colleagues, and that is who is being spoken to. The word "liar" is not there; the word "lies" is there. And it has nothing to do with a specific person. It is not directed to a specific person, and I would just as soon have it clarified. If we are not going to use the word "lies" to describe untruths in the future and we use the word untruths, then let that be the new rule, but at least let us have consistency with respect to this. If we can use the word "lies" to describe words that are spoken regarding a—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. HOKE. Then we will do it that way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

One after another after another of our liberal colleagues take to the well to carp, to moan, to deceive and to distort. The lies roll off their tongues so easily. They can say the most outlandish things with such ease, you would swear that it was Mephistopheles himself that was up there speaking.

For instance, they say that Republicans are drastically cutting Medicare. It is not true, and they know it.

Far from cutting Medicare, Republicans are strengthening the programs and saving it from certain bankruptcy as said so by the trustees of the program itself. They tell the same lies about the programs for children, about education, about nutrition, you name it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman renew his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. VOLKMER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). An objection has been heard.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair's ruling is that the use of the word "lies" in that context as it relates to specific Members and generally as it relates under the Rules of the House regarding Members' participation in debate, is inappropriate and is a breach of decorum.

Mr. VOLKMER. Is inappropriate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is inappropriate and a breach of decorum.

Mr. VOLKMER. And the gentleman's words will be stricken?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the words will be stricken.

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, does that also mean that since the gentleman's words were stricken, the gentleman is not permitted to take the floor for the rest of the day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed in order.

Mr. WISE. Reserving the right to object, I presume the Chair is making that unanimous-consent request on its own, because I did not hear a unanimous-consent request that the gentleman be permitted to take the floor. Would some other gentleman wish to?

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker in keeping with the policies of the past 2½ years that I have been here, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to be maintained on his feet on the floor of the House.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is so ordered. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] may proceed in order.

The gentleman has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. HOKE. Why are my liberal colleagues so shall we say economical with the truth? Because they are in a panic, they have no new ideas to offer, no alternatives to pose, no plans of their own. They still do not understand what happened last November. Will they say anything and will they do anything to regain the power that they feel is their birthright? I believe they

will. Maybe it will take another election to prove this.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, is it not under the longstanding rules of the House inappropriate to address on the floor of the House matters that are under discussion and not disposed of in the Ethics Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WISE. Under that same principle, though, is there not a difference between matters that might be under consideration by the Ethics Committee and matters and allegations dealing with any particular Member that are important before the body, particularly if the body or some of the body is pressing for the appointment of a counsel to remove it from the Ethics Committee?

Finally let me add to that parliamentary inquiry, I thought the principle of this House as expressed by the Speaker of this House on March 8 in a press conference was, essentially paraphrasing, anything can be spoken about on the House floor? Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Chair's understanding that that matter was clarified from the Chair the other day, first of all. Second, that Members should not refer to matters pending before the Ethics Committee.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker then I have this parliamentary inquiry, and I quote:

The fact is, Members of the House are allowed to say virtually anything on the House floor. * * * It is protected and has been for 200 years. * * * It is written into the Constitution.

That was by Speaker GINGRICH on March 8, 1995. Is that not, is that not the policy? Was the Speaker—

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair believes it was. It is the Chair's understanding the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BURTON, clarified that issue May 25 from the Chair.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, what was his ruling? Could the Chair clarify that for those of us who were not here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair's ruling was that references in debate should not be made to ethical conduct of Members.

Mr. WISE. So then the announcement by the Speaker of the House has been preempted by that, by the Speaker pro tempore?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, regular order. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, is it not true matters can be spoken on the floor of the House within the rules and it is explicitly against the rules to refer to matters before the Ethics Committee before the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That was the precedent and that is the rule.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry: Does that mean any matter before the Ethics Committee? I would like the Speaker to answer that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WISE. Does that mean any matter that might be brought to the Ethics Committee or letter that has been sent to the Ethics Committee. When is a matter before the Ethics Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should not engage in personalities in debate and discuss the ethics of Members.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry: If the proceedings of the Ethics Committee are secret, how do we know what is before the Ethics Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Ethics Committee can report the matter in a proper way.

Mr. WISE. But how do I know not to wander into this area if I do not know what the area is because the proceedings are secret; that is what I do not understand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Or a Member may rise to a proper question of privilege.

Mr. WISE. A parliamentary inquiry: A question of privilege to what? If the Speaker would guide the House we might avoid some of this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To offer a resolution with respect to a matter and during the perency of the resolution those matters may be discussed.

Mr. WISE. I thank the Chair.

THE SPEAKER AND THE ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I awoke this morning to an article in the paper entitled "Cecil B. Gingrich." Now it seems a major production studio is eyeing Mr. GINGRICH's novel "1945" for the big screen.

The novel contains a sex scene between a spy and the White House chief of staff, which led BOB DOLE to include the book in his criticism of the entertainment industry.

Mr. GINGRICH's Hollywood agent says he expects the Georgia Republican to receive more than \$1 million in movie rights. At a time when Speaker GINGRICH is asking senior citizens to take \$1,000 out of their pockets to pay for tax breaks for the rich, he is out there lining his own pockets with multi-million-dollar deals from media moguls and Hollywood producers.

MAKE ENGLISH OUR OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker for endorsing English as our official language yesterday in his speech before the Iowa Chamber of Commerce. It is a fight I have been engaged in for a long time.

We Americans are a people from every corner of the globe, every religion, every ethnic background you can think of, but we are one Nation, one people. Why? Because we have a wonderful commonality called the English language. We are losing that today and losing it very quickly. One out of seven Americans does not speak English. U.S.A. Today has reported that it costs some \$12 billion a year at the Federal, State, and local level for bilingual education. I think it is time we go back to the concept again of one Nation, one people.

In Los Angeles now you can vote in seven different languages. In many parts of the country English is not the language that is spoken. And while we want everyone to have a chance to protect their culture, speak any language they want at home, to protect their culture and promote their culture, I think it is very important when you deal with the Government, when you vote, you do it in the English language so we can keep our wonderful commonality, we can keep this common glue that has held our country together so we do remain one Nation, one people, one flag, and yes, one language.

JAPAN SHOULD OPEN ITS MARKETS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week a full-page advertisement appeared in the Washington Post that stated: "Leading Newspapers Agree: U.S. Trade Sanctions On Japan Are Not The Answer." The Washington Post raked in over \$25,000 on this one ad. The Wall Street Journal, another opponent of the sanctions, printed a similar ad, but the charges there were over \$123,000 for a page. Here on Capitol Hill, Roll Call, a newspaper that goes to every congressional office, printed an ad opposing the sanctions that cost \$6,200.

There is big money to be made by newspapers in opposing United States trade sanctions on Japan and in opposing the American people in the process, but is it not revealing who has their hands in the honey pot.

I would like to say who is going to stand up for the 700,000 United States workers employed in the auto industry, the 4 million workers who work in the textile, semiconductor, paint, and plaster industry and millions of Americans who would have jobs in the industry if Japan would open its markets?

PRESIDENT VETOES DISASTER RELIEF

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year this House passed a responsible bill that provided emergency funds for those who were affected by disasters throughout the country. Just like ordinary Americans we cut spending elsewhere to offset these new expenses. But the President says we cannot provide relief to those in need.

So to those living in California who were devastated by earthquakes and fires, I am sorry, the President says your plight is not important enough to him. To those in Oklahoma City, still reeling from your loss, I am sorry, this time the President does not feel your pain.

The responsible rescissions bill that the President vetoed yesterday would have provided disaster relief to more than 40 States throughout this country.

How do you spell, "Relief." Well, unfortunately for needy Americans, if your this President of the United States, you spell it V-E-T-O.

MEDICARE CUTS MEAN A WINDFALL FOR THE WEALTHY

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage with the Republican proposal to force the Nation's seniors to pay for their tax cut for the rich. The Republican budget proposal would force our seniors to pay more than \$1,000 out of pocket for medical care each year, while giving the very wealthiest 1 percent of Americans an annual windfall of \$20,000.

It is outrageous that at a time when our Nation's seniors are struggling to make ends meet the Republicans have chosen to make their medical care more expensive. We must not force our seniors to pick up the tab for a huge tax break for the very wealthiest Americans. The Republicans claim that they must cut Medicare because they project that the system will be out of money in 7 years. But even if you accept their figures, and I certainly do not, most of the \$286 billion the Republicans would cut from Medicare and take from our senior citizens would be used to pay for their tax cuts. A windfall for the very wealthy, not to save the future of Medicare for seniors.

For shame.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE MAX MCCARTHY

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

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Richard Dean McCarthy, better known as Max McCarthy, who recently passed away. Max was a member of the House of Representatives from 1965 to 1970.

Max last worked for the Buffalo News as the Washington bureau chief. His last column appeared in the News 2 days after he had died. In the words of the Buffalo News, "Max was an outstanding citizen of Buffalo, outstanding patriot and a fine newspaperman."

Max McCarthy served our Nation in two wars. He was with the Navy in the Pacific Theater in World War II and with the Army in the Far East during the Korean war.

After serving Buffalo and western New York in the House for three terms, Max lost a bid for the U.S. Senate and then worked as press attache in the United States Embassy in Iran. Prior to working for the Buffalo News, Max also worked in the White House as an adviser in legislative affairs in the Carter administration.

Max was a avid writer. He was first published in the Buffalo News as a corporal in the Army, stationed in Japan in 1952. He sent accounts of military life to the Buffalo Evening News and they published his stories. Max also wrote some books, one of which led to congressional hearings, policy reviews, and the cancellation of a plan to dump outdated nerve gas in the sea.

Max was known for his honesty and integrity. He received numerous awards and recognitions for the service he provided to the western New York community in many different ways. Western New York is still reaping the benefits of many of Max McCarthy's projects.

Max lost his long fight with Lou Gehrig's disease in early May. He will be missed by his family and the community.

PREVENT CHANGES IN MEDICAID

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican budget resolution in my opinion is heading us toward block granting Medicaid with strict caps on funding provided by the Federal Government to the States. These proposed caps in Federal spending will reduce services to individuals who benefit from Medicaid. As with Medicare, I believe that Medicaid should be reformed, but in the context of health care reform.

One-third of the spending for Medicaid provides benefits to senior citizens, especially in obtaining long-term care such as nursing home care. Another third of the funding assists those who are disabled or blind. As the program is currently structured, by the beginning of the next decade, every child and pregnant woman will receive health care services, universal coverage in effect for children. My fear is that by

making the proposed cuts in this program, many of these people will see a reduction in their health care services, and may not even continue to receive health benefits.

This is a very negative effect of the House Republican budget, and I hope that we can in Congress over the next 6 months prevent these changes in the Medicaid Program.

PRESIDENT'S VETO FAVORS BIG GOVERNMENT, ABANDONS DEFICIT REDUCTION EFFORTS

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's veto of the rescissions bill goes to the heart of the reason why the liberal Democrats lost control of Congress last year. Liberals are totally committed to big government, and it is totally outside their realm of understanding to reduce the deficit. They are incapable of thinking in terms of less government and less bureaucracy. Their political commitments and rigid ideology render them completely ineffective in solving the problem of deficit spending.

When liberals like Bill Clinton get up and say they want to reduce the deficit, you have to wonder who he is trying to fool.

I cannot for the life of me figure out how President Clinton has any credibility on deficit reduction or the budget.

By vetoing the rescissions bill, the President says that big government and big bureaucracy are more important than our children's future. This is why liberals lost control of Congress. They say one thing, but do another. Liberals may say they want to balance the budget, but their actions say that government is more important than people, and certainly more important than America's future.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO—THE RIGHT THING FOR AMERICA

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Clinton for his veto of that awful rescissions bill that the Republicans tried to inflict on the American people. This bill was a direct assault on our children, our seniors, and our needy. The Democrats have a better plan.

I believe that we can reduce the deficit without cutting programs like student loans and Medicare. Education should be our top priority, and the Republicans have sadly neglected and ignored the needs of America's youth.

The President's alternate proposal includes cutting out billionaire tax loopholes, cutting government overhead, and cutting foreign aid. These are areas that should be cut, not programs that the American people depend on.

The President did the right thing. Now it is up to Congress to do the right thing for America.

RESCISSIONS VETO IRONIC

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, how ironic.

What did a President who campaigned on reducing Government spending choose as his first veto? He chose to veto a bill that reduces Government spending. It's no wonder that people in America are confused about where the administration wants to take this country.

This bill provides \$9 billion in real deficit reduction. It takes a first step to balancing the budget—which will lower interest rates, stimulate job growth and provide a sound future for our children.

But the President would rather play politics.

Contrary to what the Democrats are claiming, this bill does not hurt education. Programs such as Head Start, Education for the Disadvantaged and Student Financial Assistance aren't even touched. Even where spending is slightly reduced, programs are still being funded at higher levels than last year.

When are the Democrats and the President going to stop playing politics and come to the table with real alternatives?

If they don't want to be part of the solution, then let them stop being part of the problem.

□ 1053

DO WE CHOOSE PORK OR PEOPLE?

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Clinton vetoed a bad bill proposed by the Republican leadership that would have cut crucial education and job training programs for our young people, in order to fund wasteful pork projects. As that legislation comes back to Congress, it is time to reassess our priorities. Do we choose pork or people?

Democratic priorities are clear. We want to work to make a better future for America's working families. Education and job training help to give our young people the tools they need to succeed in life. They should not be sacrificed for another multimillion-dollar courthouse or another needless tax giveaway to the wealthy.

I believe that Democrats and Republicans can work together to fashion a package of cuts that will preserve crucial education and job training programs and achieve deficit reduction. The bill that the President vetoed yesterday failed on both counts, and, therefore, failed America's working families. The President was right to veto it.

SUPPORT URGED FOR PASSAGE OF THE AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House will complete debate and vote on one of the most important bills affecting the operations of our foreign affairs agencies and programs since the cold war.

H.R. 1561—the American Overseas Interests Act eliminates three Federal agencies—cuts spending by \$3 billion over 2 years—and by a total of \$21 billion over the 7-year glide path to a balanced budget.

It is a major step in the direction of downsizing and streamlining the Federal Government, as well as reducing the deficit.

H.R. 1561 also is about ensuring that our Nation continues as a world leader by targeting scarce resources toward priorities that serve American interests. H.R. 1561 is about supporting peace and stability in the Middle East and getting nuclear weapons out of Russia and the other former Soviet states.

H.R. 1561 has been endorsed by former Secretaries of State Jim Baker, Alexander Haig, Henry Kissinger, and Larry Eagleburger. Accordingly, on final passage, I urge our colleagues to join in supporting this highly important measure.

A GOOD NEWS MORNING

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, today, for the first time in a long time, Americans woke up to a good news morning. First, Mickey Mantle, my childhood hero and that of many of my generation, is now on the road to recovery.

Second, Capt. Scott O'Grady, a young man who could become a hero to a new generation of Americans, was rescued from Bosnia by a stalwart group of Americans. Captain O'Grady braved 5 days in hostile territory and waited for just the right moment to send his radio signal. A team of 40 aircraft kept the Serbs at bay while, in a spectacular rescue, helicopter gunships rescued Captain O'Grady.

Today, Mr. Speaker, all Americans, from the President down to the average person on the street, can take justifiable pride in the bravery of Captain O'Grady and his Marine rescuers.

To Captain O'Grady and to Mickey Mantle, good luck and Godspeed.

CELEBRATING THE DAY OF PORTUGAL

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

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the millions of Portuguese-Americans across our Nation by calling attention to the day of Portugal.

This Saturday the Portuguese-American community will gather to celebrate their heritage and many positive contributions they have made to America.

Throughout the history of the United States, Portuguese-Americans have had a tremendous impact on the success of our country. From John Philip Sousa, who authored "The Stars and Stripes Forever," to Benjamin Cardozo, a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, to Cardinal and Archbishop Medeiros of Boston, and to our own distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO], the Portuguese-American community have helped to make America the great country that it is.

There are approximately 2 million Americans who are of Portuguese descent. The United States Congress today joins them in celebrating their heritage day of Portugal this weekend.

THE PRESIDENT NEEDS TO SHOW LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, like another Member who came up earlier today, I want to talk about the President's veto of the rescissions bill.

The President, of course, does not think it is a good bill. I think the bill has problems, too, but obviously not for the same reasons that the President thinks. I do not think it goes far enough. I do not think it shows enough courage.

If you want to talk about saving education programs and saving education, you need to do it back in the States. We left some money in for Goals 2000. I think Goals 2000 needs to be zeroed out. We need to get to a point in this Congress where we believe that our parents and our teachers and our communities are not so stupid that they do not know how to educate their own children.

Let us educate children at home and let Washington bureaucrats worry about what Washington bureaucrats worry about.

The President needs to come forward with some real spending cuts and show some leadership, for a change. That is something he has not done in these first 5 months of Congress, and it is something that he needs to do or else we are not going to be able to balance our budget.

THANKING THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the rescission bill was bad policy. It cuts education programs for children. The rescission bill cuts safe and drug-free schools, drastically reducing the funding to a little less than \$10 million.

Yesterday I was honored to be at the White House when the President honored 98 schools who received safe and drug-free school funds for their commitment to education in fighting crime and drugs.

One of those schools recognized was Crespo Elementary, in Houston independent school district, an inner-city school district located in the 29th Congressional District.

When the doors of Crespo Elementary opened in 1992, it was an inner-city school. Everyone expected it to be low performing. In 2 years that school has been recognized as a school by the Texas Education Agency for its academic performance and its positive drug-free environment.

I applaud Crespo's teachers and parents and administrators and students for their active programs. That is what works in this country.

I stand by President Clinton's veto of the rescissions bill on behalf of the 20 million schoolchildren in Texas and the hundreds at Crespo elementary who benefit from the antiviolenace and drug funding.

RUSSIAN MISSILE TECHNOLOGY SOLD TO BRAZIL

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, they say that actions speak louder than words. In the case of the Clinton administration, that appears to be true.

We have heard from the Clinton administration they are concerned about arms proliferation; specifically, missile technology being sold around the world.

But what are their actions? Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post headline screams out the record of the Clinton administration. "U.S. Waives Objections to Russian Missile Technology Sale to Brazil." We now learn the Clinton administration secretly has given the go-ahead to allow the Russians to begin to export their technology, while next week on the House floor, on the defense bill, we will hear all of these arguments about adhering to the ABM Treaty.

This is the second case where the Clinton administration has waived efforts to stop proliferation of missile technology. Earlier this year they failed to stop the sale of rocket motors to China, which will be used to enhance their cruise missiles.

This is outrageous. Last evening I wrote to the President a two-page letter asking for a full public discussion and disclosure, with the Congress,

about the waiver of the sanctions against Russia and Brazil.

GIVING THANKS FOR THE RESCUE OF CAPT. SCOTT O'GRADY

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to give thanks for the safe rescue of Capt. Scott O'Grady, the F-16 pilot shot down over Bosnia while flying a NATO support mission.

Captain O'Grady's training was the very best in the world, and it kept him alive for 6 days as he managed to elude hostile Bosnian Serb troops and communicate by radio with the Marine Corp rescue unit that would ultimately bring him to safety.

Though he had suffered some burns to his neck as he ejected from his crippled aircraft, Captain O'Grady never panicked.

He endured hunger and hypothermia while judiciously using his battery-powered rescue radio to call for help.

Both Captain O'Grady and his Marine Corps rescuers from Camp Lejeune performed by the book. They did precisely what their military training had instructed them to do, and thus the prayers of all America have been answered.

Mr. Speaker, it has become fashionable lately for many of my congressional colleagues to criticize our military's readiness, to allege that training has suffered as a result of more streamlined Pentagon spending.

Well, Mr. Speaker, for those who want to justify a return to the days of monstrous defense budgets in the face of deficits and mounting domestic problems, I would like to point to the textbook competence and excellence displayed by American fighting forces in this dramatic episode.

To Captain O'Grady's family, I extend America's warmest wishes.

We share your joy in the safe return of your brave loved one.

And we share your pride in knowing that he is a part of the very best trained, the very best equipped, and the readiest fighting force the world has ever known, and supported by this administration and Democrats of Congress believing in a strong, efficient, effective defense.

URGING CONGRESS TO SHOW RESTRAINT

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to urge restraint on the part of the Congress on both sides of the aisle, both Republicans and Democrats, to understand when they begin to dismantle the only health care program for the poor that we have in this country, that they should take some pause before doing that.

I think the American public needs to know not what is going on here in Washington and the bills and the resolutions, but they need to know what is not there.

The Republicans want to cut Medicaid by \$170 billion, and I listened this morning and I heard some greedy Governors, particularly Governors from Republican States, who want to have all the money dumped in one pile so they can use it as they see fit. And I guarantee you it will not all be used for the purposes for which it is intended.

They show little concern about the impact of these proposals on children, the elderly, and the severely disabled. They are concerned about management and about how they can use this money to make their coffers stronger. They like to cut dollars, but they do not like to create alternatives.

I have heard no alternatives to Medicaid since I have been here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge restraint on the part of the Congress to think about the poor and the underserved.

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

Mr. KASICH. 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 Agriculture; Committee on Banking and Financial Services; Committee on Commerce; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Judiciary; Committee on Resources; Committee on Science; Committee on Small Business; and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman is correct. The Democrat minority has been consulted and has no objection to this request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 67, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997,

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY
MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that the House conferees on H. Con. Res. 67, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1996 through 2002, be instructed to agree to revenue levels (within the scope of the conference) that exclude the revenue effects of the Contract With America Tax Relief Act (H.R. 1215), and to insist on the House position regarding the Earned Income Tax Credit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is debatable for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, who has the right to close on this motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has the right to close.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker and Members, the motion to instruct is relatively simple. To my colleagues on the Republican side, one segment of it simply endorses something you did and the Republicans in the Senate did not do, and that is not make cuts in the earned income tax credit. We commend you for it and urge you to retain that decision in conference.

Mr. Speaker and Members, it is rather difficult to find a motion to instruct when you have two very bad resolutions before us.

But, Mr. Speaker and Members, as we begin this process of evolving a budget for 1995 and the next 7 years, we should not start that process of trying to achieve a balanced budget by simply digging the hole deeper with a tax cut aimed primarily at the most affluent in this country.

Over 50 percent of the benefits of this tax cut flow to people with incomes over \$100,000 a year. What is the impact of that decision?

I might add that while the Senate does not do that, they do the opposite. They increase taxes for millions of hard-working Americans with the lowest incomes in our country.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of what the House has done and what the Senate is doing is to force deep cuts in a whole host of programs that substantially impact the American public.

Where are the biggest impacts felt? Clearly, in the health area. What we have in the House is a budget resolution that, by the year 2002, would cut Medicare by \$86 billion a year, while at the same time the tax cut is costing \$90 billion a year, deep and significant cuts in Medicaid, a program that provides health care for the most vulnerable in our society, the poor, elderly, and disabled.

By 2002, the Republican House proposal would have growth in that program at less than 2 percent, when projected caseload is 3 to 4 percent. Clearly, it either means significant numbers of American people would not have health care or else we are transferring significant costs to State and local governments.

Mr. Speaker and Members, what we have before us in the House and Senate budget resolutions are attempts to reward the most affluent in our society, those people who have benefited the most by growth and income over the last 15-20 years. We have had a revolution where income flows to the most affluent in our country. The proposed bill that comes from the House would reward those folks with a significant tax cut while we substantially cut the funding for a variety of health care programs like Medicare, Medicaid, substantially cut back on veterans' health care, scale back training for education, whether it be loan programs for college students, whether it be basic education and training to make sure that our workforce is equipped for the 21st century.

□ 1115

So, Mr. Speaker and Members, as we go to conference, let us not begin by digging a hole deeper that forces unconscionable cuts in health care programs like Medicare, Medicaid, makes our education and training programs such that there would be thousands of students who could not afford to go on to college and to cut programs that train our workforce so they are equipped for the 21st century.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for yielding, and I would like to address some of the concerns that were raised from the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on this Budget.

These tax reductions that we have in the budget plan are part of a total package, and let me explain to my colleagues how that works. We have looked very hard in the Committee on the Budget on the subsidies that business receives, whether it is agriculture, small business, dealing with housing, or whether it is even airports; that is in the entitlement and mandatory spending area. We said, Look, if you're going to lean less on the shoulders of government, we have got to give you an opportunity to retain more of your earnings within your business.

I say to my colleagues, Let's take, for example, agriculture. There have been reductions in the agricultural program since 1986, gone from \$26 billion down to somewhere around \$11 or \$12 billion, where we are today, and farmers and ranchers are saying that we have to have regulatory relief. We're willing to step back as far as the subsidies, but give us regulatory relief, give us some breaks on the tax side.

This is not wealthy people. These are hard-working Americans that have gone back on a year-to-year basis and accumulated some wealth in their business, whether it is a small businessman or an agricultural person, and then, when they get around to that stage in their life when they want to retire, then they have all of this income that comes in in 1 year, but it is income that is accumulated over years and years of hard work, and in each individual year that has not amounted to an awful lot, but over a period of 20 to 30 years it amounts to their whole retirement.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is why it is important that we have something like a reduction in capital gains. That is why it is important that we do something with the inheritance tax so that these particular businesses can pass on and remain in the family.

If we want to continue to say that the individual in this country has got to take responsibilities for his own actions, save for his retirement, provide for his own family, we have got to say that the Government takes less and we let the individual keep more, and that is what we are talking about, less Government. That is what the Republican budget is about. As the opposition will say, they want more Government. They think the answer is here in Washington. This is not where the real answers are. The answers are back in our districts, back with families, back with local elected officials.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make one simple fundamental point. We can do better than a budget that takes health care from the elderly to pay for tax breaks for the privileged few. I say to my colleagues, "If you ask me, this budget is not just reckless public policy. It's a repudiation of everything this country stands for and every purpose that we came here to serve."

Mr. Speaker, tax cuts for the privileged few and budget cuts for the middle class is the most egregious redistribution of income from workers to the wealthy since Republicans ruled the White House, and I suppose this should not come as a surprise because that is what trickle-down economics is really all about, survival of the richest

and feeding everybody else to the economic wolves. The last time the Republicans tried it in the high rolling 1980's, two-thirds of all the new wealth went to the top 1 percent of Americans. The most privileged of the privileged, the decent, hard-working, middle-income families who are the strength and soul of this country, barely got a dime.

And now the Republicans are saying that after a decade and a half of economic disaster and decline for the middle income people it is time to try it all over again. It is time to ravage health care for the elderly and disabled, rob people's pensions, and pass a back-door tax increase. It is time to slash the earned income credit, which nearly 40 percent of all families with children depend upon sometime in the decade to keep themselves out of poverty. It is time to cut education, and increase the cost of student loans and eliminate summer jobs for worthy young people.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dark moment in the history of our House. This budget is so unfair, so extreme, so reckless in redistribution, my guess is that many on the other side even find it offensive. That is why we are offering this motion to instruct. That is why we want this opportunity to build a better budget and a fairer budget.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to turn aside trickle-down economics not out of partisanship, but out of an abiding sense of justice, and fairness, and decency and what is right. Vote for this motion. Let us put an end to tax breaks for the privileged few and budget cuts for the middle class. We can and we must do better for the people of this country.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, let me state one simple fact. The Democrats have no budget proposal. We worked long and hard on a budget, and let me state it again.

At no time did the Democrats come forth with any budget proposal from the House. The President had a budget, yes, but did he take the trouble? No, he left us with \$200 billion in the hole. He did not offer any response to the problems with Medicare or Medicaid, no proposals at all. So the President punted, just as the House Democrats punted in the Committee on the Budget, and now they have the audacity to come out here when we have proposals to help people for the future of our country, for our grandchildren and our children, and the middle income people in this country, they come out with a motion like this. I think it takes a lot of gall to come out and, while proposing nothing positive throughout this whole process, to come forth and say, "We want to go a different direction now."

What we are saying, "Let's get on board, let's go in a direction for the future of our country, for our children." Greenspan says, if we want to have the

same kind of life for our children, our grandchildren, we better get about balancing this budget.

Defeat this motion to instruct.

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

Mr. Speaker, I obviously rise in opposition to the motion to instruct because I think we have been able to show that we can, in fact, balance the budget, downsize the Government, and give people tax relief.

As my colleagues know, the amazing thing about the budget document that we passed on the House floor is that it is described in Washington as a revolutionary document. But, if we were to take this document and put it on the tables of American families for discussion as they sit down Sunday morning for breakfast, it would not be viewed as revolutionary. Frankly it would be viewed as common sense. The fact is that we are going to grow over the next 7 years from \$9 trillion in spending at the Federal level to \$11 trillion in spending.

Now some would have us grow with 13 trillion. That is what would happen if we put the Government on automatic pilot. If we were to actually sit down with families at the breakfast table on Sunday morning and explain that the Federal budget—considering the fact that we are running a national debt of almost \$5 trillion, is going to grow from \$9 to \$11 trillion, their question would not be, "Why isn't it going up to \$12 or \$13 trillion?" They would be saying "Well, wait a minute. If the country is in trouble, if we got these financial difficulties, why should it go up \$2 trillion over the next 7 years?"

Well, it is because we tried to put together a document that we thought met the priorities of our country, and had a reasonable chance of being accepted and accommodated the needs of people who depend on entitlement programs. That is essentially it, and we believe that this document, described as revolutionary in this town because anything that does represent change is revolutionary in this town, is nothing more than common sense.

Now we have been dancing around the mulberry bush here since—well, I guess since September when people said it was the "couldn't, wouldn't, shouldn't" argument. Well, there is no way that we could balance the budget and provide tax relief to Americans.

Well then, after we showed that we could do it, then the argument was, "Well, the Republicans, they wouldn't do it. There is no way that they will propose a budget that will cut spending and provide tax relief." And now the argument is they "shouldn't" do it.

Well, the "couldn't, wouldn't, shouldn't" crowd is going to lose this fight because we are, in fact, going to balance the budget, and we are, in fact, going, as we downsize Government, to give people some of their money back.

Now let us kind of talk about the taxes just for a second. Capital gains. I think we could get some amazing stud-

ies on this floor that would show how the capital gains argument has evolved to the point where the people say the rich benefit. As my colleagues know amazingly, there are a great number of Americans, for example a husband and a wife who reach the age of 80 who sell a farm. All of a sudden guess what? Their income has gone from \$50,000 or \$60,000 to about \$300,000 because they are selling their assets. Now these are not rich people. These are people who have saved and invested wisely.

I say to my colleagues, I mean they could be your next-door neighbor, if you live in middle or lower income areas. I mean it's very possible, and in many cases likely, but capital gains, as I pointed out before, is—we have the highest capital gains tax in the world. I mean we penalize people to invest. We don't want to penalize people to invest. We want to give people incentives to invest because, as they invest, they create economic activity, and then people get jobs, poor people can get jobs, and then the poor people can get rich, and then they can become the bosses of the investors.

I mean I think the goal in our country and who I focus on every day—the person I focus on every day is the person that gets up, and goes to work, and tries to raise the kids, and saves money—I do not focus on the rich; I am focusing on the person that needs the opportunity to become rich. I do not think we ought to have certain advantages in our society that protect rich people. On the other hand, we should not punish rich people, but what we should do is keep in mind the fact that we need to have an economy that allows people to have maximum amount of opportunity, and capital gains is nothing more than giving people incentives to create economic growth.

Now in terms of the earned income tax credit, and I want to say to the gentleman from Minnesota in regard to the earned income tax credit, I am concerned about what happened in the Senate on the earned income tax credit. What I would tell the gentleman is that there are two things that trouble me in this area. One is the argument that has been coming to the fore lately about the fact that people have been scamming this EITC. If, in fact, there are scams going on in EITC, we got to clean that up. The other argument is, and I am going to commend; in fact with unanimous consent I will enter into the RECORD a study by a guy named Edgar Browning who talks about the effects of the earned income tax credit on income and welfare; and I want to say to the gentleman that the earned income tax credit I think was a Republican creation. It was designed to say that, if you're on welfare, we are going to give you a way to work and not lose all your benefits. I mean I think everybody is for that, but we don't want to create an earned income credit system that creates marginal rates that provide disincentives for people to work.

So I would say to the gentleman that the idea that we ought to go in and start doing major surgery on the earned income tax credit in order to get deficit reduction, I would share the gentleman's concern on that because I am not really excited about the prospect of doing that.

□ 1130

But if in fact there are scams going on in the EITC, or if in effect the earned income tax credit, like many Government programs, has grown so quickly that it is starting to provide disincentives for work, I want to focus on that as well. But the concept of the earned income tax credit, where working Americans can have an opportunity to earn more and not be penalized, I favor. I do not want to pick on people who may not have a lobbyist in this town because we can somehow go and raise some revenue. That is not my interest. I want to do an intellectually honest look at EITC. So I share some of the concerns that the gentleman has.

But I would say in closing that we, of course, want to defeat this motion to instruct because it is the same debate again. I think we have a reasonable bill to cut spending. In fact, it is a positive bill to cut spending that makes some necessary structural changes in this Government, and we are able as we downsize Government to give people some of their money back. That is all very, very positive.

I am paying attention to the gentleman's concerns about the earned income tax credit. It is a legitimate point. I share his concerns. I want to note that for the record. But I would ask the Members to come to the floor, to defeat the motion to instruct, and to move forward with the appointment of conferees and get this conference committee meeting and get the issues resolved.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I come to this floor to support this motion because I cannot imagine a proposal more devastating to the health care system of this country than the \$340 billion tax cut to the well-off which is proposed in the Republican budget.

The greatest travesty of this tax cut is that it is being paid for overwhelmingly by cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, cuts that total almost \$500 billion. The Republicans cut \$280 billion from Medicaid alone. Every senior citizen will experience an average increase of \$1,000 per year in health care costs as a result of the Republican Medicare cuts. Cost of living increases in Social Security will be applied directly to increased health care costs. The effect on senior citizens will be a 50 percent decrease in Social Security COLA's to pay for the tax cut that will give 1 mil-

lion Americans an average tax break of \$20,000 a year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Medicare and Medicaid are not bloated Government programs. They are health insurance for approximately 70 million Americans, and they have been pared down and pared down, and the benefits have been pared down each year. Medicare spends less than 3 percent of its budget on administration, compared to 30 percent by the private insurance industry.

The Medicare cuts in the Republican budget go to the bone, the muscle, and the artery of the senior citizens' health care system, but they do not effect only senior citizens. As older parents and grandparents are unable to pay these increased costs, the effect of those cuts will spill over onto young families, young families who have had stagnant incomes for the last 10 years as they face the need to educate their own children. It is the young families who will be hit hard by these unnecessary, and I say unnecessary, cuts: \$288 billion in Medicare cuts to pay for \$344 billion of tax breaks for the rich. It is an even exchange. Take it from senior citizens and give it to the rich.

Now, young families will have to come up with the money to maintain their parents' medical care. If they do not, their parents will lose the insurance coverage they have now under Medicare and they will lose access to the hospitals and physicians that they have always used. The reality is that the Republican tax cuts will force families to take on the medical expenses of their elderly parents, something that has not happened in this country in 30 years.

The Medicaid cuts, on the other hand, to pay for the rest of the tax cuts, will make this problem even worse. There is a myth in this country: Medicaid is not primarily a program for the poorest of the poor women and children. Two-thirds of the money from Medicaid goes to pay for senior citizens' nursing home care. Those Medicare fund cuts will mean that families will no longer have the long-term safety net that they have come to expect, and they will have to either cough up the money or leave their jobs to take care of people in their family who need senior citizen care.

Now, if this was not bad enough, I just left the Committee on Ways and Means, where the Republicans are preparing to get rid of the progressive income tax and shift the costs all down onto the middle class and the lower class. This is a two-pronged approach to shift all the costs onto the middle class.

I urge you to support this motion, because it is a protection not only for senior citizens, but for the middle class, the baby boomers in this country, who are going to get hit with a back door punch they do not see coming. I urge the support of this motion.

Nursing homes cost \$40,000 per year. Before these cuts, American families could be secure that if grandma's savings were used up

in paying for nursing home care, the Medicaid Program would be there to assure that her care could continue without also bankrupting her children.

With these cuts, that guarantee is gone.

The financial impact is not the only cost American families will feel. Medicare and Medicaid are the main structural beams supporting the rural health delivery system, our Nation's teaching hospitals, urban hospitals, and children's hospitals.

With these cuts, many rural hospitals and children's hospitals will simply close. Teaching hospitals will not be able to continue to train at the same level the next generation of doctors or continue to provide our most sophisticated care. Most hospitals will have to reduce services to everyone and limit nursing care to absorb the dramatic impact of these cuts.

Most hospitals will have to reduce the amount of uncompensated care they give to people without health insurance—a number that is growing every day.

And for what? To improve Medicare? To make our families more secure? To get health insurance to more people? To improve the quality of care?

The answer to all those questions is No, No, No and No. These cuts will not make Medicare more secure or save it for the next generation or make health care better. They will do only one thing. They will pay for tax cuts to the rich while everyone else will pay through the nose for health care for their loved ones.

These tax cuts paid for with Medicare and Medicaid cuts are a devastating attack on the economic and health security of American middle class families. I urge that they be reconsidered under the reasoned light of public responsibility, not the glare of tax cut politics. I urge the adoption of this motion.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct. The effect by excluding the revenue effects of the Contract With America is to deny the tax relief that we give in this legislation. What we have heard this morning from several of the speakers on the other side is the usual class warfare; the idea of it is going to be the rich that benefit, and it is the poor and the middle class that get cut.

It is not an argument with validity, but we have heard it over and over again. And the idea of trying to create this kind of class division in our society is a tired, old argument that I do not think sells anymore.

There are two points I want to make with regard to this, about why we have tax relief in this budget and why I think it is so critical. The first is one that I am asked very frequently when I am home, and I think my colleagues get as well, and it is a legitimate question from our constituents: Why, if the deficit is so important, why are you giving tax relief now? Why do you not just focus on getting the deficit down?

I think I have an answer to that. I think the answer is in the action that

the Senate took on their budget resolution, because the Senate budget resolution gets to a balanced budget in the same time that we do, no sooner, in 7 years. But it does not give any kind of tax relief.

If there are going to be painful cuts in all of this, why should not the people get something back from it? It does not get us any faster to a balanced budget to give no tax relief, so why do we not give some tax relief?

The second is the point that my colleague the distinguished chairman of the committee made earlier, that people deserve to have some of this back. This was brought home to me in a very poignant way by a letter I received this week from a friend of mine. He was a Navy buddy. We correspond at Christmas card time, but this is the first letter I have had from him I think in 20 or 25 years. He lives in New Jersey. He is writing to me, I think out of frustration as much as anything else, telling me why in this last election for the first time he became a Republican.

He says:

My concern is the same as others I know. We obey laws, pay taxes—I had to borrow \$8,000 to pay an increase in my 1993 income tax as my employer graduate tuition reimbursement payments were taxed as regular income—practice good citizenship and still recognize our future is increasingly less certain despite how hard we try to prepare. My mortgage with interest payments, property tax and tuition for Karen's education exceed my after tax income. I now have my own deficit to deal with. Barbara's income has to cover my rent and living expenses so I may work in Massachusetts. Automobile, property, and personal casualty insurance exceeds \$5,000 annually. And my home has lost 25 percent valuation since 1988. I have difficulty believing that the inadequate and at times inappropriate work by government in regulations, crime and the legal systems has not contributed significantly to those costs. I absolutely resent the incompetence and mishandling of public funds by Government. I dislike the arrogance of some public officials and those politicians who act out their fantasies or beliefs with seemingly total disregard to the consequences we have to live with as they proceed to intrude in our lives and create unreasonable and unfair barriers to opportunity. For too long government has been disconnected from the day-to-day reality that average Americans share and experience.

Mr. Speaker, this letter came to me unsolicited. I cannot think of any words more eloquent than these, anything that has been spoken on the floor of this House during this entire debate, that says it more eloquently as to why we are doing what we are doing, why we are trying to give back to the American taxpayers, to the overburdened, oppressed American taxpayers, some of what they have given. It is time that Americans took back some of what Government takes from them. That is what this budget resolution is about.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am going to urge the House to vote for this motion to instruct. It simply says we ought to drop the tax cuts for the rich in the House bill and drop the tax hikes in the Senate bill on the working poor because of the changes in the earned income tax credit.

It simply says: "Don't make war on education, don't make war on Medicare, in order to give the wealthy and the super-rich another big tax cut."

The Federal Reserve has done a new study which has shown what has happened to the Nation's wealth during most of the eighties. It showed that the richest one-half million families, who in 1983 had 24 percent of the Nation's wealth and had \$2.5 trillion in wealth, had their wealth doubled to \$5 trillion over a 6 year period in the eighties alone, and that their share of the Nation's total wealth went up from 24 to 31 percent.

That means that the richest one-half million families in this country saw their net worths increase by two-and-a-half times as much as the public debt went up during that same period. That increase came because the profitability of their business holdings exploded at the expense of their workers.

During the same period that workers' productivity went up by 15 percent, their wages went down by 10 percent, and that gap between increased productivity and lower wages went right into the pockets of the economic elite of this country. That is the same elite that asked us to pass NAFTA; it is the same elite that asked to pass GATT. But it is also the same elite that refuses to support even table scraps for workers by providing for an increase in the minimum wage and still insists that we cut education opportunities for the kids of those workers and cut Medicare for the parents of those workers and cut Social Security COLAs for the parents of those workers in order to give another break to the people whose average net worth rose from \$2.5 million per family to over \$5 million per family.

The previous speaker in the well said, "Oh, don't engage in this class warfare. Tut, tut, tut, terrible thing." Well, I have news for you. We have had class warfare in this country for the past 15 years, and the working class has lost. That is what has happened.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote for this motion to recommit.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

□ 1145

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct conferees, encouraging a budget conference agreement that does not allow for the tax cuts included in the House-passed budget but does include the House position on the earned income tax credit provisions.

I think there should be no doubt in anyone's mind how strongly I feel about balancing our budget. I am committed to finding a bipartisan answer, a bipartisan solution to our deficit problem, a reasonable and responsible path toward a balanced budget.

In my opinion, today the biggest obstacle to these goals is an immediate and enormous tax cut. I am personally committed to the spending cuts required to get to a balanced budget by the year 2002. I am not prepared at this time to vote for the additional spending cuts until I know more about that they are going to do to programs like Medicare and Medicaid, until we know more about the resolve of 218 Members of this body on the policies required before we vote the tax cuts, the easy part of it.

The additional spending cut burden created by the loss of current revenues assumed in the House-passed budget resolution fails to meet the test of being reasonable and responsible. I am extremely concerned by the strains which would be created in the areas of agriculture, health care, and education, as a result of paying for the immediate tax cuts. I give credit to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] because his budget is very credible in specifying where these cuts could come. What I am afraid is, he does not have the troops behind him.

I fear that as the reality of spending cuts of the magnitude required to pay for these tax cuts become more evident over the next few years, commitment to deficit reduction will be abandoned. Meanwhile the politically easy policy changes, the tax cuts already will have been made. Once again, future generations forced to bear even greater debt burdens will be the victims of our irresponsibility.

This dismal scenario is not what inevitably must happen. We have the opportunity to redeem ourselves with those future generations. The conference committee should start by making the difficult spending choices in a responsible way, postponing tax cuts until a balanced budget is first achieved. If such an approach is pursued, I believe there is a much greater likelihood of bipartisan support both of the budget resolution and ultimately of reconciliation.

We have a great opportunity to pass the first balanced budget this Congress has approved for decades. Let us do it the right way. Support the motion to instruct. Let us get the conference off on the right foot.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct conferees on this year's budget resolution. I take the floor not to oppose deficit reduction or even a balanced budget, but to debate budget priorities. Government can be reduced. Spending can

be cut. But we legislators have a responsibility to make spending reductions in a manner that is fair, strategic, and economically wise.

The House Republican budget proposal fails miserably on these counts. First, the tax policy contained in the Republican budget is backwards. This budget reduces taxes by \$350 billion over 7 years. At least one-half of the benefits of these tax breaks will go to families earning over \$100,000. This is, indeed, class warfare.

Families earning between \$100,000 and \$200,000 will receive a tax cut of almost \$2,500 per year under this budget. Those families earning over \$200,000 would do better yet. They would receive \$11,266 in yearly tax relief under the House budget plan. This is, indeed, class warfare.

Amazingly, at the same time the same budget increases taxes on millions of working poor people. It does this by reducing the earned income tax credit. The earned income tax credit makes work pay. The earned income tax credit only goes to working families. The earned income tax credit increases people's economic incentive to leave welfare. I cannot imagine the rationale for lowering taxes on Americans who are doing well, who are doing the best, while at the same time raising taxes on Americans who are struggling.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric about welfare reform in this Chamber. The earned income tax credit is among the best work programs for low income Americans there is. It is an outrage that the Republican budget would cut that program back. This is, indeed, class warfare.

On the spending side, the Republicans have made seniors, the disabled, the sick, students, and the poor the sacrificial lambs in their campaign to reach a balanced budget. The simple fact is this, Medicare is being reduced. It is being reduced to pay for a tax cut which would benefit mostly rich Americans.

Nearly \$500 billion will be cut from Medicaid and Medicare over 7 years. Seniors and the poor must not and should not be punished by this Congress. We must cut wisely, not indiscriminately.

A budget reflects our national priorities. Unfortunately, I am afraid this budget establishes a set of priorities that are mean spirited, shortsighted and economically foolish. Support the motion to instruct the conferees. Bring families and proper priorities to this budget.

Stop the class warfare. Discontinue this budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think we should remind ourselves what we are after. We are not just after changes in the way the Federal Government keeps its books. Our goal is to make the United States a better place to live and work and raise our families.

How do we get there? We get there, No. 1, by increasing savings. That will help us achieve more and better jobs. I would like to suggest that the biggest cost over the next 10 years of the tax decreases is a bill that I have been supporting for the last 2½ years called neutral cost recovery.

What this bill does is to say to businesses that—when they buy new machinery or equipment, they can consider that a business expense and can deduct it from the tax base before you figure out how much taxes you owe.

Guess what the economists say is going to happen if you allow businesses to deduct the price of the cost of the machinery and equipment and the facilities that they purchase in the year that they buy it? What is going to happen is, it is going to in effect reduce the price of that equipment by 16 percent and businesses are going to buy more of it. And if we want the great American work force to have better tools, then we are going to have to have some motivation, some incentive to get those tools in the hands of the best work force in the world. And the way we do that is tax policy.

We are dealing with a tax increase 2 years ago that was \$252 billion. Our conference got together, said, do we want to have an offset to that \$250 billion tax increase? The answer was yes. And we said, How do we want to do it? We want to do it in a way that is going to encourage savings and that is going to encourage capital investment. That is what we did in this tax bill. So to have an amendment that says, do away with the incentives that are going to expand business and jobs by putting better tools in the hands of the American workers, I think, is very shortsighted. As we look at the poor people that need help, our goal has got to be offering those people better jobs.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct which at its heart reaches a balanced budget, directs conferees to reach a balanced budget by 2002 by dropping the tax cuts for the privileged and knocking out the tax increases for the poor.

The chairman, I think, raised a good point. He said we ought to quit talking about this in terms of the formal budget jargon. Let us put it in the context of a couple at the breakfast table. I liked that idea.

I imagine myself talking about this with a couple back in North Dakota at the Sunday breakfast table. I think they would agree that the budget is out of balance, that we ought to do something about it. I would have to agree with them, and I would in fact commend the majority for their efforts to reach a balanced budget.

But how do we get there? I would have to tell them that the House budget starts the road to the balanced budget by a deep tax cut. I think they would

ask questions at that point. They would say, that sounds a little bit like digging the hole deeper before you start to fill it up. Like taking a trip on your credit cards before you begin to get your household finances in order. It just does not make sense.

But they might ask a question, intrigued by tax cuts like we all are, who gets it? At this point I would have to tell them, well, if you are an average North Dakotan making \$30,000 a year, you will get about 25 bucks a month. But if you are a doctor or someone making over \$200,000 a year, you are going to get \$1,000 a month: \$25 a month for the average guy; \$1,000 a month if you make over \$200,000 a year.

At that point I believe this couple at the breakfast table would start to say, wait a minute. This thing is stacked against the average working family. This is not fair.

They might also wonder, how are you going to balance that budget and pass the tax cut? Well, I would have to tell them that the House budget plan makes deep, deep, painful cuts in programs as important to North Dakota as Medicare, student loans, the farm program. In fact, I would have to tell them if they were on Medicare they would be looking at paying maybe 2,500 bucks more in out-of-pocket costs than they would have otherwise.

At this point in time, this couple at the breakfast table might say, there has got to be a better way of getting to a balanced budget than that House plan which savages these programs and gives tax cuts which benefit disproportionately the rich. I would have to say there is.

In fact, the Senate Republicans passed a plan that did not have those tax cuts for the most privileged. In fact, the Senate rejected that idea entirely. As we construct a budget, we ought to recognize that the Senate took the better course.

One thing the Senate did that was very objectionable is they added tax increase, one that falls on the poorest working families. That ought to come out. The House did not have it in its plan. And our motion to instruct directs conferees not to impose the tax increase on working families like they did.

What this motion is about is establishing a modest degree of fairness between two flawed budget proposals.

One thing is clear, there is nothing more unfair than the House version, which passes tax cuts for the most privileged, funded by deep cuts in programs important to working families.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, the last time I rose on this floor to speak about the issue of tax cuts, I said that my colleagues on the other side simply do not get it. Well, in the time that has intervened, they have not learned anything. They still do not get it.

The answer is that American people are not taxed too little. They are taxed too much. In 1950, the year after I was born, the average American family with children paid \$1 out of \$50 to the Federal Government in taxes. Today that family with children pays \$1 out of \$4. That is a 1,200-percent increase.

They say it is a tax cut for the rich. I say they are wrong. But let us hear the argument. If they believe it is a tax cut for the rich and if they understand that we have had a 1,200-percent increase in taxes in America to the Federal Government alone, why are they not proposing that we cut taxes for people below the level, that we cut them further for the people they say are the poor and the needy? The answer is, they do not believe in tax cuts. The answer is, they are addicted to spending. The answer is that over the past 40 years they created this deficit and now they said, we could not balance the budget and cut taxes. Well, guess what? We proved them wrong.

My colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], made the point. We not only balanced the budget, but we lifted the tax burden off the American people at the same time. We must do that. Get it straight. This is not our money. We are not giving back our money. We are letting the working people of America keep their money.

That is the fundamental difference. If a 1,200-percent increase is not enough, what would make you happy? Would it make you happy if we had a 2,000-percent increase in the Federal tax burden or a 20,000-percent increase. If from 1950 to 1994, we went from \$1 out of \$40 to \$1 out of \$4, how soon will it be that we are at \$1 out of \$2. Would it be enough if we took from the average American taxpayer \$1 out of every \$2 that they earned?

I tell my colleagues, this is the right budget. It is a historic budget. I urge its support.

□ 1200

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to instruct conferees. I particularly want to speak to the instruction on the earned income tax credit.

Not long ago, we in this House had a very necessary debate about welfare reform. During that debate we could agree on two things. One is that we had to reform the welfare system. The other point that Members on both sides of the aisle consistently agreed on was that we ought to encourage and reward work. This is precisely what the earned income tax credit does. It helps people who work hard for low wages. It rewards them for their efforts, and it makes it possible for them to support themselves, take care of their families, and stay off welfare.

In fact, the earned income tax credit, the reason for it, was the first step in welfare reform, so people who work,

work at the minimum wage, have children, can keep enough of their money, and as this gentleman said, it is their money, keep their money and stay off welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that the budget chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, said that he understood what the Senate did was not the right thing. I was very heartened to hear that, because he will fight for us, as this side of the aisle wants to fight, to keep the earned income tax credit.

He also said that the earned income tax credit was a Republican idea. In fact, he is half right. The earned income tax credit was a bipartisan idea which we agreed on in the Reagan years and the Bush years. When President Clinton became President he embraced the idea and funded it to the point that it became a very potent program.

Just yesterday we read that the earned income tax credit works. People do not go on the program and stay on it and keep getting the earned income tax credit. It helps them through rough patches in life. It helps them to keep working, keeps them off welfare, and lets them have dignity.

I find it appalling that the Senate would look to this program that helps working people to pay for other things. I urge conferees on both sides of the aisle to keep this a bipartisan issue, to keep the earned income tax credit, and really back up the idea that people should be able to work and keep their money.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], a very valued member of the committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think this motion to instruct is flawed. It could have been made a motion that I could have liked if it had said to lower some of the taxes, if it had said eliminate one or two of them, if it had said make one or two of them more income-sensitive, particularly the child tax credit. In that case I would have supported it.

If it had said "Make some changes to the Earned Income Tax Credit, but do not do what they are doing," it would have had some merit. What this does is basically say under no circumstance should we have any reduction in taxes. That is an interesting argument and may have some validity, but let us recognize what we are talking about. We are saying that we should not consider a child tax credit. That is a tax credit of \$500 per child.

Mr. Speaker, when my mom and dad were raising their four sons, they were allowed to take in today's dollars what amounts to \$7,000 per child off the bottom line of their income. If my parents in today's income made \$50,000, they would have been able to take \$28,000 off their total income. That is what we did for families in the 1940's and in the 1950's.

Today what we allow families to deduct are slightly over \$2,000 per child, so we are giving a \$500 tax credit per child. When I hear the speakers talk about who will benefit, I am thinking that they must think that everyone who pays taxes is wealthy, because they are going to benefit. I am thinking that there have to be middle class families, middle class families that have children. I am thinking that these middle-class families may have, in some cases, more than one child; maybe two maybe three, maybe four, maybe five. If they have four children, they get to deduct a significant sum of money. They get an actual tax credit of \$500 per child. With five children, they will get a significant sum of money back. They are not wealthy, but they are going to benefit. Under this instruction, they would not.

There is a marriage penalty, to make sure married couples do not get penalized. There is a super IRA that allows families to deduct for health care tax-free, and to use it for college and medical expenses and so on. There is even a tax credit for adoption. We want to encourage families to adopt, and we allow a \$500 credit. We have an elderly care credit, if you take care of someone who is elderly. Then we have also a capital gains tax exemption.

The capital gains tax exemption, under almost anybody's definition, is going to generate economic activity. However, to listen to Democrats describe the benefits, they say only the wealthy. This is their logic. If we have a family who makes \$40,000 a year in what we call earned income, and they have a one-time capital gains exemption of \$100,000 to sell their home, they are saying that person is wealthy. They are saying they make \$140,000.

Wrong, they make \$40,000. One year they had a slight increase, a significant increase in capital gain, probably most of it due to inflation, and we are saying they should not have to pay a significant gain on what really is inflation. We are not talking, in many cases, about wealthy people.

Mr. Speaker, the child tax credit, 75 percent of it goes to families who earn less than \$75,000. All of that would disappear if we were to adopt this.

Mr. Speaker, then they get to the angle of talking to Medicare and Medicaid, as if we are going to solve the problem by going forward with their motion. Their motion says "Do not provide these tax credits and these tax cuts that are paid for, that would generate economic activity and help families." Then they are saying that we should not control the growth of Medicare and Medicaid. We should not save it.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to put everyone out of work who works for the health care industry, particularly at hospitals, if we want to tell them to retire in 7 years, if we want to tell people on Medicare after 7 years that the money is going to disappear, because that is what is going to happen unless

we deal with Medicare, the bottom line is we want to save Medicare. We want to preserve it, we want to protect it, and we want to strengthen Medicare.

Why would we want to do that? Why does it need to be strengthened? Because we have the President's own administration, the Board of Trustees of the Federal hospital insurance trust fund, they are the ones responsible for all the money that goes into Medicare part A. Who are these people? Robert Rubin, Secretary of Treasury; the Secretary of Labor; the Secretary of HHS; the Commissioner of Social Security; the Administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration, all President Clinton's appointees. They are five out of the seven.

What did this Board say to us? What the Board said was very direct. They said "Based on the financial projections developed for this report, the Trustees apply an explicit test of short-range financial adequacy. The HI trust fund fails this test by a wide margin. In particular, the trust fund is projected to become insolvent," that means bankrupt, "within the next 6 to 11 years under all three sets of assumptions."

What they say in the next page, they say "Under the Trustees' immediate assumptions, the present financing schedule"—for the fund, the program—"is sufficient to ensure the payment of benefits only over the next 7 years." We want to save Medicare by controlling its growth. We want it to grow about 5 percent a year. We want to take Medicaid and we want to say to it, it will grow at 36 percent a year. We want to spend \$324 billion more in Medicaid in the next 7 years. Then we have Medicare part A going bankrupt. It goes bankrupt in 7 years. It starts next year. We want to save that. We are going to save it by allowing Medicare to grow at 45 percent in the 7th year, to spend over \$659 billion more during the next 7 years than we did in the last 7 years.

We hear the word "cut" as it applies to Medicare and Medicaid. Wrong. We are not cutting, we are going to spend more. We are going to spend \$659 billion more in the next 7 years. Only in Washington, when you spend more money, do people call it a cut. We are going to spend more.

Then people say "Well, you are going to spend more, but what about the beneficiaries? You are not going to increase what the beneficiaries get under Medicare." We are going to save Medicare and we are going to spend 32 percent more per beneficiary in the 7th year. It is going to go from \$4,800 to \$6,300." Under any test, we are going to save Medicare. We are going to strengthen it and preserve it. We pay for our tax cuts.

Most of the tax cuts go to help families. I am sorry, my assumption is that families have children, and half of our tax cuts go to children. I am thinking to myself, that is wrong? Under the instructions, there will be no \$500 tax

credit per family. Under the instructions, there will be no capital gains exemption.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion and to allow the committee to proceed in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time on the majority side has expired.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] controls 4½ minutes, and has the right to close.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, like most Members, I had the chance to go home last week. And when I was home, I met with students. I met with senior citizens. I met with working families.

And all of them asked me the same exact question: Why are Republicans cutting Medicare, Medicaid, and student loans in order to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy?

Why are we cutting programs that help the middle class in order to pay for tax breaks for the privileged few? That is what they wanted to know.

Mr. Speaker, these are good people. They work hard for every dollar they make.

They know the budget deficit is a problem. They know we have to make tough choices as a nation. And they are more than willing to take responsibility and do their fair share.

But is it not fair to cut Medicare and Social Security in order to give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in our society?

Is it fair to cut student loans and school lunches in order to give tax breaks to wealthy corporations?

Is it fair to target the middle class when we are not even willing to close a loophole that lets billionaires renounce their citizenship to avoid paying taxes?

Are these the values we believe in as a nation? The people back home do not think so.

They do not think students should be forced to pay an additional 40 percent for school loans just so a few wealthy corporations can pay no taxes at all.

They do not think seniors should be forced to pay an additional \$3,500 for Medicare just so we can give tax breaks to wealthy investors. Only in Republican Washington can you take \$3,500 out of the pockets of seniors and then call it an increase.

Only in Republican Washington can you increase premiums, ration care, and limit the choice of doctors and then say you are strengthening the system.

Mr. Speaker, these tax breaks are so outrageous that even the Senate rejected them by a huge bipartisan majority.

So outrageous that 106 members of your own caucus signed a letter that said these were tax breaks for the wealthy.

So outrageous that even the Wall Street Journal urged wealthy investors to "start salivating."

So do not come here today and lecture us about how you strengthened Medicare or cutting the deficit. Because we all know you are cutting Medicare for one reason and one reason only: to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, this is not what the American people voted for last fall.

I urge my colleagues: Vote "yes" on the motion to instruct. Drop this tax break for the wealthy. And stand up for the middle class for a change.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief in my comments today. I want to express my disappointment in the budgets we are considering. I am concerned the budget resolution passed by the House Budget Committee and adopted by the full House, while potentially successful in reducing the deficit, is irresponsible fiscal policy. I did not support the House budget resolution which gives enormous tax breaks to the wealthy while cutting critical Government programs—including a virtual assault on Medicare. And I cannot support a compromise crafted here which furthers these priorities which are inconsistent with the priorities of the majority of my constituents.

I fully support getting to a balanced budget. In fact, I have voted for an amendment to the Constitution mandating a balanced Federal budget. I believe we must end the continued policy of running billion-dollar deficits which add to the national debt that must be paid by our children and grandchildren. The budget resolutions for fiscal year 1996, however, cut crucial programs at a time when our Federal belt-tightening will mandate a greater need for certain programs. I am especially concerned about the deep cuts in education, health, and infrastructure.

This budget is too extreme. It is unfair, and it asks too much of the majority of Americans. I firmly believe we must continue on a serious path toward real deficit reduction. Our \$4.7 trillion dollar debt is not a legacy I, in good conscience, can leave to my children and grandchildren which I why I think we cannot afford a tax cut until we reach a balanced budget. However, as we reduce Government services we must protect those who will be hardest hit by such reductions.

I believe if we get rid of the \$340 billion tax cut for the wealthy and used those funds to help keep Medicare solvent; if we ask the very wealthy instead to pay their fair share; restore some funding for some of our most needed initiatives, such as student loans; and do not tamper with Social Security, we could reach our common goal of a balanced budget and a healthy economy and a prosperous and bright future for all of our Nation's citizens.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, now is not the time for massive tax increases. We desperately need to reduce the growing Federal deficit. The House budget plan's tax cut would reduce Federal receipts by \$190 billion over 5 years, \$350 billion over 7 years, and more than \$650 billion over 10 years. These tax cuts are forcing deep, irresponsible cuts in Medicare and Medicaid—as well as other important Federal programs like student loans and nutrition programs.

On another front, the House Ways and Means Committee is holding hearings today

on replacing the Federal income tax within the next 2 or 3 years. Frequent changes in the Tax Code create uncertainty that hinders financial decisions and reduces economic growth. If we are seriously considering making major changes to the Tax Code in the near future, we shouldn't make dramatic changes in the Tax Code now.

The most responsible policy we could adopt at this time would be no tax cut, but if that is not an option, then the Senate position is preferable. If we are serious about the budget, we shouldn't be enacting tax cuts with revenue losses that explode after the year 2000. In addition, the tax cuts are distributionally unfair—many working class families won't see a penny out of them. If we want to reduce the tax burden on the hard-pressed middle class, we should rethink our approach. In short, for many compelling reasons, I urge the House to instruct the conferees to eliminate the House tax cuts in conference.

One tax provision in particular deserves special attention—the earned income tax credit. The Senate bill would reduce the EITC. The House version—perhaps due to its brutal cuts in welfare, nutrition programs, and Medicaid—would leave the EITC untouched. The conference committee should—in this one case—follow the House's lead and leave the EITC alone.

Hard work should be rewarded, and the EITC “makes work pay”—it offsets the burden of Social Security and other payroll taxes, and it ensures that a household with an adult working full-time will have a higher income than a family on welfare.

The purchasing power of low-income wages has declined substantially since the EITC was created 20 years—for example, the proportion of full-time year-round workers paid a wage too low to lift a family of four up to the poverty level rose from 12 percent in 1979 to 16 percent in 1993. The EITC restores some of that purchasing power. It is wrong to pay for tax cuts for families with incomes over \$100,000 by increasing taxes on working families with incomes below \$27,000. Honest working families that often hold down several jobs—and yet still struggle to make ends meet—need tax relief a lot more than America's most affluent families.

Republicans from Ronald Reagan and Richard Nixon to ROBERT DOLE and PETE DOMENICI have praised the EITC as the best antipoverty program in existence. Granted, Republicans have often supported the credit in order to resist increases in the minimum wage or to counteract the disincentives created by Government welfare programs; but now that they are in control of Congress and have gutted Federal welfare programs, the need to maintain the credit at its current level is that much greater.

In short, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to instruct conferees. It's not too late to produce a budget that cuts the deficit responsibly without stabbing hard-working middle-class families and the elderly in the back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct conferees offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

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

Mr. SABO. 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.

This will be a 17-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 183, nays 233, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 361]

YEAS—183

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Olver
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Ortiz
Baldacci	Gordon	Orton
Barcia	Green	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Pastor
Becerra	Hall (OH)	Payne (NJ)
Beilenson	Hamilton	Payne (VA)
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Berman	Hayes	Peterson (MN)
Bevill	Hefner	Pickett
Bishop	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Bonior	Hinchev	Poshard
Borski	Holden	Rahall
Boucher	Hoyer	Rangel
Brewster	Jackson-Lee	Reed
Browder	Jacobs	Reynolds
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Johnson (SD)	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Rose
Cardin	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kaptur	Rush
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Clyburn	Kennedy	Sawyer
Coleman	Kildee	Schroeder
Collins (IL)	Klink	Schumer
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Scott
Condit	Lantos	Serrano
Conyers	Levin	Sisisky
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Coyne	Lincoln	Skelton
Cramer	Lipinski	Slaughter
Danner	Lowe	Stark
de la Garza	Luther	Stenholm
DeFazio	Maloney	Stokes
DeLauro	Manton	Studds
Dellums	Markey	Stupak
Deutsch	Martinez	Tanner
Dingell	Mascara	Taylor (MS)
Dixon	Matsui	Tejeda
Doggett	McCarthy	Thompson
Dooley	McDermott	Thornton
Doyle	McHale	Thurman
Durbin	McKinney	Torres
Edwards	McNulty	Towns
Engel	Meehan	Traficant
Eshoo	Meek	Tucker
Evans	Menendez	Velazquez
Farr	Mfume	Vento
Fattah	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Fazio	Mineta	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Minge	Ward
Filner	Mink	Waters
Flake	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Ford	Mollohan	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moran	Williams
Frost	Murtha	Wise
Furse	Nadler	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Neal	Wyden
Gephardt	Obey	Wynn

NAYS—233

Allard	Bereuter	Buyer
Andrews	Bilbray	Callahan
Archer	Billrakis	Calvert
Armey	Bliley	Camp
Bachus	Blute	Canady
Baker (CA)	Boehlert	Castle
Baker (LA)	Boehner	Chabot
Ballenger	Bono	Chambliss
Barr	Brownback	Chenoweth
Barrett (NE)	Bryant (TN)	Christensen
Bartlett	Bunn	Chrysler
Barton	Bunning	Clinger
Bass	Burr	Coble
Bateman	Burton	Coburn

Collins (GA)	Horn	Pryce
Combest	Hostettler	Quillen
Cooley	Houghton	Quinn
Cox	Hunter	Radanovich
Crane	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Crapo	Hyde	Regula
Cremeans	Inglis	Riggs
Cubin	Istook	Roberts
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Rogers
Davis	Jones	Rohrabacher
Deal	Kasich	Ros-Lehtinen
DeLay	Kelly	Roth
Diaz-Balart	Kim	Roukema
Dickey	King	Royce
Doolittle	Kingston	Salmom
Dornan	Klug	Sanford
Dreier	Knollenberg	Saxton
Duncan	Kolbe	Scarborough
Dunn	LaHood	Schaefer
Ehlers	Largent	Schiff
Ehrlich	Latham	Seastrand
Emerson	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
English	Lazio	Shadegg
Ensign	Leach	Shaw
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Shays
Ewing	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Fawell	Lightfoot	Skeen
Fields (TX)	Linder	Smith (MI)
Foley	Livingston	Smith (NJ)
Forbes	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Fowler	Longley	Smith (WA)
Fox	Lucas	Solomon
Franks (CT)	Manzullo	Souder
Franks (NJ)	Martini	Spence
Frelinghuysen	McCollum	Stearns
Frisa	McCrery	Stockman
Funderburk	McDade	Stump
Gallegly	McHugh	Talent
Ganske	McInnis	Tate
Gekas	McIntosh	Tauzin
Geren	McKeon	Taylor (NC)
Gilchrest	Metcalf	Thomas
Gillmor	Meyers	Thornberry
Gilman	Mica	Tiahrt
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Torkildsen
Goodling	Molinari	Torricelli
Goss	Moorhead	Upton
Graham	Morella	Vucanovich
Greenwood	Myers	Waldholtz
Gunderson	Myrick	Walker
Gutknecht	Nethercutt	Walsh
Hall (TX)	Neumann	Wamp
Hancock	Ney	Watts (OK)
Hansen	Norwood	Weldon (FL)
Hastert	Nussle	Weldon (PA)
Hastings (WA)	Oxley	Weller
Hayworth	Packard	White
Hefley	Pallone	Whitfield
Heineman	Parker	Wolf
Herger	Paxon	Young (AK)
Hilleary	Petri	Young (FL)
Hobson	Pombo	Zeliff
Hoekstra	Porter	Zimmer
Hoke	Portman	

NOT VOTING—18

Baesler	Harman	Oberstar
Bonilla	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (FL)
Chapman	Klecicka	Spratt
Dicks	Laughlin	Wicker
Flanagan	Lofgren	Wilson
Foglietta	Montgomery	Yates

□ 1235

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Oberstar for, Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut against.

Mr. Yates for, Mr. Wicker against.

Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. PORTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KASICH, HOBSON, WALKER, KOLBE, SHAYS, HERGER, ALLARD, FRANKS of New Jersey, and LARGENT, Mrs. MYRICK, Messrs. PARKER, SABO, STENHOLM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Messrs. COYNE, MOLLOHAN, COSTELLO, and JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the motion to instruct conferees on House Concurrent Resolution 67.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LA-TOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolutions 155 and 156 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. 1561.

□ 1238

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. 1561), to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal year 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal year 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. GOODLATTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 7, 1995, amendment No. 23 offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN] had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to House Resolutions 155 and 156, 1 hour and 45 minutes remain for consideration of amendments under the 5-minute rule.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer an amendment that has not been printed in the RECORD. I have consulted through staff and the ranking minority member with regard to this amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILMAN: In section 2644 (relating to further steps to pro-

mote United States security and political interests with respect to North Korea) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

(1) action by the Government of North Korea to engage in a North-South dialogue with the Government of the Republic of Korea to facilitate progress toward:

(A) holding a North Korea-South Korea Summit;

(B) resuming North-South joint military discussions regarding steps to reduce tensions between North and South Korea;

(C) expanding trade relations between North and South Korea;

(D) promoting freedom of travel between North and South Korea by citizens of both North and South Korea;

(E) cooperating in science and technology, education, the arts, health, sports, the environment, publishing, journalism, and other fields of mutual interest;

(F) establishing postal and telecommunications services between North and South Korea; and

(G) reconnecting railroads and roadways between North and South Korea;

At the end of division A insert the following new title:

TITLE VI—REORGANIZATION OF UNITED STATES EXPORT PROMOTION AND TRADE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 601. PLAN FOR REORGANIZATION OF UNITED STATES EXPORT PROMOTION AND TRADE ACTIVITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Supporting American businesses overseas and assisting United States exporters to identify market opportunities is of increasing importance to America's economic health and competitiveness, and to the well-being of American workers.

(2) At least 18 different government-sponsored organizations or agencies spending over \$3,300,000,000 exist to provide support to American exporters and international businesses. In the past, poor coordination among these organizations and a lack of accessibility often hindered the effectiveness of the Government's trade promotion activities.

(3) Recent efforts to improve coordination between many of these organizations and to increase their availability to exporters around the country were begun through the Trade Promotion Coordination Council. These efforts appear to have generated some improvement in the Government's trade promotion capabilities.

(4) Broader governmentwide reform efforts and future funding questions currently being addressed in Congress may affect different trade promotion organizations to varying degrees.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—In order to fully assess the organizational structure, capability, and spending levels of United States Government trade promotion organizations, the Trade Promotion Coordination Council, not later than March 1, 1996, shall submit to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and to other appropriate committees of jurisdiction, a report detailing what steps are being taken to improve accessibility and coordination among all trade promotion organizations and agencies, what additional measures should be taken to further improve the efficiency of and reduce duplication among these organizations and agencies, and any suggested legislative actions that would further improve the Government's export and trade promotion activities.

(c) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (b) shall—

(1) identify the name, number, function, and budget of all Government organizations

or agencies with some responsibility for supporting, advancing, or promoting international trade or United States exports;

(2) assess the amount of exports directly generated by the activities of each organization or agency;

(3) describe the overall impact of the Government's trade and export promotion programs on increasing exports and overseas market share;

(4) identify areas where increased cooperation and interoperability would improve United States export promotion efforts;

(5) identify areas where greater efficiencies can be achieved through the elimination of duplication among the organizations and agencies included in paragraph (1);

(6) identify ways to improve the audit and accountability mechanisms for each organization or agency, with particular emphasis on ensuring independent oversight capabilities for each organization;

(7) assess the trade and export promotion activities of the major trade partners and competitors of the United States, including amounts of tied aid and export subsidization provided by the governments of those trade partners and competitors; and

(8) provide a plan to reorganize the United States trade and export promotion organizations and agencies, with legislative requirements if necessary, in order to more efficiently promote trade, increase organizational assessability, organize bureaucratic effort, and expend public resources in support of American exporters and international business.

In title XXV (relating to international organizations and commissions) insert the following new section at the end of chapter 1:

SEC. 2502. REPEAL OF AUTHORITY FOR PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION.

The Act entitled "An Act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union", approved June 28, 1935 (22 U.S.C. 276-276a-4) is repealed.

Strike section 3412 of the bill (relating to prohibition on assistance to foreign governments engaged in espionage against the United States).

Page 289, add the following after line 26 and redesignate the succeeding chapter accordingly:

CHAPTER 8—OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

SEC. 3275. STUDY ON OPIC PRIVATIZATION.

The President or his designee shall conduct and, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, report to the Congress on the feasibility of transferring the activities of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to the private sector.

SEC. 3276. PRIVATIZATION OF OPIC ACTIVITIES.

Upon completion of the report required under section 3275, the President is authorized to sell the stock of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and to take other necessary steps so that all the evidences of ownership of the Corporation are transferred to the private sector, whether through the sale of the Corporation's contracts, leases, or other agreements or rights, or otherwise.

In section 2201, add the following at the end:

(c) USE OF EARNINGS FROM FROZEN ASSETS FOR PROGRAM.—

(1) AMOUNTS TO BE MADE AVAILABLE.—Up to 2 percent of the earnings accruing, during periods beginning October 1, 1995, on all assets of foreign countries blocked by the President pursuant to the International Emergency Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 and following) shall be available, subject to appropriations Acts, to carry out section 36 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act, as amended by this section, exception that the limitation contained in subsection (d)(2) of such

section shall not apply to amounts made available under this paragraph.

(2) CONTROL OF FUNDS BY THE PRESIDENT.—The President is authorized and directed to take possession and exercise full control of so much to the earnings described in paragraph (1) as are made available under such paragraph.

At the end of chapter 3 of title XXII (relating to refugees and migration) insert the following new sections:

SEC. 2256. VIETNAM POW/MIA ASYLUM PROGRAM.

(a) ASYLUM FOR ELIGIBLE ALIENS.—The Attorney General shall grant asylum in the United States to any alien described in subsection (b), upon the application of that alien.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—Asylum shall be granted under subsection (a) to any alien (1) who is a national of Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia, or Burma, and (2) who, while acting other than in an official or unofficial capacity on behalf of any government or agency, personally delivers into the custody of the United States Government a living Vietnam POW/MIA (or participates in such a delivery).

(c) VIETNAM POW/MIA DEFINED.—

(1) For purposes of this section, the term "Vietnam POW/MIA" means an individual—

(A) who is a member of a uniformed service (within the meaning of section 101(3) of title 37, United States Code) in a missing status (as defined in section 551(2) of such title) as a result of the Vietnam conflict, unless it is official determined under section 552(c) of such title that such individual is officially absent from such individual's post of duty without authority; or

(B) who is an employee (as defined in section 5561(2) of title 5, United States Code) in a missing status (as defined in section 5561(5) of such title) as a result of the Vietnam conflict.

Such term does not include an individual who the Secretary of Defense determines remained in Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia voluntarily.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

(A) the Vietnam conflict began on February 28, 1961, and ended on May 7, 1975; and

(B) an individual in a missing status shall be considered to be in a missing status as a result of the Vietnam conflict if immediately before that status began the individual—

(i) was performing service in Vietnam; or
(ii) was performing service in Southeast Asia in direct support of military operations in Vietnam.

SEC. 2257. KOREA POW/MIA ASYLUM PROGRAM.

(a) ASYLUM FOR ELIGIBLE ALIENS.—The Attorney shall grant asylum in the United States to any alien described in subsection (b), upon the application of that alien.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—Asylum shall be granted under subsection (a) to any alien (1) who is a national of North Korea, South Korea, or China and (2) who, while acting other than in an official or unofficial capacity on behalf of any government or agency, personally delivers into the custody of the United States Government a living Korea POW/MIA (or participates in such a delivery).

(c) KOREA POW/MIA DEFINED.—

(1) For purposes of this section, the term "Korea POW/MIA" means an individual—

(A) Who is a member of a uniformed service (within the meaning of section 101(3) of title 37, United States Code) in a missing status (as defined in section 551(2) of such title) as a result of the Korean conflict, unless it is officially determined under section 552(c) of such title that such individual is officially absent from such individual's post of duty without authority; or

(B) who is an employee (as defined in section 5561(2) of title 5, United States Code) in

a missing status (as defined in section 5561(5) of such title) as a result of the Korean conflict.

Such term does not include an individual who the Secretary of Defense determines remained in North Korea, South Korea, or China voluntarily.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

(A) the Korean conflict began on June 27, 1950, and ended on January 31, 1955; and

(B) an individual in a missing status shall be considered to be in a missing status as a result of the Korean conflict if immediately before that status began the individual—

(i) was performing service in the Korean peninsula; or

(ii) was performing service in Asia in direct support of military operations in the Korean peninsula.

Strike subsection (a) of section 3421 (relating to the repeal of section 537(h)(2) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1988).

In subsection (c) of section 3421 (relating to the repeal of the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1986), strike "section 1 and section 204" and insert "section 1, section 204, and title III of such Act".

In section 3401 of the bill (in paragraph (1) of section 610(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as proposed to be amended by such section 3401), insert "or the Arms Export Control Act" after "of this Act".

Strike section 3402 of the bill and insert the following:

SEC. 3402. AUTHORITY TO MEET UNANTICIPATED CONTINGENCIES.

Paragraph (1) of section 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2261(a)(1)) is amended by striking "\$25,000,000" and inserting "\$50,000,000".

Strike section 3403 of the bill and insert the following:

SEC. 3403. SPECIAL WAIVER AUTHORITY.

(a) LAWS AFFECTED.—Section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking subsections (a)(1) and (a)(2) and inserting the following:

"(a) AUTHORITY TO AUTHORIZE ASSISTANCE, SALES, AND OTHER ACTIONS; LIMITATIONS.—(1) The President may authorize assistance, sales, or other action under this Act, the Arms Export Control Act, or any annual (or periodic) foreign assistance authorization or appropriations legislation, without regard to any of the provisions described in subsection (b), if the President determines, and notifies in writing the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate—

"(A) with respect to assistance or other actions under chapter 2 or 5 of part II of this Act, or sales or other actions under the Arms Export Control Act, that to do so is vital to the national security interests of the United States; and

"(B) with respect to other assistance or actions that to do so is important to the national interests of the United States.

"(2) The President may waive any provision described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b) that would otherwise prohibit or restrict assistance or other action under any provision of law not described in those paragraphs if the President determines, and notifies in writing the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, that to do so is important to the national interests of the United States."

(b) ANNUAL CEILING.—Section 614(a)(4)(C) of that Act is amended by striking "\$50,000,000" and inserting "\$75,000,000".

(c) LAWS WHICH MAY BE WAIVED.—Section 614 of that Act is amended by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

"(b) LAWS WHICH MAY BE WAIVED.—The provisions referred to in subsections (a)(1) and (a)(2) are—

"(1) the provisions of this Act;

"(2) the provisions of the Arms Export Control Act;

"(3) the provisions of any annual (or periodic) foreign assistance authorization or appropriations legislation, including any amendment made by any such Act;

"(4) any other provision of law that restricts assistance, sales or leases, or other action under the Acts referred to in paragraph (1), (2), or (3); and

"(5) any law relating to receipts and credits accruing to the United States."

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 614(a)(4) of that Act is amended—

(1) in subparagraphs (A)(ii), by striking "or the Arms Export Control Act"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking "the Arms Export Control Act or under".

In section 3404 of the bill (in subsections (a)(1) and (c) of section 617 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as proposed to be amended by such section 3404), insert "or the Arms Export Control Act after "under this Act" each place it appears.

Strike section 2601(b) (relating to visits to the United States by officials of the Government of the Republic of China and Taiwan) and strike the subsection designation and heading for section 2601(a).

Strike section 505 (relating to voluntary separation incentives) and designate the subsequent sections and amend the table of contents accordingly).

At the end of chapter 1 of title XXVI (relating to foreign policy provisions) add the following new section:

SEC. 2604. VERIFICATION OF MISSILE TECHNOLOGY CONTROL REGIME.

Not later than February 1, 1996, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency shall transmit to the Congress a report on the capability of the United States to verify the Missile Technology Control Regime, to include any applicable United States policy statements, pursuant to section 87 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

At the end of section 501 (relating to reorganization authority) insert the following new subsection:

(c) REDUCTION IN EXPENDITURES.—A reorganization plan pursuant to any title of this division shall provide for a twenty percent reduction to apply to each of the first two fiscal years after implementation of such plan in the total level of expenditures for the functions transferred to the Department of State from amounts appropriated for such transferred functions for fiscal year 1995.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION D—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS
TITLE XLI—UNITED STATES EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

SEC. 4001. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FULBRIGHT ACADEMIC EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.—Notwithstanding section 2106(3)(A), there are authorized to be appropriated for "Fulbright Academic Exchange Programs", \$112,484,200 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$88,680,800 for the fiscal year 1997.

(b) OTHER PROGRAMS.—Notwithstanding section 2106(3)(F), there are authorized to be appropriated for "Other Programs", \$77,265,800 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$57,341,400 for the fiscal year 1997.

In section 3231 of the bill (in section 667(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as proposed to be amended by such section 3231; relating to operating expenses of the United States Agency for International Development), strike "\$465,774,000" and insert "\$396,770,250" and strike "\$419,196,000" and insert "\$396,770,250".

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.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, with the cooperation of the minority, we were able to take care of the concerns of many Members by adopting an en bloc amendment. We added provisions to this bill that were supported on both sides, even provisions that were propounded by members who have no intention of voting for this bill. We tried to accommodate as many Members as we could.

There were several amendments that we could not get agreement on however, and some matters that have come to our attention since the time for printing amendments had expired.

Whereas yesterday we only shifted funds on one amendment, in this package we make even more spending reductions. Some of these are minor, such as the decision we have made to end U.S. participation in the Interparliamentary Union. The United States pays dues of nearly \$1 million per year for the IPU assessment, but participates only minimally. The IPU has, regrettably, taken a rather arrogant attitude toward our participation and on one relatively recent occasion increased our assessment at a meeting where we were not represented.

Other changes involve greater amounts of money. For example, the Manzullo amendment represents a considerable, additional cut in cultural and educational exchanges. Mr. MANZULLO has been one of the more active members of our committee and I commend his close attention to this program. I hope he will continue to look closely at the costs and benefits of this program, and welcome his willingness to meet me more than halfway in crafting a solution to the problems he sees in it. The amendment reduces funding for these exchanges by \$10 million in each of fiscal years 1996 and 1997.

Another senior member of our committee has reached a compromise with us. Mr. ROTH has made modifications to his amendment, offered in committee and preprinted in the RECORD, relating to a requirement that the President's reorganization plan show reductions in transferred functions. We have come to a compromise making that amendment acceptable on this side.

At the request of the Committee on Intelligence, which I understand was representing the concerns of the intelligence community of this administration, we are deleting a provision that cuts off aid to countries which conduct certain intelligence activities against this country. The intelligence community felt that having to make a cutoff could in certain cases expose its state of knowledge about the activities of other countries and, more generally,

expose intelligence sources and methods. We reluctantly went along but will work with the intelligence committee and the administration to see if we cannot find another way to achieve this general goal.

We also include the Mica export promotion study language, as modified, the McInnis language on Korea, a new Hoke amendment calling for a report on compliance with the Missile Technology Control Regime, a modification of the Hoke amendment on OPIC, a modification of the Upton amendment providing for special treatment for foreign nationals who find a live MIA from the Vietnam or Korean conflicts—something we would all wish for. In addition, we include the Solomon amendment providing that interest earned on certain blocked assets be used to fund a rewards program for the arrest and conviction of international terrorists.

In response to concerns expressed after the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight held its hearings on voluntary separation payments, essentially contemporaneously with our consideration of this bill in our committee, we have stricken language authorizing such payments in this bill. I do hope and expect that as the administration puts together its plan effectuate our reform of the foreign affairs agencies, it will consider if voluntary separation payments are appropriate, and if they are will work closely with our committee and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and for my part I will sympathetically consider their views.

In terms of technical amendments, we strike a provision that inadvertently repealed provisions of laws under our jurisdiction relating to international environmental programs, and another provision that addresses administration concerns relating to the waiver and other special authorities provisions in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, in the time remaining, I would like to make a few more comments on the bill as a whole.

First, I want to thank my colleagues on the committee, and of the House, on both sides of the aisle, for their cooperation as we have moved this bill through its various stages, as well as the leadership, committee, and personal staffs who have worked on the bill. In addition, I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee of the Whole for the excellent manner in which he has presided over these extended deliberations.

Second, I want to point out that this bill has some things that everyone likes, and some things that some of us dislike intensely. We must look beyond to the details to the whole.

□ 1245

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GILMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, what we are doing in the overall bill is making fundamental needed reforms to the foreign policy establishment, reforms that this House voted for with a strong vote yesterday evening, in defeating the Ackerman amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are cutting our budget for the international affairs function in line with today's budget realities. We are setting forth policies that address important foreign policy problems, from terrorism to nuclear proliferation to the situation in Cuba.

We are doing both of these things in an effort that has earned the backing of groups as diverse as Citizens Against Government Waste and Americans for Tax Reform, from the Irish National Caucus and the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations to the Family Research Council and Phyllis Schlafley's Eagle Forum.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

And just one added note. In addition, language has been offered by another senior member of our committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], which is included, that would cut AID's operating expenses by an additional 15 percent above the 10 percent reduction in the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOYER TO THE
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOYER to the amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. GILMAN:

At the end of the amendment, add the following: In title XXVI (relating to foreign policy provisions) insert the following at the end of chapter 1:

SEC. 2604. BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA SELF-DEFENSE ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Bosnia and Herzegovina Self-Defense Act".

(b) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Serbian aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina continues into its third year, the violence has escalated and become widespread, and ethnic cleansing by Serbs has been renewed.

(2) It has been almost one year since the Bosnian Government unconditionally, and on time, accepted the "Contact Group" plan, which the Serb forces have rejected.

(3) The United Nations has failed to protect its declared safe havens from continuing and relentless Serbian aggression, and has failed to order North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) air strikes against Serb forces in retaliation for their attacks on Sarajevo, despite calls from its own field commander to do so.

(4) The United Nations Security Council has not considered a resolution providing for the multilateral termination of the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina, which would be the preferred course of action to allow that country to defend itself.

(5) The United Nations Security Council has not taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security in Bosnia and Herzegovina since the aggression against that country began in April 1992.

(6) For the reasons stated in section 520 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), the Congress has found that continued application of an international arms embargo to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina contravenes that Government's inherent right of individual or collective self-defense under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, and therefore is inconsistent with international law.

(c) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.—The Congress supports the efforts of the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina—

(1) to defend its people and the territory of the Republic;

(2) to preserve the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of the Republic; and

(3) to bring about a peaceful, just, fair, viable, and sustainable settlement of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(d) TERMINATION OF ARMS EMBARGO.—

(1) TERMINATION.—The President shall terminate the United States arms embargo of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina upon receipt from that Government of a request for assistance in exercising its right of self-defense under Article 51 of the United States Charter.

(2) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "United States arms embargo of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina" means the application to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina of—

(A) the policy adopted July 10, 1991, and published in the Federal Register of July 19, 1991 (58 FR 33322) under the heading "Suspension of Munitions Export Licensees to Yugoslavia"; and

(B) any similar policy applied by the United States Government as of the date of receipt of the request described in paragraph (1) pursuant to which approval is denied for transfers of defense articles and defense services to the former Yugoslavia.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be interpreted as authorization for deployment of United States forces in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina for any purpose, including training, support, or delivery of military equipment.

Mr. HOYER (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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. As I indicated to the gentleman last night, with the short period of time left for debate on this measure, I would think it would be more appropriate that we take this as a freestanding bill, and I assure the gentleman we will put this measure on at the earliest possible date next week in our committee so that it can move to the floor as rapidly as possible.

I think to try to compress the debate in the short period of time we have remaining on the floor today does a disservice to this very critical issue, and I would hope that the gentleman would consider at this point taking the meas-

ure off the floor and taking it up in full committee and getting it as a freestanding bill on the floor when we would all have an opportunity to extensive debate.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. He and I have discussed this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS], who wanted to be recognized initially on the en bloc amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the manager's amendment.

I oppose this amendment for three basic reasons.

First, the amendment includes bad policy language. It folds together several amendments that were printed in the RECORD that individually are objectionable.

On North Korea, OPIC, the International Parliamentary Union, U.N. command and control—the list goes on and on—the amendment takes United States policy in a bad direction.

Second, this amendment enables the bill manager to delete provisions of the current bill without any debate.

These same provisions were put in the bill without discussion and over the minority's objection.

The bill manager should have to stand up and explain to the House why a provision like that on espionage was included in the chairman's mark and the committee-passed bill, and why it is now being dropped.

These are not just technical corrections. They are U-turns in the road. The bill manager should explain his driving.

Third, I oppose this amendment on process grounds.

It contains several provisions that we start to see until yesterday, and in three cases, provisions that we received only late last night or early this morning: provisions on the environment, special authorities, MTCR verification, USIA programs, and overall funding for fiscal year 1988.

These amendments were never even filed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We haven't had adequate time to study these provisions. We don't know what they do. We don't know their implications. We shouldn't vote for provisions that many on both sides of the aisle have had no opportunity to review.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment states that the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina shall be lifted upon receiving a request from the Bosnian Government to do so.

I suggest there is no more important issue that confronts this country and the international community at this moment in time, in this moment in history, than does this issue.

Last year, with bipartisan support the House voted overwhelmingly to lift the U.N. embargo, an action designed to uphold Bosnia and Herzegovina's in-

herent and recognizable right of self-defense, as provided under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Following the House vote on June 9 last year, Bosnia accepted the contact groups, that is, Britain, France, Germany, Russia, and ourselves, plan after the group assured Bosnia that if the Serbs refused the plan, international sanctions against Serbia would be tightened, more efforts would be made to afford greater protection of safe areas by the United Nations, and ultimately the arms embargo would be lifted.

Mr. Chairman, I was at a meeting with the Bosnian President, President Izetbegovic, and Prime Minister Haris Silajdzic, and others, in Sarajevo, when it was announced Bosnia would accept the plan unconditionally. That acceptance, Mr. Chairman, was met by Serbia's ultimate rejection.

And what did the international community do? First, sanctions against Serbia were eased and safe areas were left abandoned to the wanton aggression of the Bosnian Serbs and, of course, Bosnia continues to fall victim to the arms embargo.

Well, Mr. Chairman, here we are 1 year later. And what has time brought the Bosnians? Nothing other than more deaths.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has expired.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have a number of amendments that are pending, but I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will be concerned about the time disbursement and the time other people are going to need to discuss other parts of the bill. I will not object, but I hope we do not see that go on any further.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am going to ask the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] if he would please consider other Members who want to debate other important issues and not take up a good portion of the remaining time of debate, and that is why I asked that you withdraw the amendment and give us a freestanding amendment, a freestanding measure later on next week, whenever we can get it to the floor.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my good friend.

There are a few Members on this floor for whom I have more respect. I want to tell the gentleman, with as much respect as I can, yesterday we

voted on an amendment. We had approximately 2½ hours, maybe longer, on the War Powers Act.

As the gentleman probably knows, I was one of the few Democrats who voted for the Hyde amendment. So I agreed with the proposition that the gentleman from Illinois raised. Nobody on this floor believes that if we consider the war powers amendment next week, the week after or 4 weeks from now, it would have made a whit of difference.

This amendment, for which time was not made available and which this Member had to go through a relatively strained parliamentary procedure to even get considered, at a time when people are dying in hostage, in a genocide, in a country that the international community has recognized, that the international community has said is subject to genocide and which this country, this country said is led by war criminals, Mr. Milosevic, Mr. Kradajic, Mr. Miladiz in Bosnian Serbia; our Secretary of State, Lawrence Eagleberger, under George Bush, leveled the charge and accusation they were war criminals.

I say with all due respect and affection to my good friend from New York, the chairman of the committee, I regret I have not had the opportunity even to present—

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection and just ask the sponsor of the measure to consider there are other Members who want to be heard.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Maryland has only requested the time, as I understand it, in order to make up for the time that the gentleman yielded so graciously to other Members, especially the gentleman from Florida, so that he could present in timely fashion the opposition to the en bloc amendment and, therefore, his time was used up.

I do not understand why anyone would make an objection to the gentleman now taking the time to explain the reason for his amendment, and so, the gentleman from Maryland, I think you have an amendment here that is one of the most important that we have faced this whole bill, this issue. Like you say, it is a question of genocide.

You know, we had a holocaust at one time in this world. Many people at that time said, "Never again, never again." But we are witnessing it today. We witnessed it for 3 years, and we have stood back and we have done nothing.

We are saying we do not want to do anything. We want to let it go on, just let them be killed, because they are not Americans, they are way over there in Bosnia.

So I think that the gentleman has a very good amendment, and I hope that the House will adopt his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for not objecting.

Mr. Chairman, here we are 1 year later, and what has time brought the Bosnians?

All of us know: Further deaths, further ethnic cleansing, further disruption to the democratically elected government.

□ 1300

For the aggressors however, Mr. Chairman, they just dug their trenches a little deeper. And the Bosnian Serbs upped the ante by taking more than 370 U.N. troops hostage. They released some, but they still hold others, and then, on last Friday they shot down a U.S. F-16 fighter. Thank God that he has now been retrieved. We thank the technology that allowed him to get out of that plane and to let us know where he was.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us be clear.

It is not just UNPROFOR that is being held hostage but the United Nations and NATO itself. A test of wills has been going on now for 3 years between the Bosnian Serbs, Milosevic, and the United Nations and NATO. The Serbs have won every time. And the world's most powerful collective institution is being rendered helpless.

On several occasions, we have witnessed Bosnia's aggressors stay their assaults at the prospect that Bosnia would be aided by the international community. But each time, Mr. Chairman, they have returned even more bold and resolute to try to finish their crime, the annihilation of an independent democratic, internationally recognized Bosnia, when the international community has failed to act decisively. The taking of UNPROFOR hostages is but the latest example of such boldness and of such contempt for the international community's lack of resolve.

Mr. Chairman, we in America have serious national interests in helping the people of Bosnia, which I think it very important to point out consists of Moslems, Croats, and Serbs.

First, this is a recognized member state of the United Nations. We have an interest as we did with Kuwait in seeing that it is not destroyed.

Second, we have an interest in stopping a genocide. Surely we do not want history to show that within years of one genocide we stood idly by while it was committed in Europe again?

Third, we have an interest in international norms and laws being upheld and ultimately respected. If not, why should any nation seek help from an international community that espouses rule by law yet acknowledges and ultimately respects rule by force.

Fourth, we have an interest in making sure that the carnage of Bosnia does not spread to other nations with

the real possibility of pitting NATO allies against each other.

I think it is also useful, Mr. Chairman, for us to take a moment to recall the actions that led up to the crisis with which we are now concerned. Those actions included:

First, the increasingly bold and unrelenting Serb violations of a heavy weapon exclusion zone;

Second, the shelling of Sarajevo;

Third, the carrying off with artillery pieces and a mortar out of a U.N.-NATO impoundment depot, and

Fourth, the ignoring of a U.N.-NATO ultimatum.

It was only then that NATO conducted an air raid. The Serbs retaliated by shelling 5 "safe-areas" in Bosnia killing 76 people. That triggered a second NATO strike on other pale ammunition dumps. The Serb response was to seize hundreds of members of U.N. peace-keeping forces and then to shoot down a United States fighter enforcing the no-fly zone.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that what we are encountering is similar to a scene dating back to the 1930's when another dictator sought to carve up a neighboring country in the name of ethnic unity. It occurred in Munich in 1938. It is appeasement.

At the outset of the crisis in Czechoslovakia one European leader remarked and I wish that everybody would listen to this, "How horrible, fantastic incredible it is that we should be digging trenches and tying on gas masks here because of a quarrel in a faraway country between people of whom we know nothing."

All of us, and particularly our fathers, and many who serve in this room, learned the lessons of that negligence.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that this House will repeat its message of 1993-94 and say that we are going to allow the Bosnians to have the right and ability to defend themselves from terrorists.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I have a first degree amendment, and I ask for a division of the question on the last part of Mr. GILMAN's amendment regarding AID and O&E cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will divide the question at the appropriate time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. This is going to be a very confusing period as we discuss and debate the chairman's mark because we are going to be talking about several different issues, and I would just like to point out that the gentleman's amendment is likely to pass. I voted for it, I believe, the last time. I think it will pass this time. Unfortunately this issue was not brought before the committee. Otherwise it probably would have been a part of the

entire debate, and it probably would have passed anyhow, and so I am just a little disappointed that this could not have been brought up as a separate issue. I do not have the time to yield, but I just say, I wish this wasn't in the mix right now because it is going to confuse a lot of people who are paying attention to the debate.

I had an amendment which was a freestanding amendment which is now part of the chairman's mark which will be voted on separately, which is confusing, which would cut the AID operating expenses. And AID last year got \$517.5 million to run its operation. This year it was increased to \$529 million. The chairman's mark reduced that down to \$465 or \$466 million, and what my amendment does is reduce it further, down to about \$400 million.

Now the reason that I propose this amendment is because \$400 million is more than enough money for the operating expenses of AID. We cut our staff here in the Congress by a third. What we are asking with my amendment is for AID to cut their staffs and their operating expenses by less than a fourth, and we think that is reasonable thing to do. If we can do it by a third, they can sure do it by less than a fourth.

Now I would also like to point out that AID has adopted the practice in my view of wasting money. I want to quote to my colleagues, and I hope they will pay particular attention to this if I might have everybody's attention. This is a memo that was sent out by the leadership of AID to many of their offices around the world. And I quote, I want to quote from, this inter-office memo which went around the world to many AID offices, and this is a quote from Sally Shelton, senior staffer at AID. She said:

Larry Burn, assistant administrator from management at AID, announced that AID was 62 percent through the fiscal year and we have 38 percent of the dollar volume of procurement actions completed. We need to do, and that means spend, we need to do \$1.9 billion in the next 5 months.

Burn also said, "There are large pockets of money in the field, so let's get moving."

So here was AID two-thirds of the way through their year saying they had only spent one-third of their budget so let us get on with spending more money so we can ask for more in the coming year.

This is a perfect example of bureaucrats trying to spend money as fast as they possibly can, even more than they should, so they can ask for more money in the next fiscal year.

In addition to that, there are some other items of waste that I would like to point out where AID is concerned:

In El Salvador, AID-sponsored economists helped organize a socialistic land reform program in the early 1980s that nationalized land holdings, banks and private export companies. After the U.S. had spent billions in El Salvador, former President Alfredo Cristiani commented that millions more would be needed "just to correct the damage done by U.S. assistance in nationalizing the economy."

So what AID did, the President down there said, was something that hurt them rather than help, and they spent millions and millions of dollars to do that.

After the Sandinistas lost the 1990 election, more than \$1 billion in direct and indirect U.S. aid flooded Nicaragua. Hundreds of millions of U.S. tax dollars were lost bailing out a corrupt banking system largely controlled by Sandinista bureaucrats and loan officers. Even today, this fiasco threatens Nicaragua's democracy.

In Burundi they spent \$7 million to buy a 1,000-acre farm to raise improved corn seed variety. This farm cost the American taxpayer \$7,000 an acre, and I want to tell my colleagues, in Burundi you can get it for practically nothing, which is an outrageously expensive price to pay for an acre of farmland on which you are growing corn.

The project turned out to be a complete disaster because AID located the farm near the President of Burundi's home village even though this was an area of the country with the worst soil. They were simply trying to placate the President's whimsical desire to have a fancy foreign aid project in his home village. Then it turned out after this \$7 million investment that there were no improved varieties of corn seed to be grown in Burundi because the ag research had never been done and I can go on and on and on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that AID, like every agency of Government, needs to be fiscally responsible. We have a huge national debt, we have huge deficits, and this House and the Senate are trying our dead level best to get control of runaway Government spending.

Here is an agency that has wasted money. I was a senior Republican on Africa for 10 years. I can tell my colleagues they wasted money in many countries over there. Some of the projects were good, but much of the money was wasted, and here we have, as I said before, a memo going out by the leadership in that agency saying that we have to spend money as fast as we possibly can because we are two-thirds of the way through our fiscal year and we have only spent one-third of our budget.

We need to send a message to AID. We cut back Congress by a third as far as our staffs were concerned. They can stand a 20- to 25-percent cut.

This is a good amendment which will save the taxpayers \$65 million, and once again I would like to say I am very sorry that this was incorporated into this debate that is taking place right now on Bosnia. That should be a separate debate at a separate time. Unfortunately this is not the case.

So, I hope my colleagues, when we get to this first degree amendment

which will be voted on separately later on, will see fit to support it because it is going to save the taxpayers \$65 million, it is going to downsize one of the biggest bureaucracies in Washington, and it would not hurt our foreign aid program one whit, and with that I would like to add also that there have been all kinds of atrocities in India that AID has seen fit to continue to support through our developmental assistance over there even though the Congress in the past has voted to cut that money off. AID, 2 years ago we were going to cut \$4 million in developmental assistance to India. AID overruled the elected Members of Congress and went ahead and sent that money, and that is another reason they need to receive a very strong message.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman:

You argue that this amendment would save money. Am I correct that AID would have to lay off at least half of their employees, and would that not be very costly in terms of retirement and all of the buyout benefits that come along with that in addition to the number of agencies that would be—

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me just say when we downsize Government there are going to be short-range problems, but long-term, long-term major cash savings, and I believe this amendment long term will save a great deal, more than the \$65 million that it will save initially, and I think that this is something the American people want us to do. They want to see us economizing Government and not continue to see runaway costs which have bankrupted this Nation, and so I think this amendment is a good one, and I hope my colleagues will see fit to vote for it.

BURTON AMENDMENT CUTS AID TO INDIA

WASHINGTON, DC.—Rep. Dan Burton (R-IN), Chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, today won approval of an amendment to the foreign aid bill which would dramatically cut aid to India and other countries that consistently oppose U.S. interests at the U.N.

By including developmental assistance to the list of aid programs which would be denied these countries, Burton's amendment puts some real teeth into the foreign aid bill. The bill, as reported by the International Relations Committee, ties U.S. economic assistance directly to the voting patterns of other countries at the U.N. If a country votes against the U.S. more than 75% of the time, it would be ineligible for economic support funds, International Military and Education Training (IMET) funds, and Foreign Military Financing, three relatively modest programs. The Burton Amendment adds Development Assistance, which is a more substantial program, to the list. For example, India which has voted against the U.S. more than any other country, from 81% to 95% of the time would lose \$70.4 million in developmental assistance and \$364,000 in IMET funds next year alone.

"This is American taxpayers' money we are talking about here. There is no reason

for us to be giving American money to countries who do not support our policies. I don't think it's unreasonable to expect countries who receive our assistance to vote with us 25% of the time. Most countries who do not support the U.S. in the U.N. are noted human rights violators, such as Cuba, Sudan, North Korea, Iran, and India. We should not be supporting countries like this," said Burton after the debate.

Burton has been a consistent critic of India's human rights record, speaking frequently about torture and extrajudicial killings of Sikhs in Punjab, Muslims in Kashmir, and Christians in Nagaland. During debate today, he spoke passionately on the House floor about India's long record of abuses.

All major human rights groups have condemned India as one of the most notorious human rights violators in the world. It is no surprise that India almost always votes against the U.S. at the U.N. According to Asia Watch, "Virtually everyone detained in Punjab is tortured." Amnesty International says, "Torture (in Punjab and Kashmir) and ill treatment is widespread and in some cases systematic, resulting in scores of deaths in police custody." Even our own State Department reported, "Over 41,000 cash bounties were paid to police in Punjab for extrajudicial killings of Sikhs between 1991 and 1993." This month in Kashmir, Indian troops burned to the ground a centuries-old mosque and hundreds of Muslim homes in the neighborhoods surrounding it.

"It is absolutely grotesque and inhumane to torture human beings in any way, but the government of India makes it a routine practice. There are certain standards to which we should hold countries who receive U.S. aid, and India is no exception. I believe we should cut ALL aid to India until they quit their murderous reign of terror in Punjab and Kashmir, and start supporting U.S. policies at the U.N.," said a determined Burton.

The foreign aid bill does not cut money from humanitarian food aid, international narcotics control, or antiterrorism programs, even in countries which are effected by the substantial cuts.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN INDIA AT A GLANCE

Disregard for Religious Sites and Figures

May 1995—Indian troops in Kashmir burn to the ground the centuries-old walnut wood mosque in Charar-e-Sharies, along with hundreds of homes around it.

December 1992—Hindu mobs destroy the historic Babri Mosque in Ayodhya as Indian troops stand by and watch.

December 1992—Gurdev Singh Kaonke, one of the most revered leaders of the Sikh religion, is arrested, tortured and killed in police custody.

June 1984—Indian soldiers launch an all out attack on the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the holiest shrine of the Sikh religion. 38 other temples throughout Punjab are attacked, killing thousands of Sikhs.

What Human Rights Groups Say

Asia Watch: "Virtually everyone detained in Punjab is tortured."

Amnesty International: "Torture (in Punjab and Kashmir) and illtreatment is widespread and in some cases systematic, resulting in scores of deaths in police custody."

State Department Human Rights Report (1994): Over 41,000 cash bounties were paid to police in Punjab for extrajudicial killings of Sikhs between 1991 and 1993.

Graphic Examples of Torture and Murder, Punjab and Kashmir

Extrajudicial murders of Sikh youth are a common occurrence. Between 1986 and 1994, 6,017 unidentified Sikh victims of Indian police were cremated in the District of Amritsar alone. There are 13 districts in Punjab. It has been estimated that security forces have had over 25,000 unidentified Sikhs cremated or dumped in rivers during this period.

In January 1995, the water level of the Sirhind Canal was lowered for repair work. One dozen bodies of young Sikh torture victims were found at the bottom of just one short section of the canal with their hands and feet bound. There are hundreds of miles of canals throughout the province.

In January 1993, Indian paramilitary forces in Kashmir burnt to death at least 65 Kashmiri civilians in the town of Sopore. Soldiers deliberately set fire to five separate areas of the town. They also dragged shopkeepers out of their shops and shot them in the streets. The torching of entire Kashmiri villages by Indian forces is a common tactic.

In 1994, Sikh activist Kanwar Singh Dhama was imprisoned along with his pregnant wife and son. He and his wife were tortured in front of each other. When the police were unable to extract an untrue confession from Mr. Dhama, they hung his wife up by her heels (she was six months pregnant) forcing her to have a miscarriage.

In Amritsar district in 1993, Indian police brought a Sikh youth they had tortured and thought was dead to the hospital for an autopsy. After the police left, the doctors discovered that the young man was miraculously still alive and revived him. The police returned several hours later after hearing that the man was alive. They took him out of the hospital, killed him again, and brought him back to the same hospital for his autopsy.

DON'T SUPPORT INDIAN TYRANNY WITH AMERICAN TAX DOLLARS—VOTE FOR THE BURTON AMENDMENT TO CUT AID TO INDIA

Here are some relevant facts about India and Indian-occupied Khalistan:

India votes against the United States at the United Nations 84 percent of the time, more than any other U.S. aid recipient.

India is helping Iran build up its military arsenal.

Human Rights Violations

Indian newspapers recently reported that 25,000 Sikhs were either cremated as "unclaimed bodies" or thrown in canals and rivers.

The White Paper on State Terrorism in Punjab cites S.S. Ray, Indian Ambassador to the U.S., as the "butcher of Bengal" and the "butcher of Punjab."

Over 41,000 cash bounties were paid to police officers for killing Sikhs, according to the US State Dept.

Over 120,000 Sikhs killed since 1984.

Over 150,000 Christians killed since 1947. Over 43,000 Kashmiri Muslims killed since 1988.

Tens of thousands more languish in Indian prisons without charge or trial.

Amnesty International reports hundreds of Sikhs have disappeared.

Asia Watch reports "virtually everyone detained in Punjab is tortured."

Police operate over 200 torture centers (police stations) in Punjab, Khalistan.

Police routinely pick up Sikh youths and demand ransom of tens of thousands of rupees for their safe release. Otherwise, the youths are tortured and killed.

Sikhs who die of torture are listed as being killed in an "encounter" with the police.

Despite the recent repeal of TADA, the other "Black Laws", giving the regime sweeping powers to detain anyone for any reason and kill Sikhs without fear of persecution, remain on the books.

India has not allowed Amnesty International to conduct an independent human-rights investigation in Punjab, Khalistan, since 1978.

India recently attacked an ancient mosque in Kashmir which houses the mausoleum of the venerated Sheik Nooruddin Wali. In December 1992, Hindus destroyed the Babri mosque in Ayodhya.

In June 1984, India attacked the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the holiest shrine of the Sikh Nation.

The *Chicago Tribune* reports that a nun was stabbed 36 times by right-wing Hindu fundamentalists. By these actions, India displays its religious intolerance.

The Indian newspaper *Hitavada* reported in November that the late Governor of Punjab, Surendra Nath, was paid \$1.5 billion by the Indian regime to foment terrorism in Punjab, Khalistan, and in Kashmir.

The State Department says that the human-rights situation is getting worse.

India's Nuclear Threat to World Peace

India has recently announced successful tests of the Akash antiballistic missile, India's equivalent of the Patriot.

India has deployed Prithvi missiles, which have a range of 250 kilometers, on the Pakistani border and has successfully tested other missiles like Agni, Trishul, etc.

Last year, India launched the Polar Satellite Launch Vehicle, which can be made to carry nuclear warheads.

India spends over 20% of its research and development budget on the development of nuclear weapons. Only 2% goes to education and health.

Khalistan's Right to Self-Determination

No Sikh has ever signed the Indian constitution.

The Sikh leadership declared Khalistan independent on October 7, 1987.

The movement to liberate Khalistan is peaceful, democratic, and nonviolent.

Former Member of Parliament Simranjit Singh Mann has been held in a windowless cell for four months for the "crime" of *speaking out* for Khalistan.

The Supreme Court of India ruled that asking for Khalistan is not a crime.

According to *India Abroad*, 96 percent of the Sikhs in Punjab, Khalistan did not vote in India's February 1992 elections there.

India has 500,000 troops in Punjab, occupied Khalistan, alone—more than Britain had in the entire subcontinent during its rule.

Khalistan, Kashmir, and Nagaland continue to be denied their right to self-determination.

India has 18 official languages. It is a polyglot like the former Soviet Union. It is not one country.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me first of all say that I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. I think it is very shortsighted, but I want to address the issue that my friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], mentioned with respect to Bosnia.

Mr. Chairman, after 3 years of all out war in Bosnia, and more than 200,000 people killed and 16,000 children slaughtered, and after 2 million people have been left homeless, and countless tens of thousands of women and girls have been raped, we are once again on this floor today debating whether or not the United States of America should take action in Bosnia.

□ 1315

Once again, Mr. Chairman, there are those who say we cannot lift the arms

embargo because it will involve us directly in the war. But let us be honest, Mr. Chairman. We are already involved in this war. By keeping this embargo in place for so long, not only have we denied the Bosnian people the very weapons they need to personally defend themselves, we have helped tilt the balance of the war in favor of Serbian aggression. In doing so, we have become unwitting accomplices to a mass genocide of more than 200,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no more excuses, there can be no more second guessing. It is time that we lift this embargo once and for all.

Now, over the past 3 years we have seen two dozen cease-fires come and go. We have seen the peace process start, stall, countless times. We have watched Serbs break agreement after agreement after agreement. We have seen NATO warnings issued and ignored. And the one constant through it all has been the absolute unwillingness of the West to take meaningful steps to stop the slaughter in Bosnia.

The greatest sin, Mr. Chairman, is not that we simply turned our backs. The greatest sin in Bosnia is that time and time again we have raised the hopes of the Bosnian people that the cavalry was on its way, and time and again we have not delivered.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Bosnia deserve better than this. If we are not going to stop the slaughter, if we are not going to strike back at the Serbs, if we are not going to defend Bosnia, then we should keep United States troops out and we should lift the arms embargo right away. If we are not going to defend Bosnia, then we have no right to continue to deny them the right to defend themselves.

By passing this amendment today, we will simply extend to the Bosnian people the right which is guaranteed to every other sovereign nation under the U.N. charter, and that is the right of self-defense, and even the more fundamental right to self-determination.

To those who would argue and say that lifting the embargo will disrupt the peace process. I say what peace process? There is no peace process to keep in Bosnia right now. Lifting the arms embargo will not weaken the peace process, it will strengthen it. The reason peace talks have failed the past 3 years is because the Serbs have no reason to negotiate. They faced no real opposition on the battlefield, although the Bosnian Moslems are waging a heroic battle with limited means. But they face no real opposition and they have no incentive to stay at the negotiating table as a result of that.

Only when the Serbs are certain that the Bosnians can defend themselves will they realize that further aggression will really get them nowhere, and only then, Mr. Chairman, will we have a real chance for peace in Bosnia.

Mr. Chairman, if we had been courageous in our approach on this most difficult issue from the very beginning at the beginning of this decade, we would

not be in this situation we are in today. The very least we can do today is to lift the arms embargo, because if we do not lift this embargo and at least let the people of Bosnia defend themselves, then the blood of Bosnia is not just on the hands of the Serbs, but is on all of us.

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

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to real briefly ask one question: If the Bosnia amendment passes, as I believe it will, will the gentleman from Michigan vote for the bill?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, there are too many other things in the bill I will not support.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. What is the purpose of the debate?

Mr. BONIOR. The purpose is to get out to the American people that what we are doing in Bosnia is not in the best interests of peace in Europe, Bosnia, or international relations with the United States. It seems to me that we cannot stand by and watch as 200,000 people be made homeless, as 16,000 children are slaughtered, and tens of thousands of countless women are raped.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BONIOR was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BONIOR. We have an obligation, and the purpose seems to me, as my friend from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has stated, is to let these people defend themselves.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to make the point that we on the Committee on International Operations agreed to give the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] a free-standing hearing next week on his bill, which probably would have passed and been brought to the floor and passed.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I have heard that argument three times on the floor. The problem with that argument, I say to my friend from Indiana, is this: That while the committee may do that, while the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] may be in favor of doing that, the majority leader on the other side of the aisle is opposed to what we are going here. It is my opinion that would not see the light of day.

Mr. BURTON. If the gentleman will yield further, the fact of the matter is if you vote against it after the amendment passes, you have not accomplished a thing, whereas if you waited and brought the bill up as a freestanding bill, it would pass.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I could not

live with myself and continue to serve in the Congress if I did not speak on this amendment. I would not deserve to have the right to serve in this body.

I have visited Yugoslavia three times. The first time with the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH, who will speak in support of it. We were in Vukovar when the Serbs were bombing Vukovar, and we went down in the cellars and saw the people who told us that their families had been slaughtered. Slaughtered. They had no weapons to defend themselves. Now Vukovar will go down in the history of Yugoslavia as a place that will be like somewhere unbelievable in their history.

Second, we went back one other time on a CSCE trip. We went into Mostar. In east Mostar the Croats and then the Serbs have been bombing and bombing. Here is a picture of a young lady, if the cameras and Members can pick it up, that will show that she was in a hospital, with no medicine, nothing at all to take care of her.

We were in a prison camp run by the Serbs. The Moslems used to go around like this with their heads down, and they could not come up and look you in the eye. If they did, they hollered at them, they shouted at them. That will stick in my mind forever.

I have seen these things. It is not something I read about in the Washington Post or the Times. This is not something that I saw on Peter Jennings. This is something I saw with my own eyes.

Now, the close is this: We do not want to send American troops there. I do not want to send American troops there. I do not believe there are many people here who want to send American troops there. So if you are not going to send American troops, should you not give the Bosnians, the Moslems, and also the Croats the opportunity to defend themselves? Their moms and dads are being killed.

Imagine, put yourself in their role. There you are in a little village of east Mostar. The murderers are coming in. Your wife is in the basement, your children are down in the basement, maybe your mom is, and you cannot defend yourself. You know NATO is not coming in. You do not want the United States to send troops in. All you want is for the arms embargo to be lifted, whereby you can defend yourself.

I have been in the Holocaust Museum over Christmas. I took my family. We saw the letters where during World War II people said no, these things were not happening. Believe me slaughter and genocide are occurring.

The gentleman from Michigan mentioned rape. We had hearings in the Helsinki Commission that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] can talk about, 20,000 women have been raped.

This is a good amendment. It is a good amendment on this bill. It is a good amendment on any bill. It is an amendment that will send a message,

so when they listen on their little crystal radio sets tonight or tomorrow, they will hear that the U.S. Congress has voted to lift the arms embargo, to stand with them. If this amendment passes, believe me, I do not know how I am going to vote on this bill. I am going back and forth. But if this amendment passes, boy, I will support this bill with greater vigor.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted the gentleman to yield to compliment him on his statement and associate myself with the comments that he has made. I enjoyed my service on the CSCE with him. We had been to Yugoslavia and seen firsthand. It is interesting to point out as we are debating the issue here, the Prime Minister of Bosnia is testifying before the Helsinki Commission as to the necessity to remove the arms embargo now. By enforcing the arms embargo, we are violating international law. We must give the people the right to defend themselves. I compliment the gentleman on his statement.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say first of all that I appreciate the frustration that lives at the basis of the comments of many of my colleagues who favor the Hoyer amendment. I do not favor it and am going to state the case against it. But I fully understand the frustrations involved. Let me give you several reasons why I think lifting this embargo at this time is a very dangerous move.

First of all, we are at an extremely delicate time. We have 150 hostages being held, the war is intensifying in Bosnia, the war is threatened to be broadened in Croatia, and it is at an extremely delicate point. This vote in this House is going to be construed as a vote to intensify the war. I think the proponents of the war do not really deny that. 150 hostages' lives are on the line, and we vote in this House to intensify the war. Think of that for a moment.

Now, second, there is no doubt what follows after we vote to lift, if we did lift unilaterally. And what follows is an Americanization of the war. A unilateral lifting of the embargo will put 25,000 American troops into Bosnia. There is not any doubt about that. Our allies, who are now conducting UNPROFOR, have made it very clear to use they are pulling out, and the President of the United States has said when UNPROFOR pulls out, we are going to go in. And we are going to go in. We have the commitment. There is no doubt about that commitment.

So the impact of lifting the embargo is 25,000 American troops go into Bosnia. We then will become responsible for humanitarian services. We will become responsible for protecting

the Bosnian civilians. That is the result, and it is not in doubt. Lift the embargo unilaterally and we are committed to go in. The British and the French and all the others pull out. We are sitting there, we have got to protect the Bosnian civilians, we have got to deliver the humanitarian services.

Next: Nobody addresses the financial consequences of this. The Defense Department has said that if you are going to level the playing field it is going to take \$1 billion by conservation estimates. People just ignore that. We are going to have to supply those arms. The Bosnian Government cannot pay for it. Nobody is talking about stepping up here to the bar and putting \$1 billion on the line, but that is the consequence of a unilateral lift.

Nobody talks about the problems of delivery. How do you get these arms in? In order for the arms to go in, they have got to go, if they go by land or sea, through Croatia or through Serbia. How does that happen? They are going to have something to say about it, and they are probably going to take a good many of the arms. If you do it by air, all the airfields are in range of the Serbian gunners. So the problem of delivery is a serious one.

Likewise, the problems of training. These are big guns. That is what the Bosnians need. They do not know how to use these weapons. Who is going to teach them? We are going to have to teach them. Where are you going to teach them? You are going to teach them on the ground, in Bosnia. American troops in Bosnia on the ground training them.

Now, another problem with this is the impact on our allies. None of our allies support a unilateral lift of the embargo so far as I know, save one, Turkey. The United Kingdom is against it, France is against it, Canada is against it, the Netherlands is against it, Germany is against it, Spain is against it, Belgium is against it, Denmark is against it. They are all against it, and they are the ones that have troops on the ground whose lives will be at risk when we unilaterally lift the embargo.

We see the unilateral lifting of the embargo as a kind of risk-free solution. It will solve the war. We will not injure any Americans. But, my friends, that is not what is going to be what happens. We are going to have troops on the ground, and enormous strains will develop between the United States and its allies in NATO. I do not know of any expert, military or diplomatic, who favors a unilateral lift of the embargo.

□ 1330

I have listened to testimony on this and briefings over and over again. Talk to our Pentagon people; talk to our diplomats. They will tell you that the result of lifting this embargo unilaterally is to put Americans right in the hottest war in the world today. It is a very, very unwise move.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

To say that the debate on the floor is somewhat discombobulated on this particular amendment I think would be an understatement. We have three amendments here. We have the Hoyer amendment, the Burton amendment and the manager's amendment.

Let me just say that I think the Hoyer amendment is a good amendment. I do not agree that if we lift the embargo we are putting in American troops. I think that is really stretching the argument. I think the reason that we have to lift the embargo is because we have to allow people to defend themselves and basically that is what I see this amendment doing.

But there is another provision here that we are debating. That is the Burton amendment. I want to look at the facts of that amendment, because it is extremely important to this House. But before I do, my friend here has been waiting to say a word.

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

Mr. ROTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CREMEANS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the foreign aid package we have before us today. This is a good bill, and I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and his committee for their hard work on this legislation.

We have made and we are going to make a lot of tough choices on the road to balancing the Federal budget. I could not go home to southern Ohio and explain budget reductions that affect the people there without first cutting the funds we have sent abroad. This is a good bill.

I support the foreign aid package we have before us today. This is a good bill and I congratulate Chairman GILMAN and his committee for their hard work on this legislation.

We have made, and are going to make, a lot of tough choices on the road to balancing the Federal budget. I could not go home to southern Ohio and explain budget reductions that effect the people there, without first cutting the funds we send abroad. This is a good bill.

I would however like to say that I understand that in a post-cold-war era, Radio Free Europe should and must be cut back. But I strongly oppose its outright elimination. The committee bill cuts the program from \$230 million a year to \$75 million a year. That's a 70-percent cut. It's worth saving, and \$75 million will keep it alive.

I've been to Eastern Europe and I've heard the broadcasts. In some countries its still the only independent, uncensored news available.

Former Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick said, "I think it is an important mistake to eliminate U.S. support for the freedom radios. They are the best purveyors of the message of freedom, the cheapest, safest, and most effective instrument of foreign policy." I could not agree with her more.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and reclaim the balance of my time.

Let us look at the facts behind the Burton amendment, because this is a

key amendment to this bill. Over the past 10 years, AID has become a bloated bureaucracy by anyone's estimation, including GAO and every other agency that has ever looked at what goes on in AID, including this Congress. In 1985, their programs cost \$9.8 billion. That was 10 years ago. Today these programs are down to \$7.5 billion. That is a \$2.3 billion drop. That is a 23 percent reduction in what AID's programs are costing.

But look at what is happening to administrative costs. That is what the Burton amendment is addressing. The AID bureaucracy has received an increase in salary, travel, office supplies by some 41 percent. In 1985, we were spending \$393 million in administrative costs. Now they are receiving \$556 million. That is an increase of 41 percent in their administrative costs. That is what we mean by bloated bureaucracy. The programs go down but the agency's costs for salaries and travel go up by 41 percent.

What the Burton amendment does is cut it down, not by 41 percent, but by 25 percent. And that is certainly going in the right direction.

AID is a smaller agency in programs but costs 40 percent more to run. That is why this is such an important amendment. I am asking Members to vote for it.

This is the right amendment. This issue of what it costs to run this agency is a classic picture of an inefficient bureaucracy, or a bureaucracy run amok. The AID bureaucracy is asking this year, with all the increases they got in administrative costs, they are asking for \$11.5 million more so they can all fly first class around the country and around the world.

It is time that we cut back on the administrative costs. This committee bill that we have before us makes a modest cut of 10 percent for the next 2 years. What the Burton amendment is saying is to cut it back by 25 percent. Remember, they have a 41-percent operating cost increase, while the programs have dropped by 23 percent. So it is a huge increase, even with the Burton amendment.

There is a huge amount, \$556 million. If you cut it by \$90 million, you are still at \$466 million. In 1985, when this agency was spending \$2 billion more and had many more programs, they were spending on administration costs \$393 million. So we still see increases for administration, while we have seen cutbacks in the programs by \$2 billion.

It does not make sense, does it? That is why this particular amendment is a good amendment. This amendment is only a modest reduction. If you are interested in putting the taxpayers first, if you want to cut waste and if you believe in shrinking the bureaucracy, then this vote on the Burton amendment is a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. ROTH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman know of any State Department employee who flies first class, who has flown first class in a commercial airline in this administration?

Mr. ROTH. I will not name any by name. I am more responsible than that. But call down at the State Department. They will probably give you an entire list.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, no one flies first class.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, the manager's amendment incorporates a provision which I had filed as a separate amendment. Let me commend Chairman GILMAN for including this provision.

My amendment injects some real savings into the reorganization plan. It requires that a 20-percent reduction be made in the functions that are folded into the State Department.

This reduction would be in effect for at least 2 fiscal years.

This provision insures that we will get savings from this reorganization, when it occurs in 1998 and 1999.

Without this provision, we are not assured of any savings.

This provision rectifies that problem and improves the bill.

Let me also take this opportunity to describe a provision which was incorporated in the en bloc amendment, adopted last night. This provision, which I had filed as a separate amendment, requires an annual assessment of the impact of U.S. foreign policy on our trade posture and our competitive position in global markets. In 1988, Congress enacted a similar requirement, as part of the Trade Act, however the provision "sunsetting" last year and is no longer in effect.

My amendment expands on that 1988 law, by requiring that we look at our overall competitive position.

This amendment is important because we in the Congress must begin considering how our foreign policy affects our ability to compete.

In today's world, our national security depends as much on our economic strength as on our military might. In our Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, we will use this report as the basis for increased oversight on how foreign policy affects trade.

Finally, let me register my concern over another provision—which authorizes the President to sell off the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

My understanding is that this does not in any way require the sale—it merely authorizes it.

Last year, Congress reauthorized OPIC for 2 years. Our Subcommittee on Economic Policy is scheduled to consider OPIC next year. OPIC has \$10 billion outstanding in loans, guarantees and insurance policies. Most of these commitments are for 20 years, and the Government cannot cancel them without jeopardizing the full faith and credit of the United States.

Against these liabilities, OPIC has \$2.3 billion in reserves—on deposit in the U.S. Treasury.

OPIC pays for itself, and it even makes money—last year earning \$161 million. Even though OPIC is subject to annual appropriations, it does not use any taxpayer money.

In effect, the Appropriations Committee controls how OPIC uses its own money. The

Reagan administration studied whether OPIC could be privatized—most recently in 1987—and the conclusion at the time was that no one in the private sector would buy it.

It may be time to study this again, but we must not pre-judge the feasibility of making this sale.

This provision should not be taken by anyone as a congressional policy. The truth is, we simply do not know yet what the impact would be of selling OPIC. Therefore, this provision is included in the manager's amendment with this understanding.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, we are actually debating three amendments, and I would like to speak on all three.

First of all, with regard to the Burton amendment to cut AID, I strongly, strongly oppose it. Cutting AID any further, and we are cutting it enough in this bill, would in my opinion render AID much less effective. It would be simply a matter of being penny wise and pound foolish. If we are going to lead in the world, then we have to have a strong AID program. So I oppose the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The chairman's amendment, the manager's amendment, I oppose that as well, primarily because in the amendment we are withdrawing from the Inter-Parliamentary Union. Let me tell Members what that means.

I want to read the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] with regard to the Inter-Parliamentary Union. It says the act entitled An Act to Authorize Participation by the United States in the Inter-Parliamentary Union approved June 28, 1935 is repealed.

Now, we have participated in the Inter-Parliamentary Union for 60 years. The Inter-Parliamentary Union is a group of parliaments from all over the world, 135 countries, which get together to discuss parliamentary democracy and other concerns around the world.

Is this the time that we ought to be withdrawing from such an organization? To me, as so much else in this bill, this amendment is yet another indication of the dangerous and growing isolationist wave engulfing the Republican Party. The United States is the leader of the Free World and we ought to lead.

The IPU is the only global international parliamentary organization to which the U.S. Congress belongs. We have forums who meet on NATO and CSCE, colleagues, but the IPU is the only parliamentary organization in which we have a chance to meet with members of the Middle East, including Israel, Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

And like most international parliamentary organizations, the great utility of the IPU lies not in its resolutions or debates but in the forum it provides for Members of Congress to interact and make direct contacts with

prominent parliamentarians from around the world. From personal experience, I have been to IPU meetings, and what we get in interchange of ideas and talking is certainly an enhancement of democracy.

This summer the United Nations is celebrating its 50th anniversary, and in New York City there will be commemorations and celebrations, and the IPU is taking the lead. Is this the year the United States ought to withdraw from the Inter-Parliamentary Union when we are celebrating our own country, the establishment of the United Nations and the establishment of the victory in World War II over fascism and the establishment of democracy, when countries are knocking down the door to try to be more democratic and emulate the United States? We are going to withdraw from the world. We are going to pull away. I can think of nothing that is really more ridiculous.

One hundred thirty-five countries participate. The United States is now going to join Upper Volta or some other country in not participating. We really ought to wake up. It may sound good but it is not something that is in the best interests of this country. So I am opposed to the chairman's, the manager's amendment.

I want to speak briefly on the Hoyer amendment and Bosnia. There are some of us who for the past 3 years have been arguing for a lifting of the arms embargo. Every time we get to the floor and we are able to bring forward some kind of resolution, we are always hearing the argument that we should not get involved. What has happened every time we plead? A year passes by, months pass by, more people are killed, more people are raped, more injustice has been heaped upon genocide, heaped upon a people. And yet the world wrings its hands.

In my opinion, we ought to get the British and the French and everybody else out of there and let the Bosnians defend themselves. That is all they are asking. They are asking not for American troops. They are asking for the arms to defend themselves. How can we just sit by and allow genocide to happen again on the continent of Europe? I do not understand it.

Diplomatic niceties are passed; 3 years ago, they passed. We said this 3 years, 2 years ago, last year and now, and nothing has happened. And if the events of the past several weeks have taught us nothing, I do not know how we ever learned from history.

The Serbs are arrogant. They thumb their nose; they care not about what the international community thinks. They have made a shambles out of NATO. They have made us look like fools. They have made our allies look like fools. Yet we stand by and say, no, no, no, we do not want to give the Bosnian Moslems a chance to defend themselves. Is it because they are Moslems? They are people. Give them the chance to defend themselves. That is all they are asking, and I commend the

gentleman from Maryland for his amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. He is a valued member of our committee.

He is the chair of our Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere and has been performing an important function in that area. I regret that I cannot support his amendment. The bill before us already cuts AID operating expenses by \$52 million in fiscal year 1996 and another \$98 million in fiscal year 1997.

The cuts in the bill already forces reductions in over 1,000 AID employees. This amendment is somewhat like firing the assembly line workers when the cars are only half built. Personnel reductions, if they are to improve efficiency, must be done in a deliberate and a planned manner.

While I strongly am in favor of reducing the budget and did so in the bill, the cuts outlined here would devastate our programs while saving only a small amount.

The amendment does not make exceptions for staff supporting Russian disarmament programs, disaster relief or aid to starving people. Accordingly, I urge a "no" vote on the Burton amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. First of all, I would like to say that I support the Hoyer Amendment. I applaud the gentleman for offering it, and I support it wholeheartedly.

As much as I would like to support my friend from Indiana, and I appreciate his intent to downsize our foreign aid programs, and I share that intent. His amendment unfortunately is just too extreme. The Burton amendment would cut 25 percent from the operating expenses of AID. A cut of that magnitude would almost certainly result in a shutdown of the agency by next summer or perhaps earlier. That means the child survival programs, disaster assistance and food aid program would be halted before the end of the year.

Shutting down operations would not allow AID to oversee and implement the \$8 billion in funds obligated but not yet expended. It could lead to tremendous waste and abuse, which is exactly what the gentleman from Indiana does not want to happen.

The agency has already made major cuts in its staffing. The 8,750 on-board work force level planned for October 1, 1996 is 18 percent below the level at the end of fiscal year 1993.

More personnel cuts can and will be made, but such cuts need to be made and they will be made.

Whatever one thinks of foreign aid, it would be irresponsible to force such a draconian cut in the personnel account of this agency. We have a responsibility to the taxpayers to ensure that the funds we appropriate for the government programs are properly disbursed and that adequate oversight is provided. I believe no matter how well-intentioned, this amendment is short-sighted and counterproductive and I urge the defeat of the Burton amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the Burton amendment.

□ 1345

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to the Burton amendment. While I have the utmost respect for my colleague on the International Relations Committee, and I believe that his amendment is truly well-intentioned, I think the amendment is short-sighted and counter-productive. Rather than streamline AID, the Burton amendment will undermine its ability to implement the activities that we in Congress have authorized. It will also destroy the reforms that AID has already implemented toward cost-cutting and program effectiveness.

In 1992, President George Bush appointed George Ferris to head a Commission on the Management of AID. It was Ferris, a Republican appointee, who said, "We know of no other agency that has increased its effectiveness to the degree that Brian Atwood has brought change and reform in AID. * * * What has been accomplished at AID should serve as an example for other departments and agencies of the Federal Government."

If I understand my colleague from Indiana, these cuts will save the taxpayers money without harming our foreign policy and development goals. I disagree. To accommodate such drastic cuts, AID would have to lay off almost one-half of its direct-hire staff in the next year, which would force the agency to spend most of its remaining resources in contract termination costs, lease buyouts, transportation home for personnel, and on mandatory retirement and separation benefits which would have to be paid under the Foreign Service and Civil Service Acts.

By mandating such drastic cuts in such a short time frame, this amendment would actually add millions of dollars to the cost of streamlining and downsizing our foreign aid programs. These cuts would force the agency to close down more than 20 overseas missions in addition to the 25 that they have already begun to close. This would force us to make impossible choices. Will we support new democracies or child survival programs? Foreign aid used to be writing checks to governments. But in recent years we have weaned ourselves off of direct payments, and have focused on helping

nations develop from the grassroots up. This policy shift was, correctly, mandated by Congress. I believe that most AID programs are an effective use of a very small amount of our taxpayers dollars. AID-backed training programs can stabilize new democracies in Latin America, and prevent famines in Africa. These are honorable goals which we must support. Therefore, I oppose the Burton amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my remaining time I wish to make an admission. That is that, No. 1, I supported the measure by my friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], last year, and I feel that it has great currency this year. However, the ranking member of this committee has very carefully pinpointed those areas of vital concern that all of us here should have. It is not that we do not recognize the horror and destruction that is going on in Bosnia. It is that there is at this time an increase in the UNPROFOR troops in that area. In addition thereto, the United Nations has ongoing discussions with all of our allies in that locale.

The day before yesterday the Prime Minister of Hungary visited this august body, and some of us who met with him are mindful of his entreaty that we not do anything to exacerbate conditions there.

Mr. Chairman, I understand where the gentleman from Maryland is coming from, and all of my colleagues and I stand with him and take no back seat to any Member in this House in being diametrically opposed to the continuing slaughter going on in Bosnia. However, we need a careful and reasoned approach, and not just something thrown together in just a few minutes in order for us to be able to arrive at such conclusions as we help our administration, that we help our allies, and that we help ourselves come to an understanding.

There are no good solutions in Bosnia. I defy any man or woman of this House to come forward and say that they have the answer, and anyone that did have the answer would want to utilize it most immediately.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the manager's bill, I urge defeat of the foreign aid bill, I urge the defeat of the bill of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], and the defeat of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the American Overseas Interest Act and the manager's amendment to this bill. In the midst of the dire fiscal situation in which our Nation now exists, this bill, and in particular, this amendment that I helped craft, begin to set a course in the right direction—to cut back spending and address the problems that come with a \$200 billion deficit and steadily expanding national debt.

This Nation is drowning in a sea of red ink. Each day we are passing on to

the next generation a growing \$4.8 trillion national debt. Last November, the American people spoke in clear terms that passing on massive bills to our children and grandchildren is simply not acceptable. This new Congress heard their voices and during the first 100 days we passed legislation that represented a change from business as usual—an end to the tax-and-spend policies of the past.

The American Overseas Interest Act continues this trend to cut back on Government spending. This bill eliminates three agencies and consolidates their operations into the State Department, eliminating 4,000 positions over 2 years. This bill saves the American taxpayer \$21 billion over 7 years—a cut of between 15 and 20 percent from current levels—and conforms to the budget requirement that balances the Federal budget in 7 years. This is the first authorization bill we have had of this nature in 10 years. This bill cuts \$2.1 billion over fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997, and continues to reduce spending in subsequent years.

Clearly we are on the right track to reduce spending.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support the manager's amendment, because it goes further and explores areas where additional cuts have to be made. My amendment, which is part of the manager's amendment, says "Let us take a look at all programs," including the cultural and educational exchange programs, the vast majority of which are worthwhile.

However, Mr. Chairman, the issue is not one of merit but of cost. Can we afford current spending levels, given the massive debt this Nation has incurred?

As a part of this amendment, I have proposed additional reductions in the U.S. Information Agency cultural and educational programs. Specifically, we would save the American taxpayer an additional \$10 million in fiscal year 1996 and another \$10—half coming from Fulbright scholarships and half from the other exchanges. The effects of these savings would be to reduce spending on these accounts by 27 percent in fiscal year 1996 and 44 percent in fiscal year 1997 from the fiscal year 1995 levels.

Mr. Chairman, these are reasonable reductions and ones arrived at with the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. GILMAN, whose assistance I greatly appreciate. I am pleased to see that this Congress takes seriously its mandate from the American people that massive debt is unacceptable, that passing the buck on to future generations must stop and that Government spending must be brought under control and reduced. This bill and this amendment contribute to this effort, and I urge my colleagues to support passage of both.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the manager's amendment has a number of serious defects,

and it would take more time than remains in this debate to address all of them.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to address what is referred to as the Hoke amendment, which would end OPIC. OPIC, which is an organization, is not the one associated with oil control but the one that helps American companies take advantage of opportunities overseas. OMB has found that the transfer of OPIC reserves would be substantially affecting our budget situation. There is an \$2.4 billion outlay that would be at risk. There is \$146 million in income from the reserves that are presently used in the 150 activities. The Federal budget would also lose future cash flows from insurance premiums of \$40 billion a year.

What would that do, Mr. Chairman? What it would do is endanger what has been \$40 billion of American exports. Not only does OPIC make money for the American taxpayer, but it helps produce thousands of jobs here in the United States. It seems to me unbelievable that someone would want to cripple an agency that produces revenue for the taxpayers and produces jobs for Americans and business opportunity for American companies.

In 1994 alone, Mr. Chairman, OPIC supported investments in projects that will result in over \$5.5 billion in the first 5 years of the projects' operation, and will generate approximately 18,000 American jobs. OPIC generates overseas investments, which in turn generate trade and opportunity for American companies.

When we see the Japanese restricting American trade, we understand why they are doing it. They are doing it because it is to their advantage, so when they stop American agricultural products from going to Japan, they are going to protect Japanese agriculture.

When they stop American auto parts from going to Japan, they are doing it to stop Americans from making the auto parts that go into Japanese cars, because they want to make them in Japan.

Why on Earth, Mr. Chairman, would anybody in this institution want to cripple an agency that makes profit for the taxpayers and creates jobs at home and business opportunities for American companies? If Members vote for the manager's amendment, they are endangering thousands of American jobs and the budget, because nowhere in the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], which is now part of the manager's amendment, do they explain how they will replace the millions of dollars that OPIC now generates for the Treasury.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues, for a host of reasons, to vote against the manager's amendment. When other countries do us harm in trade and take away American trading opportunities, we know why they are doing it. They are doing it to help themselves. Why somebody would take an American agency that

helps American jobs and American workers and the American taxpayers and try to destroy it is counter-intuitive to our own self-interest, and I would hope that people would recognize this and will vote against the manager's amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me bring up a few facts. I would like to speak to the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. It has been stated that the former Yugoslavia is a European problem, and that the Europeans cannot handle it; that in the estimation of many, Europe has not been willing to commit either the resources economically or militarily to solve it.

I spoke recently with Dr. Kissinger. He said, and I quote, "The only way for the war to expand to Greece and to other countries is if the major powers would have direct involvement to lift the embargo." Two weeks ago I had dinner with Dick Cheney, Colin Powell, "Cap" Weinberger, and John Sununu. They said that the President's lack of foreign policy in this particular area makes it even more dangerous for us to get involved in risky amendments. I look at Russia's involvement or willingness to become involved in this conflict. I look why Greece supports the Serbians; because they were in World War II, and it was the Croats who fought with Nazi Germany. The head of the Moslems trained with Qadhafi in Libya with Moslem terrorists. Yet, on the other side, the Serbians and the Croats both have former, and I quote, used loosely, former Communist leaders. Therefore, the whole area is awry. For us to get involved in that civil war and possibly jump in is dangerous, I think, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I voted yesterday against my own leadership on the War Powers Act, because I did not think we had enough time to look at it. I thought it was not responsible. I do not think the War Powers Act works, but we need to adjust it. I voted against my own leadership on that principle.

□ 1400

I would say to my friend from Maryland, on the same principle, I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

If we give arms to the other side, I think we invite direct input from the Russians and their intervention. I look at the Pentagon, and I know most of the generals and the admirals by first names, and I talk to them. It is wrong, in their opinion, for us to get involved and lift the arms embargo.

No one wants to raise the embargoes other than those that generally have not been directly involved in combat. For us to decrease our own military size, to put and risk our own troops in harm's way, our men and women, and then to lift an embargo, would further throw kerosene on that fire.

My job in the Seventh Fleet was to employ war-fighting both Allied and

U.S. troops in and out of countries. Seventeen weeks ago in the Christian Science Monitor I published an article that said if you bomb, the Serbs are going to retaliate. They are going to bomb Moslems and they are going to bomb Croats and they are going to kill a lot of civilians. They are going to capture our peacekeepers, tie them to the primary targets, and then move their weapons.

Yet yesterday I heard Secretary Perry say we knew that; we knew the risk, and we consider it a success. Well, after that when they chained them, they shut down, the Serbians are still bombing, they are still gunning, but yet 70 are dead.

I would ask my friend from Maryland, if you want to sit in on hearings, I will bring in those admirals and those generals, and I would just ask the gentlemen from Maryland to sit down and listen to the dangers involved in this particular amendment. I understand the good intentions of the gentleman from Maryland, but in my humble opinion, it is wrong, and I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, speaking of behaving responsibly, would the gentleman explain what he is talking about, about a Moslem leader training with Qaddafi? I know that not to be the case. I do not know who it is you could possibly be referring to.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to provide the entire dossier on the gentleman, and I will provide it to him immediately.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the manager's amendment. Is it really too much to expect the largest economic and military power in the world to spend almost 1 percent of its budget on developing market opportunities overseas, in promoting democracy, in protecting human rights? The vast majority of the American people have no idea how little we spend on foreign aid.

Now we have a manager's amendment that picked up all these little piles of amendments that were rejected by a committee that reported out a very extreme bill, they were rejected in committee, and now to get enough votes we throw them all into one package. Talk about a package that stinks, and that is entirely counter to the direction in which this country has gone from the days of Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower and all the way up through Ronald Reagan and President Bush.

You look at the Burton amendment. The Bush and Baker administration established these overseas missions in the New Independent States. The Burton amendment requires that we gut them. In fact, you have heard from the chairman of the Committee on Appro-

priations and the chairman of the Committee on International Relations on how bad the Burton amendment is.

I trust that people will recognize that that Burton amendment actually prevents us from accomplishing any of the programs we are talking about, eliminates the Micro Enterprise Program for all intents and purposes, eliminates our child survival programs, eliminates the ability to do anything more than simply write checks to foreign nations.

That is not what this Congress has voted to do in the past. They voted to give more responsibility to our international executive establishment so that we could be audited and we would be accountable for what we spend. The Burton amendment prevents us from being able to do that.

The Manzullo amendment, gutting the exchange programs. Anwar Sadat, F.W. DeKlerk, can you put a price tag on the value of leaders like that? And they were major participants in our USIA exchange programs.

I could go down the list of these amendments. Most Members have no idea what they do. We were only just shown what they did a couple of hours ago. They are wrong, they are bad, they are inconsistent with foreign policy that has been established decades ago by both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Now I would like to address the Hoyer amendment. The reason why this amendment is appropriate is that the arms embargo was never intended to apply to Bosnia. It was intended to apply when there was conflict between Serbia and Slovenia and then Croatia, and Slovenia and Croatia had the capacity, the access to arms. Bosnia never did. They never had the arms, they never had the capability for manufacturing weapons, so they have had to sit back while an aggressor came in and slaughtered them.

People who would suggest that this is a civil war are simply wrong. This is not any civil war. The reality is that it is a war that was directed, conducted, initiated by Serbia to create a greater Serbia.

No Bosnians have ever bent a blade of grass in Serbia, and we have a multiethnic democracy. It is not just a Moslem state as many would suggest. The head right now happens to be Moslem. The Ambassador to the United States is Jewish. The leadership of the Government is a combination of Croats and Serbians and Moslems.

They want to live together. That is why they are a threat to fascists like Milosevic and others. They do not want that to happen. They do not want a country like Bosnia to survive.

The United Nations comes in, the United Nations has a mission. Not to do right, not to ensure justice is done, but to sit back and essentially observe. We created safe areas. How safe is anyone living in those safe areas? We have deserted them. They have been shelled. People have been killed.

We have more than 2 million refugees throughout Europe. We have had about 40,000 women deliberately raped as a strategy, a tactic of war. We have over 100,000 people who have been slaughtered, defenseless to defend themselves.

I think we ought to lift the arms embargo, but I think we ought to do more than that. I think we ought to protect a sovereign nation. We ought to stand up for the integrity of territorial borders. That is the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 further minute, because the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] asked for 3 minutes, we gave him the 3 minutes out of deference, I think maybe a third of that time. We would ask that we have that extra time.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would have to object. We only have 15 minutes left for the full debate. We have a number of Members who wish to speak. As much as I admire the gentleman, I am going to ask him to please refrain.

Mr. MORAN. I defer to the judgment and leadership of the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Burton amendment and rise to also support the Mica amendment which is part of this package.

Let me tell my colleagues, I have seen AID firsthand in dozens of countries around the world and AID is a wasteful and ineffective bureaucracy. It should be abolished as it exists or dramatically modified.

AID represents a post-World War II mentality. It has become an international welfare system that creates dependency and fails to help our U.S. trade activities. It often does very little to assist countries in need to help themselves.

Let me tell Members some examples. After spending billions of dollars to free Haiti with a military force and having spent over \$1 billion in United States economic assistance, including \$600,000 in AID grants, what has happened?

Here is the AID plan for Haiti. The cornerstone of this AID plan is 25,000 Haitians collecting garbage, 2,400 feeding stations, millions for election supervision, millions for judicial training, and almost nothing, a couple of pages, for creating permanent jobs.

Even teenagers with whom I met just recently in Port-au-Prince who serve in our military, these are teenage soldiers of our force. This is what one of them handed me, this note. He did not sign it but he says, "Port-au-Prince is secured. There is no need for United States presence in Haiti. I believe a lot of the money spent here should go to problems in the United States. This is a waste of taxpayers' money."

This is what our teenaged soldiers who observe the process there say.

Last summer I went to Bratislava in Slovakia and found that we only had one part-time commercial officer from Vienna coming once a week to help our United States trade agencies in this emerging nation. On the other hand, the AID office in Bratislava—now get this—has more employees than our Embassy.

We spend millions of taxpayer dollars in this country, for example, to set up a banking system and provide enterprise funds. Then we let other countries get the contracts for this business.

The President, an American citizen, of the Slovak American Chamber of Commerce told me, and let me quote what he said. He said, "We spend \$200 to give away \$1."

My colleagues, we are the laughing-stock of the emerging nations.

When I visited recently our Embassy in Moscow, we had only four full-time commercial officers. In contrast, AID had an entire building with hundreds of employees.

I took in the private sector one of the first trade missions to Lithuania and every Lithuanian from the lowest official to the highest said, "Trade, not aid." Then I returned to the United States, turned on the TV and saw our transport delivering humanitarian aid to the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union, Russia. A couple of nights later I turned on the same newscast and there was the largest trade show in the history of Moscow, sponsored by the Japanese. Counting full-time employees and individuals serving under personal service contracts, AID has over 9,000 employees, more than our Embassies.

This amendment only cuts 25 percent from their funds. The entire U.S. foreign commercial service office only has 896 people working abroad. We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars with few positive results.

AID is an outdated, overrated give-away program. We should be focusing our efforts on increasing and improving trade activities as I have in my amendment. Trade rather than temporary aid will raise the fortune and opportunities and jobs for all people.

I do not oppose all foreign aid and I resent President Clinton's statement that we are isolationists.

Let me tell Members, there are still billions in this bill for aid. Americans are the most compassionate people in the world. But let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, they are not the dumbest. If the Clinton administration were around when they had outhouses, they would be opposed to bringing the plumbing inside.

I do not oppose again all aid. Look at Japan. They tie trade to aid. Look at our successes where we provide trade and business opportunities rather than a temporary handout. Finally, look at even the earliest Biblical lessons that teach a man how to fish.

People in Grenada may need sidewalks. I need sidewalks for the people

in my district. People in Port-au-Prince may need their garbage collected, but, my colleagues, in my district, I only have the people in my district and the taxpayers to pay for their trash collections.

Quite frankly, both I and my constituents believe there can be a better way. Let us revise AID.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is such limited time, I ask unanimous consent that additional speakers be limited to 3 minutes.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, may I ask how much time is left?

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately 10 minutes, until 2:25.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Then I would object, Mr. Chairman, because we have two additional speakers.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we have more than two additional speakers. I am trying to give everyone the opportunity to speak. That is why I am asking consent to agree to a limitation of time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that we have 10 additional minutes for this debate. I think it is important that Members who want to speak get an opportunity to speak.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the rule calls for a 2:25 limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out that the rule does not provide for a unanimous-consent request to extend the time beyond that provided in the rule.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment to cut the operating expenses of the U.S. Agency for International Development, the implementing arm of our Nation's concern for children around the world.

It is really ironic that a Member who has seen with his own eyes the suffering of African children would propose such a cruel amendment.

This amendment will gut programs of child survival and feeding programs for young children, because there will be insufficient staff to carry out the very programs for which we are authorizing funds. What kind of a business are we running when we commit products to save lives, but do not have the cooks and truck drivers to get the food to the needy consumers?

I know from past discussions of this subject in the International Relations Committee that Mr. BURTON somehow feels that our overseas staff is too large. Yet, in the last 2 years under the effective leadership of AID Administrator Brian Atwood we have already reduced total staff while at the same time have added 24 AID missions in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. AID has even responded to assisting in the peace process by implementing new programs in the West Bank and Gaza, bringing the results of peace to the people there.

Amazingly, Mr. BURTON seems to have a problem with an agency that is trying to turn around the management mistakes of the past administration when 87 percent of the money was spent in the last quarter.

How can any business operate this way and provide timely service to the people America wants to help? This is why we need to keep the AID budget for staff and operations on a sufficient level.

I further find this amendment ironic on the month of the African child, which we celebrate on June 16 in commemoration of the South African children that lost their lives in Soweto.

Let us save the children.

Vote against the Burton amendment.

□ 1415

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

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

I rise to support the amendment of my colleague and good friend from Maryland, Mr. HOYER. I believe we are debating a simple proposition today. There have to be consequences of aggression. There have to be consequences of aggression. It is not enough to stand on this floor and bemoan the rapes and bemoan the genocide and then not do anything.

I think we all agree we do not want to see U.S. troops actively engaged, but it seems to me that we do have to level the playing field, we do have to allow the victims of aggression the opportunity to protect themselves.

When there are consequences of aggression, when the victim has an opportunity to respond, you have a climate in which peace negotiations can take place because now the aggressor has a reason to negotiate for peace because he suffers some casualties and he suffers some hardships. In the absence of these consequences, in the absence of weapons to defend oneself, there are no consequences, and the aggression continues.

I believe that people should be cautious and I am not unmindful of the caution cited by the ranking member. But it is clear to me that this lifting of the arms embargo need not be immediate. We can have an orderly withdrawal of U.N. peacekeepers. There is no peace to keep. We can protect them,

have them move out, and then lift the arms embargo and enable the people who are the victims of the genocide we bemoan and the victims of the rapes we bemoan to defend themselves in the only way they can, and that is with weapons.

If we truly believe that we should exert leadership in the world, if we truly believe as the only superpower we have a responsibility not to allow another Holocaust, it seems to me that we ought to take the only logical step remaining, and that is to lift the embargo following the withdrawal of U.N. peacekeepers and allow the victims of this savagery to defend themselves.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoyer amendment. Through vacillation, indecision, incoherence, and incompetence, the Clinton administration has allowed the situation in Bosnia to go from bad to worse. And let us not forget that the previous administration was in office when the arms embargo was imposed. During those years I was equally vociferous in my opposition to the imposition of the arms embargo.

Beyond the deepening humanitarian disaster, 200,000 civilian killed while half of the population have been forced to become refugees—the worst humanitarian crisis in Europe since World War II. There have been over 20,000 rapes. The United Nations and NATO have found themselves very much undermined through this process. But the loss of life obviously is our overriding concern.

As Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I just left a hearing where Bosnian Prime Minister Haris Silajdzic made a very, very convincing and compelling case to lift the arms embargo. He has done this before with equal eloquence, but some of his comments today should be heard by every Member of this Chamber and every American. He said, "We face extinction; our people are dying, each and every day," while the United Nations and NATO, but especially the United Nations, talks about more talks with people like Milosevic and others who are war criminals, and frankly thugs.

Developments on the ground in Bosnia underscore the utter failure of the international community to come to terms with the armed aggression and genocide that has been perpetrated by the Bosnian Serbs against the people of Bosnia.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, we hear over and over again that we do not want to see escalation of the fighting in Bosnia. Nobody wants to see that, but there are an estimated 200,000 Bosnian government forces who want to take up arms, but there is only one rifle for every three soldiers. They cannot defend themselves. Mr. Speaker, everybody should remember and be mindful of the fact that when the breakup of the former Yugoslavia oc-

curred, the military capability and the might of Yugoslavia fell into hands of the Serbs, placing the Bosnians and the Croats at a great disadvantage. When an arms embargo was imposed, one side had all the guns, all the MiG's, all the heavy artillery and the tanks; the other side had nothing but broom handles and sticks. Again, that is why the continued imposition of the arms embargo is so immoral.

Dr. Silajdzic said, and I thought it was very well taken, that the arms embargo is illegal, immoral, and after 3 years it is inhumane. The policy of containment has done nothing to stop armed aggression and genocide. The arms embargo has rewarded aggression.

And let me make another point that I think is very important. The Prime Minister said again today as he has said before, as President Iztetbegovic has stressed, the Bosnians do not want American troops, they do not want British troops, they do not want French troops. They want to exercise their right to defend themselves, as any sovereign nation would want, especially in the face of aggression and genocide.

On the U.N. rapid reaction force, he said it is a more robust status quo. The U.N. peacekeepers are not even safe and they have the modest ability to defend themselves, but certainly the civilians who are killed each and every day by sniper fire and shelling are anything but safe.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] mentioned earlier, that he and I have been to that part of the world—we have seen the devastation. We were in Vukovar together. Shortly thereafter, we met with Milosevic, who denied that attacks in the city had resumed. We saw Serb MiG's fly over Vukovar with our own eyes, yet he denied it. We saw the tanks and devastation and that has continued year in and year out, and we have done nothing to stop it. There is bipartisan support for this effort to lift the arms embargo. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and I and others have had hearings, we have looked in the eyes of the women raped as a part of this genocide, and we were absolutely moved to tears. It is unconscionable that we will not allow Bosnia—a sovereign state—to defend itself. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the Hoyer amendment in keeping with Bosnia's inherent right to self defense under the U.N. Charter.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Burton amendment to make further cuts in AID.

If we adopt this amendment, we should forget about child survival programs,

microenterprise support and democracy promotion programs that are authorized in this bill.

This amendment will make it almost impossible for AID to implement these and other activities that don't simply involve writing checks to foreign governments, but involve serious work of program design implementation and oversight.

To accommodate such drastic cuts, AID would have to lay off nearly one-third of its direct-hire staff in the next year, throwing its operations into chaos.

In addition, the costs associated with the mandatory retirement and separation benefits which would have to be paid to those employees under the Foreign Service and Civil Service Acts would be enormous.

The Burton rapid cutback would entail termination costs in excess of \$100 million in fiscal year 1996, which could not be borne by the reduced operating expenses account. These costs include severance for U.S. and foreign national direct-hire and PSC employees, contract termination costs, lease buyouts and transportation for American employees returning from overseas.

AID would also have to close down between 15 and 20 overseas missions in addition to the 25 it is already closing down.

This would compel the United States to make impossible choices about ending support for countries in which we have real interests and which are going through tough democratic and market reforms.

While there may be some merit to streamlining the AID presence overseas, this kind of draconian cut would merely ensure that the assistance we are authorizing in this bill is not spent wisely or effectively.

This cut would also mean that AID would have to stop its development and acquisition of new technologies that are designed to make the delivery of assistance more efficient and cost-effective—technologies which we in Congress have been pushing them to develop and use over many years.

Shutting down all overseas operations and terminating all of the Agency's employees would leave no capacity to oversee the implementation of the \$8 billion in funds obligated but not yet expended in the Agency's pipeline.

The fiscal year 1996 budget request for operating expenses represents less than 7 percent of the Agency's overall appropriation request of \$7.56 billion for fiscal year 1996, an extremely low overhead rate by any standard.

Mr. Chairman, the bill already meets the category of AIP funding of \$25 million in fiscal year 1996 and \$55 million in fiscal year 1997. The Burton amendment would approximately cut a further \$70 million in fiscal year 1996 and \$25 million in fiscal year 1997. The distinguished chairman and ranking minority member of the International Relations Committee have already spoken against this amendment, as has the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. LIVINGSTON. I strongly urge Members to approve the Burton amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to correct the mischaracterization of the OPIC amendment that I have. It calls for a privatization feasibility study. It

was mischaracterized by the gentleman from Connecticut as being the elimination of OPIC. It is not. It does authorize the President to sell OPIC's stock. It does not direct him to do so. It calls for a feasibility study and its adoption will assist the International Relations Committee in its upcoming review.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] is recognized for the 2 remaining minutes under the rule.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoyer amendment and in deep opposition to the Burton amendment and in opposition to the manager's amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. He is very gentlemanly to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to use my time to say that this is a bad amendment, referring to the Hoyer amendment, to an already terrible bill. It is going to waste \$16 billion American dollars, money we have to borrow in order to give away to rich countries like Israel and Egypt.

But worse than that, the Hoyer amendment would call for the wasting of American lives. Testimony before the Committee on Armed Services coming from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Colin Powell, says you cannot just give people surface-to-air missiles. You cannot just give people heavy artillery. You have to send people over there first to deliver it and then to train them to use it, and that means putting American service personnel on the ground in the Bosnia, which is going to lead to the loss of American lives in a 700-year-old war.

Those who think that the Moslems from the Middle East are going to stand by once we lift the embargo or the Russians are going to stand by once we lift the embargo and not help the Croats are absolutely crazy.

Where is the rush to squander American lives?

Yesterday this Congress did the right thing in voting not to get rid of the War Powers Act and voting not to give President Clinton more power to send American kids off to get killed. If you are so anxious to go help the Moslems

or the Croats or the Serbs, put down your briefcase, pick up a gun, and go have a lot of fun. But do not send American troops off to do what you will not do. Do you squander their lives for a hopeless war in a part of the world where we do not belong.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the Gilman amendment for one reason and one reason only: The Gilman amendment includes the Hoyer amendment which would lift the U.N. arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina and allow that nation to defend itself.

There are several provisions of the Gilman amendment that are troubling to me. I support the continuation of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which the Gilman amendment would privatize. I support the work of the Agency for International Development and strongly disagree with the Gilman amendment's reductions in personnel at AID.

But I have been to Bosnia. I have seen the slaughter of the people there. I have been huddled with those people in basements which were their only sanctuary after their city was shelled. The Bosnian Serbs are maiming and killing innocent people and the arms embargo continues to tie the hands of the people of Bosnia in their efforts at self-defense.

The Hoyer amendment, I believe, can help to bring the war in Bosnia more quickly to an end. The Hoyer amendment will let the people of Bosnia know that the United States Congress stands with them.

For that reason and that reason alone, I vote today for the Gilman amendment which includes the Hoyer amendment to give the people of Bosnia their right to self-defense.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. MANZULLO because further reductions in funding for cultural exchange programs would cripple the country's ability to build a meaningful dialog with new democracies around the world.

As the United States scales back abroad, USIA-supported exchange programs have become vital to our national security. In the past, the exchange programs encouraged greatness in the lives of modern, global leaders like F.W. DeKlerk and Anwar Sadat. Today, in a fractured world, these programs are a beacon to young leaders searching for practical policies that have been tested over time.

We must make long-term efforts to promote, first, civil societies, second, open economies, third, respect for human rights and fourth, peaceful resolution of conflict.

Let me tell you about an exchange program that works. In Jacksonville, FL, the chamber of commerce with its 5,000 members, has jointly developed a leadership program with the Czech Ministry of Industry and Trade. The program has become national in scope as Czech future leaders come to America to learn about democracy and trade. This successful hands on program involves local participation and should be replicated rather than destroyed. Many Czech participants have written letters telling how their internship changed their life by opening doors they did not know existed.

This is a win/win situation for Jacksonville and other cities that have entered into USIA-supported exchange programs. Today Jacksonville is reaching out to the world because it knows it must in order to grow and not stagnate in the 21st century.

I support USIA-supported exchange programs because I know that our Nation must not stagnate in the 21st century.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to unilaterally lift the arms embargo on the Bosnian Government.

I take this position very reluctantly. But I have to say that I believe that voting for this action today would be a grave mistake. Some of our most important allies have put their forces in harm's way to try to bring about a halt in the fighting and to safeguard the civilian population in Bosnia. True, they have not been completely successful. But compared to the carnage and atrocities that occurred in Bosnia prior to the deployment of U.N. forces, the situation is more than a modest improvement. And our allies have just taken further action to introduce additional forces for a rapid deployment force to enhance the prospects of peace enforcement and to open supply lines to civilian populations.

If we lift the arms embargo we will pull the rug out from under our allies and invite the Serbian forces, which have been the aggressors in this conflict and have been responsible for utterly abhorrent atrocities and human rights violations, to renew completely unbridled hostilities. We will endanger the lives of UNPROFOR troops who today remain in illegal Serbian custody. And we will put the forces of our allies who are on the ground today in even greater danger than they currently find themselves.

Our allies with troops on the ground have said they will withdraw from Bosnia if we lift the embargo. Our President has already pledged that he would support this withdrawal with the deployment of U.S. ground troops. So make no mistake about it—if we lift the embargo now we will absolutely compel the introduction of U.S. ground forces to extricate UNPROFOR troops.

I might add that if anyone here thinks the Serbs will wait until the embargo is lifted, the Bosnian Moslems rearm, and the Bosnian Moslems train in the effective use of the new weapons they receive before the Serbs resume further offensive actions, including the full-scale shelling of civilian populations, they are sadly mistaken. The Serbs will initiate mass shelling immediately. Thousands more civilians will be killed or wounded.

We should wait to see how the latest European initiative introducing troops into Bosnia fares before we ruin its chances for success. I know the situation in Bosnia is tragic. Last year some 3,000 people were killed in Bosnia as a consequence of the fighting there. But this is nothing compared to the number that would die if the fighting proceeds without check.

If our allies give up on this situation, if they conclude that there is no further utility in trying to intervene on the side of peace and they choose to withdraw their forces, then we should indeed lift the embargo. But doing so before that time would be premature. It will result in further terrible loss of life. And it surely will suck U.S. ground troops into this conflict and involve our Nation in a war it does not want to be in.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment being offered by Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would further cut funding for one of the most successful

programs our Nation operates—the Sister Cities Program, as well as other important cultural exchange programs.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower founded the Sister Cities Program almost 40 years ago, and now Sister Cities is the largest citizen exchange organization in the world. There are more than 1,000 U.S. cities in partnership with over 1,900 international cities in 120 countries.

As a former member of the board of directors of Sister Cities, I have seen first hand the benefits that the program brings.

My own city of San Jose, CA, has built strong relationships with such cities as Okayama, Japan, and Dublin, Ireland.

When the San Francisco Bay Area suffered the Loma Prieta earthquake in 1989, the citizens of San Jose, Costa Rica, another of our Sister Cities, generously sent supplies and aid for the relief centers.

The Sister Cities Program, Mr. Chairman, brings people of different nations together in friendship and understanding. It builds relationships that strengthen the bonds between the United States and the other nations of the world.

Mr. Chairman, as we seek to reduce the Federal budget deficit, we must do so responsibly. In cutting funding for cultural exchange programs like Sister Cities, this amendment goes far beyond what is reasonable and will cripple programs that are of very great importance.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Gilman amendment.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, today, we have the welcome news of Capt. Scott O'Grady's rescue by U.S. Marines in northern Bosnia. Having survived the trauma of being shot down by hostile forces is testimony to Captain O'Grady's courage and determination. This mission was a combination of Semper Fidelis and the luck of the Irish.

As a Member of this body and because of my own Croatian heritage, Bosnia is a major concern. I continue to pray for the quickest possible—and least bloody—resolution to the crisis in the Balkans.

Let me make firm by belief that there must be no large-scale commitment of American troops in Bosnia.

The need, Mr. Chairman is to lift the arms embargo immediately. What many fail to see is that by not lifting the embargo, the internationally recognized state of Bosnia cannot effectively defend itself. We must not be a party to preventing fearless people from resisting naked aggression. The aggressive conduct of the Bosnian Serbs can and will be met—and punished—by those who want to defend themselves.

If the international community will not help, it must not hinder.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of a provision in the fiscal year 1996 American Overseas Act [H.R. 1561], related to unresolved commercial claims between United States nationals and the Government of Saudi Arabia.

This section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export and Control Act to require congressional oversight and scrutiny of all arms sales to the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia until such time as the Secretary of State certifies and reports to Congress that the unpaid claims of American companies described in the June 30, 1993 report by the Secretary of

Defense pursuant to section 9140(c) of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1993, Public Law 102–396; 106 Stat. 1939, including the additional claims noticed by the Department of Commerce on page 2 of the report, have been resolved satisfactorily.

For more than 2 years now, Gibbs & Hill, Inc., has been waiting for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to honor commitments to it and to our Government to favorably resolve its \$43.4 million debt owed to it by the Saudi Arabian Government. The claim is one of the long outstanding claims designated for resolution by the Saudi Arabian Government, by its Embassy here in Washington, under the special claims process which was originated by this body following hearings on May 9, 1992 on the commercial abuses of American companies by the Kingdom.

As recently as 3 weeks ago, United States Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, Raymond Mabus, advised Members of Congress and the company that he had been assured by a member of the Saudi Royal Court, on the authority of the King, that the Kingdom was soon to pay the claim. Despite this assurance, the Saudi Arabian Embassy here in Washington continues its efforts to delay, obfuscate, and avoid payment of the debt. This outrageous situation cannot be allowed to continue. This section will show the Congress intends to stress upon the Saudi Arabian Government that the claims issue must be successfully concluded through the payment of this last remaining claim.

The claim of Gibbs & Hill dates back more than a decade. In 1978, Gibbs & Hill went to Saudi Arabia to provide its engineering expertise to the Royal Commission for Jubail and Yanbu in connection with the design and construction of the Yanbu industrial city. Gibbs & Hill was hired by the Royal Commission to help design the desalination and related facilities which are a major component of this industrial complex. The Royal Commission required significant additional services of Gibbs & Hill to perform the work, committing to compensate Gibbs & Hill for the added services, benefiting from the work performed, and highly praising Gibbs & Hill's work product, but the Royal Commission refused to pay. Gibbs & Hill's attempts to seek redress through the Kingdom's court system was useless, as the court merely upheld the wrongful acts of another agency of the Kingdom. Gibbs & Hill was decimated by the financial losses suffered on this project as a result of the commercial abuses of the Kingdom.

We have an opportunity now to bring the special claims process to a successful conclusion through the full and prompt resolution of the Gibbs & Hill claim. This is a stated policy objective of our Nation, which is currently supported by some 50 Members of Congress and Senators from both sides of the aisle. This section will ensure that in the future, American companies are protected from the type of commercial abuses suffered by Gibbs & Hill at the hands of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for consideration of amendments under this rule has expired.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. To understand the parliamentary situation at this point in time, am I correct that the Gilman en bloc amendment will be voted on after the Hoyer amendment as a secondary amendment which will be voted upon first; then is it my understanding that the Burton amendment will be then split out of the en bloc amendment for the purposes of a vote, and then the Gilman amendment as amended?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. For the information of the Members, the Chair will announce that the order of voting will proceed as follows: first on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]; next on separate votes on any divisible portion of this Gilman amendment; and finally on the remainder of the Gilman amendment, as amended or not.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I have a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, does that mean that Members could ask for a division on any of the manager's amendments that are in there?

The CHAIRMAN. Any divisible portion of the amendment can be subjected to a separate vote.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair announced that he may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the period of time within which a rollcall vote by electronic device may be taken without intervening business on the divisible portions of the Gilman amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 318, noes 99, not voting 17, as follows

[Roll No. 362]

AYES—318

Ackerman	Bishop	Calvert
Allard	Blute	Camp
Andrews	Boehlert	Cardin
Archer	Boehner	Castle
Bachus	Bonior	Chabot
Baker (LA)	Bono	Chambliss
Ballenger	Boucher	Chenoweth
Barcia	Brewster	Christensen
Barr	Brown (FL)	Chrysler
Barrett (NE)	Brown (OH)	Clayton
Bartlett	Brownback	Clement
Barton	Bryant (TN)	Clyburn
Bass	Bryant (TX)	Coble
Becerra	Bunn	Coburn
Beilenson	Bunning	Collins (GA)
Bentsen	Burr	Collins (MI)
Berman	Burton	Condit
Bevill	Buyer	Cooley
Bilbray	Callahan	Costello

Cox	Johnson, Sam
Crapo	Jones
Cremeans	Kaptur
Cubin	Kasich
Danner	Kelly
Davis	Kennelly
DeFazio	Klidge
DeLauro	Kim
DeLay	King
Deutsch	Kingston
Diaz-Balart	Klink
Dickey	Klug
Dingell	Kolbe
Doggett	LaFalce
Dooley	LaHood
Doolittle	Lantos
Dornan	Largent
Doyle	Latham
Dreier	LaTourette
Duncan	Lazio
Dunn	Leach
Durbin	Levin
Ehrlich	Lewis (CA)
Emerson	Lewis (KY)
Engel	Lightfoot
English	Lincoln
Ensign	Linder
Everett	Lipinski
Ewing	Livingston
Fattah	LoBiondo
Fawell	Lowe
Fields (TX)	Lucas
Flake	Luther
Flanagan	Maloney
Forbes	Manton
Ford	Manzullo
Fox	Markey
Frank (MA)	Martinez
Franks (CT)	Martini
Franks (NJ)	Mascara
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy
Frisa	McCrery
Frost	McHale
Funderburk	McHugh
Furse	McInnis
Galleghy	McIntosh
Ganske	McKeon
Gekas	McNulty
Geren	Meehan
Gilchrest	Menendez
Gillmor	Metcalf
Gilman	Meyers
Gonzalez	Mfume
Goodlatte	Mica
Goss	Miller (FL)
Graham	Mink
Green	Molinaro
Greenwood	Mollohan
Gunderson	Moorhead
Gutiérrez	Moran
Gutknecht	Morella
Hall (OH)	Myers
Hall (TX)	Myrick
Hancock	Nadler
Hansen	Neal
Hastings (WA)	Nethercutt
Hayes	Neumann
Hayworth	Ney
Hefley	Norwood
Heineman	Nussle
Hegger	Obey
Hilleary	Olver
Hilliard	Ortiz
Hinchev	Orton
Hobson	Owens
Hoekstra	Oxley
Hoke	Packard
Holden	Pallone
Horn	Parker
Hoyer	Pastor
Hunter	Paxon
Hutchinson	Payne (NJ)
Hyde	Pelosi
Inglis	Peterson (MN)
Istook	Pickett
Jackson-Lee	Pombo
Jefferson	Pomeroy

NOES—99

Abercrombie	Borski
Armedy	Browder
Baessler	Brown (CA)
Baker (CA)	Canady
Baldacci	Clay
Barrett (WI)	Clinger
Bateman	Coleman
Bereuter	Collins (IL)
Billirakis	Combest
Bliley	Conyers

Porter	Evans
Portman	Farr
Poshard	Fazio
Pryce	Fields (LA)
Quillen	Filner
Quinn	Foglietta
Radanovich	Foley
Rahall	Fowler
Ramstad	Gejdenson
Rangel	Gephardt
Regula	Gibbons
Riggs	Goodling
Rivers	Gordon
Roberts	Hamilton
Rogers	Hastert
Rohrabacher	Hastings (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Hefner
Roth	Hostettler
Roybal-Allard	Houghton
Royce	Jacobs
Rush	Johnson (SD)
Salmon	Johnson, E.B.
Sanford	Johnston
Sawyer	
Saxton	
Scarborough	
Schaefer	
Schiff	
Schumer	
Scott	
Seastrand	
Sensenbrenner	
Serrano	
Shadegg	
Shaw	
Shays	
Shuster	
Skeen	
Slaughter	
Smith (MI)	
Smith (NJ)	
Smith (TX)	
Smith (WA)	
Solomon	
Stearns	
Stenholm	
Stockman	
Stump	
Stupak	
Talent	
Tanner	
Tate	
Tauzin	
Taylor (NC)	
Tejeda	
Thomas	
Thornberry	
Thurman	
Tiahrt	
Torricelli	
Towns	
Trafficant	
Tucker	
Upton	
Velazquez	
Vento	
Volkmer	
Waldholtz	
Walker	
Walsh	
Wamp	
Waters	
Watts (OK)	
Weldon (FL)	
Weldon (PA)	
Weller	
White	
Whitfield	
Wilson	
Wise	
Wolf	
Wyden	
Wynn	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	
Zeliff	
Zimmer	

Kanjorski	Roukema
Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Knollenberg	Schroeder
Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Longley	Skaggs
Matsui	Skelton
McCollum	Souder
McDermott	Spence
McKinney	Stark
Meek	Stokes
Miller (CA)	Studds
Mineta	Taylor (MS)
Minge	Thompson
Moakley	Torkildsen
Murtha	Torres
Lewis (VA)	Visclosky
Petri	Vucanovich
Reed	Ward
Reynolds	Watt (NC)
Richardson	Waxman
Roemer	Williams
Rose	Woolsey

NOT VOTING—17

Bonilla	Klecza	Peterson (FL)
Chapman	Laughlin	Spratt
de la Garza	Lofgren	Thornton
Dicks	McDade	Wicker
Harman	Montgomery	Yates
Johnson (CT)	Oberstar	

□ 1448

Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Messrs. CRANE, BROWDER, LEWIS of Georgia, and CLINGER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BUYER, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Messrs. CALLAHAN, NADLER, SERRANO, BLUTE, and RUSH changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the last divisible portion of the amendment as originally offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], as amended, demanded by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The Clerk will report the divided portion of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 3231 of the bill (in section 667(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as proposed to be amended by such section 3231; relating to operating expenses of the United States Agency for International Development), strike "\$465,774,000" and insert "\$396,770,250" and strike "\$419,196,000" and insert "\$396,770,250".

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this portion of the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the last divisible portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 236, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No 363]

AYES—182

Allard	Funderburk	Paxon
Archer	Gallegly	Peterson (MN)
Armey	Gekas	Petri
Bachus	Geren	Pickett
Baker (CA)	Goodlatte	Pombo
Barcia	Graham	Poshard
Barr	Gutknecht	Quillen
Barrett (NE)	Hall (TX)	Radanovich
Bartlett	Hancock	Ramstad
Barton	Hansen	Riggs
Bass	Hastert	Roberts
Bevill	Hastings (WA)	Roemer
Boehner	Hayes	Rogers
Bono	Hayworth	Rohrabacher
Browder	Hefley	Ros-Lehtinen
Brownback	Heineman	Roth
Bryant (TN)	Herger	Royce
Bunning	Hilleary	Salmon
Burr	Hoekstra	Sanford
Burton	Hoke	Saxton
Buyer	Horn	Scarborough
Camp	Hostettler	Schaefer
Canady	Hunter	Seastrand
Chabot	Hutchinson	Sensenbrenner
Chambliss	Inglis	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Istook	Shuster
Christensen	Jacobs	Skelton
Chrysler	Johnson, Sam	Smith (MI)
Coble	Jones	Smith (NJ)
Coburn	Kasich	Smith (TX)
Collins (GA)	Kennedy (RI)	Smith (WA)
Combest	Kim	Solomon
Condit	Kingston	Souder
Cooley	Klug	Spence
Costello	Largent	Stark
Cox	Latham	Stearns
Cramer	Lewis (KY)	Stenholm
Crane	Lincoln	Stockman
Crapo	Linder	Stump
Cremeans	LoBiondo	Talent
Cubin	Lucas	Tanner
Cunningham	Luther	Tate
Deal	Manzullo	Tauzin
DeLay	Martini	Taylor (MS)
Diaz-Balart	McColum	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	McCrery	Thornberry
Doolittle	McHugh	Thurman
Dornan	McInnis	Tiahrt
Dreier	McIntosh	Traficant
Duncan	McKeon	Upton
English	Metcalf	Waldholtz
Ensign	Mica	Walker
Ewing	Minge	Wamp
Fields (LA)	Moorhead	Weldon (FL)
Fields (TX)	Myers	Weldon (PA)
Flanagan	Myrick	Weller
Forbes	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Fowler	Neumann	Young (AK)
Fox	Ney	Zeliff
Franks (NJ)	Norwood	Zimmer
Frisa	Parker	

NOES—236

Abercrombie	Clay	Fawell
Ackerman	Clayton	Fazio
Andrews	Clement	Filner
Baesler	Clinger	Flake
Baker (LA)	Clyburn	Foglietta
Baldacci	Coleman	Foley
Ballenger	Collins (IL)	Ford
Barrett (WI)	Collins (MI)	Frank (MA)
Bateman	Conyers	Franks (CT)
Becerra	Coyne	Frelinghuysen
Beilenson	Danner	Frost
Bentsen	Davis	Furse
Bereuter	DeFazio	Ganske
Berman	DeLauro	Gejdenson
Bilbray	Dellums	Gephardt
Bilirakis	Deutsch	Gibbons
Bishop	Dingell	Gilchrest
Bliley	Dixon	Gillmor
Blute	Doggett	Gilman
Boehlert	Dooley	Gonzalez
Bonior	Doyle	Goodling
Borski	Dunn	Gordon
Boucher	Durbin	Goss
Brewster	Edwards	Green
Brown (CA)	Ehlers	Greenwood
Brown (FL)	Ehrlich	Gunderson
Brown (OH)	Emerson	Gutierrez
Bryant (TX)	Engel	Hall (OH)
Bunn	Eshoo	Hamilton
Callahan	Evans	Hastings (FL)
Calvert	Everett	Hefner
Cardin	Farr	Hilliard
Castle	Fattah	Hinchev

Hobson	Meek	Sanders
Holden	Menendez	Sawyer
Houghton	Meyers	Schiff
Hoyer	Mfume	Schroeder
Hyde	Miller (CA)	Schumer
Jackson-Lee	Miller (FL)	Scott
Jefferson	Mineta	Serrano
Johnson (SD)	Mink	Shaw
Johnson, E. B.	Moakley	Shays
Johnston	Molinari	Sisisky
Kanjorski	Mollohan	Skaggs
Kaptur	Moran	Skeen
Kelly	Morella	Slaughter
Kennedy (MA)	Murtha	Stokes
Kennelly	Nadler	Studds
Kildee	Neal	Stupak
King	Nussle	Tejeda
Klink	Obey	Thomas
Knollenberg	Olver	Thompson
Kolbe	Ortiz	Thorton
LaFalce	Orton	Thompson
LaHood	Owens	Torres
Lantos	Oxley	Torricelli
LaTourette	Packard	Towns
Lazio	Pallone	Tucker
Leach	Pastor	Velazquez
Levin	Payne (NJ)	Vento
Lewis (CA)	Payne (VA)	Visclosky
Lewis (GA)	Pelosi	Volkmer
Lightfoot	Pomeroy	Vucanovich
Lipinski	Porter	Walsh
Livingston	Portman	Ward
Longley	Pryce	Waters
Lowey	Quinn	Watt (NC)
Maloney	Rahall	Watt (OK)
Manton	Rangel	Waxman
Markey	Reed	White
Martinez	Regula	Williams
Mascara	Reynolds	Wilson
Matsui	Richardson	Wise
McCarthy	Rivers	Wolf
McDermott	Rose	Woolsey
McHale	Roukema	Wyden
McKinney	Roybal-Allard	Wynn
McNulty	Rush	Young (FL)
Meehan	Sabo	

NOT VOTING—16

Bonilla	Klecza	Peterson (FL)
Chapman	Laughlin	Spratt
de la Garza	Lofgren	Wicker
Dicks	McDade	Yates
Harman	Montgomery	
Johnson (CT)	Oberstar	

□ 1459

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Wicker for, with Mr. Yates against.

Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. QUINN changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. KASICH, KIM, and MCCOLLUM changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the last divisible portion of the amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1500

The question is on the remaining portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 117, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No 364]

AYES—239

Andrews	Frelinghuysen	Myers
Archer	Frisa	Myrick
Armey	Funderburk	Nethercutt
Bachus	Gallegly	Neumann
Baker (CA)	Ganske	Ney
Baker (LA)	Gekas	Norwood
Ballenger	Geren	Nussle
Barcia	Gilchrest	Oxley
Barr	Gillmor	Packard
Barrett (NE)	Gilman	Parker
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Paxon
Barton	Goodling	Peterson (MN)
Bass	Goss	Petri
Bereuter	Graham	Pombo
Bevill	Greenwood	Porter
Bilbray	Gunderson	Portman
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Thorton
Bliley	Hall (TX)	Quillen
Blute	Hancock	Quinn
Boehlert	Hansen	Radanovich
Boehner	Hastert	Ramstad
Bono	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Brewster	Hayes	Riggs
Browder	Hayworth	Roberts
Brownback	Hefley	Rogers
Bryant (TN)	Heineman	Rohrabacher
Bunn	Herger	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Hilleary	Roth
Burr	Hobson	Roukema
Burton	Hoekstra	Royce
Buyer	Hoke	Salmon
Callahan	Horn	Sanford
Calvert	Hostettler	Saxton
Camp	Houghton	Scarborough
Canady	Hunter	Schaefer
Castle	Hutchinson	Schiff
Chabot	Hyde	Seastrand
Chambliss	Inglis	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Istook	Shadegg
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Chrysler	Jones	Shays
Clement	Kasich	Shuster
Clinger	Kelly	Skeen
Coble	Kennedy (RI)	Smith (MI)
Coburn	Kim	Smith (NJ)
Collins (GA)	King	Smith (TX)
Combest	Kingston	Smith (WA)
Condit	Klug	Solomon
Cooley	Kolbe	Souder
Cox	Largent	Spence
Cramer	Latham	Stearns
Crane	LaTourette	Stenholm
Crapo	Lazio	Stockman
Cremeans	Leach	Stump
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Talent
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Tate
Davis	Lightfoot	Tauzin
Deal	Lincoln	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	Linder	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Lipinski	Thomas
Dickey	Livingston	Thornberry
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Tiahrt
Dornan	Longley	Traficant
Dreier	Lucas	Upton
Duncan	Luther	Vucanovich
Dunn	Manzullo	Waldholtz
Ehlers	Martini	Walker
Ehrlich	McCrery	Wamp
Emerson	McHugh	Watts (OK)
English	McInnis	Weldon (FL)
Ensign	McIntosh	Weldon (PA)
Everett	McKeon	Weller
Fawell	McNulty	White
Fields (LA)	Metcalf	Whitfield
Fields (TX)	Meyers	Wolf
Flanagan	Mica	Young (AK)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Fox	Minge	Zeliff
Franks (CT)	Molinari	Zimmer
Franks (NJ)	Moorhead	

NOES—177

Abercrombie	Brown (CA)	Danner
Ackerman	Brown (FL)	DeFazio
Baesler	Brown (OH)	DeLauro
Baldacci	Bryant (TX)	Dellums
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	Deutsch
Bateman	Clay	Dingell
Becerra	Clayton	Dixon
Beilenson	Clyburn	Doggett
Bentsen	Coleman	Dooley
Berman	Collins (IL)	Doyle
Bishop	Collins (MI)	Durbin
Bonior	Conyers	Edwards
Borski	Costello	Engel
Boucher	Coyne	Eshoo

Evans	Levin	Richardson
Ewing	Lewis (GA)	Rivers
Farr	Lowey	Roemer
Fattah	Maloney	Rose
Fazio	Manton	Roybal-Allard
Filner	Markey	Rush
Flake	Martinez	Sabo
Foglietta	Mascara	Sanders
Foley	Matsui	Sawyer
Ford	McCarthy	Schroeder
Fowler	McCollum	Schumer
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Scott
Frost	McHale	Serrano
Furse	McKinney	Sisisky
Gejdenson	Meehan	Skaggs
Gephardt	Meek	Skelton
Gibbons	Menendez	Slaughter
Gonzalez	Mfume	Stark
Gordon	Miller (CA)	Stokes
Green	Mineta	Studds
Gutierrez	Mink	Stupak
Hall (OH)	Moakley	Tanner
Hamilton	Mollohan	Tejeda
Hastings (FL)	Moran	Thompson
Hefner	Morella	Thornton
Hilliard	Murtha	Thurman
Hinchee	Nadler	Torkildsen
Holden	Neal	Torres
Hoyer	Obey	Torricelli
Jackson-Lee	Olver	Towns
Jacobs	Ortiz	Tucker
Jefferson	Orton	Velazquez
Johnson (SD)	Owens	Vento
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Viscosky
Johnston	Pastor	Volkmer
Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)	Ward
Kaptur	Payne (VA)	Waters
Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi	Watt (NC)
Kennelly	Pickett	Waxman
Kildee	Pomeroy	Williams
Klink	Poshard	Wilson
Knollenberg	Rahall	Wise
LaFalce	Rangel	Woolsey
LaHood	Reed	Wyden
Lantos	Reynolds	Wynn

NOT VOTING—18

Allard	Johnson (CT)	Oberstar
Bonilla	Klecicka	Peterson (FL)
Chapman	Laughlin	Spratt
de la Garza	Lofgren	Walsh
Dicks	McDade	Wicker
Harman	Montgomery	Yates

□ 1509

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Wicker for, with Mr. Yates against.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to reiterate my strong support for the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, of which I am an original co-sponsor.

Those who support this portion of H.R. 1561 believe in the integrity of the United States, and are sensitive to preserving America's credibility abroad. That credibility is linked to effectively carrying-out policies of humanitarian assistance. U.S. humanitarian assistance must be allowed to be delivered to those countries in need all over the world.

Specifically, this legislation will address situations such as that found in Armenia, where a Turkish blockade is preventing our aid from being delivered. It is essential that United States aid be allowed to flow unhindered into Armenia.

I urge my colleagues to support the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1561, the so-called American Overseas Interests Act. Despite several good provisions, this bill will severely restrict the ability of the United States to exercise leadership in the post-cold war world. By

micromanaging foreign policy and slashing valuable foreign aid resources, this legislation unilaterally disarms America and relegates the world's sole remaining superpower to a second-class status.

H.R. 1561 includes a number of provisions that tie the hands of the President and reduce the leverage he needs to solve complex foreign policy problems in countries such as Russia, North Korea, and China. It also undermines our effective participation in international organizations and our efforts to encourage other nations to share the burden of global responsibilities.

It is ironic that many of my colleagues who criticized Democrats for curtailing and micromanaging the foreign policies of Presidents Reagan and Bush will vote for this measure today. They would be wise to heed the words of Lawrence Eagleburger, former Secretary of State under President George Bush, who recently stated on the bill, "all of these various restrictions and demands on the President * * * are an absolute attack on the separation of powers. Foreign policy is now and always should be in the hands of the executive branch with the advice and consent of the Congress. * * * You can't put in prescriptions that may apply today and don't apply tomorrow."

Moreover, despite promises by its sponsors that it will reduce bureaucracy, H.R. 1561 will create a megabureaucratic State Department that is unwieldy, costly and ineffective. By contrast, the Clinton administration is already proceeding vigorously with its efforts to streamline the State Department foreign policies agencies, reducing staffing by 4,700 positions, cutting bureaucratic layers and duplication.

H.R. 1561 also cuts our foreign aid programs by \$1 billion, including a 30 percent cut in development assistance. These cuts will restrict the ability of our President to fight for our interests through diplomacy, protect our global security interests, and open markets to U.S.-produced goods and services.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some reservations that I oppose final passage on this measure today. I support the provisions in H.R. 1561 that include the administration's full request for foreign assistance to Israel and Egypt. This aid is absolutely critical to keeping the Middle East peace process moving forward.

While aid to Israel is protected in the short term in this legislation, the long-term future of Israel's security is jeopardized by the isolationist policies implicit in this legislation.

By slashing America's foreign policy resources, H.R. 1561 will hollow out our first line of defense against future threats to the United States and Israel. It will impede our ability to bar the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that threaten both the United States and Israel. It will slash the resources we need to combat international terrorism that threatens both the United States and Israel. And it will diminish our influence and leadership in efforts to peacefully resolve potential conflicts in the Middle East before they flair into military conflicts.

H.R. 1561 will set foreign aid spending on a downward spiral that will ultimately increase political pressure to cut into the aid accounts for Israel and Egypt. Under this legislation, aid to Israel and Egypt will comprise almost half of the overall foreign aid budget. Under this trend, there will soon be nothing left to cut in these accounts.

Without foreign aid, our country will lose its ability to exercise leadership to confront the challenges of the post-cold-war world. It is a small but very important investment, representing less than 1 percent of our overall budget, in our ability to safeguard America's political and economic interests abroad.

Mr. Chairman, despite the end of the cold war, the world remains a dangerous and uncertain place. We will be confronted with new challenges abroad every day. H.R. 1561 will inhibit the ability of the executive branch to meet those challenges. For this and many other reasons, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1561 should be defeated, and the House should instead approve an authorization bill that gives the President the tools he needs to exercise leadership in the postcold-war world.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interest Act. I believe that the bill before us represents a responsible foreign aid approach that clearly defines America's overseas interests. It is a departure from the past and a vision into the future.

An important provision of H.R. 1561 is the inclusion of the MacBride Fair Employment Principles, that serve as a corporate code of conduct for U.S. companies doing business in Northern Ireland. The MacBride Principles, named for the late Sean MacBride, co-founder of Amnesty International and Nobel Peace Prize winner, were initiated, proposed and launched by the Irish National Caucus in November 1984. Since their inception, the MacBride Principles have provided Irish-Americans with a direct, meaningful and non-violent means of addressing injustice in Northern Ireland. H.R. 1561 codifies these principles and for the first time ever, any U.S. company accepting funds from the International Fund for Ireland must comply with the MacBride Fair Employment Principles. Importantly, these principles do not call for quotas, reverse discrimination, divestment—the withdrawal of United States companies from Northern Ireland—or disinvestment—the withdrawal of funds now invested in firms with operations in Northern Ireland.

The MacBride Principles have been widely endorsed by many states, companies, and individuals. For the record I would like itemize the principles as follows:

First, increase the representation of individuals from under-represented religious groups in the work force including managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs.

Second, ensure adequate security for the protection of minority employees at the work place and while traveling to and from work.

Third, ban provocative religious or political emblems from the work place.

Fourth, advertise all job openings publicly and making special recruitment efforts to attract applicants from under-represented religious groups.

Fifth, lay off, recall, and termination procedures should not favor a particular religious group.

Sixth, abolish job reservations, apprenticeship restrictions and differential employment criteria which discriminate on the basis of religion.

Seventh, develop training programs that will prepare substantial numbers of current minority employees for skilled jobs, including the expansion of existing programs and the creation

of new programs to train, upgrade and improve the skills of minority employees.

Eighth, establish procedures to assess, identify and actively recruit minority employees with potential for further advancement.

Ninth, appoint a senior management staff member to oversee the company's affirmative action efforts and the setting up of timetables to carry out affirmative action principles.

It is important that the United States take a strong moral stand against unfair employment practices. As the largest contributor to the International Fund for Ireland, we should lead by example and not tolerate those who exclude any group because of their religion.

It is my hope that someday employment practices in Northern Ireland will be fair so that the MacBride Principles will no longer be necessary. However, at this stage in the Northern Ireland peace process, the voice of the United States on the topic of fair employment practices is more critical than ever. I strongly endorse this legislation and urge its passage.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to first praise the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] on his fine leadership in producing a bill that reduces our foreign aid spending in a responsible manner.

The collapse of the Soviet empire has eradicated the threat of Communist aggression worldwide leaving only one superpower, the United States. With this end to the cold war, in turn, came radical changes in the political and social landscape of the world and therefore, strategies to keep stability in the world need drastic reforms. We can no longer depend on the "for us or against us" formula of foreign aid. With the rise of new regional conflicts posing new threats to world peace and leaving us with new challenges for our foreign policy, we must develop new strategies to meet the demands of the new world order. Unfortunately, many of the antiquated foreign aid programs that existed during the cold war are still in use, and paid for by American taxpayers. While I understand that foreign aid cannot and should not be cut out completely, it must be reformed and reduced to meet the demands of the post-cold-war world.

H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act of 1995, does just that. The House is currently considering H.R. 1561, which will further reduce Federal spending, and take yet another step toward balancing the budget by streamlining overall spending on foreign aid programs and redefining U.S. foreign aid policy for the future. Specifically it would consolidate three agencies in the State Department and reduce their budgets, forcing them to streamline and become more efficient. The agencies to be consolidated are the Agency for International Development, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the U.S. Information Agency. The bill authorizes \$32.3 billion over the next 2 years, saving the taxpayers \$2 billion in fiscal year 1996 and \$1 billion in 1997. The overall savings to the American taxpayer by the year 2002 is projected to be nearly \$21 billion.

I rise in support of the American Overseas Interests Act passed by the International Relations Committee, not only because of the reductions, eliminations and consolidations of bureaucracy, but because of the reasonable funding for valuable programs that are in our best interests. As I have always stated in the past, foreign aid programs are an integral part of the President's efforts to protect and ad-

vance U.S. interests at home and abroad. But, I strongly support foreign aid reform. The U.S. aid program must be constantly evaluated and held accountable to high standards of performance and results. Clearly measurable and achievable goals should be established. Tough standards should be applied to our aid program, as well as to those international organizations and financial institutions to which we contribute funding. Where our aid has no lasting impact, it should be terminated. Redundancy must be eliminated, and this will require major program changes. I would like to comment on two programs, in particular, that I believe are worthy aid recipients: FUSADES and FUNDESA.

Almost everyone knows of my interests in Central America. As a member of the International Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, and an active participant in the affairs of Central America, I am quite concerned with the political, economic, and social climate in this region. Over the years, I have had the unique opportunity to meet and forge great relationships with leaders throughout Central America. Today, we are witnessing all across Latin America that those countries who emerged from the disasters of civil war with a commitment to improve human rights have been able to foster a stronger foundation for social and economic development. The movement to democracy in Latin America is no longer the great dream of this century. Victories in the Western Hemisphere, from Argentina, Chile, Nicaragua to El Salvador, are just a few examples of democracy in action.

These organizations have helped people realize this dream and have received U.S. funding indirectly. FUSADES in El Salvador and FUNDESA in Guatemala have successfully helped the people of these developing countries progress economically and democratically. FUSADES and FUNDESA were created to promote economic and social development improving the precarious situation of many of our neighbors to the South. They promote equitable, responsive development by awarding grants to small entrepreneurs throughout the region. More importantly, these organizations provide small loans to local individuals who start small businesses and later repay their debts, at repayment rates of approximately 95 percent. For example, only a \$100 loan for the purchase of a sewing machine can be the driving force to help an individual start his or her own business. These small entrepreneurs create jobs, assist the emerging middle-class, and in turn help stabilize the region's economy. A small amount of U.S. aid goes a very long way.

While recognizing the need to rein in federal spending, we have also witnessed the positive side of foreign aid. With this in mind, I urge Members to support H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act. In an era of rising global interdependence, this bill sends the message that America is turning inward, away from its allies and the areas that need it the most. Instead of maintaining and strengthening the leadership and vision expected from a great superpower, this bill cuts and weakens the powers of the executive branch and distorts the priorities of foreign policy. More specifically, H.R. 1561 creates a vacuum of lead-

ership and support for the nations in our own hemisphere at the time when they need it the most.

As a former member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and as a representative of a district heavily populated by Hispanic-Americans from throughout Latin America and the Caribbean, I have a strong interest in issues affecting this area. This bill would reduce assistance to the region by \$213 million. Mr. Chairman, where is the logic in this reduction when it is clear that our closest neighbors are in dire need of our leadership and support? In the last few years, this region has borne the brunt of the reductions necessary to accommodate preserving or increasing assistance to other regions of the world and any reduction only further jeopardizes the process toward peace, prosperity, and democracy currently underway in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Developmental assistance and economic support funds further our own national security interests by encouraging fledgling democracies, emerging economies, and public health initiatives. Not long ago, the Western Hemisphere was ruled largely by military dictatorships. Now it is overwhelmingly represented by emerging democracies. We should not turn our back on the nations of this hemisphere while they struggle to establish the structures which support strong democracies.

In addition, foreign aid to Latin America and the Caribbean makes economic sense. It strengthens the ties forged by NAFTA, GATT, and the Summit of the Americas and supports the President as he seeks to further U.S. trade and economic interests in our hemisphere. The United States should not reduce its commitment to our fastest growing market, which accounts for \$178 billion in two-way trade, \$91 billion in U.S. exports, and 2 million in American jobs.

Finally, public health initiatives for the hemisphere should be supported. The Western Hemisphere has been declared polio-free thanks in part to the decade-long investment by the United States in polio prevention programs. Significant progress has also been made in the areas of immunization, family planning, oral rehydration therapy, and AIDS. Cutting aid for these programs could affect the lives of millions of children and cause a public health crisis in the region.

Aid to Latin America and the Caribbean furthers the interests of the United States with respect to national security, trade, and public health. It is in our own best interest to live in a neighborhood of nations which are stable and prosperous.

While this bill seeks to cripple our own Nation's ability to forge ties with our closest friends and allies, it also works to dictate the foreign policy objectives of the rest of the world by prohibiting assistance to any foreign government that the President determines has provided economic assistance to or engaged in no-market-based trade with the Government of Cuba or any entity controlled by such government in the preceding fiscal year. Mr. Chairman, is assistance to Russia or Israel in jeopardy as they move ahead with their trade initiatives in the Caribbean island? Do we expect hundreds of other sovereign and independent nations to, in effect, support an embargo which they have consistently voted against in the United Nations for 3 consecutive years? Are we asking the nations of the world

to submit to our punitive and vindictive Cuba policy and our obsession with its leader?

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1561's short-sighted objectives with regard to Latin America and the Caribbean reflect the short-sightedness of the bill in general. Foreign assistance only represents 1 percent of the total Federal budget, but it is a crucial part of our role in world leadership. At a time when the world looks to the United States for leadership and vision, this bill sends the message that the United States prefers a narrow, arrogant, isolationist policy. As the world changes, it is logical that our foreign policy priorities also change, but this does not imply a need for withdrawal from our responsibilities. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

So the remaining portion of the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS) having assumed the chair, Mr. GOODLATTE, 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. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorization of appropriations for U.S. foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 155, 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 committee amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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. HAMILTON

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill in its current form?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAMILTON moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1561 to the Committee on International

Relations, with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 11, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 82, line 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

DIVISION A—STREAMLINING OF
FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES
TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

"This division may be cited as the Foreign Affairs Agencies Streamlining Act of 1995.

"SEC. 102. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

"The Congress makes the following findings:

"(1) With the end of the Cold War, the international challenges facing the United States have changed, but the fundamental national interests of the United States have not. The security, economic, and humanitarian interests of the United States require continued American engagement in international affairs. The leading role of the United States in world affairs will be as important in the twenty first century as it has been in the twentieth.

"(2) The United States budget deficit requires that the foreign as well as the domestic programs and activities of the United States be carefully reviewed for potential savings. Wherever possible, foreign programs and activities must be streamlined, managed more efficiently, and adapted to the requirements of the post-Cold War era.

"(3) As part of an overall review to foster efficiencies in the executive branch, the President has had under review the organization and functions of those departments and agencies responsible for administering the international affairs (150) budget function.

"(4) The President deserves commendation for the results of such review to date, including significant numbers of foreign posts closed and personnel reductions made by some foreign affairs agencies.

"(5) In order to achieve further budgetary savings and eliminate overlapping responsibilities and duplication of efforts in the foreign programs and activities of the United States without jeopardizing United States interests, continued careful review and strong effective leadership will be required.

"(6) A streamlined foreign affairs structure under the leadership of the President can more effectively promote the international interests of the United States in the next century.

"TITLE II—ONGOING REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT

"SEC. 201. REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AGENCIES.

"(a) REVIEW.—The President shall review, as part of an overall effort to foster efficiencies in the executive branch, the programs described in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act, as well as other initiatives within the administration of international affairs programs, to determine how best to achieve the cost savings and streamlining.

"(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The review conducted pursuant to subsection (a) shall include a review of—

"(1) any additional costs or cost savings that would result from reorganizing the agencies administering programs under the international affairs (150) budget function;

"(2) the management implications of any agency reorganization;

"(3) the optimal organizational structure for the foreign affairs agencies;

"(4) the implications for the conduct of United States foreign policy and United States foreign assistance programs of any agency reorganization;

"(5) the justification for staffing levels of non-foreign affairs agencies overseas, includ-

ing the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Justice, Treasury, and any intelligence agencies;

"(6) the extent to which the activities of such non-foreign affairs agencies contribute to United States foreign policy and national security interests;

"(7) the implications for United States foreign operations of recent developments in communications technology;

"(8) the feasibility of centralizing worldwide financial services of all foreign affairs agencies in the United States, including the feasibility of moving all such services to a location outside of the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area;

"(9) the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of contracting with private companies or other United States Government agencies for certain services, including payroll, vendor payments, and Foreign Service pension payments systems, medical examination programs, and certain training programs; and

"(10) efforts to consolidate management of all U.S. international exchange programs to eliminate duplication and overlap.

"(c) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report on the results of the comprehensive review required by subsection (a).

"SEC. 202. REORGANIZATION AUTHORITY.

"(a) AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to submit to the Congress a reorganization plan, if he determines such reorganization is necessary, to enhance the coordination, effectiveness, and efficiency of programs within the international affairs (150) budget function.

"(b) EXCEPTION.—Any plan submitted pursuant to the authority of subsection (a) may be submitted pursuant to chapter 9 of title 5 (relating to executive reorganization) of the United States Code, notwithstanding section 905(b) of that chapter.

On page 84, beginning on line 21 strike "\$1,728,797,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$1,676,903,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,748,438,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 85, beginning on line 11 strike "\$366,276,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$355,287,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$372,480,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 86, beginning on line 1 strike "\$391,760,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$391,760,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$421,760,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 86, beginning on line 11, strike "\$23,469,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$23,469,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24,250,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 86, beginning on line 16, strike "\$15,165,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$14,710,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,465,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 86, beginning on line 20, strike "\$9,579,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$9,579,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,579,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 87, beginning on line 6, strike "\$873,505,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$867,050,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$934,057,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 87, beginning on line 17, strike "\$309,375,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and

\$302,902,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$425,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 94, beginning on line 15, strike "\$445,000,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$345,000,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$533,304,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 96, beginning on line 10, strike "\$68,260,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$68,260,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 100, beginning on line 9, strike "\$13,858,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$12,472,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$13,858,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 100, beginning on line 11, strike "\$10,393,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$9,353,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,393,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 100, line 17, strike "\$666,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$740,000".

On page 100, beginning on line 20, strike "\$3,500,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$3,195,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,550,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 101, line 1, strike "\$13,202,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$14,669,000".

On page 104, beginning on line 11, strike "\$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$9,000,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 105, beginning on line 4, strike "\$450,645,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$428,080,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$496,002,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 105, beginning on line 14, strike "\$117,484,200 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$113,680,800 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$130,799,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 106, beginning on line 19, strike "\$87,625,800 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$87,341,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$119,536,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 107, beginning on line 1, strike "\$321,191,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$286,191,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$395,340,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 107, beginning on line 17, strike "\$75,164,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$67,647,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$85,919,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 108, beginning on line 2, strike "\$4,300,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$3,870,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,300,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 108, beginning on line 8, strike "\$15,000,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 108, beginning on line 23, strike "\$44,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$40,050,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$76,300,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 197, on line 19, strike "\$3,284,440,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,351,910,000".

On page 197, on line 20, strike "\$3,240,020,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,351,910,000".

On page 200, line 18, strike "\$22,620,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$37,000,000".

On page 200, line 22, strike "\$37,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$52,890,000".

On page 218, beginning on line 5, strike "\$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$25,000,000

for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,244,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 248, beginning on line 16, strike "\$2,356,378,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$2,283,478,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,504,300,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 264, line 9, strike "\$858,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,300,000,000".

On page 264, line 14, strike "\$629,214,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$802,000,000".

On page 264, beginning on line 18, strike "\$643,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$650,000,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$788,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 264, beginning on line 24, strike "\$325,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$275,000,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$480,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 265, beginning on line 5, strike "\$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$31,760,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 265, beginning on line 10, strike "\$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$17,405,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 283, beginning on line 11, strike "\$456,774,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$419,196,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$529,027,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 284, beginning on line 3, strike "\$35,206,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$31,685,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$39,118,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 284, strike line 20 and all that follows through line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"There is authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the provision of agricultural commodities under title III of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1727 et seq.)."

At the end of the bill, insert the following new title:

"TITLE XXXVI—AGGREGATE AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 3601. AGGREGATE AUTHORIZATION.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the maximum aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act shall not exceed \$16,505,843,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$15,395,362,000 for fiscal year 1997.

Mr. HAMILTON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1515

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The motion to recommit is rather simple and straightforward. The motion to recommit has two components to it. First of all, it deletes that portion of the bill that requires the abolition of AID, USIA, and ACDA. In its place it replaces those portions with a

requirement that the President review the management and operations of the foreign policy agencies. It is a requirement that the President review those agencies and report to the Congress efforts to streamline those operations. That is the first part.

The second part of the motion authorizes the same level of funding for each of the line items in this bill that the President requested, but then it cuts the overall authorization funding to the level that is now in the bill.

The effect of the motion to recommit, then, is to accept the funding levels that the committee and this House have already voted on. We accept those cuts. What we do is permit the President of the United States, however, to have flexibility as to how those funds are spent. We earmark Egypt and Israel, but in other respects he has flexibility. So the motion to recommit accepts the funding levels that this House has voted on.

Second, with regard to reorganization, it lets the President take the initiative; after all, it is his administration. He should be able to reorganize that executive branch as he sees fit. We tell him he has to do it, no discretion at that time on that point. But there is no micromanagement on our part. We do not force him to reorganize in a particular way, but we do require him to reorganize.

So the motion to recommit accepts the funding levels that we now have as voted on in this House but gives the President flexibility to spend those funds, and it requires a reorganization. It does not try to micromanage. It does not tell the President how to organize his own executive branch, but it does permit the Congress to set the policy parameters and give the President the flexibility with regard to reorganization.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]. (Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to ask Members to vote for this motion to recommit. I do it in a bipartisan way. We have always had a bipartisan foreign policy for this country. We have always tried to stop partisanship at the water's edge. And we have always tried to write these authorization bills for foreign policy together. And we have always tried to balance the power of the President with the power of the Congress in reaching our foreign policy.

In all humility, I suggest to all of my colleagues that this bill does not carry on that tradition. I was proud of the House last night when in a bipartisan way we refused to give up powers that I think it was important for the Congress to keep with regard to how we declare and make war. And I ask tonight that we pass this motion to recommit; we leave more of the power in reordering the structure of our foreign policy

to the President, that as we make these cuts we give the President more authority in exactly where the cuts ought to be made.

Let me finish with this simple thought: Foreign aid and foreign policy are not popular and never have been in any district in these United States. But it is vitally important to every one of our citizens that we have a good foreign policy that is in the deep self-interest of every American citizen and in our great country.

The best way to do that is to make it bipartisan and keep it that way. I urge Members to send this bill back to the committee along the lines the distinguished ranking member has made and let us return to the successful tradition of foreign policy that we have had in this country, which has served this country very well.

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

I rise in strong opposition to the motion to recommit. Our bill consolidates three major agencies. It cuts \$3 billion in spending and changes the status quo. The motion to recommit keeps the status quo. It tries to add over \$4 billion in spending. The recommit motion also calls for yet another study. We have studied the issue long enough. The cold war ended half a decade ago.

I say it is time now to reform foreign affairs agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the distinguished chairman of our Committee on the Budget.

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

I know there is a lot of concern about the bill. America has a responsibility to practice smart strategic foreign aid, which I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is delivering us in this bill. The motion to recommit takes us back to the status quo.

I am told that this morning the Heritage Foundation released a study saying that the Agency for International Development hired a group to study their studies. And we do not need to study anybody's studies anymore.

The simple fact of the matter is under the Gilman bill, which is the most successful effort at reform in foreign aid since I have been in the House, will consolidate the Agency for International Development, ACDA, the [Arms Control Disarmament Agency], the United States Information Agency, in some sense a relic, and also makes cuts in foreign aid.

The bill is endorsed by the Americans for Tax Reform by the Citizens Against Government Waste. Why? Because they recognize the fact that the United States has a role to play in the world. But they also recognize the fact that the gentleman from New York has made changes.

Furthermore, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, one of the best examples of big corporate pork, is now authorized to be sold and to be phased out and to be privatized. This bill deserves and merits our support.

I would argue to the Members that if you believe America has a role in the world, that you want that role to be narrowed and focused, this is not perfect, but this is the biggest step that we have made in the House in a dozen years to try to bring improvement to foreign aid and to satisfy some of the frustrations that our hard-working, tax-paying constituents have wanted.

Mr. GILMAN deserves a vote in favor of this bill and against the motion to recommit. I would urge Members, as the leader of the world, to adopt this bill. I think it makes good sense. It is fiscally prudent and moves us in the right direction on foreign aid reform.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

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

Let me take a moment to thank the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the members of the committee for the hard work they put into this bill.

My colleagues, we have just finished celebrating the 50th anniversary of D-day. I do not know about you, but I spent a good deal of my past weekend watching old film clips of that 50th anniversary. I was reminded, as I watched those brave men all too often falling on the shores of some remote beach, that this is a great Nation and in one very, very special regard, it is the greatest Nation in the history of the world. Because in America, in the history of the world, no nation has ever so much loved freedom that their nation's people have been willing to risk their own peace to secure freedom for other nations.

We have all too many times seen our Nation's children on the field of battle, fighting for freedom and dreaming about peace. When we think of those terribly horrible, frightful times when men and women were willing to put their life and their limb on the line for the double dream of freedom and peace, we then should reflect upon the times when we can put some part of our national treasure on the line for freedom and peace.

What can we do, where can we do it in the world, to help protect the freedoms of people, help ensure the peace of people, help to see to it that starving children perhaps have hope, help where we can to breathe hope and life into this world.

We do not spend so awfully much but we have always been a frugal Nation. We always have insisted that we spend our treasure with care, with discretion, with compassion that is mixed with understanding and where in fact it will make the difference we hope and dream for in the lives of people.

This committee has done this. This committee has repaired American foreign aid efforts, maybe not enough to suit everybody, but enough to tell the world that, yes, indeed, we are willing

to look at the needs in the world. We are willing to be discrete. Yet we are willing to be generous, and we are willing to be organized and we are willing to be systematic. And we are willing to put some part of our treasury behind the dream of freedom and peace for all the world's people. This is a good bill. This is a good dream. It deserves our support.

I implore Members, vote "yes" for the dream of freedom and peace in the lives of all the world as sponsored by the generosity of this greatest Nation in the history of the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 237, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

YEAS—179

Abercrombie	Furse	Moran
Ackerman	Gejdenson	Morella
Baesler	Gephardt	Murtha
Baldacci	Gibbons	Nadler
Barcia	Gonzalez	Neal
Barrett (WI)	Gordon	Obey
Becerra	Green	Olver
Beilenson	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Bentsen	Hall (OH)	Orton
Berman	Hamilton	Owens
Bevill	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Bishop	Hefner	Pastor
Bonior	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Borski	Hinchev	Payne (VA)
Boucher	Holden	Pelosi
Browder	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Jacobs	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Reed
Bryant (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Reynolds
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Clay	Johnston	Rivers
Clayton	Kanjorski	Roemer
Clement	Kaptur	Rose
Clyburn	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Coleman	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Collins (IL)	Kennelly	Sabo
Collins (MI)	Kildee	Sanders
Conyers	Klink	Sawyer
Costello	LaFalce	Schroeder
Coyne	Lantos	Schumer
Cramer	Levin	Scott
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Davis	Lipinski	Sisisky
DeFazio	Lowey	Skaggs
DeLauro	Luther	Skelton
Dellums	Maloney	Slaughter
Deutsch	Manton	Stark
Dingell	Markey	Stokes
Dixon	Martinez	Studds
Doggett	Mascara	Stupak
Dooley	Matsui	Tanner
Doyle	McCarthy	Tejeda
Durbin	McDermott	Thompson
Edwards	McHale	Thornton
Engel	McKinney	Thurman
Eshoo	McNulty	Torres
Evans	Meehan	Torricelli
Farr	Meek	Towns
Fattah	Menendez	Traficant
Fazio	Mfume	Tucker
Fields (LA)	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Filner	Mineta	Vento
Flake	Minge	Visclosky
Ford	Mink	Volkmer
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Ward
Frost	Mollohan	Watt (NC)

Waxman
Williams
Wilson

Wise
Wolf
Woolsey

Wyden
Wynn

NOES—237

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Brewster
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
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
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

NOT VOTING—18

Baker (LA)
Bonilla
Chapman
de la Garza
Dicks
Foglietta

□ 1545

The Clerk announced the following pair:
On this vote:
Mr. Oberstar for, with Mr. Wicker against.

Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). The question is on the final passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 192, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

AYES—222

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunning
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren

Baker (LA)
Bonilla
Brown (CA)
Chapman
de la Garza
Dicks
Furse

NOES—192

Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchee
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Obey
Olver
Ortiz

NOT VOTING—21

Harman
Johnson (CT)
Kleczka
Laughlin
Lofgren
McDade
McKinney

□ 1603

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Wicker for, with Mr. Montgomery against.

Mr. Bonilla for, with Mr. Oberstar against.
Mr. TEJEDA changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call 366, I was unavoidably detained

and unable to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote No. 366. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1561, AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1561, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, cross references, punctuation, and indentation, and to make any other technical and conforming changes necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent all members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material, on H.R. 1561, the bill just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for purpose of inquiring about the schedule from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The House will not be in session on Monday, June 12.

On Tuesday the House will meet at 12 o'clock p.m. to consider H.R. 1530, the fiscal year 1996 National Defense Authorization Act, subject to a rule. Members should be advised that recorded votes may take place beginning at 12 noon on Tuesday.

Wednesday and the balance of the next week the House will meet at 10 a.m. to complete consideration of H.R. 1530.

After completion of the defense measure we plan to take up the 1996 military construction appropriations bill. It is our hope to have Members on their way home to their families and

their districts by no later than 3 p.m. on Friday.

Mrs. KENNELLY. I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I am very concerned about what I understand the rule is going to be next week. Many of us were not able to offer very critical amendments this week to the foreign aid bill, and next week I had an amendment to the defense authorization bill that would bring the authorization bill down \$9.5 billion to the level the Pentagon asked for. It is my understanding that will not be made in order and I am very concerned about that, because I understood we were going to be allowed to at least debate fundamental differences and people of the committee, of which I am on the committee and a senior ranking member on the committee, would like to debate this fundamental deference.

So I am very concerned about whether next week we are just going to be here doing some pro forma pantomime rather than getting to the fundamental issues of the defense committee and these incredible markups that have happened.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Rules would like to speak to the rule on this bill. All I can say is that this is a very important piece of legislation. We are hoping to let many issues come to the floor under this legislation. There are a lot of Members who wanted amendments; unfortunately we could not accommodate all of them, but the chairman from the Committee on Rules can probably speak to this.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. I say to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], I am not aware of any amendments being denied as yet. We are still in the process at this late hour of consulting with both the minority on the Committee on National Security and with the minority on the Committee on Rules as to what amendments will be made in order. The rule will be, as it has been in the past, a structured rule.

However, in our preliminary discussions with the minority on the two different committees, I believe they believe this is going to be a fair rule to all Members. Certainly we are going to try to take all of the major issues, significant issues, into consideration.

As soon as I finish this colloquy we will go up to the Committee on Rules and finish the consulting, and, hopefully, within the next hour or two pass a rule.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am then hoping what I am hearing is that you have not made a final decision on this. I know that the ranking member on the Committee on National Security has spoken to the Speaker, has spoken to all sorts of people. We feel this is one of the most fundamental issues there, and we thought people had come here to debate reasonable levels of expenditures. To deny our side the right to offer a very basic amendment that would bring the defense budget, the bloated defense budget, in my opinion, back down to where the Commander in Chief had it and the Pentagon had it I think would be absolutely outrageous, so I am glad to hear the Committee on Rules has not done that and that is a malicious rumor, and I certainly hope the gentleman from New York will not do that, or we are going to have to declare war or something.

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to reinforce what the gentlewoman from Colorado said. It is inconceivable to me that the proposal on the budget made by the President would not come forward. I want to add, I have been disturbed, I had hoped we had had some progress on the rule, but I do not really believe that we have. In the first place, 3 days to do the defense bill is inadequate.

Now in fairness to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, given an inadequate amount of time there is not much he can do about that, but I would say to the leadership on the Republican side, 3 days to do the whole defense bill, which I assume includes debating the rule, which includes the general debate, and then amendments on this enormous amount of money which is in fact being increased, is clearly going to be inadequate, and we are seeing a restriction.

In particular I would like to urge and I would say to my friend, the chairman of Committee on Rules, if he is going to continue to do these rules that have a 6 hour and 8 hour, in the name of basic fairness, quorum calls should not come out of that time. If there is a debate about someone's words being taken down, it should not come out of that time. The problem now is that you give us the 6 hours and the clock does not stop. It is like a basketball game where the time outs and the fouls and everything else just run the clock, and then obviously allows people to game it, and even if they are not trying to game it, it is a problem.

So to them a rule with a hour limit if it does not exclude from that time things like quorum calls, fights over points of order, et cetera, we are clearly making a mockery of the process, and I would hope that that would not continue to happen.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. I am sure, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules over there would attest to, that we do not intend to place a time limit certain. There will be 25 to 30 hours of debate on general debate and the amendment process, but there will be a assigned time for each amendment as we go along. We do not intend to have a time certain to cut off debate at all.

The points are well-taken.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield again to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that from the gentleman. I would hope that in the future if we do have a time certain there would be exclusions, you know, words being taken down or quorum calls, et cetera. The only thing I would like to say though as I am told that in accordance with past practice the minority on the Committee on Rules has been given a tentative list of amendments, and the gentlewoman from Colorado is conspicuous by her absence from that list. I am told that there is a tentative list out and the amendment that the gentlewoman from Colorado is proposing, the President's numbers, was not on that list. I hope that that was very tentative and soon to be corrected, because it does seem to us a major omission for that not to be there.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. In response to the gentleman from Massachusetts' comments, and I do appreciate his comments, because it is a very important bill, I might warn Members that because it is such an important bill we could go late into the evenings the 3 days that we will be on this bill.

Mrs. KENNELLY. The gentleman is saying that there is a possibility that we will go late Tuesday and Wednesday and Thursday?

Mr. DELAY. It is highly likely that we will go late on Tuesday, Wednesday, and even Thursday.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield again to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I just want to hope that the House dining room has got the television on and heard what the gentleman said.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, quickly I would just like to ask one other thing. I notice on the schedule we got that morning hours on Tuesday have not been there. Is that just an oversight?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentlewoman will yield, that is just an oversight. We will have morning hours.

Mrs. KENNELLY. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW TO TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 1995

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, June 9, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 13, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1615

PROVIDING MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 962) to amend the Immigration Act of 1990 relating to the membership of the United States Commission on Immigration Reform.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to ask the gentleman from Texas to explain the bill, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 962 adds former Representatives Hamilton Fish and Ron Mazzoli, by name, to the Commission on Immigration, chaired by former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan of Texas.

Hamilton Fish and Ron Mazzoli were both long-time members of the Committee on the Judiciary and of the Immigration Committee. Adding these two individuals to the commission would be a fitting tribute to their years of service in the Congress and to their work on immigration policy, and both have much to contribute to the commission itself.

Barbara Jordan, Chair of the Commission on Immigration Reform and Dr. Susan Forbes Martin, executive director of the commission, have expressed their support for this bill.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the minority is in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 962

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION.

Section 141(a)(1) of the Immigration Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-649) is amended—

(1) by striking "9 members to be appointed" and inserting "11 members"; and
(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

(F) Hamilton Fish, former Member of Congress and Ranking Minority Member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and Romano Mazzoli, former Member of Congress and Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Law, Immigration, and Refugees of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Texas: Page 1, line 6: Strike out "to be appointed".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAJO-HOPI RELOCATION HOUSING PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Resources be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 349) to reauthorize appropriations for the Navajo-Hopi Relocation Housing Program, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] to enable him to explain this piece of legislation.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the immediate consideration of S. 349, legislation which would reauthorize, for the upcoming 2 fiscal years, funding for that portion of the 1974 Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute Settlement Act, Public Law 93-531, which has come to be known as the Navajo-Hopi Relocation Housing Program.

This housing program provides payments to relocated Navajo and Hopi families who have been forced from lands partitioned pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 93-531.

As of the beginning of this year, Mr. Speaker, 2,518 families had been relocated. Another 746 eligible families are awaiting their benefits. Additional families may be determined to be eligible for relocation assistance in the months and years ahead.

S. 349 is needed so that this relocation program may be brought to a conclusion and this chapter in the long dispute between Hopi and the Navajo tribes can be resolved.

This legislation would authorize to be appropriated not more than \$30 million each year for the upcoming 2 fiscal years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this important legislation.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the purpose of S. 349 is to extend the authorization of the Navajo-Hopi Relocation Housing Program through fiscal year 1997. The Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute Settlement Act was enacted in 1974 to resolve land disputes between the tribes dating back over a century. The act required the partition of the disputed lands and relocation of members of each tribe from the lands partitioned to the other tribe.

The House has had hours of debate on the land dispute between the Navajo and Hopi tribes and I will not debate the merits or problems here today. This bill does nothing to change the Settlement Act or the lands addressed by it. It simply allows for an extension of time for additional families to relocate.

As is often the case, I think it is safe to say that neither tribe is thrilled with this bill, but both accept it as necessary to the process which I hope will come to an end soon.

The Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 349

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NAVAJO-HOPI RELOCATION HOUSING PROGRAM.

Section 25(a)(8) of Public Law 93-531 (25 U.S.C. 640d-24(a)(8)) is amended by striking "1989," and all that follows through "and 1995." and inserting "1995, 1996, and 1997."

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN CHILD PROTECTION AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Resources be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 441) to reauthorize appropriations for certain programs under the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California to explain this piece of legislation.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the immediate consideration of S. 441, legislation which would reauthorize, for the upcoming 2 fiscal years, funding for the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act.

That 1990 act, Public Law 101-630, currently provides prevention and mental health treatment for child abuse and family violence victims on Indian reservations.

S. 441 would reauthorize \$10 million each year to be provided in the form of Indian Health Service grants to tribes for treatment programs for Indians who have been victims of child sexual abuse.

This legislation would also reauthorize \$30 million each year to be provided to tribes to be used for the development of Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Programs. In addition, S. 441 would reauthorize \$3 million each year to fund Indian Child Resource and Family Service Centers within each Bureau of Indian Affairs area office.

Mr. Speaker, Public Law 101-630 has spent 5 years awaiting implementation primarily because the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service have failed to promulgate regulations needed under the act. However, it is my understanding that these long-awaited regulations have finally been completed and are now awaiting final approval.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of S. 441, without amendment, so that this legislation can be forwarded to the White House as soon as possible and, thus, so that the Appropriations Committee can move forward in considering funding pursuant to a program which is authorized for each of the 2 upcoming fiscal years.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, S. 441 extends the authorization of certain programs under the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act for 2 years.

This act was written to counter a rising number of prosecutions of Federal, State, and tribal employees for child abuse on reservations and the high rate of incidents of family violence affecting American Indian families. It provides for on reservation treatment for abused children. Suffering abuse is traumatic enough for small children to endure, but to then be taken for treatment far from those who love and support the child only deepens the wounds already inflicted.

This act also provides tribes with needed assistance in reporting child abuse, and resources for family violence prevention programs on reservations.

Mr. Speaker, the work of this important act has only just begun. I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 441

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS.

Sections 409(e), 410(h), and 411(i) of the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act (25 U.S.C. 3208(e), 3209(h), and 3210(i), respectively) are each amended by striking "and 1995" and inserting "1995, 1996, and 1997".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THANKS FOR THE HEROIC RESCUE OF CAPT. SCOTT O'GRADY

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, this morning at 5:50 a.m., two CH-53 Sea Stallion assault helicopters, two AH-1 Cobra attack helicopters and two AV-8 Harrier jump jets were launched from the U.S.S. Kearsarge to travel into war-torn Bosnia and rescue Capt. Scott F. O'Grady whose F-16 jet was shot down over hostile Serb territory 6 days ago.

It was a daring, risky daytime rescue. Less than 1 hour after the launch, Capt. Scott F. O'Grady ran out of the woods, pistol in hand, and safely boarded one of the massive CH-53 Sea Stallion helicopters.

As the chopper took off to flee Bosnia in these most dangerous and harrowing of circumstances, its fuselage was hit by two shots and its blades were clipped by small fire. A missile was fired but missed. Still, the pilot of that 53 Echo chopper was able to safely exit Bosnia over the Adriatic Sea and return Captian O'Grady to safety aboard the U.S.S. Kearsarge.

The pilot of that chopper in that extraordinarily courageous rescue mission was U.S. Marine Capt. Paul A. Fortunato, 30, the son of Paul and Gayle Fortunato of Concord Township in Northeast Ohio.

Captian Fortunato's mother, Gayle, said, "This is what they train for." But I would disagree. You cannot train for acts of heroism. They come from within the heart and soul. They are the products of a deep and abiding love of country. Capt. Paul A. Fortunato is the embodiment of a hero.

For that, on behalf of citizens of the 19th District of Ohio and all of the

United States of America, we thank you Capt. Paul A. Fortunato, and the rest of the brave participants in this heroic and spectacular rescue mission.

America is infinitely proud of you, and forever grateful.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to exchange my 5-minute special order with that of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO INCLUDE AMERICAN SAMOA AND GUAM INTO THE EXPEDITED FUNDS AVAILABILITY ACT

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD], to introduce a bill to include the U.S. territories of American Samoa and Guam into the Expedited Funds Availability Act.

Mr. Speaker, for as long as I have been doing my banking in American Samoa, getting access to funds represented by checks drawn on banks outside of American Samoa has taken literally weeks. Banking customers throughout the United States had similar problems, and in response Congress passed the Expedited Funds Availability Act in 1987. The 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands were included in the act, but the territories of Guam and American Samoa were not.

While Guam and American Samoa are still the most distant territories, billions of dollars now move daily around the world at close to the speed of light.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of years ago the Samoans and the Micronesians carried their currency across vast expanses of open ocean in heroic voyages in wind-driven canoes made of hollowed logs. I have sailed part of the Pacific Ocean in a double-hull Polynesian voyaging canoe called the Hokuleian from Tahiti to Hawaii for 28 days, and I think I could have carried my currency in stones from one port to another faster than funds are now being made available by the Banks in American Samoa and Guam. This is the 95th year of this country, and I hope the banks in the Pacific will enter this century before the rest of us move on to the next one.

I ask that a copy of the bill be printed in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

H.R.—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Expedited Funds Availability Act (12 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 602(20) (12 U.S.C. 4001(20)) by inserting “, located in the United States,” after “ATM”;

(2) in section 602(21) (12 U.S.C. 4001(21)) by inserting “Guam, American Samoa,” after “Puerto Rico,”;

(3) in section 602(23) (12 U.S.C. 4001(23)) by inserting “Guam, American Samoa,” after “Puerto Rico,”; and

(4) by adding at the end of section 603(d) (12 U.S.C. 4002(d)) the following new paragraph:

“(3) EXTENSION FOR CERTAIN DEPOSITS IN GUAM AND AMERICAN SAMOA.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any time period established under subsection (b), (c), or (e) shall be extended by 2 business days in the case of any deposit which is both—

“(A) deposited in an account at a depository institution which is located in Guam or American Samoa; and

“(B) deposited by a check drawn on an originating depository institution which is not located in the same State as the receiving depository institution.”.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

TRIBUTE TO DEPARTING PAGES

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise, as chairman of the Page Board, to advise my colleagues that today marks the end of the school year for our pages and those who are here with us today, the pages here with us today, will be replaced over the weekend by a new group of pages who will be with us for the summer.

For those who may be unfamiliar, we have school year pages and we have summer pages, so this is to advise that the pages who are here today will not be here on Monday, and, second, Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the very wonderful group of young people who have served throughout this past school year. Not all of them have served the whole year. Some of them have served only this last semester, but whether it is for the whole year or the whole semester, they have rendered distinguished service, and I do not want their parting to be unnoted.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a list of all the pages who have served here in the spring of 1995.

The list follows:

DEPARTING PAGES—SPRING 1995

Maria Grace Abuzman, Paulette M. Adams, Seth A.G. Andrew, Angela S. Armstrong, Kathryn L. Ballintine, Alison J. Bell, Rebecca A. Belletto, Joanna L. Bowen, Kirk D. Boyle, Tamara L. Brewer, Nancy M. Brim, Erin C. Carney, Carolyn A. Cassidy, Erin A.

Coker, Todd D. Connor, Richard A. Consul, Keegan B. Cotton, Mary K. Derr, Courtney M. Duncan, and Tristan A. Durst.

Joseph F. Eddy, Micheal D. Ellison, Tatum C. Evans, Kristin M. Francis, Robert C. Gates, Rebecca M. Geraci, Jennifer C. Gerard, Carolyn J. Gereau, William J. Heaton, Joseph R. Hill, Erica L. Hogue, Anna M. Holder, Molly K. Hooper, Sarah C. Jackson, Francie J. Julien, Kathleen A. Kelly, Karly A. Kevane, Debrorah L. Kinirons, Lisa N. Konitzer, and Ross C. Maradian.

Rene Marcano, Katharine J. Mills, Abigail M. Moon, Kristina M. Motulewicz, Joel T. Niedfeldt, John S. Parker, Jeffrey A. Pojanowski, Kathleen E. Quinlan, Alison J. Rabb, Lindsay E. Rosenfeld, Marianne E. Royster, Vanessa M. Ruggles, Nick T. Ryan, Timothy P. Scharf, Allison M. Sessions, Serena M. Sherrell, Tatiana I. Sohrakoff, Jennifer T. Sontag, Kelle L. Stanforth, Joshua K. Stello, Todd J. Stonewater, Xaviera M. Vanegas, Brooke E. Wagner, Matthew R. Williams, and Calvin W. Winchester.

Mr. Speaker, it may interest my colleagues, if you do not know it, although I am very proud to talk about this, and it may interest the pages if they do not know it, that I am the only sitting Republican in the House of Representatives who was actually here the last time we Republicans controlled the House.

□ 1630

I was not a Member at that time. It was as a page that I served here in the 83d and the 84th Congresses, and I want to say also that I have always—I have long regarded, since I underwent the experience, that having been a page was probably the finest, most objective, educational experience of my life. I've said many, many times that you learn as a page by doing and observing and participating and that is just an awfully lot different than reading about it in the textbooks.

So I hope to the pages—let me say I hope that this experience has been as meaningful to you as it was for me, and I wish all of you, and I know I do this on behalf of the entire House, I wish all of you well in your life's endeavors.

Some of you will be going off to college, others to the military, perhaps others to other things. But I hope this experience has served you well, will be a constant point of favorable reflection throughout your life and that you will have much success and happiness and good health in all of your undertakings.

So from me on behalf of the House to all of our department pages, “God bless you and Godspeed.”

Let me at this time yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. I thank my very good friend, the former page from Cape Girardeau, MO, for yielding to me, and I would like to first extend to him hearty congratulations for his stellar service. He served in the last Republican Congress, and we certainly hope that these pages on the Republican side who have blazed a trail will not follow the precedent that my friend from Cape Girardeau established in seeing the

other party control the place for 40 uninterrupted years.

I believe that, as we look at the fine work that these pages have done here for the past several months, it clearly is an example that should be set for many young people throughout the rest of the country and the world. We so often see the negative side of young people. It makes the headlines and the news, and very rarely is the attention focused on those who are providing stellar service as these pages have, and I would simply like to join with my colleagues here, and I know that every one of our colleagues would want to extend congratulations to them.

I thank you again, my friend, for allowing me to participate, and I hope very much that these young people have great futures ahead of them.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] for having taken this special order to honor our pages. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for his very appropriate remarks.

As the gentleman from Missouri well knows, this is traditionally a bitter-sweet time, happy on the one hand for the pages to return to their respective homes, some sadness on the other for having to leave this place that has been their home for the past year.

In closing I say to the gentleman from Missouri, and I say to the Speaker, we will forever be in the memories of these pages. They conversely will forever be in our memories. They have indeed done well here, and, as they depart, we wish them Godspeed and smooth seas, and again I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for offering this special order.

As my colleagues know, quite often not only the pages but the staff members on both sides of the aisle, the Republicans and the Democrats; I see these young ladies and young men that supervise these pages. I see them yell, "Snap to," when the pages arrive, and I see all of them cry when they leave because it is like a big family here, and quite often not enough of us pay attention to what I call our critters that run about. You will see them here at 5:30 in the morning going to school, you will see them here at midnight, and I challenge any one of our Members to ever see a page that did not look at them and smile and say "hi," and maybe sometimes all of us can take a note from that.

But I want to thank you for the special order and say, job well done, kids, or critters, and thank you very much.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman from California.

I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will just be very brief.

I say to the outstanding young people who are the pages, we thank you for your service. It seems that the good times always go very, very quickly, but you will be missed and remembered, and do not lose track. Come back, stay in touch, and God bless you. Thank you very much.

Mr. EMERSON. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. I thank my dear colleague from the great "Show Me State" of Missouri, and I am happy to see one of the best clerks in history—We are watching the new one very closely—Donald K. Anderson on the floor here, who has also been one of the masters in inspiring these young pages.

I want to tell you pages something about my last page, where he is today. I have got a page come in in the new class. Not every Congressman can get a page every class, so it has been 5 years since I had a page. He was a son of a good friend of mine, Andy Messing's son Eric. He spent his page time here. He set a record; I bet some of you have passed it: One of the swiftest couriers, male or female, I have ever seen, and he went from here to Annapolis, and he graduated from Annapolis a few months ago, went to a brief school, and he arrived in the Mediterranean with our beautiful 6th Fleet just a few days ago. I do not know where Eric Messing is. Maybe he is on the *Kearsarge*, and what a day it is to be on the *Kearsarge*. Today, your day of graduation, a true story book place, better than any Hollywood movie, and an ex-page may be an eyewitness to this, on a U.S. carrier, a Navy-Marine Corps carrier named after one of our great battles. This morning, June 8, two big giant H-53C Stallion helicopters launched U.S. Marines as marines saved DUKE CUNNINGHAM out to rescue an Air Force F-16 pilot, two Huey Cobra gunships flying escort and two U.S. Marine Corps ADAD vertical takeoff carrier jets flying cover, and they find our Air Force captain, Scott O'Grady. He comes running out of the woods, pistol in hand, jumps on one of the Marine choppers, rescue guys helping him on board, and a rocket-propelled grenade is fired at these massive helicopters as they lift off in victory. God plays a role at this point. Mere miss, and they are all back on the *Kearsarge* now, toasting one another.

Dr. O'Grady and Mrs. O'Grady, right here, a physician in Alexandria, brother Paul, sister Stacey, all happy.

What a country you young people have just served, what a great blessed country, the United States of America, and you have a Government experience in your youth second to none. Run for office, some of you. Come back here like several of our pages, like this gentleman, who are serving their country.

Go out and become doctors and fighter pilots and young female physicists. Do anything you want, you women. But some of you, please run for office even if you lose. Try and come back here so when I come in here in a wheelchair I can visit with you about June 1995. Godspeed and, my God, bless you in your every endeavor, and may all of your dreams come true. Well done.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ]. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Thank you very much because I have not failed on previous occasions of this nature. From my inception of a career here, the question of pages has always been foremost, and preeminently so. I believe I was the first to bring about the occasion of dipping into a segment of our population back in the Southwest that had never had a page proceed from its midst, and very proud to say that it was the beginning for him in which the stimulus he received, and being that he had never been out of the city of San Antonio up to that point, enabled him to chart a course that has resulted in his carving a niche in our San Antonio society and his finding his place on a professional level.

So I want to add my voice to the gentleman's in complimenting these young ladies and young men who have taken time. Now, it does take dedication, and it is a selected choice that each one of the individuals does. When you consider that not every youth is interested, we then have more reason to be grateful to them for their interest in the most intimate aspect of the proceedings of this great lawmaking body, and I again want to thank the gentleman for his thoughtfulness.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I think we should also note the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] alluded to it, that in the Chamber with us at this time is the distinguished former Clerk of the House, Mr. Donald K. Anderson, who has had a long-time interest in the page program, he himself having been a page many years ago.

Mr. Anderson, unfortunately, does not have the privileges of the floor and cannot speak, but he has prepared some remarks that he would have delivered if he could have said them.

So, for the RECORD, I include at this point a statement by Mr. Anderson:

STATEMENT OF DONALD K. ANDERSON,
FORMER CLERK OF THE HOUSE

I am grateful, indeed, to Congressman Emerson for the opportunity to share my thoughts on the occasion of the departure of the House Page Class of 1994-5.

My roots in the Page Program are deep, beginning with my own appointment as a page in the Eighty-sixth Congress and graduation in the Class of 1960. For eighteen years as the Manager of the Democratic cloakroom, I was a page supervisor and during my eight years as the Clerk of the House was a member of

the Page Board on which I continue to serve as Member Emeritus.

The Class of 1995 is a splendid and remarkable group of young Americans. They have unflinchingly distinguished themselves in every area of their page experience. Successful and useful lives are easily predictable. I am proud to have been a page and proud to be a friend of the Class of 1995.

God bless you and stay in touch.

Now, with that, Mr. Speaker, that concludes my remarks. Once again I want to thank the pages for their service and extend every good wish to them for their future success and for their careers.

THE SHOCKING AUDIT OF THE OFFICE OF SUPPORT AIRCRAFT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Today Senator GRASSLEY and I received a very important report from the U.S. General Accounting Office. We asked for an audit of the Office of Support Aircraft of the Department of Defense, and what we received in this audit is shocking. The Department of Defense, which is required to keep administrative aircraft adequate to meet the wartime needs of the United States of America, made use of 48 such aircraft during the Persian Gulf war, maintains over 500 aircraft, 10 times what they used at the height of the Persian Gulf war and, last year they spent \$378 million on these support aircraft.

There are some notable problems with their use of these aircraft. There is no centralized control. Each and every service determines who and when people will be eligible to use these aircraft. Frequently, one-star generals and lower-ranking civilian officials from the Department of Defense, instead of using their chauffeurs and their automobiles, their limousines and their drivers, to go to Andrews Air Force Base to catch a jet, opt to take a helicopter at the cost of \$1,400 to \$1,600 an hour. According to the GAO, they save between 5 and 15 minutes instead of spending \$30 on a cab. They spend \$400 to \$1,600 to operate a helicopter. I think it is more for their ego than it is for any support purposes, and that is what the General Accounting Office has found.

We also have the fact that we are providing now for the commander in Korea, C-U-S-F-K, as he is called, a four-star general, we are going to provide him with a luxury pallet. That is something which can be inserted into a jet aircraft as this general is required, often, to come back to Washington, DC, to receive orders, and the current \$350,000 luxury pallets—I think that most Americans would like to live in a \$350,000 house, but this general does not think that a \$350,000 luxury pallet is adequate to put in an airplane so he can fly back in comfort to Washington, DC. No, he needs a \$750,000 pallet so that this general can fly back and forth

to Washington, DC, in extraordinary luxury at probably seven times the average median price of houses for most Members of Congress, \$750,000 for a luxury pallet for one general.

□ 1645

It is time that the generals in the Pentagon and the civilians in the Pentagon entered into the real world, the world of limitations, the world where you do not go first class-plus when you are not on an urgent mission. And the GAO identifies that most of these missions were not urgent missions.

In fact, they also find that not only are these aircraft used to transport generals, as I said, every one-star general in the Pentagon can take a helicopter and then get a private jet any time they want. They do not have to justify it or compare it to commercial rates. They do not even have to compare it to first class rates with a chauffeur-driven limousine. They can just do it, because it is there. And there are no controls.

We not only use it indiscriminately for Pentagon brass and for officials at the Pentagon, we are carting around the cadets at our academies to football games and swim meets. We had one football game in Hawaii. The Air Force played the University of Hawaii. The taxpayers of the United States of America spent \$270,000 to transport Air Force cadets to the University of Hawaii football game. Now, is that not wonderful?

My hometown university, the University of Oregon, went to the Rose Bowl this year, something that only happened once in the last quarter of a century. It is our second time. Nobody asked the State of Oregon to support the students of the University of Oregon or the alumni of the university of Oregon and spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to transport them. People made their own way.

But no, not when it comes to the Air Force Academy. Was it a particularly important game in Hawaii? Why did we spend \$300,000 on transporting? It had something to do with the fact the game was in Hawaii. They spent a total of \$2 million transporting cadets to and from sporting events last year, many times at the cost of \$2,000 per student. Those same students could have flown first class and each student could have had a chauffeur-driven limousine and had their meals and hotels paid for, for less than it cost to transport them, and this does not include the cost of the crew on the ground and other incidental costs, wear and tear on the airplane. These are only the actual operating costs of the plane.

So it is time the Pentagon came to reality here. I have introduced with Senator GRASSLEY legislation that would reduce the support aircraft to that which is needed, truly needed by the military, 50 percent, save \$200 million next year and every year thereafter.

ALTERNATIVES TO OUR CURRENT TAX SYSTEM

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the need to change the tax system.

Mr. Speaker, James Madison, one of the architects of the Constitution, once warned that we must keep our laws simple. Our freedom is in danger, he explained, when laws become so complicated that no one knows what they mean and change so often that no one can predict what they will be in the future.

Our Tax Code in the United States provides an example of what happens when we ignore Madison's warning. Today, thanks to the bold leadership of Chairman BILL ARCHER, we can now discuss fundamental changes in our Tax Code, including even the elimination of the income tax.

As a former chairman of the Senate Finance Committee in Michigan, I had the opportunity to deal with several alternatives to our current tax system. Among these alternatives was a consumption tax, a sales tax with our industrial processing exemption, and a flat-rate income tax. I would like to simply make a few comments about our experience in Michigan.

Michigan is the only State in the Nation with a consumption tax. We call it the single business tax. It has been in effect since 1975. A couple of points that come from this experience are, first of all, if a consumption tax is adopted at the national level, it must include a deduction for capital acquisition. That is full expensing of the cost of machinery and buildings. Michigan's capital acquisition deduction has been the most successful element of our consumption task. It increases productivity and encourages business and job expansion.

Second, the tax base should be determined using a subtractive method of calculation. Michigan uses the additive method to get the value added, and it has given us some problems. While it is going to yield the same base as the subtractive method, it has created a great deal of confusion among businesses. The tax is viewed as our income tax by many businesses and results in such questions as why can not I deduct wages? Why do I have to pay a tax even though I do not have profit? These types of questions would be eliminated if the tax was calculated using the so-called subtractive method.

Third, the primary problem with a consumption tax is that the tax is hidden in the final price of the product. This creates a danger that the government can raise the rate without individual taxpayers being aware of it. This is what has happened oftentimes in Europe. However, our experience in Michigan has been that since the business tax rate has not been increased since 1976, it has not been a problem. In

fact, it was recently reduced by a small amount.

One major problem with a sales tax is that it tends to become a turnover tax. It is important that only the final sales are taxed. For example, we should not tax the sale of rubber sold to Goodyear Tire, for example, and then tax the full value of the tires when they are again sold. This fundamental concept is clear in theory, but there are numerous difficulties in actual implementation that we have pretty much solved in our Michigan system. The problem with services is especially severe.

Finally, the flat rate income tax has some important advantages. It is simple, it has the same economic effect as the ideal consumption or sales tax, and the taxpayer, if withholding is eliminated, will be very knowledgeable about the rate.

There are two negatives with a flat tax, as I see it. First, it would not allow the repeal of the 16th amendment and dismantling of the Internal Revenue Department, and thus special interests could again come and complicate the existing Tax Code.

Second, there are problems with the tax treatment of U.S. exports. While the economic effect of the Army flat tax is identical to a value-added tax, GATT may preclude us from removing a flat tax on our exports while governments using a VAT could remove the tax on their exports.

In summary, each alternative to the current income tax system has strengths and weaknesses, but each method is far superior to our current invasive system that we have today. In "The Wealth of Nations," Adam Smith spoke against the income tax, saying the necessary invasion of privacy to enforce tax would be too much for citizens to bear. Today his words ring true, and we must move forward with this opportunity to replace the current tax system.

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

[Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SETTING THE STAKES ON THE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be rec-

ognized ahead of Ms. JACKSON-LEE for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will Ms. JACKSON-LEE join me, and my colleague from Orlando, Mr. MCCOLLUM from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues, GENE GREEN and KEN BENTSEN from the great city of Houston and the great State of Texas in a full-throated support of defending our world champion, yes, you might be thinking, Houston Rockets.

To Ms. BROWN and Mr. MCCOLLUM, who are from Florida, and their Orlando constituents, all of you have much to be proud of in their young Magic team, a team that promises to be a strong NBA contender for years to come—in the future. But I am confident that in this instance, the veterans experience of Hakeem the Dream, Clyde the Glide, and the rest of the tested Rocket squad, will be a decisive advantage over the strong shoulders and young, young legs of Shaq, Penny, and the talented Magic lineup.

The Houston side of this friendly wager offers a basketball signed by all of our team, but particularly our all-star center. And our staffs, now, listen to this, are prepared to provide the Floridians when you lose with a delicious Texas barbecue meal. We do not think that this will happen, that we would have to prepared that for you, but, however, in the good spirit of good sportsmanship, we look forward to receiving a signed ball from Magic and, as well, I look forward to enjoying a delicious meal prepared by your staffs in the true Floridian style, and I know you know how to get a good meal going.

So I hope you will accept this friendly wager for the Houston Rockets World Champion to do it again.

I yield to Mr. MCCOLLUM.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank you both for yielding. I must say having Orlando Magic, with CORRINE BROWN and I representing Orlando, we are mighty proud of them, and we are ready to step up to the challenge that you have just made to us.

We understand the talent the Houston Rockets have, and we saw them last night as they won a very, very close game. I think, however, the closeness of that game and the excitement of it just proves how evenly competitive these teams are. And it is our judgment, and I am sure CORRINE BROWN and BILL MCCOLLUM will both agree, that when the chips are down after the whole series is completed, our young Magic are going to surprise your Houston Rockets and we are going to be able to be the ones receiving the meal.

We are more than happy to provide a basketball if indeed we are on the short end of the stick, but we do not think we are going to be. We have got Penny Hardaway, we have got Shaq and Anderson and Scott and Shaw and Grant and a whole list of others, Bowie and Royal, and I could go on down the list, Turner.

Those are players who have never had the chance to be where they are today, with the exception of Grant, who was with the Bulls for a few years, and they are hungry. And we got a feeling that they are just as hungry, and in fact more than we are for a meal, they are hungry for the championship.

We are looking forward to the next few games as we meet the challenge you have offered. We are proud in Orlando of our Orlando Magic.

For the moment I will yield back to my colleague, CORRINE BROWN.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Ms. JACKSON-LEE, not only do we accept your challenge, I am prepared to raise it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Oh, my goodness.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Not only do we stand by our men in Orlando, the Magic, but we will throw in a couple of Disney tickets and Universal Studio tickets. And I understand we have some of the sweetest corn in the country. We are prepared to provide sweet corn and peanuts. And someone from your delegation asked for an alligator. But what we are prepared to do, is the Houston team will be alligator bait.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. If the gentleman will yield, before that, about the corn, we have zellwood sweet corn in season right now. If we do not make it, and we think we will, we are going to bring some of that up here and we are going to serve you some of the best sweet corn you have ever eaten.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. My goodness, it looks like two on one. But my colleagues who are in absentia will join me in accepting the challenge. We have got beets, we have got good fruit, we have a variety of other talent going on in our great State, along with Sam Cassell, Kenny Smith, Mario. We have got a whole list of those on the fine Houston team. I do realize that all of this that we are betting on the friendly wager will go to charity for all of our good efforts in our respective States.

But I tell you standing here in the well, I am feeling embellished and strong to accept your challenge, for the world champion Houston Rockets will do it again.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. We will see you tomorrow night at 9 o'clock in Orlando.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. We will indeed. And we look forward to seeing you in a couple of games after that too. We are sure we are going to be around right to the end, and we are looking forward to this challenge.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Thank you. We are all very optimistic.

CONCERN OVER LIMITATIONS ON OFFERING AMENDMENTS ON FOREIGN AID BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time when we expect that legislation that is passed will be offered and passed in a bipartisan manner in the light of the seriousness and importance of the issue it confronts. Unfortunately, at the conclusion of the passage of H.R. 1561, the foreign aid bill, some 60 amendments were not allowed to be discussed. I rise to express my concern over that, as well as the passage of this particular legislation.

□ 1700

For the amendment that I felt was most important, among many others that was eliminated, was the increased funding from \$2 million to \$2,500,000 in fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the micro- and small enterprise development credit program.

This program, which is administered by the Agency for International Development, has been a successful program emphasizing direct assistance to businesses owned by the poor in developing nations. Most of the businesses employ less than 10 individuals but help develop a strong entrepreneurial tradition in many countries.

The microenterprises are very small, informally organized, nonagricultural businesses that employ a third of the labor force in lower income countries. As I heard one of my Republican colleagues say, it teaches these entities and individuals to fish and not merely to be given fish.

The micro- and small enterprise development program, in conjunction with the private financial institutions, help provide full access to formal financial markets to small businesses that would not otherwise have such access.

These small businesses participating in the MSED are run by and employed by the poor. This would help keep a stabilized atmosphere in developing nations and that is a sure way to ensure political and economic peace.

If we are in fact to be a world power, it is important for us to stand on behalf of economic development in Third World and developing nations helping themselves. Again, we were not able today to rise to the support of the African Development Foundation, by adding to its budget \$1,500,000 to increase it from the \$5 million. This is a modest increase and it reflects the concern of Americans that we must be budget wise.

However, this particular foundation, established in 1980, is a forward-thinking organization that delivers funds directly to self-help organizations in economically undeveloped countries in Africa.

Since no funds are channeled through any foreign government, the ADF

avoids any bureaucratic patterns in dispensing funds. This organization also has been instrumental in expanding ties and developing goodwill among the citizens of the United States and the citizens of many African countries.

In the year 1995, ADF received \$18 million. This year's budget proposes \$7 million, leaving ADF with only \$10 million. However, as we proceed in the years to come, the funding will go to \$5 million, which would be a 50-percent reduction from fiscal year 1996.

At this rate, Mr. Speaker, ADF, which has been very helpful, will simply go out of business.

My amendment that was to be proposed was part of an effort to ensure that these countries are able to stand on their own two feet. It helped agricultural cooperative youth groups and self-help organizations. These groups have been effective stewards of these grants which range from \$25,000 to \$250,000.

Moreover, the ADF conducts annual audits on how these community organizations utilize these funds and ADF has been pleased with the performance of the grantees. Many of my corporate constituents who do business in Africa and other Third World nations have indicated how important it is to maintain a stable climate, how important it is to have a responsible community in these countries so that we in America can do business and create jobs.

My amendment would have helped the African Development Foundation and helped millions of Africans and Americans and support adequate development assistance which would ultimately improve foreign relations and commercial trade between Africa and the United States.

I simply ask, as we move this legislation toward the U.S. Senate, that we enact responsible foreign policy. Yes, be efficient and effective with our dollars. We do not give away dollars recklessly and for no reason, but we do try to help those nations who are trying to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the U.S. Senate devise a foreign aid bill that works for Americans and works for its allies.

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

[Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TIAHRT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. POSHARD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my special order of today for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

OPIC

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when this country has a \$4.5 trillion national debt, and at a time when there are Members here who are talking about cutting back on Medicare and Medicaid and veterans programs, student loans, school lunch programs, and other programs of tremendous need for the vast majority of our people, it seems to me that we can no longer tolerate spending billions and billions of taxpayers' dollars on corporate welfare. That is money that goes to the largest corporations in America and to the wealthiest people.

I want to say a few words today about one particular program which I think is a very good example of corporate welfare. That is OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. What OPIC does is receive about \$5 million a year of taxpayers' money. And what they do with that money is something that is very interesting. What they do is help some of the largest corporations in America invest abroad. They provide insurance for those companies who are investing in politically unstable countries such as Russia, Eastern Europe, former Communist bloc and certain Latin American countries. What they are saying is, if there is political unrest in those countries, if your assets are nationalized, we will provide insurance to cover your loss.

Also, OPIC provides generous financing to the large multinationals who wish to invest abroad.

Now, it seems to me that, if the largest corporations in America wish to invest in Russia, wish to invest in Croatia, wish to invest in Peru or Latin America, they have every right in the world to do so. But it also seems to me to be absolutely wrong to say to the middle class of America, people who are working longer hours for lower

wages, that we are going to subsidize your investment abroad.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that particularly outrages me is that many of the companies who we are providing incentives to invest abroad are precisely those companies who are laying off hundreds of thousands of American workers.

Now, it seems to me that it is a little bit absurd that we are helping the Ford Motor Company invest abroad, after they have laid off 337,000 workers here in the United States in the last 15 years. And I would ask my colleagues to take a good look at this chart, which is right here by my side.

What this chart shows is that Ford is getting help from OPIC to invest abroad; interesting, after laying off 337,000 American workers in the last 15 years. So we are saying to Ford and the other companies, thank you very much for throwing American workers out on the street. Thank you very much for lowering the standard of living of American workers. And here is your reward, the taxpayers of America will help you invest in other countries. And we say thank you to the Exxon company. You have only laid off 86,000 American workers in the last 15 years. Here some help. Maybe you want to go abroad and hire people there for low wages. Thank you very much. Thank you AT&T, you have only laid off over 200,000 American workers. General Electric, 221,000 American workers, and so forth and so on.

Now, it seems to me that rather than having the taxpayers of America providing incentives for these huge corporations to go abroad, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, and this is a fact not very often talked about, that these American corporations, the large multinationals who are laying off millions of American workers, they have invested this last year \$750 billion abroad. Now, in every city in America, in every State in America, mayors and governors are getting down on their hands and knees and they are saying to these companies, invest in the State of Vermont, my state, invest in Texas, invest in California. But these corporations do not. They are laying off American workers and they are going abroad.

So it seems to me that instead of encouraging them to go abroad, maybe we may want to say to them, hey, stay back here in the United States and provide jobs for our workers; pay your taxes here.

At a time when this country has a \$4.5 trillion national debt it seems to me that we can no longer afford to maintain various forms of corporate welfare, at great expense and risk to the taxpayers.

I rise today to call for the end of Government funding for OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and for the elimination of this agency which receives about \$50 million a year in funding but, more importantly, has placed at risk some \$6.3 billion of taxpayer money through Government insured assets.

It is important to acknowledge that concern about Government funding for OPIC extends across the political spectrum—progressives, moderates and conservatives increasingly see no sense to the public funding of this agency.

I am also delighted to say that Budget Chairman JOHN KASICH, in the recently passed Republican budget, quite appropriately called for eliminating the appropriations for OPIC, and I want to credit Mr. KASICH for doing so.

Furthermore, a Wall Street Journal editorial of April 12, 1995, also called for the defunding of OPIC. The Wall Street Journal is deeply concerned, as I am, about OPIC's risky financial guarantees in Russia and Eastern Europe.

A very conservative think tank—the Center for Security Policy—is also sounding the alarm regarding the growing danger of OPIC continuing to use taxpayer dollars to insure risky investments in Russia and other former Communist countries.

But it is not only conservative groups who are calling for the elimination of OPIC funding. Progressive groups are also raising the same cry. For example, here in Congress the 46-member progressive caucus was the first congressional organization to call for OPIC's elimination. Furthermore, two organization affiliated with Ralph Nader—Congress Watch and Essential Information—have called for the elimination of OPIC.

Mr. Speaker, if huge Fortune-500 corporations like Ford, Exxon, AT&T, General Electric, IT&T, and Coca-Cola want to make investments in politically unstable countries, they have every right in the world to do so. That is not what we are debating today.

These multi-billion-dollar corporations have every right in the world to invest in Russia and Eastern Europe—in Albania, Croatia, El Salvador, Somalia, Peru, or anyplace else they want to invest. But, Mr. Speaker, they do not have the right to ask the American taxpayers to underwrite the insurance on those investments. And they do not have the right to get advantageous financing from the Government.

If these corporations invest and make a lot of money—the stockholders get the profits. If, on the other hand, they invest in Russia or any other country and because of political instability they lose their assets through nationalization or expropriation—the American taxpayer picks up the bill. That is wrong. If you take a risk, you can sometimes make a lot of money. But sometimes you lose. And it is not the function of the U.S. Government to place our taxpayers at risk for \$6.3 billion to protect the investments of huge, multinational corporations.

Now, who are some of the corporations who are receiving this help? Here are some recent examples: OPIC is providing \$105,057,000 in insurance in Russia for the Coca-Cola Export Corp.; \$200,000,000 in insurance for Du Pont in Russia; \$200,000,000 in insurance for Mars, Inc., in Russia, which I believe is owned by one of the wealthiest families in America; and \$200,000,000 in financing for GTE and AT&T for a joint cellular telephone project in Argentina.

Other major corporations that are being provided insurance by OPIC are: First National Bank of Boston, the Enron Corp., Bechtel, Cargil, Duracell, American Express, International Paper, Levi Strauss, and Citibank.

Mr. Speaker, another aspect of this whole situation which bothers me very much is that the U.S. Government is providing financial in-

centives to the largest corporations in America to invest abroad—when, on the contrary, we should be demanding that these companies invest in the United States, hire workers in the United States, and pay taxes in the United States. Corporate America already invests \$750 billion a year abroad—and the number is increasing every year. They do not need Government subsidies to increase that investment.

It is especially outrageous that we are using taxpayers dollars to help finance companies who, in the last 15 years, have thrown millions of American workers out on the street. My colleagues, take a good look at this chart, and note how many workers have been fired by some of the very same companies that OPIC is now providing financial assistance to.

Should we really be helping Ford Motor Co. invest abroad after they have laid off 337,000 workers in the last 15 years. Thank you, Ford, for laying off these workers. Now here is your Federal subsidy to invest abroad so that you can hire foreign workers. Exxon—86,000 workers laid off, AT&T—233,000 laid off, General Electric—221,000 workers laid off or downsized as they occasionally say. And on and on it goes. This is a list of only 10 companies—and they have laid off over 1 million workers. Helping companies go abroad after they have laid off 1 million American workers does not make a lot of sense to me.

I wonder what the laid off workers of these companies must think when they learn that their tax dollars are rewarding those companies who have caused so much suffering and, to a large degree, are responsible for the terrible decline in the standard of living for working people all over this country. Yes, cut-backs in Medicare, Medicaid, student loans and veterans programs, but \$50 million a year, and a \$6.3 billion insurance risk for the largest corporations in America. A very sensible policy.

BOSNIA

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in order to report on my actions and activities with respect to the ongoing situation in Bosnia and my letter to President Clinton, which I had prepared immediately, that that became a crisis point, and it looked as if the President might take unilateral action without any real consultation with the Congress.

So in my letter I said: "The preparations currently underway for the possible involvement of U.S. military forces on the ground in Bosnia impel me once again"—because I have previously "to urge you in the strongest possible terms to seriously consider this matter before committing our troops to any such action and to abide in the closest possible way to the laws of the land with regard to the use of U.S. military force abroad."

Let me say, this has been the story of my career since I first came to the Congress, beginning with then-President Kennedy, believe it or not, who was probably one of the most intimate personal friends I have had as a President, and then with President Johnson,

who succeeded him, whom, of course, I had known from the beginning back in Texas. And more so with President Johnson, I became a gadfly, as the drum beats rose in noise and the urge to propel our armed services into action became irresistible.

So in this letter I say, as I said in my letter to you last year—and this reflects my consistency “air strikes will not accomplish the goal of peace in the former Yugoslavia.”

Fortunately, of course, we know now that the president has been restrained, and I compliment him. But as I said in this letter, in my last paragraph: “As I have expressed to you with regard to Somalia, Haiti, and before in Bosnia, as I have with previous presidents about other situations, the Constitution and the War Powers Resolutions”—which I had the great honor of first evolving and developing in this House and eventually, unfortunately too late, enacted “the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution clearly afford Congress an important role to play in the use of U.S. military force overseas, and, as you know, I have long struggled to uphold this balance of powers among co-equal branches of government. I was heartened by your comments today that Congress would be consulted in this matter and that you continue to exercise restraint in deploying United States forces on the ground in Bosnia. I fully hope and trust that you will continue to do so.”

□ 1900

I am happy to say that up until now that seems to be the case.

However, I do want to point out that one of the things that in fact has made me an irritant to be even friends, like President Johnson, is the fact that we have become inured more and more to an excessive weight in that coequal branch, which should be a coequal branch, the presidency.

After all, the Constitution itself does not make the office of the presidency Article 1. It is the Congress, and it was deliberately done. There was a reason for it. The men who wrote the Constitution were the first to protest that the king made wars. Now in democracies, we have the equivalent. The only thing is that it is not the king declaring then, but as far as the will of the people expressing itself and the idea of the fundamental nature of a justified war having been lost sight of, makes it impelling that we review this matter.

I want to terminate by saying that I will place a copy of this letter in the RECORD, so that those of my colleagues interested will have a chance to review it.

The material referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 31, 1995.

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President, *The White House, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The preparations currently underway for the possible involvement of U.S. military forces on the ground in

Bosnia impel me once again to urge you in the strongest possible terms to seriously consider this matter before committing our troops to any such action and to abide in the closest possible way to the laws of the land with regard to the use of U.S. military force abroad.

As I said in my letter to you last year, airstrikes will not accomplish the goal of peace in the former Yugoslavia. I am truly sad to say that recent events make this all the more clear. The Serbian forces in Bosnia have shown that they will exact as high a toll as possible from their adversaries in their pursuit of their military goals. In this situation where the Serbs are waging a war against the Bosnian government and where they consider the United Nations an enemy in their fight, deploying U.S. forces on the ground, whether it be in support of a reorganization of U.N. forces or in a related effort, will surely put our troops in a hostile situation and in imminent danger of being involved in combat. With the Bosnian Serb's recent demonstration of their grotesque lack of respect for civilian life and for U.N. peace-keeping forces, there can be little doubt that American forces would likewise be a target for attack.

As I have expressed to you with regard to Somalia, Haiti and before on Bosnia, as I have with previous presidents about other situations, the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution clearly afford Congress an important role to play in the use of U.S. military force overseas, and, as you know, I have long struggled to uphold this balance of powers among co-equal branches of government. I was heartened by your comments today that Congress would be consulted in this matter and that you continue to exercise restraint in deploying U.S. forces on the ground in Bosnia. I fully hope and trust that you will continue to do so.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THOSE IN A CREATIVE MEDIUM AND OF AMERICA'S ELECTED OFFICIALS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week when Senator BOB DOLE made his statements about Hollywood, it was unfortunate that they were made in the context of a presidential campaign, because his remarks were immediately analyzed and seemingly split into two camps, deciding whether or not it was an attack on Hollywood, justified or unjustified, and whether or not Hollywood should defend itself, justified or unjustified, and that seemed to end the debate. You could take sides on whether or not that attack had taken place or not.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a very fundamental mistake for Hollywood or anyone else in this country to believe that because that speech appeared in a political context and was analyzed mainly by political analysis and analysts, pundits who deal with the political people in this country, to believe that his remarks do not represent a concern in this country about the level of violence in the media, in all of its different forms, in music, in

films, TV, and a concern that is one that is shared by millions of American families, and a concern for many of us in public life.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the issue would not get down to the issue of censorship, or picking our favorite stars, or deciding who bankrolled the good movie versus the bad movie, but I would hope that we would have the possibility of having a national conversation in this country about the future of our children, about the impact of the media on our children, on our families, on ourselves, because none of us are immune from this.

It is not just young, impressionable children who absorb the hours and hours of violence that are now portrayed on TV, in the movie theaters, and in our music. It happens to all of us. It makes statements about our society. I think we have to have this discussion. I do not think you can end this discussion by denying the power of this media, all of a sudden saying we have no impact, or suggesting that it is the only reason, or the cause of many things that we do not like in our society, because it is not. These are all multifaceted problems.

I think we should do it with an understanding that this is a country that loves its movies, love its moviemakers, its songwriters and its performers. We recognize the creativity, we recognize the agility, the ability, the fascination that they can create.

We also, in loving them, recognize that they are powerful; that music can pick up our spirits, it can lower our spirits. It can excite us, it can soothe us. A film is designed to invoke emotions, to create a result, to get a response. When you listen to the great filmmakers of our time discuss how they put movies together, what they were thinking about, why they picked to do it this way, why music was added in this fashion, why this scenery, why this color, why black and white, why this, why that, why that lighting, it is all designed to move people in the viewing of that medium, designed to get a reaction, to get a response, to create an atmosphere, and they successfully do it. They have been doing it as long as the movies have been around.

You listen to them discuss that, and you appreciate that they understand the power of their medium, the power to move a Nation, the power to move a Nation's children, to excite us, to fascinate us. They know they can do that if you give them an hour and a half of your time, if you give them 2 hours, if you give them a subject. It does not matter if it is fantasy or animation, it does not matter if it is in a historical context or a completely fictional context, they know they can do that. That is the tribute, the genius.

The same is true with songwriters. They know they can move a Nation to its feet. They know they can move romance, where romance maybe was not. We have to recognize that. However,

they have also got to recognize that when it becomes unpleasant and the outcomes are not what we desire, in some instances, or what some of us do not desire in a pluralistic society, they cannot run away and say "Oh, we could not be responsible for that, because after all, it is just a movie." No, you cannot take that genius and understand and know what you have created, and then deny it the next moment, to suggest it has none of the impacts for which you designed it in this movie, but it could not have any impacts over here.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would just hope that we would not let this get down to who is getting the advantage and not getting the advantage in presidential politics, but we would bring this as a national conversation about the future of our children. I hope to have more to say on this to their body, to my constituents and to others, but I think we need this conversation without jumping to a conclusion, but understanding the responsibilities, the powers, and the obligations that go with this medium and with those of us in public office.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO ON THE RESCISSIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but notice that the President vetoed the rescissions bill, and our attempts to cut back spending on the Federal level, and to send money back home on education programs and on job training programs. The President vetoed the bill because he thought it cut too much. I have to tell you, I agree with the President that the bill was not perfect, but I do not think it was perfect for another reason. I do not think we went far enough.

Let me explain, Mr. Speaker. When he talks about education dollars, when he talks about job training dollars, what he is actually talking about is spending money on the Department of Education bureaucracy in Washington, DC. We are not talking about spending money on children, we are not talking about spending money on raising teachers' salaries, we are not talking about spending money on hiring more teachers so we can lower the student-teacher ratio, so our students can learn more. We are talking about spending more money in Washington, DC, on an education bureaucracy that has, unfortunately, failed miserably over the past 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, I was named to head the task force to look into education reform. I believe today, more than at any other time in this country's history, we have to be bold and aggressive in reforming the educational system of this

country, because if our children are going to be prepared for the 21st century, and if our children are going to be able to work in the 21st century workplace, they are going to have to do it by having the best education possible. With two young boys in public schools, I have as much at stake in this fight as anybody.

Mr. Speaker, we have to start with basics. The bill that we are introducing is called the back-to-basics education reform bill. The basics that we begin with are these. First of all, parents and teachers and principals know how to teach our students and our children better than a bureaucrat in Washington, DC. That is not a foreign concept in this country's history, or in our educational history.

The fact of the matter is that over 200 years ago we had Founding Fathers, who believed that education belonged in local communities; that we were to be a nation of communities, instead of a nation of bureaucrats and a nation of education bureaucracies.

James Madison wrote, as he was helping to frame the Constitution, "We have staked the entire future of the 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 from James Madison, one of the 3 men that was most responsible for framing the Constitution.

Of course, Thomas Jefferson wrote that "The government that governs least governs best." As they were saying that, they were not saying that because they were antigovernment. Far from it. The men and women that helped found this great constitutional republic believed government could serve a useful purpose. In fact, they dedicated their entire lives to this government, put their lives on the line in a brutal war, where they could have been killed or where they could have been hung as traitors. They believed that the Federal Government had a role, but that role was in protecting the God-given rights of the men and women and the children of the country that they were serving.

One of those rights, I have to believe, was the right to teach your children and to educate your children, instead of having bureaucrats in Washington, DC do it. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison believed that this country should be a great experiment; that we should have a country that was a nation of communities, and not a nation of bureaucrats and bureaucracies; that would have parents and individuals and families and communities making decisions on how to teach children, and what type of school programs needed to be implemented.

Unfortunately, somewhere along the line we lost our way, because in the late seventies the great education bureaucracy experiment began. It began in 1980, as Jimmy Carter struck a deal

with the NEA teacher's union to set up a national education bureaucracy. Since that time, we can see what has happened to education.

Back when it started in 1980, we were spending \$14 billion on education in this Federal bureaucracy. Since 1980, spending has gone from \$14 billion in Washington, DC, to \$33 billion. What have we gotten for our education revenue? The fact of the matter is that despite the fact we have gone from spending \$14 billion on an education bureaucracy to \$33 billion in 15 years, we have spent more money on the bureaucracy, but as you might guess, the results have not been positive. Test scores have gone down. Dropout rates have risen.

Of course, as all of you know, violence in schools has risen. You go to inner-city schools, whether it is in the South Bronx or whether it is in South Central Los Angeles, or Gary, IN, or in parts of Miami or Tampa, or even in your hometown, you know and parents know and I know as a parent that our educational system in this country continues to decline.

□ 1730

That is because education dollars are not getting into the classroom. They are coming up to Washington, DC, to our Federal bureaucracy.

Let me give you a perfect example of how this has happened. Do you know this year the Department of Education will be cutting \$100 million from their budget to keep our schools safe? Think about that. They are cutting \$100 million to keep the infrastructure in our schools safe across the country. But at the same time when they are saying we don't have the money to keep our school buildings safe for our children, they are spending \$20 million to upgrade their own bureaucracy right down the street.

Think about that. This is not robbing Peter to pay Paul. This is robbing our schools across the country, I suppose what they consider to be the flyover space between Washington, DC and Los Angeles. They are taking the money out of our schools so they can bring it up to Washington, DC, and upgrade their bureaucracy.

Is that what education should be about? Is that what educational reform should be about? I don't think so, and I know that men and women across the country that have a little bit of common sense don't think so, either. We need to put our education dollars in our school system, but the fact of the matter is that by the time the money goes through the process, the education dollars don't get to the schools.

Think about it. Where I come from—I am from northwest Florida, specifically I live in Pensacola, FL—when I have to pay a dollar for my taxes, that dollar goes from Pensacola, FL, to Atlanta, GA. That is our regional IRS center.

So when it goes up to Atlanta, the IRS center up there, they obviously

have to take out their brokerage fee in Atlanta. Then it comes up to Washington, DC, goes to the IRS there, they take out their brokerage fee, so this education dollar is getting carved up a little bit around the edges.

Then it goes to Treasury and they take out their brokerage fee. After that, of course, it goes over to the Department of Education and they take out their brokerage fee, so the education dollar is getting cut up.

Does it go down to the schools now? No, it goes to our State capital. In Florida, that State capital is Tallahassee, so the dollar goes to Tallahassee. Of course they have to take out their brokerage fee, too. By the time it gets back to our community, that dollar is being carved up and cut up in such a way that you would not even recognize it.

Some officials of the Department of Education claim that they only spend 2 percent on overhead. If you believe that, I have got some swampland to sell you in south Florida. We all know that is not the case. That dollar takes a very tortured route before it gets back to the school districts. We need to keep education dollars in the communities.

This is not a budget-cutting exercise. It is about making sure that our children get the most bang for their educational buck. We are not going to do it as long as we keep throwing money at Washington and that money is not coming back home.

Some people have suggested that this is some ideological battle, that Republicans, or conservatives, want to take power away from an educational bureaucracy for their own ideological purposes. The fact of the matter is, Republicans and Democrats alike, as well as liberals and conservatives, are slowly coming around to the realization that our teachers and our parents and our communities and our States can be trusted with the important role of educating children.

Alice Rivlin, the President's OMB director, wrote a book back in 1992 when she was at the Brookings Institute. Of course at that time she was not working for President Clinton, so she was allowed to think for herself. When she did, she wrote what I thought was a tour de force on educational reform and on reforming this Federal Government.

Alice Rivlin talked about a productivity agenda where you had States experimenting in educational reform and in job training reform and in other areas. She talked about the States all competing against each other to see who could come up with the best idea for educational reform, instead of having Washington throw down all these dictates saying this is how you are going to teach your students.

So we allow the States to compete, and the States that have the best educational system will obviously have the greatest economic development, and will have money coming into their

States and will have students coming into their States. It is what I like to call legislative laboratories.

Ask yourself this: Would you rather have Bill Clinton and an education bureaucracy in Washington tell us all how to teach our children, or would you rather have your State and your community competing with 50 other States to see who could do the job best?

What they would do is create legislative laboratories that would experiment, and they could borrow from other States. If California was doing something Utah liked, Utah could borrow from there. If Florida was doing something that Georgia liked, Georgia could borrow from that, instead of having Washington, DC, and bureaucrats in Washington continue to labor under the extremely, extremely presumptive belief that they know how to teach our children better than we know how to teach our children. It is a false premise. I have got to tell you, I believe that it is a very, very dangerous premise.

We have got again to spend our education dollars on teachers' salaries, on computers, on improving the teacher-student ratio. Let me tell you, I had an education townhall meeting in my district. I was absolutely stunned to find out that a special education teacher had 30 students in her class. Let me tell you something. There is no way a teacher teaching special education is going to be able to give children the type of attention that they need to have.

But there are shortfalls, budget shortfalls in the State. Why was that? Because we have got \$33 billion in education money coming up to Washington instead of going to the schools. We have got to do something about that.

I talked before about our Founding Fathers. We can talk about what works, what does not work, but we also need to look at what is constitutionally proper and what is constitutionally improper.

I would certainly say that any reading of the Constitution of the United States of America would show that the system that we are laboring under right now is patently unconstitutional. Read your Constitution. If you read the 10th amendment, the 10th amendment states explicitly that all powers not specifically granted to the Federal government in the Constitution of the United States are reserved to the States and to the citizens that live within those States.

You can look through the Constitution all you want to. But our Founding Fathers did not state that the Constitution of the United States allowed the Federal Government to get involved with an education bureaucracy.

If you read the Federalist Papers, when they explained why they wrote the Constitution the way they did, there is nothing in the Federalist Papers that show that the Federal Government wanted us to have an edu-

cation bureaucracy. The fact of the matter is the Constitution, the Federalist Papers, and all the other documents of the Founding Fathers show that they believed that our parents and our teachers and our communities should teach children instead of having an education bureaucracy in Washington, DC, teach children. I think they were on to something.

If the Federal Government does not have it in the Constitution, what about the States? It is not surprising that in all 50 State constitutions, every one of these documents state explicitly that State governments and communities and local governments should be the ones that get involved in educating our children. I think that is extremely important to realize, that the States and the Federal Government got together, drafted constitutions that clearly show that the Federal Government has no business in forming an education bureaucracy, that again it needs to be formed back into the States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we need to turn back where we trust communities again and we trust parents again and don't labor under this false assumption that they are too backward or too stupid to take care of their most important resource, and that is children, and in educating children.

I hear a lot of people say, well, look what happened 30 years ago. Look what happened when Bull Connor was running the streets of Birmingham, or 60 years ago when Huey Long was Governor of Louisiana. Can we really trust the States?

I say, yes, emphatically, we can trust the States. Alice Rivlin in her book "Reinventing the American Dream" talks about moving to a point where we can trust the States again. David Halberstam in his book "The Next Century" talked about the face that the most talented and most gifted leaders in this country did not occupy the well of the House of Representatives, and I know that might shock a lot of people in Washington, DC. But the people who know where the rubber meets the road are back in the States. They are the ones who have to put together an education budget every year, they are the ones who understand what losing \$33 billion in education revenue means. They are the ones that are closest to the problem.

Let's trust our parents again. Let's trust our teachers again.

As a parent of two young children who are in public schools, I have got to tell you, I am deeply offended by any bureaucrat in Washington, DC, who tells me they know how to teach my children better than I know how to teach my children.

I will side with James Madison and Thomas Jefferson and the Constitution of the United States any time over bureaucrats in the education bureaucracy who have destroyed our public education system over the past 15 years. If they have not destroyed it, well, they

sure have not done anything to improve it.

A lot of people will say that the burden of proof rests on those who say abolish the Federal Department of Education bureaucracy and send it back to the States.

I say the burden of proof rests on those bureaucrats that take \$33 billion out of local communities and school boards all across this Nation and give us very little in return.

Look at the test scores. Look at the dropout rates. Look at violence in schools. They have to step forward and explain how the principals of the NEA teachers union and how the principals of the education bureaucracy are somehow in harmony with the philosophies of Jefferson and Madison. I have got to tell you, they cannot do it.

Again, listen to the great words of James Madison:

We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government but upon the capacity of each of us to govern ourselves, control ourselves, and sustain ourselves according to the 10 commandments of God.

It is a very simple premise. Trust communities, trust families, trust individuals, trust parents. You can do that.

Two hundred years after the greatest experiment in the history of government, we are getting back to a point where we once again are going to untie parents and communities and teachers and school boards, and say, "Be creative, dare to make a difference." If we do that, if we return authority back to parents and teachers and school boards instead of an education bureaucracy in Washington, DC, then my two boys and children all across this country will once again be able to take control of their school system and be prepared for the 21st century workplace. We have got to do it now. We cannot delay any longer. I certainly would ask for all of your support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. I just wanted to thank the gentleman. As one of my troopers on the Military Personnel Subcommittee, it has been a joy working with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Because my fatherly days are behind me as far as education is concerned—my youngest son is graduating from UCLA on Sunday, the 18th of this month—but I have got nine grandchildren and, God willing, more to come.

Your statement resonates in my ears. I also take personal affront to any bureaucrat saying, "I know how to teach your children better than you do."

No, when that report came out that showed that for the first time in the history of this great Nation, in over two centuries, a generation, the current one, was not as well educated as their parents, the prior generation, we hit a stonewall in education, where all the educrats, the bureaucrats of education, do not have the answers anymore.

□ 1745

That is why I am a strong supporter of home schooling. I have not had to do that with any of my sons or daughters yet, but home schooling is growing across this country because the main area where our education system has failed us is in the area of teaching values, ethics, and if we have to come down to a plan that a grandmother told me the other day, not my own wife, but a grey-haired grammy, said, "Why don't you people just broadcast to every school in America now that we are on the informational highway on Mondays and Tuesdays the prayer at the beginning of the House of Representatives, and then on Wednesdays and Thursdays—you are smiling, Speaker GILCHREST, this is not your idea, is it?—then on Wednesdays and Thursdays we broadcast the prayer to every public school in America at the beginning of the U.S. Senate's day, and on Friday, a special day, the prayer at the beginning of the U.S. Senate, in every school in America. And then occasionally we can sing at general assemblies the most popular song during the War between the States that kept our Nation together, "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." Mine eyes have seen the glory in the coming of the Lord. Who would that be? I do not know, would it be Jesus Christ, our savior, our redeemer, the son of God. Lilies across the sea in Jerusalem or Bethlehem or Nazareth, names familiar to one generation of schoolchildren, not anymore. I would love to see pumped to every school in America rabbis as we have seen here invoking the God of Abraham and the code of ethics of Moses, who is staring right down at the gentleman from Florida, look at him looking down at Speaker GILCHREST there, over in the corner, Maimonides, who in Sephardic tradition in Spain and Portugal rewrote the entire code of ethics for every Jewish person in the world. On this wall look at the wall of saints up there, Edward the Confessor, St. Ed, Alfonso, a saint of Spain, Gregory IX, a saintly pope, St. Louis, whose mother said "I would rather have my son dead at my feet than see him commit a grievous mortal sin."

So there is a lot of education our kids are not getting, it is being denied, and there is a way to do it, to recognize the Western civilization, culture, and there are a lot of colleges around, including UCLA, where in my son's first five classes Christianity was attacked by name in two of those classes, Catholicism attacked by name after they worked over Christianity, and in one of those classes Jesuits attacked. My son has never had the thrill of sitting in a class with a Jesuit teacher at the front, but I had 7 great years of it, and I am still grateful for my teachers. The Jesuits were all conservatives in those days and lived up to their fourth vow of being loyal to the Pope. They are having some problems these days. But I tell you, we are going to get this edu-

cation thing solved, and why are we going to do that, because Ronald Reagan said we are Americans, which means we can win any battle. Thank you for weighing in today. Glad to associate myself proudly with your words.

THE BATTLE OF OKINAWA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased is not a strong enough word, I am so ecstatic today over this rescue in Bosnia that I am glad I have got a Marine Corps sergeant sitting in the Speaker's chair today. Let me see that 1,000-yard stare, because as a former Air Force fighter pilot, peacetime to be sure, let me thank you for the whole Marine Corps in that superb rescue this morning, and wait till you get details tonight on CNN or C-SPAN or whatever, because I have got the bare outlines off the wire service stories, I called the Pentagon, they are having down in the cellar of the Rayburn Building a goodbye party for some of our great military people, liaison people who help us understand everything we can about our heroic men and women all around the world they will they cannot tell me much because they are hanging off the wire services' stories too.

But let me put this in perspective for the Marine Corps and the Army and every fighter pilot in those days was either Marine, Navy, or Air Force, I mean Army Air Corps, there was no Air Force. I was going to finish my Okinawa special orders today, June 8, 1945, and it is interesting, fascinating that the Battle of Okinawa started on Easter Sunday in 1945, that was April 1, and it was no April Fool's Day for the bloodshed on those beaches. It started off easily as the Japanese warlord forces were back in their caves and said come on, soft beach landings, everything looked good, and said oh, this is not going to be Iwo Jima, and then it became hell on Earth. That started April 1, 50 years ago. So all of April is 30 days, all of May, we are up to 61 days, this is the 8th, this was day 69 of an 87-day battle which means they had 18 brutal days to go where more marines and more Army soldiers died in a battle than ever before. This was the highest-fatality battle of the whole Pacific war.

And MacArthur took a bum rap there. Some people called him Dugout Doug because they wanted to see more of him up front. If he was not up front with one unit it is because he was with somebody else. Where was Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who stood right in front of you in one of the greatest speeches ever given at the Presidential lectern there and said and like most

old soldiers I will fade away, that ringing speech, hardly a dry eye on either side of the House here, everybody conceding that Harry Truman, President, had his right to fire him, but that on the merits of the issues MacArthur was right. We should have bombed Manchuria, we should have bombed the Yalu River bridges when once the Chinese came at him, which he did not think they would do because he did not realize we had filthy, sneaky, dirty, spying, traitorous people in our government feeding a whole homosexual network of spies in the British Government of Burgess, Maclean, Kim Philby, all of them telling the Russians to tell the Chinese, go ahead and attack, the Americans will never come back at you, they will not bomb the bridges in the Yalu. All of our pasty-faced types in the State Department are not going to allow that to happen.

So, MacArthur was wrong about the Chinese coming in, but when he was fired in April of 1951 I had just turned 17. It was a sad day when he came to this Congress and said goodbye and kept the promises.

Where was MacArthur today? On the deck of a cruiser, in a combat action, could have been a kamikaze coming at him off the island of Borneo. He is on the bridge of one of our cruisers, the *Boise*, the *Nashville*, the *Phoenix*, and Australian cruiser *Hobart* named after the capital of Tasmania, seven destroyers with these cruisers, and they are bombarding one of the richest cities in the world today, the highest-income city. The wealthiest man in the world today on the planet Earth is the Sultan of Brunei, and they were in Brunei Bay bombing northern Borneo in that harbor and MacArthur is on the bridge of the task force softening up the landing beaches for Australia's Ninth Division. Their glorious feats in combat are known in Australia, little known to us. Their prisoners like all prisoners were being severely tortured, beaten to death. This is less than 2 months from the dropping of the atom bomb on August 6. But MacArthur was not aware of the bomb at this point. He was preparing for on this onslaught on the Japanese homeland islands where we would have lost maybe 300,000 men were in danger of KIA, higher than all of the war before that, certainly a million overall casualties and a million dead Japanese people, all of them innocent of what their warlords had done to them except for a few officers in the officer corps, they would have been wiped out.

So what else was happening in the South Pacific? Down in Sumatra, the Japanese cruiser, *Asha Gara*, overloaded with 1,200 young Japanese kids, peasant kids recruited out of the countryside in Japan without ever firing their guns in anger go to the bottom of the sea because the British submarine, the *Trenchant*, sinks this Japanese cruiser and all 1,200 soldiers and most of the crew drowned. Planes from the carrier *Cowpens*, the great *Independ-*

ence, the *Shangri-La*, so named because Roosevelt said the *Hornet* and Jimmy Doolittle was a Shangri-la where we launched our raid 53 years ago last April against 5 Japanese cities, and the *Yorktown*, the great fighting lady, the *Yorktown*, they were all pounding their planes kamikaze bases on the Japanese southern island of Kyushu, and when any of those pilots were captured they were murdered as some of the Japanese Bushido warrior, brace yourself Mr. Speaker, cut them open and ate their livers. I have just come across that research. They killed so many of our air crews out of the B-29's and our Navy pilots that we hung the Japanese commander on the island where George Bush almost drifted ashore, Chichi Jima, hung him for cannibalism.

This was a rough conclusion to this war, less than 2 months to the first atomic bomb, 2 months and a day to the Nagasaki bomb, and I still get angry when I think about that phony politically correct exhibit that a bunch of liberals almost put around the fuselage of the *Enola Gay*.

Back to Okinawa. Artillery, naval gunfire, air strikes pounding the Japanese positions on Yaeje-Dake Mountain. I spell that not only for our recorders but for the vets to jog their memory. It was a strong point of the military commander Ushi Jima's last defense line.

The Sixth Marine Division, there was a day when we had six Marine divisions, the Sixth Marine Division compresses Admiral Minoru Ota, his marines, into a 3-mile pocket on the Oroku Peninsula, and how many Americans met their God on that peninsula during the next 18 days of fighting? So let us close the loop from 1945 to today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know as a ground NCO what your favorite motion picture representation of the hell that is warfare is. But for pilots, it has been a long dry spell. The best one ever was based on a fictional book, more truth than fiction, by the great writer, James Michener, written during the Korean war while it was still in progress in 1953. I read it on my way to pilot training, published in its totality in *Life* magazine, just as they did that same year with "The Old Man and the Sea" by Hemingway, and I read this story in *Life* magazine and then got the book later, called "The Bridges at Toko-Ri," and it had a gut-wrenching decidedly non-Hollywood ending. Bill Holden, at the peak of his career at 36 years of age playing a symbolic naval aviator named Brubaker is in a ditch in northern Korea, and he is with the rescue pilot, the crewman, the gunner on the rescue pilot, Mickey Rooney, and Mickey Rooney says to him "Lieutenant, what are you doin' here in a ditch in human feces," they probably softened that for the movie, "here in Korea? Aren't you a lawyer from Denver?" And he says, "That's what I'm trying to figure out."

Well, he was there because he was called. Within seconds the Skyraiders

flew right up until a few years ago, flew all the way through Vietnam as rescue support, Spads, they call them, their code name was Sandy, the Navy A-1 Skyraiders, then called AD's aforeship, then painted Navy dark blue, they made their last strafing run, kill some of the enemy coming in on Brubaker, and the young enlisted man from the rescue helicopter sitting there smoking, and then they pull off, just as they had to do in Vietnam sometimes, wiggle their wings, goodbye, good luck, friend, and within seconds, Mickey Mooney is dead, shot in the chest, and then Bill Holden starts running back and forth in this filthy human manure ditch, and finally they drill him again and again, and he dies spread-eagled in this filthy mud, and then it goes to the carrier bridge, Frederick March in one of his great final roles says those words that Ronald Reagan used to quote all of the time, this fictional admiral again more true than fiction, and says, "Where do we get such men, they go out, they do their job, they come back, they find this little pitching deck in these heavy seas, and they come home. Where do we get such men? Why is America lucky enough to have such men?" That was 1954. Here we are 41 years later and it is not a good Hollywood movie, it is real, somebody will make a movie out of this.

What happened with Capt. Scott O'Grady today is better than any Shakespeare could put it on print. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1800

June 2, Scott O'Grady's F-16 goes down over Bosnia. He had air-to-air missiles. He also had air-to-ground missiles. It was a deny-flight flight. As I argued with Secretary Perry, whom I deeply respect, and Shalikashvili, a soldier's soldier, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, they would contradict themselves in their own testimony in front of the Senate yesterday morning and in front of the National Security Committee yesterday, because they kept calling these air combat missions, and they kept saying we are not in combat. This is combat.

My colleague from Colorado once said fighter pilots are not athletes. I almost took off out of my chair. I said, "Excuse me? Would the gentle lady yield?" She got all flustered. Fighter pilots are athletes, and these women officers demanding to go into combat, they have given up the fight to go into special operations. They do not want to be Delta Force people. They do not want to rappel off of helicopters in the middle of the desert or jungle or Arctic situation. They are not asking for infantry anymore. They certainly do not want to work around artillery with 100-pound shells, slinging them around, and they are not asking anymore to go into tank armored units, because they know trying to pull a wounded 200-pound unconscious man out of a tank is something I have never seen a woman can do, not even the ones

pumping weight to get on the Glad-iators. I could not lift a 200-man out of a tank on fire about to explode. If I called for somebody, I want it to be somebody who, together, we can lift him out, not somebody with not too much upper body strength who says, "Oh, I can't be of any help. Sorry. Let's get a third person here."

No, they are not asking for armor, special ops, infantry, or artillery any longer. But they are still lusting for those fighter pilot seats.

So all the time I am discussing this, picture the strongest, best woman fighter pilot, and I do not think the Marines have any yet, in the Navy or the Air Force today, trying to do what Scott O'Grady did. He goes down June 2. His wingman, I just confirmed on the phone, did not see him go down.

I bailed out once in peacetime on a gunnery range in the Gila Bend Mountains. I had a towship, two guys in the towship with a target, four guys in my flight, three others, a flight behind me, a flight in front of me; nobody saw me bail out, because I was going straight down 500 knots, 500 miles an hour, 450 knots, and went out upside down. Nobody saw this guy go out.

National Security Adviser Tony Lake tells Mr. Clinton that we could probably launch a search and rescue mission. Lake tells the President that he may be alive, based on a variety of sources. Meanwhile, the military is lying to me, and I love it. I want to be lied to. If there is a search and rescue operation going on, I do not have a need to know and, therefore, I am not in a position to be wishing well to some newsman that I trust for the umpteenth time and stabs me in the back, because an Air Force officer trusted some newsman, and they went running right out yesterday while Scott O'Grady is still on the ground and published we were getting beeper signals. Is the media not great with their first amendment right to know? Could have gotten O'Grady captured.

So now we skip forward. That was on June 7, yesterday, that he might be alive, 5 days, for 5 days, and I will tell you the truth, Mr. Speaker, I started to say prayers for this young pilot without knowing his name. I thought his wingman was probably right, that he was blown up.

June 8, that is today, Scott O'Grady, U.S. Air Force captain, F-16 Fighting Falcon, snake-eating face on fire, fighter pilot makes contact with NATO aircraft. That is probably an Air Force AWACS.

Two-twenty, and let us see, what time was it here in Washington, 7-hour difference, so this is 7:20 at night, after I had said in committee to Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili, in my mind thinking that Scott was probably gone, in heaven 5 days ago, I said, "And our F-16 pilot who may be lost," and I said, "God willing, the F-16 jockey is hiding in the bush as we speak," and that is exactly what was happening

yesterday at about 11, no, at about 1:30, when I asked that question.

O'Grady makes contact with NATO airplane, 2:20, 7:20 last night, D.C. time, 4:20 in California, the signal is positively identified. The reason I brought up the West Coast is his mother, Mary Lou Scardapane, is up there in Washington State, in Washington, so she did not know, wherever you were, Mary Lou, at 4 o'clock, and I think she is watching this special order, wherever you were at 4:20, think about that moment. That is when God answered your prayers.

The father, a physician, Bill O'Grady, over here in Alexandria, VA, at 7:00 at night, maybe he is in the office late, trying not to bug the Pentagon, but like any dad, worried about his hero son. Three-thirty a.m., Bosnia-Herzegovina, Lake calls the President in his residential quarters and says, "It looks like it is real. It looks like a go." Sunrise, Bosnian time, 5:06, so it is 10:06 at night. I am watching the Channel 5 news, still no word about our missing pilot; name kept secret.

By the way, I want to tell you about Scott so you can picture him, and I do not know how tall he is or what color his hair is.

Do know he graduated from Embry-Riddle University. There are two of those, one in New Mexico and one in Florida. I do not know which one. He has got a younger brother, Paul, who is 25, a sister, Sheila, 26. She is the one I woke up to this morning to hear through her eyes and ears that her father walked into her room in the middle of the night and says, "Scott is alive. They have got him. He is rescued."

She said she thought it was a dream, and then she shook her head and realized that it was not a dream. Then she said, "We went berserk." So I guess that means Paul and Stacey and Dr. Bill were jumping around, that God had answered their prayers.

So it is now 5:45. A backup group of rescue aircraft and helicopters is launched. They remain offshore to monitor the rescue operation, to assist, if needed. Meanwhile, the Air Force guys, Avion, the best rescue guys in the world, are probably chomping at the bit to get there. But the Marines are closer on the deck of the *Kearsage*, and the primary rescue aircraft are told, "Go get him." They are launched from the *Kearsage*, two gigantic CH-53 Sea Stallion assault helicopters made up here in Connecticut, two AH Cobra attack helicopters, probably made in Texas, if I am correct, and two AV-8 Harrier jump jets made in St. Louis, all of them launched from the *Kearsage*.

I have been lucky enough to fly in all of these, and that Harrier still steals every air show everywhere in the country, everywhere it goes, when it bows to the audience, turns around, turns the vanes on those jets, and then it is up, up and away like Superman.

Six-twelve, rescue aircraft make radio contact with O'Grady, a happy

ending here to the bridges of Toko-Ri. This is utterly fantastic.

Six-forty-four, rescuers spot a yellow smoke flare. Yes, Scott, our equipment does work, that O'Grady released to mark the landing site.

O'Grady, Captain Scott O'Grady, runs out of the woods, pistol in hand, and is picked up by a big Marine Corps CH-53 helicopter.

Six-forty-nine, 5 minutes later, Lake calls the commander-in-chief and says, "Got him." Clinton says, "It sounds like this is one amazing kid." Not a kid, a man, an athlete, a fighter pilot, a real man, not a young boy at 23 ditching classes at Oxford.

Seven-oh-seven, missile fired at helicopters after they lift off with O'Grady. Helicopter carrying O'Grady leaves Bosnia. The way the Marines probably said that to the *Kearsage* is, "Crossing the beach."

Over the Adriatic, 7:30, O'Grady is safely aboard the USS *Kearsage*. Break out the champagne aboard. So, from first contact, let us see, rescue makes contact at 6:12, and 1 hour and 8 minutes later, he is back on the deck of the *Kearsage*, and the Air Force rescue guys, Avion, probably launched, are probably saying, "Oh, well, next time."

Now, you could not write a better story than that, Mr. Speaker. Listen to this, what a great happy day for America. We have gone from what was, in my mind yesterday, questioning our Defense Secretary, one killed in action, our first in 3 years of that Bosnian fratricidal, horrible killing scene; I thought we had our first KIA. By the grace of God, we have gone from one KIA back to zero, no American man or woman dead in the Balkans, and I want to keep it that way.

Listen to this, Air Force Captain Scott F., and I wonder if that is for Fitzgerald or Francis, Scott F. O'Grady survived for 6 days after his F-16 was shot down by Serbs in Bosnia, shot down by a SAM-6 missile. That is 4 quad missiles on a mobile unit, very tough to hunt out and destroy. He hid out by day, slept by day, and hid out, moved at night, living on a small supply of survival rations, sparingly activating a radio transmitter.

His sister, Stacey, says he knew they were hunting him down, looking for him. She finally spoke to her brother by telephone between 3 and 4 a.m. this morning. What a happy day for them. Over there it is already 10 o'clock.

"He told us he was thinking about us and that helped him get through," O'Grady's younger brother, Paul, said. "If he made it out of the plane," Paul said, "I was not worried about my brother's survival or not. He has been well trained. He told me about all the survival things. I knew he would be okay."

The siblings all gathered at the home of their father, Dr. William O'Grady, in Alexandria, immediately after hearing, and I hope you are watching, Doc. He remained there throughout the week waiting for news. Stacy flew in from

Chicago, where she is a teacher. Oh, gosh, what a heart-gripping vigil for the O'Grady.

Paul drove up from Chapel Hill, NC, where he has a summer job before beginning dental school in the fall. The family stayed in contact with Scott's mom, who lives in Seattle. I am going to call her when I walk off the floor here, Mr. Speaker.

"We had a lot of ups and downs as the week went on," said the elder O'Grady. Dr. O'Grady said, "We knew he was hit by a missile. But at first we really did not know if he had ejected. There was no evidence of life." Later, news media reports indicated a parachute had been found. I missed that. A radio signal was being received. That sounded good. There was nothing definite.

Then the military may have known more than they could tell us. Yes. And they handled it perfectly.

I am a chairman, and they did not tell me, Doctor, and I am on the Intel Committee, and they did not tell me, Doctor, and I asked them, and I am glad I was not told. He was the first person to tell us that they had been contacted, if they contacted Scott by radio, and they were going in to get him, said the dad.

A short time later, perhaps 20 minutes, an Air Force general called to say O'Grady had been brought out by helicopter, a class act, hearing from a general officer.

The siblings reminisced, joked about old times together. "I slept with it last night, and I told them," because she was dreaming about her brother being rescued when she got the call, adding it was a very emotional moment. He was overwhelmed by the fact that so many people were fussing over him.

Stacey said she had been born on Scott's third birthday. They have the same birthday. "I took the limelight away from him. Now he is getting it back. He can have it all."

In Seattle, Scott's mother, Mary Lou Scardapane, was relieved enough to joke with reporters, typical fighter pilot's mom. "As a parent, I think one of our fears is when our kids are out at night and they are not at home on time. When they get home, they had better have a darned good reason. When he gets home, he had better have a darned good story." Oh, he does, Mary Lou, and Mrs. Scardapane and the stepfather, Joseph, said they planned to go to Italy to see Scott.

O'Grady suffered little more than a burn on the neck. Little more than a burn on the neck? That is not a sunburn. That is from the SAM-6 missile. Hunger pangs, he probably did not worry about that too much; and dehydration.

Clinton has called the O'Grady family. Clinton says bravery and skill are an inspiration. Yes, sir, just what is needed up and down the whole civilian chain of command who is still abusing our military men and women, so are the bravery and skill of those who took part in the operation, just doing their

duty, Mr. President. They are all American heroes. That is right, particularly under these trying times, no pay raises.

Marine Colonel Marty Berandt, who helped coordinate the mission and was in one of the rescue choppers, it is getting too good to be believed here, Mr. Speaker, Marine Corps bird colonel, eagle type, in a chopper over enemy country, in the hot zone, with SAM-6 missiles and big SAM-2's tracking him; he is on the rescue board; that is my kind of Marine colonel, excellent, Marty, this is great.

"It won't be very soon," says the colonel, "that I will forget the look on the pilot's face as he approached the helicopter this morning." He said in a NATO commander's report that he pulled the pilot aboard was wrong, well, a Marine Corps colonel being a little humble. Here he was probably watching from the front cockpit, and why did he not pull him aboard? I bet he would have loved to have. Berandt said O'Grady was very talkative. That is called high adrenaline rate, in good spirits, and got a block here, lost 3 or 4 lines, helicopter this morning, no, here it is, here it is, I skipped ahead.

Once on board, O'Grady took some water and then dug right into a meal-ready-to-eat. Meals rejected by Ethiopians, and an MRE must have looked good to Scott, so he must have really been hungry, the colonel said.

Paul O'Grady praised his brother's rescuers. "I want to thank the Armed Forces, just from the bottom of my heart. I cannot thank them enough."

O'Grady, oh, it is getting better, born in Brooklyn, NY. I am born in Harlem, I hate to trump him, but Harlem trumps Brooklyn, probably not if you are born in Brooklyn, born on Columbus Day, October 12, 1965, so he has got his 30th birthday coming up. What an adventure for a 29-year-old.

O'Grady grew up in Spokane, WA, his home of record, earned a degree in aerospace aviation management in 1989. So he has only been out of college 6 years this month, from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University. It is the one in Prescott, AZ. He was commissioned on April 20; that is the birthday of my young nephew, Matt, who is fighting as we speak to get into pilot training. Good luck, Matt. Commissioned April 20, 1989, 6 years ago, pilot training in the Euro-NATO joint jet pilot training. That is my nephew's fondest dream, at Sheppard Air Force Base in Texas, served as an F-16 pilot in Korea, Osan, I will bet, in Germany, and most recently in Italy, and has more than 780 hours of flying time.

□ 1815

I am glad I went long enough to get one of the hottest Marines serving in this House, my vintage, from the early fifties, the chairman of our great Committee on Rules, JERRY SOLOMON.

May this Air Force peacetime fighter pilot thank this Marine, as I did Wayne Grisham when he was in? God bless you

for saving this snake-eating, face-on-fire, 29-year-old fighter pilot, plucking him right out of the hands of the crazed Serbian guys there.

I yield happily to the gentleman.

Mr. SOLOMON. I just want to thank the great American for yielding to me, but you know what happened yesterday in the rescue of that downed pilot just speaks to the real need of what we are going to be doing next week on the floor of this House, and I do not have to tell the gentleman because he is such a valuable member of the Committee on Armed Services, but we are going to take up a bill which is going to turn this country around and turn our military preparedness around.

The gentleman knows the condition that we were in back in the early 1970's, when just to attempt to rescue our hostages in a place called Iran we had to cannibalize about 14 helicopter gunships just to get 5 that would work, and they failed. So did the mission. That is the condition of our military preparedness back in the seventies. We have almost reached that area now.

Mr. DORNAN. Same helicopters, by the way, big H-53—

Mr. SOLOMON. Absolutely, and in the budget that we are going to be taking up, the armed services bill, on next Tuesday, which the gentleman had a lot to do with writing that bill, we are going to increase procurement by 11 percent instead of cutting our defense. We are going to be increasing procurement by 11 percent—

Mr. DORNAN. Hurrah.

Mr. SOLOMON. Research and development increased by 5 percent instead of a 20-percent cut, operation and maintenance up 3 percent, military facilities and installations up 5 percent.

And more than anything else, BOB, instead of putting a ceiling on how many Members can serve in the Armed Forces, we are putting a bottom on it, saying that this is how we cannot go any lower than this. We are going to maintain a strong military preparedness.

But the whole idea was in the rescue of that pilot which you know so well, the state-of-the-art technology in order to find the pilot, to communicate with him, and then to go in there and bring him out. That took great state-of-the-art technology, the same kind we used in Desert Storm where we could see them with night vision; they could not see us.

That is what we need to do any time we put any man or woman in combat. They better be there with the best we can give them, and that is what this bill is going to do next Tuesday, and I thank you for what you have done that way.

Mr. DORNAN. JERRY, I just wanted to touch on one thing.

I am the chairman of the Military Personnel Committee, so all of these ceilings and floors on military strength falls under my purview at first, until I turn it over to my friend and super chairman, FLOYD SPENCE, Navy captain

type on Armed—now renamed the National Security Committee.

We also re-added to the floor that we put there now 7,500 new slots, and so as not to get into micromanaging, we told the Secretary of Defense, fine gentleman, Mr. Perry, "Look, here is 7,500 birds. You need them in Patriot missile batteries. You may need them in the Air Force and AWAC's. You may need them in the Marine Corps in certain areas where the Marines are stretched too thin. You pick them out for us, and, if we have disagreement with you, try not to micromanage. We will counsel together and figure out where we can put these slots."

Now I had an account for something else, and it looks like the battle is over. Even though you know just about everything on that Rules Committee, you do not know that I just went over to the Senate and asked my equivalent over there—we served with him, one of our class of '80, great Members in the House, DAN COATS, Senator, Indiana, chairman of their Military—

Mr. SOLOMON. Great Senator.

Mr. DORNAN. Right.

He told me he will put in his chairman's mark my HIV language, and it is not cruel. It simply says, as you and I have spoken, that if you have contracted the AIDS virus, and nobody is left in the military who got it through polluted blood.

You and I know that the odds are a 100 to 1, a 1,000 to 1, 10,000 to 1 you got it from violating the Uniform Code of Military Justice. You put a dirty needle in your arm. That is the biggest category out of the roughly 400. You went to an off-limits house of prostitution where 100 percent of the prostitutes are infected with AIDS—the killing venereal disease virus—or you went to an off-limits homosexual bar. That is the smallest of the three categories. You are going to get a honorable discharge, and you ought to thank your stars for it, and you got 6 months to pack up your bags. I hope the military will move paster because they are going to go "figmo," and you remember what that means, not much you can get out of somebody when they know they are going to leave in a few months and they are leaving a little disgruntled. They will get the world's best hospital treatment in the VA hospitals. You worked those hospitals for almost two decades here. They transfer even to the very same hospital where they are already getting care.

But here is the important part. I have actually bought our military by putting off active duty honorably 1,400 HIV carriers. Not only do we make the walking blood bank safer, but we now have 1,400 slots to add to the 7,500 of men and women who are deployable anywhere in the world, who can fly, shoot, sail, and get in an armored vehicle, JERRY.

These people could not do any of this, and we have put off active duty, Mr. Speaker, 8,114 good, patriotic Americans because they did not have the will

power to control their diet, for being overweight, and a few hundred for being underweight or too weak to do push-ups, lack of discipline. They are being honorably discharged.

How could we put our 8,000 people who have not violated the UCMJ, and, to be politically correct, keep on board 1,400 who cannot leave Virginia or California, if they were under the Naval Department, and not much else if they are Air Force or Navy? We have won that battle. No abortions in military hospitals. There is going to be a fight on the House floor.

Chairman COATS said he will put that in his mark, and next year, you will be happy to hear—and I am kind of an up front guy, that is my style, it is yours, too, JERRY—hearings on women in combat. We have agreed to have that this winter, hearings on "Don't ask."

I believe it is immoral not to tell a confused young person who maybe comes out of this all homosexual, weird high school in New York City that it is not compatible with military life. Democrat SAM NUNN's words, or IKE SKELTON, Democrat here in this House, other side of the aisle, good patriotic, gung-ho American whose son is in the First Armored Division in Europe. You must ask them so they can go, "Oh, I didn't know that. I won't join, then, if you don't want me." Instead, we bring them on board. They then get the news that then it is an administrative discharge and we wasted all that money.

We have fixed a lot of things, and there is more to fix, and, Chairman SOLOMON, you know how I look at this as a one-two punch in the 104th Congress. We have a lot of work left to do. We have got to work together.

Next year's defense bill will continue this earth-shaking bill that you have just discussed. It is going to be a great debate on the House floor, and hopefully this weekend I will be in Aviano hugging a lot of heroes over there and be back to give you a firsthand report; okay?

Mr. SOLOMON. We wish you well over there, and I will be interested in getting your report when you come back.

Mr. DORNAN. You got it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Thanks so much for being such a great Congressman.

Mr. DORNAN. You got it. Semper Fidelis, and, if I may say so, the Air Force is still aiming high. Off we go into the wild blue yonder, but not over Bosnia. Off the coast, stay out over the Adriatic.

I yield back the balance of my time. Have a good weekend, Mr. Speaker, and take care of all your Air Force guys down there in your neck of the woods.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-136) on the resolution (H. Res. 164) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1530) to authorize appro-

priations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business.

Mr. YATES (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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POSHARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes each day, on June 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, 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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. BONIOR in six instances.

Ms. DELAURO in two instances.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. HINCHEY.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. CLEMENT.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. PORTMAN.
Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.
Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
Mr. HANSEN.
Mr. CAMP.
Mr. UPTON.
Mr. MCCOLLUM.
Mr. HORN.
Mr. DORNAN.
Mr. FUNDERBURK.
Mr. ISTOOK.
Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

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

Mr. STUMP.
Mr. MCHUGH.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. HORN.
Mr. BORSKI.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM in two instances.
Ms. KAPTUR.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. TALENT.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 9, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1002. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department intends to offer for lease one naval vessel to the Government of Eritrea, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

1003. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department intends to offer for lease one naval vessel to the Government of Tunisia, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

1004. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's annual report on Federal Government energy management and conservation programs during fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6361(c); to the Committee on Commerce.

1005. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's 29th quarterly report to Congress on the status of Exxon and stripper well oil overcharge funds as of December 31, 1994; to the Committee on Commerce.

1006. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and

Acceptance [LOA] to Israel for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95-26), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1007. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95-25), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1008. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Act and Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Small Business.

1009. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the 1995 annual report on the public debt, pursuant to Public Law 103-202, section 201(a) (107 Stat. 2355); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 962. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1990 relating to the membership of the U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform (Rept. 104-135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SOLOMON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 164. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R.1530) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-136). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. YOUNG of Alaska:
H.R. 1786. A bill to regulate fishing in certain waters of Alaska; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself, Mr. BURR, and Mr. COX):

H.R. 1787. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to repeal the saccharin notice requirement; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. MOLINARI (for herself and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 1788. A bill to reform the statutes relating to Amtrak, to authorize appropriations for Amtrak, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 1789. A bill to make permanent certain authority relating to self-employment assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORN (for himself, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TORRES, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1790. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit tax-exempt financing of certain transportation facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KIM, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. FROST, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 1791. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to make certain technical corrections relating to physicians' services; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee:

H.R. 1792. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that no deduction shall be allowed for personal income taxes paid to a State, or political subdivision thereof, which taxes nonresidents on income derived from certain Federal areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 1793. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit or deduction for interest paid on educational loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHRYSLER (for himself, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 1794. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to double the minimum and maximum penalties for crimes against elderly and child victims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.R. 1795. A bill to improve Government procurement procedures; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on National Security, 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. CRANE:

H.R. 1796. A bill to amend section 1951, commonly called the Hobbs Act, of title 18 of the United States Code to prevent union violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELLAURO (for herself, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. WARD, and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 1797. A bill to require employer health benefit plans to meet standards relating to the nondiscriminatory treatment of neurobiological disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and Commerce, 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. DELLUMS:

H.R. 1798. A bill to establish a U.S. Health Service to provide high quality comprehensive health care for all Americans and to overcome the deficiencies in the present system of health care delivery; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Government Reform and Oversight, National Security, and Veterans' Affairs, 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. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. WELLER, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. BLUTE):

H.R. 1799. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for the cleanup of certain contaminated industrial sites; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 1800. A bill to amend the Expedited Funds Availability Act to clarify the application of that act to American Samoa and Guam; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 1801. A bill to privatize certain Federal power generation and transmission assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BONO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 1802. A bill to reorganize the Federal administrative law judiciary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. HORN):

H.R. 1803. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize additional projects; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 1804. A bill to designate the U.S. Post Office-Courthouse located at South 6th and Rogers Avenue, Fort Smith, AR as the "Judge Isaac C. Parker Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT:

H.R. 1805. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to exempt qualified current or former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 1806. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Legal Services Corporation Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BEREUER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. HEFNER):

H.R. 1807. A bill to provide means of limiting the exposure of children to violent programming on television and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 1808. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to repeal the minimum adjustments to prices of fluid milk under Federal marketing orders and to establish basing points in various geographical areas of the United States for purposes of determining prices to be paid to milk producers under such orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.R. 1809. A bill to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to enter into arrangements for the repair and long-term maintenance of war memorials for which the Commission assumes responsibility; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZIMMER (for himself and Mr. KLUG):

H.R. 1810. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the privatization of health care services in the Federal prison system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 165. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that children are America's greatest assets; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

108. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to memorializing the U.S. Congress to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to restore to the people the right of free religious expression, including the right to allow prayer, religious study, and religious expression in public schools and other public assemblies, and to submit such constitutional amendment to the several States for proper ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. TANNER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 72: Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 73: Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 188: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 219: Mr. BONO.

H.R. 248: Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 249: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 311: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 326: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 359: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 390: Mr. METCALF and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 427: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 444: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 607: Mr. OBEY.

H.R. 682: Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 743: Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mrs. SEASTRAND.

H.R. 752: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. FROST, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 753: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 769: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 833: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 835: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 844: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 893: Mr. SABO, Mr. MARTINI, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 910: Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 940: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GONZALES, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 946: Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 963: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PETRI, Mr. STUMP, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 966: Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1020: Mr. GEKAS and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1023: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 1044: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 1114: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1138: Mr. HOKE and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1172: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. MCNULTY, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1204: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1210: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 1229: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1264: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1274: Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 1278: Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 1319: Mr. SAWYER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 1329: Mr. OLVER and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1377: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 1386: Mr. PICKETT and Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 1424: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1501: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1515: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1535: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 1540: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. POMBO, Mr. BONO, and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 1547: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1552: Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WARD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 1559: Mr. MARTINI, Mr. SABO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 1594: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1598: Mr. KLINK, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1608: Mr. OWENS and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1610: Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 1627: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 1640: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. CANADY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1744: Mr. CARDIN and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1768: Mr. ISTOOK and Mr. ROYCE.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. WAMP, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. FLANAGAN.

H. Res. 28: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. JACOBS.

H. Res. 30: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. WARD, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H. Res. 39: Mr. MORAN.

H. Res. 102: Mr. CANADY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of March 10, 1995]

H. Con. Res. 5: Mr. FOX.