



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 1995

No. 101

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 20, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable FRANK D. LUCAS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority and minority leader, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes and not to exceed 9:50 a.m.

RETURN ON INVESTMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, good morning. It is appropriations season again and the money is tight everywhere, as we all know, as we discussed the budget in this town. However, there is a \$2 billion expenditure that I do not believe is receiving the scrutiny it deserves; the money we are spending on continued United States operations in Haiti.

During this very painful process where even the good programs are likely to be cut in Washington, I have been particularly disheartened by the reports I have been receiving from Haiti and by how little return the American taxpayer seems to be getting for the precious tax dollars the Clinton administration is spending there.

We know that the total costs will run well past the \$2 billion, that is "B," billion, mark or if our soldiers leave as scheduled in February of next year, 1996. This is an extraordinary sum of money. In fact, to put it in perspective, we could have given every person in Haiti \$300; more than the average Haitian makes in a year, incidentally.

What will we have to show for it when it is all said and done? That is the question. I sincerely hope that we will have at least two free and fair elections. In fact, I am going to travel to Haiti later this week as the head of an elections observation team for a firsthand look at the electoral process for the elections this Sunday.

From the briefings I have received, though, I fear that this weekend's parliamentary and local elections may be dangerously close to falling below internationally accepted standards for good elections. And it is not for lack of money.

In fact, it seems the Clinton administration had to learn the hard way that doing things in a country with a history of political turmoil and a near vacuum in infrastructure and democratic government costs a lot more to get done than it does to get things done here in the United States.

While the FEC estimates that an American election costs around \$2 a ballot, recent reports in the Arkansas Democrat I saw indicate that it will cost United States taxpayers between \$10 and \$15 per ballot in Haiti. That adds up to \$30 million in administrative costs alone just to hold elections in Haiti.

Of course, this does not include the Presidential elections expected for sometime in December, if all goes well. Still more disheartening is the fact that once again, as in 1934, the United States may depart Haiti leaving nothing behind to help Haitians consolidate the progress they have made.

There are very serious gaps in the long-term picture. The constitutionally required permanent electoral council was never formed and the provisional electoral council is just that, it is provisional and it is struggling and not working as well as it needs to be.

Thus, we will leave behind no cadre of trained individuals to carry forth the democratic electoral process. We will leave behind no institutionalization of the justice system, the judicial system, which is a prerequisite for any democratic society.

A further concern is the police force. The Aristide government is resisting President Clinton and his team not to build a large, well-trained, independent police force. This is no doubt the legacy of his bad experience with former Haitian dictators' military police forces, but it nevertheless remains deeply troubling.

At the time U.S. forces are scheduled to leave, next February, barely 4,000 newly trained police will be in place. If training continues as scheduled, the program could produce a maximum of maybe 6,000 police. Would this be enough police, given the dissolution of the Haitian military and the historical propensity in Haiti for chaos? Will this provide stability for a country with nearly 7 million people, 4,000 police? I do not think so.

If there is anything that Haiti needs it is law and order, democratic law and order. That means a set of laws that apply equally and effectively to all citizens, a judiciary and a police force answerable to the democratically elected government.

□ 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

H6091

I think every American, including people like myself who opposed the armed invasion of Haiti and entangling military occupation, are hoping that we will leave enough in Haiti for Haitians to build on; that a few years down the road we will not be faced with the same crisis all over again, starting with a great refugee crisis into Florida.

Frankly, I am not convinced that is happening, though. I hope every American will write their Congressman or Congresswoman and demand a full accounting of spending on United States and United Nations operations in Haiti by this administration. We are asking all Americans to tighten their belts still another notch. They deserve to know whether or not they are getting a reasonable return on the \$2 billion-plus investment of their tax dollars that the Clinton administration has spent in that small Caribbean nation.

Mr. Speaker, where has all that money gone? And what did the U.S. taxpayer get for it? That is the question that deserves an answer.

SO MUCH FOR OPEN RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Well, well, well, here we go again, Mr. Speaker. The Rules Committee has really become the first line of defense for sacred cows. Today we are going to be taking up another rule that once again shuts out all sorts of amendments that would knock out sacred cows around this place.

Let us talk about that a little further. When we bring up the legislative branch appropriations bills, many of us thought that it was very important to have a ban on gifts to staff and Members. Once and for all, get the lobbyists' gifts out of here. It taints the whole place. People are tired of that. You know what? In this group that pledged open rules, we are not allowed to offer that amendment. That amendment has been denied. Keep the gifts coming. Boy, is that wrong.

We also have two major committees that do nothing. They have no legislative jurisdiction. There were amendments to try and go after these. One has a staff of over \$6 million a year; the other is over \$3 million a year. The one that has the over \$6 million, the last thing it did was a 300-page report defending the right of billionaires to be able to give up their U.S. citizenship and move offshore to avoid paying taxes. Now, that is not something I feel like funding, thank you.

Not only that, we have two tax committees that have legislative jurisdiction. Why do we need this third one that is really nothing but a select committee?

Why am I angry? Well, we did away with all the other select committees, ones that dealt with children and fami-

lies, the one that dealt with hunger, and the one that dealt with the elderly. Those are gone. Those were people ones, but when you talk about taxes you cannot have enough staff up here protecting billionaires. No, no, no, we have to preserve them. So we have the Rules Committee denying any amendments to take those out, because if those amendments came to the floor, they are afraid people might vote for them. Well, so much for open rules.

I must say this saddens me very, very much. People may remember at the end of the 100 days I suppose I misbehaved. I climbed up on the top of this dome and I hung out a sign that said "Sold," because I feel I am watching this place being sold right under my eyes. It is like sold to the highest bidder; sold to the highest gift-giver. We are becoming a major, major coin-operated legislative machine.

There are ways to prevent that. There are ways to prevent that with campaign finance reform, with the gift ban, with doing away with committees that are just defending the super-rich who have their lobbyists up here protecting their special interest in the Tax Code. There are ways we can do that. But we cannot do that if we are denied the right to even bring these up as real amendments on the floor.

So far they have not denied my right to come here and at least talk about it. I suppose that is next. But we cannot do anything meaningful about it because the process has been shut down.

Now, I think for Americans this is a very serious issue, a very serious issue. We know that lobbyists can come in here and turn things around. We know they have been here a long time. But we now know we are seeing them in a magnitude greater than we have ever seen.

I was for the gift ban before they moved in with this magnitude. But for heaven's sakes, I think before the cynicism just gets so deep that we all drown in it we need to get to these basic House cleaning rules.

We really need to clean all this stuff up. We need to make the Tax Code look like it is working for the average person rather than working on the average person. We should be focusing much more on issues and how they affect children and families. Instead, we did away with the one committee that monitored that type of thing.

We ought to be standing up against hunger. That has been one of the great things that this country has done traditionally, is fed the world with this great breadbasket we have. No, we did away with that committee.

But, by golly, today we will not even have the chance to save \$10 million and do away with the one that is protecting the billionaires over there on the Joint Committee on Taxation and do away with the Joint Economic Committee.

Have you ever seen an economist that has come out with anything that is on target yet? Why do we keep buying more and more and more of those,

especially when we do not look at these other issues that are so critical?

So I rise with great sadness, and I hope many people think, very, very long and hard before they vote for this rule, because when you vote for this rule, remember, you have totally shut out the ability of being able to bring up these kind of amendments once more.

If you remember, last week when we did the defense bill, we had a rule that prevented us from bringing the defense number down to what the Pentagon wanted. This must stop. Think about that when you vote for the rule and vote "no."

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 13 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

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

Remind us always, O God, that honest communication between people demands that we not only speak but we also listen, that we not only express our ideas and feelings but we also heed the words and feelings of others, that we not only hear the sounds of conversation but actually contemplate the meaning intended by such words. May we, gracious God, appreciate that before we can act faithfully, we must also listen faithfully to that which others say to us. So let us truly commit ourselves to listen to others—in word and thought and meaning and purpose. 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. The Pledge of Allegiance will be led by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE 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 a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 652. An act to provide for a pro-competitive de-regulatory national policy framework designed to accelerate rapidly private sector deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies and services to all Americans by opening all telecommunications markets to competition, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 219) "An act to ensure economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. NICKLES, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GLENN, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. REID, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The chair will recognize each side for fifteen 1-minutes.

DIME STORE DEFICIT REDUCTION

(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, earlier this year some Members of Congress were infected with the me too but syndrome. As we discussed welfare reform they would say, "I'm for welfare reform, but" or when we passed a tough crime bill they said, "Me too, but, not that bill."

Now it appears a strain of that virus has infected the White House. President Clinton seems to have come down with me too not as much and I have no details syndrome.

The President told us last week that he was for spending cuts just not as much as Congress and he offered no specifics for his so-called budget plan. He claimed he was for tax cuts for hard working middle class Americans. But the House plan would allow families to keep too much of what they earn. And now we learn this week that the Clinton budget II, still leaves our children with huge annual deficits.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be fooled. As this House is trying to save the next generation from bankruptcy, the President is offering dime store deficit deduction.

STAND UP FOR WORKING PEOPLE

(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, the morning talk shows were having a great time, for they were talking about how the Congress was getting ready as a legislative body of the United States of America to do our own budget. As we address the appropriations for this Congress, there is a lot of smoke and mirrors, and I have come to stand on behalf of the working people.

What are we doing with this appropriation? We are cutting out jobs for working people, the folding room, hard-working citizens who have been working for many, many years, dedicated and loyal, providing mail service to this House—they will lose their jobs. The Printing Office, skilled craftsmen who have been working and contributing to this House, they, too, it seems will lose their jobs. And then the citizens who come to work here, they may be driving a 1967 Chevrolet, but they are coming to the Congress to work. What do we do? We cut out their parking lot just so a few extra dollars can go somewhere else.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to do real appropriating and let us be real fair, do not cut valuable services and real jobs for working Americans who work in lower level positions. Let us stand on the side of Americans who work, the citizens who come to work every day in the folding room, the Printing Office, and, yes, those individuals who drive far to come to work for the citizens of the United States of America who need just a simple unfancy parking lot to park in.

Smoke and mirrors, that is this appropriation. Vote "no" on this congressional budget appropriation process. There are no real cuts only smoke and mirrors—vote to save jobs.

PORKER OF THE WEEK AWARD

(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, last month 238 employees of the National Immunization Program held a conference at the luxurious Century Plaza Hotel in downtown Beverly Hills.

The event cost \$1,015,900.

This money could be used to immunize 13,500 babies. But I suppose a conference among bureaucrats in beautiful Beverly Hills was more important.

I am told the conference organizers selected Beverly Hills because of a recent outbreak of measles in Los Angeles. I wonder how many of the infected were in Beverly Hills at the time of the conference.

For whittling away taxpayer dollars so that bureaucrats can live high on the hog, the National Immunization Program gets my Porker of the Week Award.

SHAME, WASHINGTON POST

(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, the Washington Post bought eight brand-new printing presses, \$250 million, a quarter of a billion dollars. They got them from Mitsubishi of Japan, who they said was the low bidder over Rockwell International.

Beam me up. How many, Mr. Speaker, how many businesses in Japan buy ads in the Washington Post? How many Japanese read the Washington Post? How many Japanese buy the Washington Post?

Shame, Washington Post. Hide your face, and while you are hiding your face, on behalf of all the workers at Rockwell International who are not allowed to bid in Japanese markets, shove your printing presses up your low bid.

CONGRATULATING THE HOUSE ON CORRECTIONS DAY

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take a minute to congratulate the House. Later on today we will pass the provision in the rules which creates Corrections Day. Later, after that, we will establish the bipartisan committee or task force which will be reviewing proposals for Corrections Day. Later, after that, we will establish the bipartisan committee or task force which will be reviewing proposals for Corrections Day.

This is an idea which first developed earlier this year, and people said, "Isn't there some way to correct the bureaucracy when it is doing things that make no sense?" I think it is a sign of real progress that on a bipartisan basis we were able to work out both the arrangement to establish a procedure for Corrections Day and we were able to establish, with the minority leader, a proposal and a list of names so there will be genuine bipartisanship in pursuing this, I think it is an example of working together.

We can get something good done for the American people, and we can cut some of the nonsense out of the Federal Government.

So I commend the Committee on Rules for its diligence, and I commend the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and the others who worked so hard to make this come true.

WHAT WE ARE NOT DOING TODAY

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is important, after just hearing from

Speaker GINGRICH, what we are going to do and what we are not going to do today.

Well, I will have to ask the empty Chamber what we are not going to do today.

What we are not going to do today is deal with the question of billionaires and the tax loopholes they can take in renouncing their citizenship. What we are not going to do today is to add a gift ban, a meaningful gift ban, which many of us have taken voluntarily, that requires, that allows, that makes sure that we do not fall under undue influence.

What is important to ask today is not what we are doing with some of these poll-driven, cynical ideas that seem to reach out to the common denominator, but, rather what we are not doing up here. We are not taking care of Medicare. We are cutting Medicare to give a tax break to the most wealthy.

We have got to look not at what we are doing today but what we are not doing, and what they are planning to do.

WE WILL BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, we will balance the budget. This will not be easy, but we will balance the budget, but not quite as soon as we would like, but we are going to do it.

How will we do this? We are going to have to rein in the spending, and we will rein in the spending.

The way that we should look at each expenditure, as this budget comes before us, look at each expenditure in this way: Is this spending so important that we are willing to borrow the money to do it? We do not have the money. We have debt now. We do not have the money. Borrow the money to do it and force our children and grandchildren to pay interest on it for the rest of their lives, to lower their standard of living to pay interest on that money for the rest of their lives? If it is that important, then we should spend the money, and if it is not, we should delete it.

BAN GIFTS FROM LOBBYISTS

(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, the American public strongly favors banning gifts from lobbyists to Members of Congress, yet, again and again, the Republican leadership has turned back Democratic efforts to pass gift ban legislation. Yesterday, yet another Democratic gift ban amendment ran up against yet another Republican stone-wall.

The Baldacci amendment to the legislative appropriations bill we will con-

sider today would have prohibited legislative funds from going to any Member or employee who has accepted a gift from a paid lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or an agent of a foreign principal. Yet, the Republican leadership will not even allow this amendment to come to the floor for a vote.

Perks and privileges demean this institution and everyone who serves here. We are here to do the people's business and we are well compensated for that. We do not need paid vacations, frequent flier miles, or free meals to sweeten the deal. It is high time Republicans live up to their rhetoric on reform and join Democrats to clean up Congress and ban gifts from lobbyists.

PEOPLE OF AMERICA KNOW HOW TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, balancing the budget is serious and difficult business. This was made even plainer this week when it was made known by the Congressional Budget Office that the President's plan to balance the budget in 10 years, which, by the way, is far longer than most Americans want to take to balance the budget, that his plan is out of balance by roughly \$200 billion a year and is still out of balance at the end of 10 years by, I think, \$209 billion.

Now, I am sure that the President and all of his people worked very hard on this plan to balance the budget, and the fact that it is out of balance every year roughly \$200 billion and still out of balance in year 10, over \$200 billion, indicates how difficult balancing the budget is.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you where the real wisdom is in how to balance the budget, and that is outside the beltway. Let us go out to real America where people work and earn a living and balance their budget day in and day out, year in and year out. They will have the answer of how to do it here.

IN SUPPORT OF NIH FUNDING

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans want to balance the budget, provide tax cuts for the wealthy, and increase defense spending at the expense of vital programs that serve the health of every American.

In their budget plan, they have proposed a \$2.8 billion cut in funding for the National Institutes of Health, the world's leading biomedical research institution.

Their plan would jeopardize our Nation's health and our economy.

It would limit medical advances for life-threatening diseases such as heart disease and cystic fibrosis.

It would reduce the number of new technologies and treatments which save billions in annual medical care costs.

It would also threaten America's status as the premier health research center of the world and the 726,000 jobs this industry has created.

A cut of this magnitude is not only wrong, it lacks public support. Over 91 percent of Americans want us to spend more, not less, on health research.

M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, located in my district, is one of the best cancer research facilities in the world. The cancer center was among the first institutions to conduct trials of the new anticancer drug taxol, now being used to treat over a dozen types of cancer. NIH provided the resources to help M.D. Anderson develop this drug.

I do not believe the American people want us to reduce experiments which could provide a breakthrough in the treatment or cure for breast cancer, Hodgkin's disease, or melanoma.

If NIH's budget is reduced, M.D. Anderson and other institutions across the Nation would face even tighter budgets. These facilities would be forced to eliminate thousands of research-associated jobs.

Let us not risk America's role in biomedical research. If we do, our Nation could face a serious health care crisis down the road.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET OUT OF BALANCE

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, a week ago the President of the United States spoke to the American people and entered, reentered the debate. He had sort of been AWOL for several months about the budget, and he reentered the debate, came in from the cold and said that he was presenting us with a balanced budget, or a budget that would be in balance after 10 years.

Republicans, while wishing that he had probably been there a lot sooner, generally welcomed him and asked him to be a part of it and looked forward to that and felt good about that, felt good he was going to enter back into the fray.

We have now found out from the CBO that, in fact, this budget that was presented is not in balance at all. In fact, it shows \$200 billion deficits through the 5th year, through the 6th year, through the 7th year, through the 10th year. Every single year, it goes from \$191 billion to about \$210 billion.

It reminds me a great deal of the same situation we had in 1992, where the President campaigned from the center and then, after he was elected, governed from the left. Here we have a situation where the claim was made a

week ago there was a balanced budget when, in fact, it is not.

LEGAL SERVICES FOR THE POOR

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, very soon now, this House will be engaged in a great debate as to whether or not to preserve legal services to the poor as is now a part of the Federal establishment.

There is general agreement across the board from those who want to zero it out altogether and not spend one penny in the support of legal services from the Federal Government to those who would expand the legal services grouping, as we now know it; somewhere in the middle lies the final principle upon which this House will take action.

Do we want to provide legal services access to the courts for the poor? The answer is resoundingly probably, yes. But do we want to allocate Federal funds to a private corporation to dole out these sums to help the poor in the various States, or do we want to shrink the amount of money, send it to the States in the form of block grants and have them decide how to provide legal services for the poor?

These are the outlines for the debate that is yet to come.

IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME [SIDS]

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, Representative TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota and I want to send a wake-up call to our colleagues about the No. 1 killer of infants during their first year of life: Sudden infant death syndrome, otherwise known as SIDS or crib death.

SIDS is defined as the "Sudden death of an infant under 1 year of age which remains unexplained after a thorough case investigation, including performance of a complete autopsy, examination of the death scene, and review of the clinical history."

The tragic and unexpected loss of a newborn is devastating to parents. What makes this disheartening experience even more agonizing is when doctors have no medical explanation for the infant's death.

SIDS is the leading cause of death among infants between the ages of 1 week and 1 year and strikes infants of all countries and cultures—in the United States alone, there are between 6,000 to 7,500 infants who unexpectedly die of SIDS each year.

As a new Member of the 104th Congress, I remain committed to increasing national public awareness about SIDS and educating parents about

steps they can take to reduce the risks of SIDS.

In 1994, a national "Back to Sleep" public education campaign was launched by Federal and private entities.

The goal of this campaign is to encourage parents to place healthy babies on their backs or sides to sleep which research has shown to reduce the risk of SIDS.

Representative JOHNSON and I have sent important information to each office about the "Back to Sleep" campaign and SIDS public service announcements. We encourage our colleagues to send this vital message about SIDS prevention home to your constituents.

WHAT A DIFFERENCE A REPUBLICAN MAJORITY MAKES

(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, the new Republican majority has decided to set an example for everyone else to follow. Today we are bringing to the floor our own funding bill, the legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 1996. It may come as a shock to the American people, but, this year we are cutting our own budget by \$155 million. Yes, \$155 million.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a Republican majority can make. We have worked hard to eliminate unnecessary programs, privatize programs, and to streamline this huge bureaucracy that we call our home away from home. We are going to make Congress work better with less money. In fact, if every other program in the Federal Government were being proportionately reduced, we would save more than \$130 billion during the next fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a Republican majority makes.

□ 1020

EFFICIENCY, COST SAVINGS ARE HALLMARKS OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority continues to make good on our promise to change the status quo by cutting Government. Today we are bringing to the floor two measures to prove our dedication—the legislative branch appropriations bill, and legislation to establish a Corrections Day.

Through the legislative branch bill, we will reduce our own budget by \$155 million for the next fiscal year. We have cut congressional staff and eliminated unnecessary programs.

Corrections Day will help purge the Federal Government of ridiculous red tape. It will especially help State and

local officials, who have been dealing with ridiculous regulations for too long.

Mr. Speaker, a smaller, less costly, and more efficient Government is our goal.

EXTENSION OF AGREEMENT ON FISHERIES BETWEEN LATVIA AND THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-86)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Resources and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), I transmit herewith an Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia Extending the Agreement of April 8, 1993, Concerning Fisheries Off the Coasts of the United States. The Agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Riga on March 28, 1995, and April 4, 1995, extends the 1993 Agreement to December 31, 1997.

In light of the importance of our fisheries relationship with the Republic of Latvia, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this Agreement at an early date.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 20, 1995.

CUT CORPORATE WASTE

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, corporate welfare is defined as payment of Federal assistance in the form of subsidies, tax credits, and payments to business.

Such corporate welfare has grown to be so widespread that nearly every member of the Fortune 500 receives some sort of subsidy. Besides the enormous burden corporate waste places on the Federal budget, subsidies serve to weaken businesses; incentive to be competitive, efficient, and productive.

Reducing corporate subsidies is an important step in controlling spending. By sharply reducing these programs, we could eliminate unproductive programs while freeing much-needed funds for deficit reduction. In fact, cutbacks in corporate waste would have far more impact in reducing the deficit than many of the current efforts by Republicans to cut discretionary spending.

The Republicans have proposed to cut billions from programs that assist families, children, seniors, farmers, and veterans. Yet, while Republicans

seek to gut programs that allow American families to make ends meet, over \$160 billion a year in corporate welfare is buried in our Tax Code in the form of giveaways and loopholes.

It is indefensible to ask Americans to sacrifice without asking big business to do its fair share. I challenge the majority to cut aid to dependent corporations.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 169 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 169

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 302(f) or 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report are waived. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during future consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by this resolution. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to find passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 169 is a structured rule, providing for the consideration of H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

The rule waives section 302(f), prohibiting consideration of legislation which exceeds a committee's allocation of new entitlement authority, and section 308(a) which requires a cost estimate in committee reports on new entitlement authority of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule also waives clause 2, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations of legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, and clause 6, prohibiting re-appropriations, of rule XXI against provisions in the bill.

In addition, the rule makes in order only the amendments printed in the report on the rule, to be offered only in the order printed, by the Member specified, and debatable for the time specified in the report. The amendments are considered as read and are not subject to amendment or a demand for a division of the question in the House or Committee of the Whole. Also, all points of order are waived against the amendments.

House Resolution 169 permits the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone consideration of a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and to reduce to 5 minutes the time for voting after the first of a series of votes.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, as in last year's legislative branch appropriations rule, House Resolution 169 is a fairly standard structured rule to allow for the consideration of H.R. 1854. Amendments were made in order that allow the full House to make changes in areas where there are true differences of opinion. Last year, a total of 43 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee and 12 of those were made in order. This year, 33 amendments were filed at the Rules Committee, and House Resolution 169 makes 11 in order. Of this year's group of filed amendments, less than one-half, by the way, Mr. Speaker, of the amendments filed were submitted on time and several were repetitive. A full dozen of these amendments

dealt with franked mail and the Rules Committee made three amendments that affect Members mailings in order. We also allow amendments that would restore functions that some Members want to retain. In addition, we allow the full House to vote on an amendment that would allow Members to return unspent portions of their office expense allotments to the Treasury to be used for deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege in being the only Member of Congress to currently serve on both of the Speaker-appointed committees, and in my role on the Committee on House Oversight, I am very proud of the reforms achieved in H.R. 1854 based on the recommendations by House Oversight. We had some tough choices to make, but getting our own House in order and tightening our own buckles is a necessary step if we are ever going to achieve a balanced Federal budget; which is, of course, our goal.

H.R. 1854 incorporates House Oversight plans to revolutionize the internal workings of the House of Representatives, and over the next few months alone, save the taxpayers \$7 million by streamlining operations. This bill is below the subcommittee's 602(B) allocation and is over 8 percent below last year's spending level. H.R. 1854 eliminates, consolidates and reduces, paving the way for privatization of functions that will likely be less costly when performed in some instances by the private sector. Quite frankly, House Oversight and the legislative branch subcommittee did such a fine job that there really is not much room for improvement by way of further reductions on the floor.

I would like at this time to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative, and of course the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, for their excellent work in bringing this bill forward. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that House Resolution 169 is a necessarily structured and yet fair rule, and I would urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we reluctantly oppose this rule for the legislative branch appropriations bill.

We are aware of the dilemma faced by the new majority in fashioning a rule for the consideration of this spending bill, which has for the past several years has proved especially contentious. We very much would like to be able to support this rule, but we do not oppose it because it makes in order only 11 of the 33 amendments that met the required pre-filing deadline. We do not oppose it because it waives points of order against provisions in the bill

that violate House rules. We do not oppose this rule because it does not represent the "free and open legislative process" under which amendments are not blocked—the type of rule promised by the gentleman from New York—who is now the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Rules—when we debated the rule on this same spending measure last year.

Mr. Speaker, we oppose this modified closed rule because it does not make in order amendments that deal with some of the most significant issues raised by the spending priorities in the bill. We oppose the rule because it denies Members the opportunity to vote on important reform and spending amendments.

During committee consideration of the rule late yesterday, we sought to make in order those amendments; our attempts were defeated each time on a party-line vote.

We argued that Members of the House should be allowed to vote on the deficit reduction lockbox amendment offered by Representatives BREWSTER and HARMAN. After all, the hallmark of the bill before us is that it cuts the spending of the legislative branch of Government; ends several of its functions and programs, and turns others over to the private sector.

As a consequence, we felt it only fair that the House have the opportunity to debate what happens to those savings, and whether or not they can be directly applied to reducing the Federal deficit.

Unfortunately, the majority on the committee voted once again to deny Representatives BREWSTER and HARMAN the opportunity to address this deficit reduction issue on the floor of the House.

We also felt strongly that a responsible amendment dealing with funding for the Office of Technology Assessment should be in order. The OTA is a nonpartisan research organization that provides Congress with valuable and timely information about issues in the legislation we are considering. It has strong bipartisan support in the Congress. Many of us on both sides of the aisle are concerned that the Appropriations Committee has acted precipitously in eliminating funding for this important research arm of Congress.

The rule makes in order one of the two amendments filed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] which is written to retain a smaller version of the OTA. Unfortunately, the amendment made in order is not the one favored by the author; he testified before the Rules Committee that he preferred his amendment that retains for the OTA some of the autonomy it currently has, and which has been a large part of its success.

The amendment required a waiver of the rule prohibiting legislative provisions in an appropriations bill. But, Mr. Speaker, since the rule itself provides a waiver of this point of order for other provisions in the bill and also waives all points of order against the

amendments that are allowed, we felt it would have been equitable and certainly not unreasonable to protect the amendment Mr. HOUGHTON had hoped would be made in order.

The majority on the committee also refused to make in order several reform amendments, including one offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] to abolish the Joint Committee on Taxation. The Schroeder amendment should have been made in order, especially since the new majority intends to end or weaken one of its major functions—reviewing the tax returns of individuals and corporations with refunds that exceed \$1 million, a function that saved the taxpayers of this country \$16 million last year alone.

Our colleagues will also remember, of course, that we have, in the past, come to rely on the Joint Tax Committee as a voice of independence. But recent actions, including the 300-page report on the billionaire expatriates, have called its autonomous nature into question.

This amendment, along with another offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], to eliminate funding now for the Joint Economic Committee, would have helped in our effort to streamline congressional operations, as well as save taxpayers money.

We are also being denied the opportunity to bring a gift ban to a vote. The committee refused to make in order an amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCIO], that would have prohibited the acceptance of gifts by Members, their staffs, and the officers of the House.

As Members know, Mr. Speaker, we have been attempting to vote on a gift ban since the first day of this Congress, when the majority voted down a rules change that would have implemented a similar provision as a House rule.

We believe that officially ending this practice of accepting gifts would go a long way toward restoring faith in Congress by removing the appearance of impropriety by Members. This amendment would have given us the chance to vote on this important issue, the resolution of which has been dragged out far too long.

Mr. Speaker, this rule unfortunately also denies us the right to vote on another long-overdue congressional reform, a bipartisan amendment that would have ended the personal use of frequent flier miles by Members of Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we believe the Members of this body deserve the chance to debate and vote on a handful of amendments that could, in fairness, have been made in order by this modified closed rule. They addressed important congressional reform issues and the continuation of the OTA with some semblance of autonomy; they should have been a part of today's debate, and should not have been denied consideration.

This legislation is obviously essential if we want to continue to do well what

we were sent here to do: Represent the people in our districts and legislate with their best interests and the interests of the Nation in mind at all times.

Mr. Speaker, we regret that we are unable to support the rule for this very important legislation.

We urge our colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we will be able to consider the important budget and reform amendments that were denied by the majority of the Committee on Rules and locked out of the amendment process.

If the Brewster-Harman lockbox amendment and the Baldacci gift ban amendment had been made in order, we would have had more spending cuts and more reform, and we shall ask our colleagues to give us the opportunity to make these important amendments part of the process today.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I will not consume very much time. Let me just say I rise in strong support of the rule. Like most of the rules on legislative branch appropriations bills adopted by the House in recent years, this is a structured rule. My colleague from Miami, FL, has so stated. He is a very valuable member of our Committee on Rules and also a very, very important member of the Committee on House Oversight. As he has stated, the rule provides for the consideration of a total of 11 amendments, or substitute amendments, 5 of which are Republicans', 4 of which are Democrats', and 2 of which are bipartisan.

□ 1040

The rule will give the House an opportunity to work its will on most of the major issues relating to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I heard some criticism of this rule and of the bill before us, but let me tell Members how important this is. We have just enacted a budget in this Congress which is going to realize a balanced budget in 7 years. I would have preferred to have it be 5 years, but, nevertheless, 7 years guaranteed, I think, is certainly a step in the right direction.

What does this legislative appropriation bill do? This sets the tone for exactly what we are going to be doing throughout the entire Federal Government when we restructure that government. We have reduced committees, we have reduced subcommittees, and, to drive a point home, that means 833 fewer employees, 833 fewer employees. If you look at my good friend RON PACKARD's committee report on page 16, it talks about the savings that are arrived at from reducing 833 employees. That means less taxpayers' money that goes to the contribution to pension

benefits for employees and for Members of Congress, it means less taxpayers' money that is appropriated to pay the congressional employees' share of health care costs, and so it goes, on and on and on.

Well, if that saves several million dollars, just think what is going to happen when we abolish the Department of Education, with 7,000 employees; when we abolish the Department of Commerce with 36,000 employees; and the Department of Energy with 18,000 employees. Think how fewer contributions there are going to be of taxpayer dollars going to benefits for those employees of the Federal work force. We are not reducing the amount for the Federal work force that pays for those benefits, but we are reducing the total amount of dollars. That is what we need to do.

So for anyone who wants to vote against this rule or the legislative appropriations bill, they are making a big mistake, because this does set that tone. For the first time in years I am going to vote for a legislative appropriations bill, because it reduces the spending on this Congress and sets the right tone. I urge all Members to do the same thing.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT].

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because, among other reasons, the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], preserving OTA, was not put in order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment to retain OTA. I have served on the OTA board for 4 years, and I feel strongly that this agency should be retained.

I have three main points I want to make concerning OTA in my brief comments today. My first point is that the work of OTA is not simply a luxury to Congress, the work done by OTA cannot and will not be replicated by any other organization.

Second, I want to point out that OTA exists as a result of growing awareness over the early part of the 20th century of the ever-increasing need for sound scientific analysis in policymaking. Much careful thought went into creating OTA, and we should be equally careful as we consider what its future should be.

Congress will not get a lot of symbolic mileage out of eliminating OTA. With all the inefficient organizations we have to cut in the Federal Government, eliminating a small agency that is considered a model of efficiency by experts across the political spectrum is not the way to score political points.

During the joint hearing on congressional support agencies on February 2 of this year, a number of experts on congressional reform from across the political spectrum discussed OTA. Each witness praised the expertise of OTA

reports, and several witnesses noted that OTA could serve as a model of efficiency and organization for other government entities.

No one questioned the objectivity of OTA, nor were there serious concerns raised about the utility of their reports. The only argument made for eliminating OTA was that the organization was not essential to the Congress. The question then comes down to the necessity of having OTA continue its work for Congress.

I think we all can agree that Congress is being called upon to legislate in a world which only becomes more technically complex, we clearly have a need for good technical analysis from an objective and professional organization.

Some say we should go directly to the outside experts, and that objective and balanced advice should be obtained that way. This is based on the belief that professional standards in the technical fields are sufficient that Congress does not need an office to help sort out competing scientifically based claims.

As a medical professional, I know enough about science to know that there is a lot of ground for differing interpretation and presentation of scientific facts. In my own field, I can make judgments about what constitutes solid evidence. But we are incapable of making those sorts of judgments outside of our own fields. I would have very little basis to judge good or bad scientific advice outside of my own area of medicine.

In OTA, we keep on hand a small but highly trained group of experts in numerous technology related fields. They have no institutional or economic agenda to push. They exist to sort out competing arguments, to explain seemingly contradictory facts, and then present them to us so that we may make our policy decisions with these complicated scientific perspectives sorted out.

Here is an example of why it would be difficult to rely directly on experts or the private sector to fill the functions of OTA.

Many of us have been concerned over the past several years about the emergence of bacterial disease resistant to many of our antibiotics. What is unknown is how serious a problem this truly is, and how we should deal with it. Presumably we could go directly to the experts, the microbiologists and infectious disease specialists.

But we might expect these professionals could have a conflict of interest, and might overstate the problem, in hopes of obtaining more funding for surveillance and basic research. OTA has no stake in this issue other than to serve the policymaking needs of the Congress.

They can afford to be objective and ask the question, Is this truly a public health crisis, and what needs to be done about it? The OTA is just a few months away from having a report completed on this question, and it will

almost certainly shed important light on a problem which is a significant cause for public concern.

We must recognize that OTA exists as a result of a long history of recognition by Federal policymakers that policy requires data and analysis. The National Academy of Sciences argued for the creation of OTA, because they—among others—recognized that the pace of science demanded an expanded capacity for Congress to obtain balanced technical advice.

The number of scientific and technology issues, the pace of change and the complexity of these issues will only increase in the next decade. It strikes me as precisely the wrong time for impulsive acts like the elimination of an entity that exists because of a long, carefully considered need for such assistance.

OTA was not some luxury created based on some monetary whim. OTA exists because policymakers found a significant gap that was not filled by the existing experts, think tanks, academic centers, or other sources.

The National Academy of Sciences, Institute of Medicine and National Academy of Engineering continues to this day to strongly support the continuation of OTA.

Furthermore, we should not expect that an entity like OTA can be quickly recreated. OTA has accumulated an experienced staff in an amazingly broad range of science and technology issues, and that have a considerable amount of institutional memory in addition to their technical expertise.

A hasty decision to fire these professionals would undo many years of careful thought and painstaking hiring.

The American people sent a lot of new people to Congress in November to act; but they did not send them here to act impulsively or with shortsightedness. I think that if we have learned anything it is that the public can usually tell the difference.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a structured rule, a rule that I think is very fair. It will give complete opportunity for us to debate every issue that I think is important to be debated. Frankly, I want to express my appreciation as chairman of the subcommittee to the Committee on Rules for providing us with this very fair and open opportunity for debate.

In reference to OTA, I must make some comment. We will have a complete opportunity to debate OTA. There are two amendments made in order. One is to restore virtually all of OTA to where it is now, 85 percent of it. Then a second amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON]. We will have complete opportunity to debate OTA. Frankly, I

think that the Committee on Rules was very fair in that area.

I also want the Members of the House to know that we spent considerable time and effort in trying to craft a bill that would do some of the fundamental things that Congress and we think the voters have called upon the House to do, and that is to downsize Government, and to start with themselves.

This bill does that. This sets the model. This sets the mold for all the rest of Government to follow in downsizing, in consolidating, in eliminating, and in cutting those areas that Government needs to cut, and we have started with the Congress and the related agencies that support the Congress in this bill.

It is a very good bill. We have given considerable effort and bipartisan debate before we come to the floor of the House to it. This rule gives us a chance to debate those very issues that were debated and were still controversial in the committee and subcommittee. We do not believe there should be any need for additional amendments. In fact, we would have preferred less amendments. But the Committee on Rules, in their good judgment, balanced the amendments to both sides of the aisle, and we think that we will have an opportunity to debate the important issues.

We like the rule, we appreciate the Committee on Rules, and I strongly urge the Members of the House to vote in support of the resolution.

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

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today we take up the 2d of our 13 appropriations bills, this time the legislative branch appropriations bill. Sadly, the rule on this bill once again does not include the Brewster-Harman bipartisan lockbox amendment.

Later today we will also resume consideration and vote on the military construction appropriations bill. The rule on that bill did not include the Brewster-Harman bipartisan lockbox amendment.

Let me explain what is sad about this and why I will vote against the rule to this bill and the rule to future appropriations bills, so long as they do not include the Brewster-Harman bipartisan lockbox amendment.

The lockbox is a very simple concept. It is supported by or was supported by 418 Members of this House and I believe all members of the Committee on Rules when it was voted on earlier this spring. What it says is a cut is a cut. It is a mechanism whereby when we cut spending on an appropriations bill, as we did last Friday when we voted down a proposal for an Army museum that would cost \$14 million, the money that is saved is scored in a lockbox. It could be called anything, but it is separately

and identifiably set aside. That means that when the House bill passes, that lockbox money is identified. When the Senate bill passes, whatever is in the Senate lockbox is identified, and the conferees are required to come out with a figure somewhere between the House and Senate number. That final amount in savings must go to deficit reduction.

These are not actual dollar bills that are in a box. This is less money that has to be borrowed, and it is money that comes off the 602(b) allocation.

I want to explain to my colleagues if we do not do this, we are deceiving the American people. We are saying that we are cutting spending, when we are not. Instead, we are giving a certain kind of power to the appropriators that the American people do not understand that they have. It is not the right thing to do in this House in my view, to cut spending and then to reallocate that spending without people knowing about it.

So one more time, colleagues, deficit hawks, all of you, let me urge that we change this rule to make in order the Brewster-Harman lockbox amendment and that we make clear to the American people that we are not kidding, that the money saved comes off the bottom line, and that the deficit will go down because of the courageous actions we take in this body.

Vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague and dear friend, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, for yielding me this time. I must say that it has been a pleasure to have him on the Committee on Rules and I am pleased to see him managing these legislative efforts.

Mr. Speaker, in the time I have been in Congress, we have had much discussion about the need to look close to home as we work to bring balance to our Federal budget. Not only is there an actual real need to clamp down on unnecessary and lower priority spending—but there is also a very important symbolic need behind that effort. My mail strongly suggests the American people are willing to make some sacrifices in order to bring down our deficit and begin paying off our debt. But they want to be sure that the sacrifice is spread fairly, all the way around—and they sure want to know that their elected officials are leading the way, not hiding behind some royal velvet curtain in the castle or the Imperial Congress. I am very proud of the work done by our friends on the legislative branch subcommittee in bringing us H.R. 1854, the bill that outlines our own budget up here on the Hill for the com-

ing year. The subcommittee made some very real cuts—reflecting the action we took on the opening day in cutting our staff budgets by one-third and in reducing the actual dollars we intend to spend next fiscal year by 8.2 percent from what we are spending this year. That is a real cut—not just slower growth or some budgetary hocus-focus. Still, though the committee has done good work—there are Members who have ideas about further cuts and ways to change priorities in how the money is spent. Although appropriations bills are privileged and could come straight to the floor without a rule, this bill requires certain waivers as explained by my colleague from Florida. In addition, because we are under a tight time schedule to complete our work on all the appropriations bills, our Rules Committee chose to follow recent precedent and provide a structured rule, which was reported by our committee on a voice vote. This rule provides for consideration of 11 amendments—including several proposals for additional cuts in Members' franking. I am a strong proponent of reducing the allowances Members get for free mail—having spent the past 6 years fully responding to my constituents' inquiries and staying in touch—while only using a fraction of my allocation. I am certain many other Members have had similar experience of underutilization of the over generous franking allowances. Likewise, we will consider an amendment to afford Members the opportunity to return unused office funds to the Treasury for deficit reduction—an important proposal designed to change the incentives from spending toward saving. All together—the bill and this rule—provide strong testimony to the fact that Members are starting to get it—the American people want us to lead by example and that is exactly what we are doing. This doesn't reduce Congress and its Members to sackcloth and ashes. It does responsibly tighten our belts another notch or two. I urge support for this rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the moment we have no further requests for time, although such requests may yet appear. We reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for House Resolution 169, the rule which provides for consideration of H.R. 1854, appropriations for the legislative branch.

In the past, Congress has proven that it absolutely cannot restrain itself from spending taxpayers' money. This bill is a significant move to curb Congress' spending on itself. H.R. 1854 cuts the congressional budget by \$154 million in fiscal year 1996, eliminates 2,350 congressional staff positions, and

privatizes those operations that would be better provided in the open market.

The bill crafted by the Appropriations Committee continues our commitment to shrink Government, beginning with ourselves. This rule assures that the Members of the House can vote on a number of amendments that would further cut the funds that Congress spends on itself, including funds spent on congressional allowances, congressional mail, and congressional staff. While only 12 percent of amendments offered by the minority party were permitted in the last Congress on this bill, the Rules Committee will allow almost one-third of minority amendments to be considered on the House floor today.

Some amendments, such as a loosely written gift ban amendment, should not be in this bill. However, under the ill-advised amendment offered in the Rules Committee, if a group from the Fourth District of Georgia decided to hold a reception, I could be prohibited from joining the event because it was funded by interested constituents.

A House bipartisan task force is working on effective gift ban language, and the Rules Committee acted responsibly in not permitting this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we will balance the budget so that our grandchildren will not have to pay for our extravagances. We are cutting our own budget first, and are working to assure that future generations will not have to pay for the excesses of Government. I urge support for this fair rule and the bill that will create a streamlined, responsible legislative branch.

□ 1100

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill. By slashing Congress' own budget by \$154 million, this bill shows that Congress is not just asking others to make do with less money, but we are starting with ourselves.

The rule for this bill, though, allows us to go even further than the base bill. The rule makes in order a number of amendments that will cut even more funding, including an amendment to cut Members' office allowances by \$9.3 million, another amendment to cut franking funds by \$4.6 million. We allow an amendment that would further reduce the Government Printing Office and an amendment that allows Members to return the unspent portions of their office expenses to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

I have pledged to cut my office expenses by 25 percent over last year's mark and we are doing it. And I would much rather see that money go to deficit reduction than back into Congress' own spending accounts.

As we work to bring our own House in order, this rule gives us the opportunity to make additional spending cuts beyond the bill's nearly 9 percent reduction.

The American people have become increasingly disillusioned with Congress and for good reason. We have squandered their money for too long. All over this country families are tightening their belts and figuring out how to make do with less, but Congress has failed to do the same over and over again.

This bill proves to American families that we, too, are willing to do our part to help tame the budget deficit by downsizing Congress and bringing spending under control.

This bill takes an important step toward making sure that Congress learns how to do our work better for less money. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the bill.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me. Let me say that talking about how this is a good rule is like trying to put lipstick on pigs. This is a bad rule. Let me tell you why.

Some very essential amendments were denied. They were denied by the same group who promised open rules. The most essential, I think, is the one that would cut off gifts being able to be delivered to Members of Congress and their staff. I think this place should have had a gift ban from the day it started, and to think in 1995 we still do not have it is unbelievable. But we were denied the opportunity to come forward with a gift ban once and for all and say to the lobbyists, no, no, no, this place is not for sale.

So that is one reason. No. 2, if you think we ought to be paying \$6 million to the staff on the Joint Committee on Taxation who just finished preparing a 300-page document defending billionaires in America and their right to give up their citizenship and move offshore to keep from paying taxes, then you will love this rule, because the amendment that would cancel that joint committee that has absolutely no legislation was also not allowed. Those guys are there defending the fat cats, and they are going to keep them there defending the fat cats. They are the first line of defense I guess for fat cats when it comes to taxes. I think they should be gone.

It is very interesting that we cut the Select Committee on Children, the Select Committee on Hunger, the Select Committee on Aging; all of those are gone, but not the select committee that protects tax bennies, no, no, no.

They do not have any more legislative jurisdiction than the other select committees. And on children, let me tell you, the Select Committee on Children Youth and Families, which was around here for 10 years, their entire

10-year staff budget did not equal what one year is in this Joint Committee on Taxation. That was not allowed. So that amendment was not allowed, nor was the amendment to cut out the Joint Committee on Economics.

Now, let me tell you, we either do away with all select committees; I think that is a very good point, if you are going to do all of them. But to selectively just target the ones that are people oriented begins to tell you what our priorities are.

Maybe I would lose if I could offer my amendment. Maybe the gift ban would lose if we could offer that amendment. But let me tell you, anybody who votes for this rule is voting against our chance to even offer that amendment. The only thing we can do is stand down here and talk about it.

What people will then say when they go home and are asked why they did not vote to clean up the Congress and get rid of gifts, they will say, because I could not. What they are not telling is that the reason they could not was because they voted a rule out that did not allow them to clean up the place.

Let us hope people out there are sophisticated enough to ask the second question. If you cannot clean up a gift ban, who can, and why in the world would you vote for a rule that would deny the opportunity for this debate and deny the opportunity for these issues to come to the floor.

If you vote for that rule, that is exactly what you are doing. So if you love gifts coming to your office, vote for this rule. If you or your staff wants more gifts from lobbyists, vote for this rule. If you think it is a great idea to spend \$6 million a year for people to write defenses of billionaires being able to give up their citizenship and duck taxes, vote for this rule; you will love this rule. For me, I do not like this rule and I am voting "no."

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, after hearing the last speaker, I think it is very important that we clarify what exactly was attempted to be done through a gift ban in this legislation versus legislation that I have cosponsored along with other members of the bipartisan task force on reform that really will eliminate gifts from lobbyists coming to Members of this institution.

The amendment that was offered, while I recognize the intent and the spirit with which it was offered, simply said that if we discovered that someone was accepting gifts, they could not get money out of the legislative appropriations bill. What we are trying to do in my gift ban bill is not say it is OK to take gifts as long as you do not get caught, it is to say that gifts should not be accepted by Members of this body.

The amendment that the previous speaker referred to was a few sentences that did not define a gift, that did not

define a lobbyist, that left so many loopholes, it would be far too easy to ignore the plain intent of gift ban legislation.

The bill that I offered, along with other Members, by contrast defines exactly what a gift is, includes trips, includes meals, and gives Members a framework in which to know exactly what things are not permitted. It defines it clearly so that Members cannot argue that they simply did not realize that a meal from someone constitutes a gift.

So if Members are serious about outlawing gifts in this institution, which I hope they are, then it is too important to try to deal with for political purposes in some amendment that does not really truly address the problem. We need to address this problem in a way that makes it clear that we do not have loopholes, that we have an opportunity to really clean this practice up.

In my office we do not take gifts. Things that are sent to us go to a homeless shelter in the area. It is very important to me that we deal with this gift ban, but we need to do it responsibly, not through something tacked on that really will not deal with the problem.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, that is always the great excuse, that this is not the perfect amendment. So my first question is, why did you not offer yours in lieu thereof, if you did not like this one? And second, if you did not like this one, why still not allow it to come to the floor and we at least debate it? You could amend it, whatever. I think that is very important.

Third, why did you not allow the amendment to cut out the two select committees, one on taxation, one on the Joint Economic Committee? Those were also denied. That is 10 million dollars' worth of savings when you just add those two together.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, let me address the gift ban aspect. The reason that I did not offer my bill to legislative appropriations is because it is not appropriate to be legislating in an appropriations bill. I am sure the gentlewoman well knows that. This gift ban needs to be dealt with on its own merits. We need to have a discussion about this. The people of this country need to be able to see exactly what it is we are doing, and I have offered my bill and it is working its way through the process so that Members have an opportunity to know exactly what we are dealing with, that the people of this country can then have confidence that this is not some little thing that we added onto another bill that does not really mean anything, that has an enforcement mechanism, that has definitions that will allow people to really know that we are going to do away with gifts from lobbyists coming to Members of this institution.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, let me say we passed a very strong bill last year. We tried to put it through as legislation, as rules of the House at the beginning of the session. There are many of us who have a discharge petition up there trying to get it out here in one form.

As I say, we have been waiting for over 200 years in this Congress to get decent gift legislation. There is always a reason why not now, not right now. I think this is the perfect time. I thought the gentleman's amendment was excellent. I think it is a shame we would use the amendment to shut off the rule.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I will simply close by saying this: Gift ban legislation is too important to deal with it in a haphazard manner. We need to deal with it not as an add-on to a legislative appropriations bill, not as simply adding a sentence saying that if we find out you are taking gifts you will not get money from this fund.

We need to deal with it in a responsible way that the bipartisan reform task force is attempting to do, by dealing with it in a way that makes it clear to members of the public and to Members of this body that we will not take gifts and trips and meals and all the various things that the people at home have come to feel are too influential in how a law gets made.

I would urge those who are genuinely sincere in wanting to accomplish a gift ban to work with the bipartisan reform team and help us move our legislation forward that deals with this issue responsibly in a way that will make it clear to the public that the days of that influence into this body are over.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected to Congress a little shy of 6 months ago, we were faced with this revolution that was going to be taking place this session. And that revolution was going to be reforming the way the Congress operates.

We passed congressional accountability to make Congress accountable for the laws it passes and it passes on everybody else. We were told at that time that gift ban legislation would be taken up later on, and it could not be done when we tried to do it during that first day.

Now we are being told again that it cannot be done now because it is not the right time and that we want an opportunity for people to understand what is all entailed here.

I think that the people of my State and I think the people of this country understand very well what is taking place and why we do not have gift ban legislation.

□ 1115

They understand very well, whether we establish an enforcement mechanism, whether we establish a watchdog

to watch over it, they know where the majority does not want this issue to be, in front of this Congress, because it is what the American people want and what they demand.

Congress is paid a good salary. They have good benefits. There is no need to have somebody else picking up our check when we go out to eat. We get enough money to pay our own bills. We do not need people buying us tickets to go to a hockey game or to a baseball game, because we have the income and the ability to do it.

We are supposed to be serving the people of this country. We are public servants for the people. I swore an oath to the people, and that is the contract that I have. I do not know what Members are afraid of in bringing this issue up. It may not be perfect, but it will not be the only thing that is not perfect that has been brought up this session.

Mr. Speaker, I implore Members to pass this legislation. We need the Four Horsemen to pass reforms: campaign finance reform, gift ban legislation, congressional accountability. Start putting trust back into the people, so the trust will be raised within the population, so they will have faith in all of us.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to do this job. I voted for term limits. I voted for congressional accountability. I want to vote for campaign finance reform, and I want a gift ban, because it is important to get back the trust of the people in what we are doing on the issues before us. I implore the Members, I do not know what they are afraid of in addressing this issue now. I want to do it, I want to do it now, and I want the people to have their trust back in their public servants, because it is their institution, and we are here to serve them.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, this year we are embarking on a long and arduous journey to balance the budget. Our lingering deficit and staggering national debt make balancing the budget a critical necessity. We must take serious action now. We cannot afford to spend yet additional years and spend additional money before we make cuts that have already been identified.

During this process we are going to have to make many painful decisions to cut programs that are beneficial. We will have to scale back the size of Government. We will have to cut waste, set priorities for dispersing the limited pool of Federal dollars. In this spirit of eliminating waste and reducing the deficit, I had hoped to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 1996 legislative appropriations bill that would have eliminated funding for the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Joint Economic Committee has been identified as an appendage of this institution that is not needed. It is slated

for elimination in fiscal year 1997. Why should we wait for another year? By eliminating the Joint Economic Committee this year, we could save the taxpayers \$3 million.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer afford the luxury of funding redundant, duplicative Government entities such as the Joint Economic Committee. We already have budget committees, tax committees, in both the House and Senate. Earlier this year the committees in the House were reorganized, and the total number was reduced to eliminate overlap and duplications. Now, during the budget process, we should continue this effort and eliminate wasteful joint House and Senate committees.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Members for their efforts to pare down the size of the legislative branch and improve efficiency. Let us take another relatively easy step toward balancing the budget by eliminating the Joint Economic Committee now. I urge my colleagues to support this effort and save the taxpayers \$3 million. I ask, why could this rule not have allowed for that step to be taken this week?

Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, certainly, as the last speaker very articulately pointed out, the American people want us in Congress to act on the budget, and act with fairness to balance the budget and make some

tough spending cuts. One of the ways we can achieve that is to lead ourselves, to return money out of our congressional accounts back to the U.S. Treasury Department.

Over the last 4 years, I have returned over \$670,000. Many Members of Congress have done much better than that. What we should be able to do is have that money designated for deficit reduction and not go back into a fund that pays for other Members' mail, office accounts, salaries, whatever be the case.

A bill that I introduced on the first day of Congress this session, last session, the session before, H.R. 26, would achieve this purpose. It simply says, "Any excess funds in an account will go directly to the U.S. Treasury, and not back to the U.S. Government to be respent."

Mr. Speaker, I think this is fair. It is accountable. It shows some leadership on the part of the Congress to address the deficit. This is bipartisan legislation; 121 Members of Congress have joined with me, Democrats and Republicans joining together to do something about the budget deficit, including the acting Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON]. I will be joining tomorrow with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] to offer an amendment to have excess moneys go directly to the deficit.

I am hopeful that we can pass this legislation to account for truth in budgeting, so we do not appropriate

less money than we actually need, and count on Members to return money, and second, to show the American people that Members of Congress are going to be fiscally disciplined and make some of the tough decisions in their own office to return funds.

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

(Mr. BEILENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we regret we are unable to support the rule for this very important piece of legislation. We do urge our colleagues to vote against the previous question, so we will be able to consider the important budget and reform amendments that were denied by the majority of the Committee on Rules, and kept out of the amendment process.

If the Brewster-Harman lockbox amendment and the Baldacci gift ban amendment had been made in order, we would have had more spending cuts and more reform, and we shall ask our colleagues to give us the opportunity to make these important amendments part of the process today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD information regarding the floor procedure in the 104th Congress:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS: COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed: contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive: Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive: only certain substitutes	2R; 4D
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (O)	Restrictive: considered in House no amendments	N/A
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open: Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision	N/A
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive: brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed: Put on suspension calendar over Democratic objection	None
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed	H. Res. 88	Restrictive: makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive: makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive: 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive: 8 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive: 7 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive: makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive: Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(g) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive: Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive: Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive: Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive: waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open: waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open: pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery of the State of Iowa	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility.	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive: Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order: Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D:1R
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive: Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive: Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R: 18D: 2 Bipartisan
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open: waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive: Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R: 4D: 2 Bipartisan

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation, 65% restrictive; 35% open. *** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. **** Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] bring up that very important subject which we have permitted to be addressed by virtue of making in order an amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] that

will allow Members to return unspent portions of their office expense accounts to the Treasury to be used specifically for deficit reduction.

This is a fair rule, Mr. Speaker. It has been a rule that has been well thought through. There has been very close work and cooperation between the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on House Oversight, and

the Committee on Rules. I think it is a good piece of work that we have brought before the floor today, before our colleagues today, and I would urge that our colleagues adopt this rule and move this bill onto the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a table reflecting the amendment process under special rules reported by the Committee on Rules.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 19, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	29	73
Modified Closed ³	49	47	11	27
Closed ⁴	9	9	0	0
Totals	104	100	40	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
				A: voice vote (3/21/95).

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170 A: 255-168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	National Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 233-183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1617	MillCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180 A: 245-155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. 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. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed until completion of action on House Resolution 168.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I was objecting to a vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes that.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

ESTABLISHING A CORRECTIONS CALENDAR IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 168 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 168

Resolved, That clause 4 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"4. (a) After a bill has been favorably reported and placed on either the Union or House Calendar, the Speaker may, after consultation with the Minority Leader, file with the Clerk a notice requesting that such bill also be placed upon a special calendar to be known as the "Corrections Calendar". On the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month, after the Pledge of Allegiance, the Speaker may direct the Clerk to call the bills in numerical order which have been on the Corrections Calendar for three legislative days.

"(b) A bill so called shall be considered in the House, debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the primary committee of jurisdiction reporting the bill, shall not be subject to amendment except those amendments recommended by the primary committee of jurisdiction or those of-

ferred by the chairman of the primary committee, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment there to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

"(c) A three-fifths vote of the members voting shall be required to pass any bill called from the Corrections Calendar but the rejection of any such bill, or the sustaining of any point of order against it or its consideration, shall not cause it to be removed from the Calendar to which it was originally referred."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 168 is the long-awaited reform to create a new House Corrections Calendar for legislation that would repeal or correct laws, rules, and regulations that are obsolete, ludicrous, duplicative, burdensome, or costly.

The idea was first proposed by our Speaker back in February of this year, and it has since captured the imagination and enthusiastic support of our colleagues and the American people alike.

The resolution amends clause 4 of House Rule 13 by repealing the obsolete Consent Calendar and by replacing it with the new Corrections Calendar.

The Consent Calendar has not been used since the 101st Congress and, even then, was only used for three bills.

For bills to be placed on the Corrections Calendar, they must first be reported by the committee of jurisdiction and placed on their normal Calendar. The Speaker could then place the bills on the Corrections Calendar after consultation with the minority leader.

The Calendar could be called on the second or fourth Tuesday of each month, at the discretion of the Speaker, after the Pledge of Allegiance. Bills

would be called in the numerical order of their placement on the Calendar, after pending there for at least 3 legislative days, following the existing rules of the House.

The bills would be debated for 1 hour equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the primary committee of jurisdiction. No amendments would be allowed unless recommended by the primary committee or offered by its chairman.

Each bill would provide for one motion to recommit with or without instructions. That means a final, alternative amendment or substitute could be considered, debatable for 10 minutes divided between the proponent and an opponent.

Finally, the rule provides for a three-fifths vote to pass a bill on the Corrections Calendar.

We think the three-fifths super-majority vote for Corrections Calendar bills is a reasonable middle ground between a two-thirds, which is used for suspensions when the bills are reasonably noncontroversial, and a simple majority vote when bills are extremely controversial. The bills should be relatively noncontroversial and bipartisan, but there is bound to be some controversy on some of these measures. Even so-called stupid rules will have their defenders.

Given the prospect of some controversy on some corrections bills, we purposely built-in the ability of the minority to offer an amendment as part of a motion to recommit with instructions. This is something that is not available under the suspension process.

Nor do bills have to be reported from a committee to be considered under suspension. It was the strong feeling of the Speaker and his advisory group that drafted this proposal that regular process should be followed at the committee level for a bill to be eligible for the Corrections Calendar.

Moreover, suspension bills can be in violation of House rules and still be considered. Corrections bills do not have such protection against points of order. They must be in conformity with House rules. The only exception is that a corrections bill will not be subject to the point of order that it should be considered in the Committee of the Whole. Instead, the bills will be considered in the House under the 1-hour rule.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Speaker on originating this idea and on following through on it by appointing

the special advisory group that developed and drafted the rule before us today. That advisory group consists of Representative BARBARA VUCANOVICH, its chairman, and Representatives ZELIFF and MCINTOSH.

□ 1130

They have put in countless hours in perfecting the concept and in gathering support for it. We all owe them a debt of gratitude in bringing this to the Rules Committee and to the House floor today.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other concerns expressed by the minority is that this process may not have sufficient input from the minority. To address that concern, we adopted the amendment requiring the Speaker to consult with the minority leader before placing any bill on the Corrections Calendar. The minority would have preferred giving the minority leader veto power over placing bills on the Corrections Calendar, but we felt that went too far in interfering with the scheduling prerogatives of the majority leadership.

Moreover, we included report language at the suggestion of the minor-

ity, urging the Speaker to follow through on his stated aim of having a bipartisan group of Members to help develop criteria for corrections bills and in recommending which bills should go on the calendar.

I am pleased to report that today the Speaker will act on his original intention to have a bipartisan advisory group—even without the benefit of our report language. In addition to the initial three-member group, the Speaker has named four additional Republicans and five Democrats recommended by the minority leader. So this should go a long way toward meeting the major concerns expressed by the minority.

It is our hope that we will see bills by Members of both parties considered under this process.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the work of the Speaker's advisory group and the further amendments adopted by the Rules Committee, help to ensure that this will follow the normal committee process and will allow for minority participation and input at every step of the process—including the right

of the minority to offer a final floor amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Corrections Day resolution before us is another positive step forward by this House in relieving our constituents, local governments and small businesses of the needless, and costly red tape that has hampered their ability to fully and freely contribute to the betterment of their communities and to the creation of new job opportunities, economic growth, and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very excited about this new Corrections Calendar because we really are going to take the burden off of small business in particular, which creates 75 percent of all the new jobs in America every single year. If you don't think that is important, look at all the graduating seniors from college today, look at all the graduating seniors from high school today, and look at the lack of job opportunity out there. We need this kind of Corrections Calendar, and I hope it passes unanimously today.

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

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 19, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	29	73
Modified Closed ³	49	47	11	27
Closed ⁴	9	9	0	0
Totals:	104	100	40	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95)
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17 H.J. Res. 1.	Social Security Balanced Budget Amdt.	A: 255-172 (1/25/95)
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif.	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95)
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95)
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95)
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/10/95)
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95)
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95)
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: v.v. (2/27/95)
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95)
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95)
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95)
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95)
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/1/95)
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	Debate			A: 257-155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242-190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95)
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95)
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 233-183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1617	MillCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

For example, let me point out some of the very serious problems I have in my own congressional district and even my own home town of Glens Falls in upstate New York.

As you might expect, nestled in the middle of the Adirondack mountains and on the shore of Lake George, tourism and forestry are the major industries in my home town. Both of these industries are threatened by extreme environmental regulations. Another industry which has sprung up in the region during the past 10 years, three major medical device companies, are now moving off shore because of restrictive and senseless Food and Drug Administration regulations.

Most recently, a 100-year-old cement company may be forced to close their doors because of a new interpretation of Clean Air regulations by the EPA.

Mr. Speaker, Glens Falls, NY, is small town U.S.A. and just look at what the Federal Government is doing to it. Let me give you specific examples of the devastation misguided Government regulations have caused in my home town.

The Cluster Rule caused Scott Paper to lay off 400 people.

The Cluster Rule may force Finch, Pruyn paper company to lay off 1,000 workers.

The safe drinking water act requires the hotel and motel owners to put up unsafe drinking water warning signs—killing tourism and costing hundreds of jobs.

New EPA kiln emissions standards could put Glens Falls cement out of business—another 130 people unemployed.

In 1994, Mallinckrodt Medical announced plans to relocate its manufacturing operations to Ireland and Mexico where they can market their products directly to the EEC without waiting 5 to 10 years for F.D.A. approval. This cost 450 jobs.

A similar medical device company, Angio Dynamics, is also considering closing its doors and moving to Ireland for the same reason. This could cost another 400 jobs.

Additionally, allow me to outline the traumatic effect of the Cluster Rule on the paper industry, not only in my district, but in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Cluster Rule is the biggest and most costly rule ever proposed by the EPA for a single industry. Because of the inflexibility and tremendous costs involved, 33 U.S. paper mills could be forced to close, eliminating 21,000 jobs.

For Finch, Pruyn paper mill in Glens Falls, the effect is even more damaging. That is because the most stringent aspect of the EPA's Cluster Rule applies solely to the small category of papergrade sulfite mills they belong to. This is the aspect which requires totally chlorine-free bleaching. While EPA intended to eliminate the discharge of chlorinated compounds into waterways, they determined technology did not exist to permit the larger category of kraft mills to adopt totally chlorine-free paper bleaching. Thus only papergrade sulfite mills would have to comply.

This regulation undermines the economy of upstate New York. It is not based on good

science, it upsets the competitive balance of the open market and threatens the very existence of a 130-year-old company. This is a prime example of the type of damaging regulations we need to remedy through Corrections Day.

All in all, the small Glens Falls area in upstate New York is subject to losing upwards of 2,500 jobs as a direct result of excessive Government regulation. Mr. Speaker, Corrections Day would provide the ideal forum to rectify these grave ills facing the American worker.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to this resolution, and we urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question, and "no" on the resolution. We need to go back to the drawing board and develop a corrections process that is fair and bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of us agree that it could be useful for the House of Representatives to try a new way of facilitating changes in laws and regulations that are not working well. The reason that the Corrections Day idea resonates is that all of us can give examples of regulations that seem to defy common sense, and all of us have probably experienced the frustration of getting nowhere with changes we suggest to certain laws.

From time to time, constituents bring thoughtful ideas to me about changes they think should be made in a law, and I send their ideas over to the appropriate committees, but we do not always get a response—not even the assurance that the committee is looking into the matter. Being able to submit ideas to an advisory panel that carries more weight with committees—as proponents of Corrections Day envision—might give us a more effective avenue to pursue such changes.

What many of us find appealing about the proposed corrections process is the idea that our committees would, presumably, receive strong messages about problems with laws under their jurisdiction. As a result, they would likely do a better job of finding out exactly what agencies are doing, and figuring out how the implementation of the laws under their jurisdiction can be improved. This process has the potential to greatly improve congressional oversight and, if it does, it will have turned out to be a useful and constructive tool.

What concerns us, however, about the Corrections Day idea is the specific rule change before us today. We believe that this new and unusual procedure is both unfair to the minority, and unnecessary. In fact, the entire corrections process has not been well thought out,

so it is premature for the House to act on any rule change for this purpose.

Proponents of House Resolution 168 have failed to make a convincing case for the need to establish a floor procedure for considering so-called corrections bills that differ from existing procedures. As Members know, the House already has a procedure—suspension of the rules—that permits the expedited consideration of relatively non-controversial bills. This procedure has been a feature of the House since 1822, and is well accepted by both minority and majority members. The requirement of a two-thirds vote ensures that bills considered by this method have bipartisan support and are non-controversial.

In contrast, the procedure provided by House Resolution 168, in which only a three-fifths vote is required for passage, means that bills will not necessarily require bipartisan support. Members should be reminded that, during 4 of the last 10 Congresses, one party held three-fifths of the seats in the House.

If bills considered under the corrections procedure are not allowed to be amended—other than by an amendment by the committee of jurisdiction and through a motion to recommit—then they should meet the same test for bipartisanship, and lack of controversy, that is imposed on bills considered under the suspension process.

The right to offer amendments is important to all Members, but it is particularly significant to minority members because it provides the opposition party its best opportunity for meaningful involvement during floor consideration of a bill. I would hope that our colleagues on the other side—most of whom had the opportunity to serve here in the minority—would give serious thought to this matter. Those who do will surely agree that it would be a mistake for the House to abandon its longstanding protection of minority floor rights by requiring anything less than the approval of two-thirds of the House to waive those rights.

We also find it troubling that Members are being asked to approve a change in the rules of the House for a class of legislation before we have a clear understanding of what corrections bills are, and why they require a separate and distinct floor procedure for consideration. Neither the resolution itself, nor the accompanying report, defines a corrections bill; there has been no explanation of how the correction process will work before a committee reports a bill; and we have yet to receive an explanation of what roles the leadership, the corrections advisory group, committees and individual Members will play in this process.

Until information on those matters is provided, we believe it is unwise for the House to act on any measure establishing an unusual legislative procedure for considering corrections bills, particularly when the procedure vests all authority to determine which bills qualify for it in one person, the Speaker.

We believe that if the House is going to establish a new expedited procedure, then the minority party should have a formal role in determining which measures may be brought up under it, as it does in determining the scheduling of bills under suspension of the rules. In such cases, the Republican conference rules themselves require the approval of the minority.

When the Speaker testified before a joint hearing of the Rules Committee and the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, he said—repeatedly—that he wanted the corrections process to be bipartisan. In fact, he stated emphatically that “if this is going to work, it has to be bipartisan.”

That was on May 2. Some time between that date and June 6, when this resolution was introduced, the Corrections Day proposal took a wrong turn. Despite the Speaker’s strong bid for a bipartisan process, Corrections Day became a highly partisan matter. No minority members were involved in the development of the proposed procedure or any aspect of the corrections process; no minority members were added to the initial corrections steering group; and the minority leader was—until just today as we understand it—unable to secure assurances that the minority party will be able to select its own members for the corrections advisory group, as has been the longstanding tradition in the House for appointments to committees and all other formal bipartisan panels.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has just said that the minority leader has had no input. I do believe that Speaker GINGRICH has received a letter appointing those Members from your side of the aisle. The gentleman really should correct his statement to that effect.

Mr. BEILENSON. The gentleman, reclaiming his time, has corrected his statement. The gentleman has said, and I will quote him:

No minority Members were involved in the development of the proposed procedure or any aspect of the corrections process; no minority Members were added to the initial corrections steering group; and the minority leader was—until just today as we understand it—unable to secure assurances that the minority party will be able to select its own Members for the corrections advisory group.

I think what the gentleman from California said was absolutely correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Just for clarification, the minority leader has appointed the minority members.

Mr. BEILENSON. As of today, we understand that is correct. But we have had no part to play in the development of this process from the beginning.

We think that the existing suspension process would be sufficient for the consideration of corrections bills, and we urge the majority to try using this process before establishing this new procedure.

Alternatively, we proposed changing the three-fifths margin for passage of corrections bills to two-thirds. We also asked that a motion to recommit be permitted during consideration of corrections bills. And, we proposed requiring the minority leader’s concurrence to place bills on the Corrections Calendar.

We also asked that appointments to the corrections advisory group—which is expected to play a pivotal role in the corrections process—be made in the same manner as appointments are made to other formal bipartisan panels, with the minority members chosen by their leadership. And, we asked that the bipartisan leadership define corrections bills, and issue guidelines for the corrections process, before using the Corrections Calendar.

We offered these proposals not only to safeguard minority rights, but also to protect the integrity of the legislative process in the House. Unfortunately, except for the inclusion of a motion to recommit, and now the acquiescence and the approval of the minority leader in appointing Members to the advisory committee, our proposals were rejected by the majority members of the committee. Actually, a provision for a motion to recommit had to be added, because otherwise the resolution would have violated the Rules of the House.

It is unfortunate that the proponents of this rule change decided to follow a path of partisanship in this matter, rather than accept our modest suggestions which would have ensured broad—if not unanimous—support for the corrections process, and which would have kept the process in the same bipartisan spirit in which the Speaker first offered it.

However, it is not too late to turn this proposal into a procedure that will be embraced by Members of both parties. If the previous question is defeated, we shall offer an amendment to change the three-fifths vote requirement for corrections bills to two-thirds. With a two-thirds vote requirement, we will have the assurance that, regardless of which party is in power, the rights of the minority will be as well protected for purposes of considering corrections bills—however they turn out to be defined—as they are for any other legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we urge our colleagues to oppose House Resolution 168 in its current form.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the gentleman’s comments regard-

ing the amendment we offered and adopted to permit a motion to recommit with instructions on corrections bills.

The fact is that it was only after we decided to offer this amendment that it came to our attention that House rules prohibit the Rules Committee from denying a motion to recommit—even in a House rule change such as this. We had thought it only applied to special order resolutions.

However, we did not have to include the language “with or without instructions.” We included that language voluntarily to guarantee the minority’s right to offer a final amendment in a motion to recommit, even if a committee substitute has been adopted.

Ordinarily, such a substitute would block further amendments in a motion to recommit.

So, my only point is that we overcame a problem even before we knew it was a problem; and we solved it by going further than we had to do to protect the minority’s rights.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], one of the most important Members of this Congress in bringing about reform, and vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, which I have the privilege of chairing.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend the gentleman from Glens Falls, distinguished chairman of the committee, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent that we have an opportunity to deal with what the Speaker has accurately described as a corrections day, to face some of the most ridiculous, preposterous regulations the Federal Government has imposed on the American people and get rid of them. But the Speaker was right when he, on May 2, testified before the joint hearing that was held by the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House Committee on Rules, and the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight that dealt with this issue, when he said it should be done in a bipartisan way.

Let me say to my friend from Woodland Hills and to others on the other side of the aisle that, as we have gone through this process, I have been working very closely with my colleagues to ensure that minority rights are not ignored. Let me underscore that again. Minority rights are very important.

I have served in this House as a Member of the minority. I am much happier serving as a Member of the majority but I think, having served as a Member of the minority, I am very sensitive to the concerns the minority has raised, and I believe the Speaker was very sincere when he said we should do this in a bipartisan way.

So what have we done? Well, the Corrections Calendar procedure does call for, as my friend said just a few moments ago, the minority leader to appoint the minority members, and he is right, it was just done recently, but the fact of the matter is those Members have been appointed by the minority leader.

This measure requires a three-fifths vote for passage. It requires the Speaker to consult with the minority leader

before placing bills on the Corrections Calendar. It requires that all measures placed on the Corrections Calendar be favorably reported by a committee and placed on the House or Union Calendar. It does not waive points of order against measures called up on the Corrections Calendar, and as my friend knows, I offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules which was adopted in a bipartisan way which allows minority amendments through a motion to recommit with amendatory instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is going to deal with these onerous regulations and at the same time recognize minority rights. We should have support all the way across the board.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise with regret to express my opposition to the proposed Corrections Day Calendar.

I strongly support the idea of correcting truly silly regulations. But I fear that the new corrections procedure we are considering will become a fast track for special interests to stop regulations that protect public health and the environment.

My concern is not hypothetical. We have already seen many examples this Congress of special interest fixes being described as "corrections."

Consider the recent actions of the House Budget Committee report. Last month, the Budget Committee identified over 50 regulations in its budget report that it said are "the most expensive and onerous and appear ripe for termination or reform." Unfortunately, the Budget Committee's list wasn't limited to expensive and onerous regulations that truly need correction. Instead, it included many regulations whose correction would enrich special interests at the expense of public health.

One example involves the tobacco industry. This industry is the Nation's biggest special interest. During the last election cycle alone, the tobacco industry gave \$2 million in soft money to the Republican Party.

This powerful special interest is an enormous beneficiary of the corrections proposed by the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee recommends that Congress—and I quote—"rescind enforcement of laws regarding cigarette sales to minors"—Budget Report at page 171. The committee also recommends that Congress prevent OSHA from regulating exposure to environmental tobacco smoke—a known human lung carcinogen.

I cannot support a new corrections process that could be used by the tobacco industry to increase their cigarette sales to children.

The tobacco companies are by no means the only special interest that is likely to benefit from the new process.

The Budget Committee also recommends that we stop the Department of Agriculture from finalizing its regulations to modernize meat inspections. These regulations are estimated to save thousands of lives and prevent millions of illnesses each year. Yet they are put in jeopardy by the rule changes we are considering today.

Other examples of regulations that the Budget Committee wants to correct include:

The Clean Air Act requirements that sources of toxic emissions monitor and report their emissions.

The requirements that cars meet minimum fuel-efficiency standards.

Key requirements to clean up drinking water.

The regulations implementing the motor-voter law.

We must not adopt a corrections process that would make it easier for special interests to subvert the legislative process and achieve goals like those proposed by the Budget Committee. Unfortunately, I am afraid that the proposal before us will have exactly this result.

□ 1145

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just have to point out, and I would point out to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], we just heard the previous speaker. Now, I understand that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is going to appoint the previous speaker to this task force. You have heard his attitude. The gentleman thinks this whole corrections concept is silly and absurd.

Can you imagine how constructive the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is going to be in trying to get corrections bills for regulations that I consider silly and ludicrous? The gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. COLLIN PETERSON, has been denied the right to have these votes on the floor in the past.

That is why the minority leader cannot be given a veto right. We would never get any of these silly and dumb rules out onto the floor for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Reno, NV, Mrs. BARBARA VUCANOVICH, the chairwoman of the task force, who has done such an outstanding job of putting together this corrections calendar concept.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Chairman SOLOMON for his invaluable help in putting together this historic rules change we are considering today. Without his support and guidance this House would not be about to launch this important initiative.

I also want to thank the Speaker for allowing me to chair the steering committee on Corrections Day. It has been an honor to work on this important project.

This is a historic day. For the first time the Congress is going to implement a plan for eliminating ridiculous Federal rules and regulations. For the first time this House is going to make

it a priority to relieve average citizens of regulatory excess.

There are 100 million words of Federal regulations on the books today, and it is growing by the thousands each and every day.

The truth of the matter is—no one can possibly comply with all these rules and no one can possibly enforce them all. We have to do something to turn the tide.

This is not an attempt at wholesale repeal of health and safety laws, or environmental regulation.

We all agree, some regulation is necessary. But you can't tell me that there aren't just a few of those 100 million words of regulation that we can live without.

During this debate we are going to hear a lot about the corrections process being unnecessary or unfair to the minority.

These issues are minor when compared to the important task we are undertaking.

We have come up with the most fair and workable plan to handle corrections. I urge Members to support this resolution and strike the first blow against stupid regulations.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this change in the House rules to establish special new procedures for a Corrections Day, which has been billed as an opportunity to pass simple bills that correct mistakes in laws, or correct regulations that go far beyond what Congress intended.

The Speaker has indicated that these bills should enjoy bipartisan support, and that they would correct silly results of previous laws.

At a joint hearing of subcommittees of the Rules Committee and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, on which I serve as ranking minority member, there was bipartisan agreement that corrections bills could serve a useful purpose, if handled properly. No one should believe, therefore, that any Member opposes efforts to establish a corrections day to modify laws that don't make sense.

Unfortunately, House Resolution 168 would rig the playing field to the advantage of the majority for these supposedly noncontroversial bills. This resolution would allow corrections bills to go to the floor at the sole discretion of the Speaker under rules that permit no amendments and require just a three-fifths vote.

The common procedure of the House for noncontroversial bills is the Suspension Calendar. Those bills require a two-thirds vote for passage. Many bills that were passed with a two-thirds vote will not require just a three-fifths vote for correcting. This is illogical. If we require a two-thirds vote to pass a bill

under suspension of the rules, it should take a two-thirds vote to correct it.

The question is why are the Republicans not comfortable using the two-thirds majority already established for suspension votes. The obvious answer is that they feel quite certain that they can muster 261 votes, but are not certain that they can get the 290 votes that would be needed if two-thirds were required.

Since the difference between the proposed procedure for a correction bill and a bill brought up under a rule is the ban on amendments, it appears that the Republican majority is renegeing on its pledge of fewer rules that prohibit amendments. Corrections bills under House Resolution 168 would not be amendable, and unlike suspension procedures, require just a three-fifths vote. There is an inconsistency here.

The other problem presented by the proposed Corrections Day procedure is the lack of any definition of a correction. Under the proposed change of the House rules, the Speaker would be the sole arbiter. At our hearing regarding the establishment of Corrections Day, we got a glimpse into the Republicans' view of mistakes that need corrections.

The list ranged from EPA monitoring requirements under the Safe Drinking Water Act to the Federal Trade Commission review of the Nestle purchase of Alpo Pet Food.

CORRECTION INVENTORY

1. FAA landfills and airports.
2. Fish and wildlife, Back Bay wildlife access.
3. Defense logistics surplus DOD property, humanitarian assist. program, foreign military sales.
4. Federal Trade Commission, Nestle purchase of Alpo Pet Food.
5. Federal Highway Admin., P.L. 100-418, metric measurements.
6. Dept. of Education 1992 Higher Educ. Act State Postsecondary review entities.
7. Private pension law reform, IRS Code revisions to provide designed base safeharbors.
8. EPA, rainfall overflow of sanitary sewer systems.
9. State covert auditing of emission test vendors, 40 CFR 51.363(a)(4).
10. Individuals With Disabilities Act revisions: 1. Apply Federal Administrative Procedures Act; 2. State option to combine idea fund with other Fed. funds; 3. Authority for States to use 10 percent of idea funds for non-categorical supports and services for children with disabilities; 4. State ability to use simplified application for local education agencies.
11. Clean Air Act, employee commute options State compliance.
12. ISTEA requirement of recycled rubber for paving.
13. EPA penalties for standards not yet announced.
14. Safe Drinking Water Act, EPA requirement for State monitoring of 25 contaminants.
15. Title V permit fees under Clean Air Act not counted as match for Federal grants.
16. IRS and SSA requirement that States verify asset-income information.
17. Home and community-based services eligibility for employment services.
18. State supplementary payments for SSI recipients.
19. Federal community mental health services block grant planning requirements.

20. Justice Dept. substance abuse RFP's require notice of funds available.

21. Title IV-E client eligibility requirements for AFDC.

22. Religious Freedom Restoration Act required religious services for any and all religions in State prisons.

23. CDBG requirements too burdensome for small communities.

24. Federal Management Improvement Act requirement that States pay interest on Federal funds.

25. Dept. of Labor should not prohibit coverage bank costs related to unemployment insurance taxes.

26. FUTA and SSA require State to withhold tax from unemployment.

27. Take Federal unemployment trust fund off budget.

28. Amend Fair Employment Standards Act to prevent absurd rulings for law enforcement agencies.

29. Streamline data collection for Federal education programs.

30. Amend Single Audit Act to require audits for grants in greater amounts.

31. 50 CFR 930, requires agencies to review competence and physical qualifications of all employees who operate vehicles.

32. OSHA requirement of four member fire-fighting crews.

Corrections Day could very easily become Special Interest Protection Day. The voices of those special interests are far more likely to propose the opening of regulatory and tax loopholes than closing them.

In order to set the Corrections Day Calendar, the Speaker has established yet another task force—this one to review corrections legislation.

When the House voted in January to eliminate three committees, and to reduce committee staffs by a third, surely it was not intended that their work be done by task forces. We do not need more task forces any more than we need new Government agencies.

These partisan task forces are not governed by any rules. In this particular case, the Corrections Day task force could become a group before which special interests will come to plead their case out of the view of the public. We saw a similar problem with the Competitiveness Council chaired by Vice President Quayle, where big businesses that failed before agencies went to the Council to plead their cases in private. It is wrong for the party that proclaimed its new Sunshine in Committee rules on the first day of Congress to be using task forces that operate in the dark behind closed doors.

Despite the call in Contract With America for fewer closed rules and fewer House committees, this proposal would result in more closed rules and more House committees, renamed task forces.

Just last week I was successful in offering an important amendment to retain full and open competition in procurement. It was a close vote, but after the vote the House passed the underlying procurement amendment by a near unanimous vote. However, if the Speaker decided that Chairman CLINGER'S procurement bill were a correction of previous procurement laws, I

would not have been able to offer the amendment, and small businesses and the taxpayers would have suffered. This is wrong.

There is a simple solution that Members of both sides of the aisle could easily endorse: Require a two-thirds vote for a correction bill rather than the proposed three-fifths vote. That would be consistent with the vote required for a bill on the Suspension Calendar. If a bill is unlikely to get a two-thirds vote, then bring it up under normal procedures, where a simple majority is required, but amendments are permitted. Unfortunately, the only way we can amend these proposed procedures is to defeat the previous question on this resolution. Then, in a bipartisan manner, we can adopt the Corrections Day procedures. Let me remind my colleagues, if the House could pass the Contract With America in 100 days, there is no need to rig the playing field for the benefit of noncontroversial bills.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thought it was really out of place and I resented the fact that there was a personal attack on me by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. The gentleman did not address the issues I raised on why this bill is going to be a vehicle for special interest.

I would like to have a corrections day to correct silly regulations, but I do not want a vehicle, which I fear this will be, to give special interests an opportunity to get a return on their investment in the candidacies of a lot of people that are in power in this institution.

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

Let me just assure the previous speaker that because of the deep respect I have for the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] I would never personally attack him. And I am sorry if the gentleman thought I did.

Nevertheless, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], one of the most outstanding members of the Committee on Rules, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislation and Budget Process of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 168, legislation which is designed to respond to the plea of the American people that the Federal Government become more responsive and more attuned to common sense.

One of the worst byproducts of our overblown Government and the cumbersome bureaucracy that it has

spawned over the years is that often good intentions lead to bad, or just plain dumb, rules or regulations upon implementation. That is what happens, unfortunately, when you try to enforce too many centralized, one-size-fits-all requirements on the diverse communities and individuals that make up this great country.

Government is not the answer to every problem that comes along and it never was intended to be so. Like so many good and creative ideas, the proposal for corrections day arose because of discussions with ordinary citizens and with State and local officials who for years have labored under the rigid, onerous, and at times downright absurd requirements of the Federal Government.

It is our intent, through this procedural change, to find a way to cut through the redtape and inertia and allow for speedy, narrowly focused action in addressing those problems. It is the old principle of feedback, some call it representative government, when the Federal Government hands down an ill-advised or misdirected requirement and the folks at the other end of the mandate cry out for relief. The corrections day procedure provides for a rapid-response means to receive that message through the static and tune out the problem quickly.

There were concerns raised by my friends on the other side of the aisle that this proposal could be abused and would not protect the rights of the minority. I shared that concern on the Committee on Rules and was pleased that our Committee on Rules, under Chairman SOLOMON's leadership, adopted an amendment by my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] to afford the minority its traditional right to a motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

I think that, coupled with the Speaker's public pledge to seek bipartisan corrections proposals, should allay those concerns of the minority. The abuse that we should be most worried about is the abuse that for years has allowed unnecessary, burdensome and counterproductive rules to weigh down the productivity and the individual freedoms of Americans and American institutions.

□ 1200

That is the relief we are after here today, and while some in opposition have questioned whether Republicans have got exactly the right formula, I think we do have a formula that will get the job done, and I am delighted to urge support for approval of this effort. I urge a "yes" vote as we go into this.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

(Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support House Resolution 168.

I am a cosponsor of this resolution, in spite of the fact that it is not everything that some of us wanted. Some of us actually wanted a tougher process than we have got in this resolution. But I do think it moves us in the right direction.

There is bipartisan support for this process, and I am glad to be able to serve as part of this corrections day task force that is being set up.

As I say, there are a number of Democrats on our side that think that we need to do something about overly burdensome Federal regulations. I was not really too involved in all of this regulatory process until I got looking at this moratorium bill that was introduced early on this session and got to reading some of the regulations that were promulgated and were of concern in this moratorium. What I found out is there were 615 regulations adopted in just a month and a half, and I sat down and read all of those 615, and if every Member of Congress would sit down and read every regulation, we would be in a lot better shape in this Congress, and we maybe would not need bills like this.

But the other thing that I found is that there are 204 volumes of Federal regulations, and if you sat down and read those regulations 40 hours a week, it would take you 8 years to read all of the Federal regulations that we have promulgated over the last number of years.

I do not think that there is anybody that understands everything that is in all of these regulations. I really think that what we need is a requirement that every Member of Congress read every rule and every regulation, and that would be the best thing that we could do.

We are working on some other bills. We have a sunset bill which will help, if we could get that passed, that would say we are going to look at every regulation, and we are going to sunset those that are no longer necessary.

We thought in the House that the moratorium would help, that we would have a timeout on regulations to look at the process. I think the 45-day legislative veto that the Senate is proposing will help. Again, I am not sure how much good it will do, but it will clearly put more focus.

I think this Corrections Day process will clearly help us in changing this regulatory process, because what it will do, in my opinion, it will focus Members and focus the public's attention on this regulatory process which, in my judgment, has really gotten out of hand.

I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], and the subcommittee that I serve on for kind of making it a priority of that subcommittee to do oversight on the regulatory process. We have traveled to a number of areas in the country and listened to ordinary citizens and their reactions to some of the regulatory overburden. And as I

understand it, the chairman is going to continue that process so that we are going to have oversight on the regulatory process, and that is going to help, as well.

I also want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for being with us on these issues, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], and others.

So I just want to say that there are a number of Democrats that are concerned about the regulatory process. We have been working where we can to have a reasonable response to the overregulation that we have seen in this country, and the truth is that we should write, in my judgment, legislation more specifically so we would not have so much rulemaking, that we should read every rule that comes out, and, lastly, that we should pass this Corrections Day bill because it will move us in the right direction.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Warren, PA [Mr. CLINGER], the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, who has been very much involved in this.

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

At the outset, I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for his courage and his tenacity in reading 615 regulations. I think that is some sort of a Guinness world record I suspect he should be submitted for.

I take your point if we read more of these things, we might be a little more sensitive to the fact that we are overburdening vast portions of our economy with needless regulations. So I would rise in support of the resolution. It is well thought out, I think, and it provides a deliberative means to implement Corrections Days as suggested by our Speaker.

Corrections Day is a new and innovative approach to fixing longstanding Washington problems, and by establishing a Corrections Day calendar we have an opportunity to highlight and fix in an expedited manner laws, policies or regulations that simply do not make much sense, that are unnecessary, outdated, or over reaching. We will really have a chance in this exercise to reinvent Government, not just by talking about it but by taking concrete steps to make it more reasonable and efficient.

It is also an opportunity for us to put a call out to all Americans that not only are we serious about changing Government but to enlist their help in identifying corrections.

We need to start down this road as quickly as possible because there is clearly a lot in this city that needs correcting.

I would also state that I know the concerns of the minority about the possible abuse of this proposed new process, and I would hope that that would

not be the case. My sense of Corrections Day is that these are going to be items that we can universally agree on in a bipartisan manner, that these are stupid and these are things that should be corrected. I do not anticipate that this is going to be used as a partisan club to accomplish things but, rather, it will be done in a very bipartisan and cooperative effort to ensure that only those things that are clearly egregious and clearly outrageous will be affected.

We did have in the joint hearing held by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Committee on Rules in May, at that time both members and witnesses had the opportunity to share their thoughts about how we should be establishing Corrections Day, and it was a very bipartisan effort, and I think there is a general agreement that this is something that is needed in this climate.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, as a committee chairman, one of the concerns that I expressed at that time was how these legislative proposals would fit into the committee structure and whether committees would be bypassed in the process, and in many cases, use of the committee provides the opportunity for stakeholders to participate in the process.

House Resolution 168 addresses this concern by providing for committee consideration of all Corrections Day legislation and that allays the concerns I had about shortcircuiting the committee process. At the same time, many of us do appreciate the expedited floor procedures provided in this resolution. House rules, as we all know, can be cumbersome.

This is a sound, balanced, very well thought-out means to implement Corrections Day. The new calendar affords us the opportunity to rid ourselves of Washington policies, regulations and procedures, that just do not make sense, in many cases are just plain dumb.

So, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this procedure for Corrections Day.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is going to sanction the creation of the mother and the father of all closed rules.

Very frankly, there is a mechanism to bring matters of this kind to the floor quickly. It is called suspension of the rules. It requires a two-thirds vote. Virtually nothing else is present in this legislation which is not available to the leadership at this time under the process known as suspension of the rules.

All of us favor the idea that something should be done about dumb regulations and, like others, I have been extremely critical of legislation and regulation which has not worked in the

broad public interest and which has, in fact, been counterproductive because it did not address the problems with which we are properly concerned.

The practical effect of the rule change which we are undergoing at this particular minute is to confer on the Speaker the ability to put a piece of legislation on the floor which will be considered under 1 hour's time, with no amendments permitted except that which either the chairman or the leadership wants to take place. It will foreclose thereby all meaningful amendments which are not concurred in by the leadership, foreclose all meaningful debate because clearly any piece of legislation can be brought to the floor under this rule change. It can involve massive termination of programs. It can involve termination of agencies in Government such as the Department of Commerce, Department of Education, Department of Defense, Department of Energy. It can involve termination of programs such as welfare or air pollution or water pollution or the Food and Drug Administration or legislation which would protect the consumers or the Federal Trade Commission or any other piece of legislation which could probably be brought here under an open rule, affording more adequate and proper debate and affording adequate opportunity to amend and to discuss amendments.

In short, as I have indicated, this is the mother and the father of all closed rules. It confers on the Speaker the opportunity to pass legislation without consideration of amendments and without more than 1 hour's debate on something like 261 Members of this body. This is not something which is going to lead to good legislative practice. It is not something which is significantly expanding the authority of the leadership to do anything other than one thing, and that is to curb debate, to curb amendments, and to do so with less than two-thirds now required, only requiring three-fifths.

Now, it should be noted in the 5 of the previous 10 Congresses, 10 out of the previous 20 years, from 1975 to 1994, one party controlled over 60 percent of the seats. This is clearly a bad proposal, and no fancy language or discussion of wrongdoing is going to change that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Jackson, NM [Mr. ZELIFF], another member of the task force appointed by Speaker GINGRICH, a very valuable Member of this body.

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time.

I rise today in the strongest support for this change to the House rules. Corrections Day is a revolutionary idea for this Congress, and it deserves a special place, along with the Contract With

America, in changing the way we do business. Back in November the voters made their feelings clear about their dissatisfaction with the way this House of Representatives operates. Republicans came to the majority as part of a revolution for change. These old ways of doing business are over.

In just the past 6 months we have changed the way Washington works. Corrections Day is a natural step in this Republican revolution for change.

There is just no way that we can continue to operate under the systems of the 1950's. This is 1995, and we live in a society which demands immediate action to correct the onslaught of Federal regulations which enter into every American's everyday life.

Corrections Day serves as one way for this Congress to begin to relieve those threats to liberty, clean out some of the legislative deadwood that has accumulated around here for the last 40 years, and to do it quickly and effectively, and it all comes with change.

Today we are hearing argument after argument from the other side about fairness to the minority and how Corrections Day will trample their rights. What we hear, ladies and gentlemen, is the voice of the status quo and the voice of denial. They are not concerned with minority rights. We have gone to great lengths to insure the rights of the minority by allowing motions to recommit, requiring consultation with the minority on all corrections requiring a three-fifths' vote to assure these bills pass on a bipartisan basis, which, by the way, will require strong Democratic support.

Corrections Day allows us to finally have an effective tool to get rid of the most ridiculous, outrageous, dumb ideas, laws, rules, regulations which now plague the future of our country. With Corrections Day, we can make these changes without having to go through an entire reauthorization of legislation which will take months.

We have been very deliberate to assure nothing could reach the floor as a correction without first going through the committee process, since their Members are the experts on these subjects. Corrections Day is a new idea with a strong potential to change the way that this Congress does business.

I thank the Speaker for coming up with a great idea. I commend the Committee on Rules for their fine work, and I look forward to this Congress becoming more efficient in the way we run our country's business.

This is a private sector idea. It is a time where we start looking at more efficient ways to do our business.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, one of the responsibilities of any legislature has

always been to correct features of previously enacted bills when appropriated to do so, and to correct actions taken by the executive pursuant to legislative authority when the legislature believes that the executive action is unwise or unwarranted. Such legislative corrections have been part of this Congress' activity for almost as long as there has been a Congress.

What has been proposed more recently is that we have a special Corrections Calendar, to highlight and expedite the corrections legislating that we have long done. House Resolution 168 would amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create such a calendar, to empower the Speaker to decide which of all the bills placed on the other calendars of the House should be placed also on the new Corrections Calendar, and to allow the bills on the new Correction Calendar to be considered without amendment and to pass by a three-fifths vote.

There is nothing wrong with the idea of creating a separate Corrections Calendar, and there is nothing wrong with trying to expedite Congress' longstanding efforts to correct what needs to be corrected in existing law or in executive branch action.

The Speaker testified before the Government Reform and Oversight Committee that the purpose of a new legislative procedure for corrections should be to deal with issues which obviously warrant corrections and for which the correction enjoys broad bipartisan support and is not controversial. That is exactly the kind of corrections legislation which should have an expedited procedure so the correction can be accomplished quickly.

I, therefore, support, and I believe most Members would support, an expedited Corrections Calendar for corrections bills which enjoy broad bipartisan support and which are not controversial.

Unfortunately, that is not what House Resolution 168 would do. The effect of this resolution would be to allow any bill, whether it was a corrections bill or any other bill, to be taken up under procedures which would bar amendments from the floor of the House, and it would make it easier than it has ever been to do that.

Nothing in this resolution would prevent this or any future Speaker from putting a bill which was not a corrections bill at all on the Corrections Calendar.

At present we have a Suspension Calendar, designed to expedite consideration of smaller, noncontroversial bills. A bill on the Suspension Calendar may be considered without amendments from the floor, but it must achieve a two-thirds vote in order to pass. That two-thirds vote has been the high standard for routinely barring amendments—a bill had to be sufficiently noncontroversial that it could pass by a two-thirds vote in order to be considered under procedures which barred amendments. What House Reso-

lution 168 would do, for the first time, is create a procedure by which amendments could be routinely barred for bills which could only get a three-fifths vote.

In other words, the sole effect of this resolution would be to make it easier to bar amendments to bills which are not sufficiently noncontroversial and bipartisan to get the two-thirds vote.

The sole power to decide what would be placed on the Corrections calendar would be in the hands of one person—the Speaker of the House. By virtue of being on that calendar all unfriendly amendments would be barred. It would thus be the power of the Speaker alone to decide whether a bill being considered under procedures barring all amendments would have to meet the two-thirds test or the three-fifths test. The Speaker alone would have the power to adjust for each bill the standard of what it takes to pass a bill while preventing amendments from being offered.

The difference between two-thirds and three fifths in the House is the difference between 290 votes and 261 votes. What this resolution is all about is giving the Speaker the sole power to decide whether any bill needs 290 votes to be considered under provisions barring amendments, or whether it needs only 261 votes to be considered under those procedures.

That is a lot of power to give any individual. It is the power for 1 Member to negate the votes of 29 other Members. It is a degree of power that we should not give to any one Member of this House, whether Speaker or not, whether a Member of one party or the other, whether a past, present, or future Member.

This is not a power anyone needs who simply wants to pass bills which are broadly bipartisan and noncontroversial.

This is a device for stifling alternative points of view, for preventing full and open consideration of alternatives, for keeping opposing ideas out of the public debate, for making it easier for some Members to avoid votes and public accountability on tough issues.

If what we wanted was a Corrections Calendar which offered an expedited procedure for noncontroversial bills, we would use the same two-thirds requirement we have always had for the Suspension Calendar.

I would urge Members to oppose the previous question so that an amendment can be offered which would keep the idea of a Corrections Calendar, but would also retain the present practice of requiring a two-thirds vote to pass bills under procedures barring all amendments. Let us make Corrections Day what the Speaker said he wanted, an opportunity to pass broadly bipartisan and noncontroversial bills, not an opportunity to make it easier to exclude amendments from bills which are controversial.

□ 1215

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, Vice President Dan Quayle came under a lot of criticism for speaking up for family values. It turns out he was so right; was he not?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, let me say I think this change in the rules today is one of the critically important reforms that we are making in this House of Representatives not to cater to special interests, but to actually cater to what the American people want us to do, and that is to correct the problems that have grown up over 25 years of big government, increasing regulation and burdens that in many cases just simply do not make any sense. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON], the ranking member on my subcommittee, indicated that we had traveled to many places and held field hearings where we actually listened to people and the problems that they have with the Federal Government. Let me report to my colleagues some of the things we heard.

In Muncie, Kay Whitehead, who is a farmer who has a pork production facility, has to get rid of the waste product of that pork production facility. She needs to spread it on her fields as manure. One agency tells her to spread it on top of the fields. Another agency tells her, no, to plow it into the fields. She does not care what she does, but she needs to have guidance from the Government. We need to correct that so she knows one way or the other she is following the law.

The city of Richmond came in and testified they have a paraplegic van to help people who are handicapped in their transportation network. They also have eight city buses. They are now required under the Americans With Disabilities Act to expend over \$100,000 in changing those buses to make them handicapped accessible. The problem is in the last 3 years they have only had one person who would need that new facility. Everybody else uses the vans that they make available to them.

In Maine we heard from the city that had to spend millions of dollars in correcting their sewage treatment facility. They have an excellent record of protecting the environment there. This money was not needed. They could have done it in a much cheaper way, but Federal regulations were imposing those costs.

Firefighters wrote to me and said, "You know, in a small town we have difficulty getting four firefighters to the fire at the same time, but OSHA has a regulation saying that we can't go in and start fighting the fire until all four of us are there. What do you

want us to do? Stand on the sides letting the building burn." Another stupid regulation that needs to be corrected.

Finally we heard about a new guideline came out from a Federal agency to builders saying in new homes we have to have a different type of toilet. It cannot be the regular toilet with a full tank of water to flush. It has to be a smaller tank so that one would only use a small amount of water. The problem is the way the Federal Government designs these toilets, they do not have enough water to flush the drain. Everybody flushes twice and ends up using more water and undermining the whole goal of this regulation. This is a rule that should just be flushed down the toilet. Let people know what they need to do, and let them design the solution for themselves.

Let me close by saying that I think the genius of Speaker GINGRICH's proposal here is that he has reversed the incentives. As Members of Congress we can now come forward with solutions to correct these problems, have a calendar that will let us do it. It is a bipartisan initiative. It will let us have a process that will let us flush these old rules down the drain.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House, there was a time once upon a time when committees of Congress had the power to veto stupid regulations. That power was taken away from us by the Supreme Court when it ruled that the right to regulate under any statute we create belonged to the agency, the executive agency. We can no longer veto regulations that we have authorized in legislation. The President of the United States can veto bills, but he cannot veto regulations, and, worse than that, the Supreme Court ruled, that if an agency wanted to change a regulation, get rid of a regulation, it has to go through the same process it used to create that regulation in order to get rid of it.

What we have got in America is a situation where the bureaucrats have more power than the legislature and more power than the President himself under our Constitution. A day like Corrections Day makes sense. It is a day when we in Congress can do what the Supreme Court says we ought to do, be a little more careful when we write laws, what we allow people to regulate, a day for us to correct those mistakes in a legal, constitutional way.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 168 that would establish the Correction Calendar to expedite the repeal of outdated, unnecessary, and ridiculous laws

and regulations. The need for such a Correction Calendar is readily apparent, has been for some time. Whether it is a rule that was irrational and unnecessarily burdensome to begin with or a law that has outlived whatever usefulness it may have had, the time has come to provide a mechanism to correct these regulatory and statutory errors.

Mr. Speaker, I think that not only is this an opportunity for us to repeal regulations that fit that characterization, but it will also have a very salutary effect upon the agencies that write the regulations in the first part, and, second, I think it is likely to cause our constituents to give us their ideas repeatedly about regulations that do not seem to be too rational in their effect, and I think we are going to hear from our constituents, and they are going to have greater hope that we in the Government, the legislative branch, will be able to do something about inappropriate regulations.

Mr. Chairman, this Member rises in support of House Resolution 168, which would establish a Corrections Calendar to expedite the repeal of outdated, unnecessary and ridiculous laws and regulations. The need for such a Corrections Calendar is readily apparent. Whether it is a rule that is irrational and unnecessarily burdensome to begin with or a law that has outlived whatever usefulness it may have had, the time has come to provide a mechanism to correct these regulatory and statutory errors.

Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to highlight two examples of regulations which cry out for inclusion on the Corrections Calendar. The first is the DOT hours-of-service regulation as it applies to farmers and farm suppliers. The need to repeal this regulation is obvious—each year farmers and their suppliers must be prepared to move quickly and work long hours at planting and harvest time when the weather permits. During certain weeks of the year, there is a small window of opportunity in the crop-planting and harvesting season when the demand for farm supplies escalates. Unfortunately, this demand runs headlong into the Department of Transportation's regulations for the number of hours a driver can be on duty.

DOT's hours-of-service regulations are highly impractical, burdensome, and costly for farmers and farm suppliers because the law can require them to take 3 days off—at the peak of agricultural production—and wait in order to accumulate enough off-duty time to resume driving. This is because DOT regulations define on duty time as "all time from the time a driver begins work or is required to be in readiness to work until the time he/she is relieved from work." Of course DOT could correct this problem by a change in regulations but they are performing like an unyielding, arrogant bureaucracy unsympathetic to the necessary problems their regulations create for the farm community.

The hours-of-service regulations are directed toward long distance truck drivers. However, they also apply to the local distribution of farm input materials even though driving is incidental to the farm supplier's principal work function of servicing farmers.

Last year, working with farm State colleagues in the House and the other body, this Member sought regulatory relief for farmers and farm suppliers from the DOT's unfair on-duty hours of service restrictions on this class of drivers and joined many Members in a letter to the DOT on this matter. Unfortunately, last year's legislative effort to provide an agricultural exemption was reduced to a mandated rulemaking which has now become a bureaucratic nightmare with no hope of regulatory relief in sight. The DOT proposed rulemaking includes a number of hurdles which will further burden farmers. This Member introduced legislation earlier this year along with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] to address this issue. Such a bill would be a perfect candidate for the first Corrections Calendar.

Second, this Member has introduced legislation to correct a badly flawed interpretation of the law by the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD]. That department has willfully flaunted congressional intent to promulgate a final regulation which burdens homeowners unnecessarily and undermines the intent of this Member to bring common sense to HUD's requirements for water purification devices in rural FHA insured properties.

This Member's legislation, H.R. 69, is identical to legislation passed by the House in the 103d Congress as section 410 of H.R. 3838, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1994, passed July 22, 1994. The need for this provision arose when HUD promulgated extremely unsatisfactory regulations to implement section 424 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987. The 1987 provision is one this Member introduced to provide for either point-of-use or point-of-entry water purification equipment in FHA insured housing. HUD's initial regulations did not allow point-of-use systems.

Despite passage of section 424 in 1987, HUD took until 1991 to promulgate an inadequate proposed rule, and the final rule was not promulgated until March 19, 1992. After taking an outrageous period of time—nearly five years—to develop a new rule, the rule that was finalized is seriously flawed. That rule requires a point-of-use system on every faucet in an FHA insured house which has a water supply not meeting HUD's water purity standards, whether the faucet is used for human consumption or for showers, washing machines, and so forth.

This Member's legislation provides that a point-of-use system is required on every faucet used primarily for human consumption thereby protecting the safety of the dweller without irrationally over-regulating at a great cost to the homeowner.

The legislation also requires that for testing water purification devices, HUD use water-purification industry accepted protocols or protocols using technically valid testing methods of the Environmental Protection Agency. This take HUD out of the business of creating environmental standards and leaves those standards to those with expertise in the area.

HUD has show complete intractability in meeting the original intent of this Member's legislation. This is a problem which should have been solved in 1987, but instead has lingered on for over 7 years. If ever there was a candidate for a correction of bureaucratic mismanagement, this foolish regulation is it. This Member hopes that his colleagues will

lend their support to finally resolve this problem.

Mr. Chairman, these are only two examples, but they highlight the much larger problems associated with a bureaucratic Federal Government which has grown too big. This Member urges his colleagues to strike a blow for common sense and vote for the Corrections Calendar to be established by House Resolution 168.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Scottsdale, AZ [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I think what we saw on November 8 of last year was the American people saying, "Let us open the windows of this Congress, let us reform this Congress; yes, perhaps in revolutionary style, but also in a rational style. Let us have common sense returned to Government."

Mr. Speaker, that is what this legislation will do. By innovation we will be able to streamline and correct problems, outmoded regulations, outmoded laws, find a vehicle to restore rationality, and that is why I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to stand here in strong support of the legislation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mrs. WALDHOLTZ), a new Member of this House.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly support Corrections Day of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor. This bill gives Congress a sensible approach to eliminating irresponsible, nonsensical Federal regulations. Overreaching regulations impose a heavy cost on our economy and are killing small business which creates the majority of new jobs throughout our country and particularly in my home State of Utah. Each new mandate means higher costs, increased litigations, more failed businesses and fewer jobs. Government administrators currently face no explicit requirement to consider the effects of the rules that they have developed, nor have lawmakers done so in the past. Even when agencies or congressional committees have considered the effects of proposed regulations, policymakers often did so in ways that were simplistic or relied on faulty assumptions or models, and nowhere in the entire regulatory processes did anyone consider the cumulative effects of proposed and existing regulations. As part of the Contract With America we passed important regulatory reform to help Federal bureaucrats prioritize regulatory decisions ensuring that limited resources have targeted to the greatest needs, but while this was a positive step for future regulations, we still have not addressed the problems that we have with current Federal regulations.

That is why I support Corrections Day. It is not enough for us to ensure that future regulations are controlled. We need to reform the current regulatory maze. Inefficient regulation costs the American economy \$600 bil-

lion each year or more than \$5,900 per family, and Congress has been too slow to fix the problems we have inadvertently created. Corrections Day will give us the flexibility to respond quickly to correct our obvious errors and mistakes while still having the benefit of review by the committee of jurisdiction and the consensus reflected by the three-fifths requirement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the previous question and to support this bill so that we can work to free Americans from bureaucratic red-tape and help to remake our economy into the greatest job making machine in the world.

□ 1230

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say this. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] and others have spoken of regulations and laws that need changing. May I gently point out that nothing is stopping us from changing those laws and regulations right now. Nobody really has explained why we need a new procedure.

The truth of the matter is that none of this is necessary. The Speaker or anyone else can gather together any bills that he or others deem corrections bills and put them on the calendar right now and call it a corrections calendar. In fact, presumably every bill we pass around here is a correction of one sort or another, or an improvement of one kind or another on existing laws or regulations.

For the many reasons previously given, perhaps most cogently most recently by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] and others, we do oppose the proposed rules change.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to Members that the first vote will be on the previous question on the Corrections Day resolution. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If it is defeated, I shall offer an amendment to change the three-fifths vote requirement to two-thirds. With a two-thirds vote requirement, we will have the assurance, regardless of the party in power, that the minority is as well protected in the corrections process as on all other legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment I propose to offer, should the previous question not be ordered, simply reads: "On page 3, line 1, strike 'three-fifths' and insert 'two-thirds.'"

Mr. Speaker, in closing, again I urge a "no" vote on this proposed rules change.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the Members of this body that this country had a great President not too many years ago, and his name was

Ronald Reagan. He had a unique ability to focus this entire Nation in the direction that he wanted to move it. I guess we are so very fortunate today to have a Speaker of this House who has that same unique ability to keep this Congress focused.

The big difference between the old majority controlled by the Democrats and the new majority controlled now by the Republicans is that we try to focus this Nation on the problems that have literally brought this country to a halt and that have threatened generations to come with huge deficits and huge burdens of overregulation that are heaped on not only local government but on small business in particular.

This particular resolution, by creating a corrections calendar, is going to focus the entire bureaucracy of this Government on the problems that really are facing business and industry today. By our bringing these corrections up one by one in a separate calendar, every bureaucrat inside this Beltway is going to take notice. That is the real reason for this.

So when we bring these corrections bills before the Congress, they will be relatively noncontroversial, but there will be some controversy. They will be confined to a single subject. They will not involve the expenditure of additional money or the raising of additional revenues. That is very important. These are the criteria for these kinds of legislation. They will deal with the silly, dumb, and ludicrous rules that have literally just about brought business and industry to a point where they cannot be profitable anymore. If you cannot be profitable, you cannot create a new job for all of the high school seniors, as I said before, or for the college seniors who are graduating today. This is what we are doing.

I am so excited about this. When we bring this first corrections bill to the floor, every bureaucrat in this Government is going to pay attention to what is happening and they are going to think twice before they promulgate the kinds of rules and regulations that go far beyond what the legislative intent of Congress is.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member will vote for the previous question and will vote for this change of the rules, which is going to really make a difference in this country.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of creating a calendar for the purpose of Corrections Day legislation. From the start, I've thought having regular Corrections Days would be the perfect way to deal with the myriad of rules and regulations that are unduly costly or simply make no sense.

It is particularly timely for us to be doing this now because July 9, just a couple of weeks away, is Cost of Government Day. This is the day when Americans will have earned enough money to pay off the total financial burden of government at all levels, including taxes, mandates, borrowing, and regulations. This means

that 52 cents out of every hard earned dollar are going to the government either directly or indirectly this year.

Cost of Government Day is a sad reminder that the size of government has reached unbelievable proportions.

But the 104th Congress is very different from past Congresses. Earlier this year, the House began to shrink the burden of government by passing a number of regulatory reform bills, and the Senate will soon bring similar legislation to the floor for a vote.

However, while we are making significant changes to the process by which regulations are promulgated, there is still the arguably even bigger problem of ridiculous regulations that are currently on the books and are encroaching on people's lives every day. Many of these are hard to believe:

Last year, a Houston roofing company was cited by OSHA 23 times for a grand total of \$13,200 in fines for such transgressions as a bent rung on the bottom of a ladder and a splintered handle on a broken shovel placed in the back of a truck after it had been broken.

Also last year, a 14-year-old Boy Scout was left stranded in new Mexico's Santa Fe National Forest after being lost for 2 days because the Forest Service would not allow a police helicopter to land and pick him up. It seems the boy was in a "wilderness area" in which "mechanized vehicles" are banned.

And many of you have heard of OSHA's rule requiring employers to provide detailed safety information and training regarding the use of such hazardous substances as diet soda, Joy dishwashing liquid, and chalk.

I assume the Federal Government is not intentionally trying to wreak havoc on people's lives. Nonetheless, the American people shouldn't have to continue to suffer the consequences of poorly written or poorly implemented rules and regulations.

Mr. Speaker. I say to my colleagues, Corrections Day is a real opportunity to right wrongs. All across the country, Americans are fed up with a system that is overly intrusive, unreasonable, and excessively costly.

This rules change will address one aspect of the problem and create a process by which we can repeal the most egregious, oppressive, and ridiculous regulations that this Government has promulgated.

I urge support of the Members for House Resolution 168 to create a Corrections Calendar.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I live by the old adage: If it ain't broke don't fix it. We have spent a whole lot of time and energy coming up with a way to fix a legislative process that is not the least bit broken.

I might remind my Republican colleagues that we already have a procedure for bipartisan, noncontroversial bills, it is called suspension of the rules and it would take care of everything you want to go after and allow the Democrats to join you.

But, we are not leaving well enough alone; for some reason we are changing the rules.

Mr. Republican colleagues say we need this rules change to get rid of unnecessary regulations. Although this version of the resolution is an improvement over the last version—it is still a long way from being fair to the Democrats.

If these regulations we will be ending are so silly, then why lower the vote margin from two-thirds to three-fifths?

Democrats want to get rid of silly regulations and unnecessary laws just as much as any-

one else but this process will not give us much say.

We firmly believe that there are far too many wasteful, useless provisions and it is time to eliminate them. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that Democrats can join in the corrections process.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. 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.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 185, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]
YEAS—236

Allard	Cubin	Hefley
Archer	Cunningham	Heineman
Armey	Davis	Henger
Bachus	DeLay	Hilleary
Baessler	Diaz-Balart	Hobson
Baker (CA)	Dickey	Hoekstra
Baker (LA)	Doolittle	Hoke
Ballenger	Dornan	Horn
Barr	Dreier	Hostettler
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Houghton
Bartlett	Dunn	Hunter
Barton	Ehlers	Hutchinson
Bass	Ehrlich	Hyde
Bateman	Emerson	Inglis
Bereuter	English	Istook
Bilbray	Ensign	Johnson (CT)
Bilirakis	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Blute	Ewing	Jones
Boehert	Fawell	Kasich
Boehner	Fields (TX)	Kelly
Bonilla	Flanagan	Kim
Bono	Foley	King
Brownback	Forbes	Kingston
Bryant (TN)	Fowler	Klug
Bunn	Fox	Knollenberg
Bunning	Franks (CT)	Kolbe
Burr	Franks (NJ)	LaHood
Burton	Frelinghuysen	Largent
Buyer	Frisa	Latham
Callahan	Funderburk	LaTourette
Calvert	Galleghy	Laughlin
Camp	Ganske	Lazio
Canady	Gekas	Leach
Castle	Geren	Lewis (CA)
Chabot	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Chambliss	Gillmor	Lightfoot
Chenoweth	Gilman	Linder
Christensen	Goodlatte	Livingston
Chrysler	Goodling	LoBiondo
Clinger	Goss	Longley
Coble	Graham	Lucas
Coburn	Greenwood	Manzullo
Collins (GA)	Gunderson	Martini
Combest	Gutknecht	McCrery
Condit	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Cooley	Hancock	McInnis
Cox	Hansen	McIntosh
Crane	Hastert	McKeon
Crapo	Hastings (WA)	Metcalf
Cremeans	Hayworth	Meyers

Mica	Rogers	Stump
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Talent
Molinari	Ros-Lehtinen	Tate
Moorhead	Roth	Tauzin
Morella	Roukema	Taylor (NC)
Myers	Royce	Thomas
Myrick	Salmon	Thornberry
Nethercutt	Sanford	Tiahrt
Neumann	Saxton	Torkildsen
Ney	Scarborough	Trafficant
Norwood	Schaefer	Upton
Nussle	Schiff	Vucanovich
Oxley	Seastrand	Waldholtz
Packard	Sensenbrenner	Walker
Parker	Shadegg	Walsh
Paxon	Shaw	Wamp
Peterson (MN)	Shays	Watts (OK)
Petri	Shuster	Weldon (FL)
Pombo	Skeen	Weldon (PA)
Porter	Smith (MI)	Weller
Portman	Smith (NJ)	White
Pryce	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Quillen	Smith (WA)	Wicker
Quinn	Solomon	Wolf
Radanovich	Souder	Young (AK)
Ramstad	Spence	Young (FL)
Regula	Stearns	Zeliff
Riggs	Stenholm	Zimmer
Roberts	Stockman	

NAYS—185

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

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra	Edwards
Bliley	Flake
Brown (CA)	Jefferson
Deal	

McCollum Moakley Schumer
McDade Peterson (FL) Stark

□ 1254

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Bliley for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Mr. MINGE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. STENHOLM changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were ayes 271, noes 146, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—271

Allard	Cunningham	Hayworth
Archer	Danner	Hefley
Army	Davis	Heineman
Bachus	de la Garza	Heger
Baesler	Deal	Hilleary
Baker (CA)	DeLay	Hobson
Baker (LA)	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Ballenger	Dickey	Hoke
Barr	Doollittle	Holden
Barrett (NE)	Dornan	Horn
Bartlett	Doyle	Hostettler
Barton	Dreier	Houghton
Bass	Duncan	Hunter
Bateman	Dunn	Hutchinson
Bereuter	Ehlers	Hyde
Bevill	Ehrlich	Inglis
Bilbray	Emerson	Istook
Bilirakis	English	Jacobs
Blute	Ensign	Johnson (CT)
Boehlert	Everett	Johnson (SD)
Boehner	Ewing	Johnson, Sam
Bonilla	Fawell	Kasich
Bono	Fields (TX)	Kelly
Brewster	Flanagan	Kim
Browder	Foley	King
Brownback	Forbes	Kingston
Bryant (TN)	Ford	Klug
Bunn	Fowler	Knollenberg
Bunning	Fox	Kolbe
Burr	Franks (CT)	LaHood
Burton	Franks (NJ)	Largent
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Calvert	Frisa	LaTourette
Camp	Funderburk	Laughlin
Canady	Gallegly	Lazio
Castle	Ganske	Leach
Chabot	Gekas	Lewis (CA)
Chambliss	Geren	Lewis (KY)
Chenoweth	Gilchrist	Lightfoot
Christensen	Gillmor	Lincoln
Chrysler	Gilman	Linder
Clement	Goodlatte	Livingston
Clinger	Goodling	LoBiondo
Coble	Gordon	Longley
Coburn	Goss	Lucas
Coleman	Graham	Luther
Collins (GA)	Greenwood	Manzullo
Combest	Gunderson	Martini
Condit	Gutknecht	McCrery
Cooley	Hall (TX)	McHale
Cox	Hamilton	McHugh
Cramer	Hancock	McInnis
Crane	Hansen	McIntosh
Crapo	Hastert	McKeon
Cremeans	Hastings (WA)	McNulty
Cubin	Hayes	Metcalfe

Meyers	Rivers	Stockman
Mica	Roberts	Stump
Miller (FL)	Roemer	Stupak
Minge	Rogers	Talent
Molinari	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Montgomery	Ros-Lehtinen	Tate
Moorhead	Rose	Tauzin
Morella	Roth	Taylor (MS)
Myers	Roukema	Taylor (NC)
Myrick	Royce	Thomas
Nethercutt	Salmon	Thornberry
Neumann	Sanford	Tiahrt
Ney	Saxton	Torkildsen
Norwood	Scarborough	Traficant
Nussle	Schaefer	Upton
Orton	Schiff	Vucanovich
Oxley	Seastrand	Waldholtz
Packard	Sensenbrenner	Walker
Parker	Shadegg	Walsh
Paxon	Shaw	Wamp
Payne (VA)	Shays	Watts (OK)
Pelosi	Shuster	Weldon (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Sisisky	Weldon (PA)
Petri	Skeen	Weller
Pombo	Skelton	White
Pomeroy	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Wicker
Portman	Smith (TX)	Wise
Pryce	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Quillen	Solomon	Young (AK)
Quinn	Souder	Young (FL)
Radanovich	Spence	Zeliff
Ramstad	Spratt	Zimmer
Regula	Stearns	
Riggs	Stenholm	

NOES—146

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Neal
Ackerman	Gephardt	Oberstar
Andrews	Gibbons	Olver
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Ortiz
Barcia	Green	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Pallone
Becerra	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Beilenson	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Pickett
Berman	Hefner	Poshard
Bishop	Hilliard	Rahall
Bonior	Hinchey	Rangel
Borski	Hoyer	Reed
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Reynolds
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Rush
Bryant (TX)	Kaptur	Sabo
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Chapman	Kennedy (RI)	Sawyer
Clay	Kennelly	Schroeder
Clayton	Kildee	Scott
Clyburn	Klecza	Skaggs
Collins (IL)	Klink	Slaughter
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Stark
Conyers	Lantos	Stokes
Costello	Levin	Studds
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Tejeda
DeFazio	Lipinski	Thompson
DeLauro	Lofgren	Thornton
Dellums	Lowey	Thurman
Deutsch	Manton	Torres
Dicks	Markey	Torricelli
Dingell	Martinez	Towns
Dixon	Mascara	Tucker
Doggett	Matsui	Velazquez
Dooley	McCarthy	Vento
Durbin	McKinney	Visclosky
Engel	Meehan	Volkmer
Eshoo	Meek	Ward
Evans	Menendez	Waters
Fattah	Mfume	Watt (NC)
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Fields (LA)	Mineta	Wilson
Filner	Mink	Woolsey
Foglietta	Mollohan	Wyden
Frank (MA)	Moran	Wynn
Frost	Murtha	Yates
Furse	Nadler	

NOT VOTING—17

Bliley	Jones	Obey
Buyer	Maloney	Peterson (FL)
Edwards	McCollum	Schumer
Farr	McDade	Serrano
Flake	McDermott	Williams
Jefferson	Moakley	

□ 1303

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Bliley for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Ms. LOFGREN changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 390, I inadvertently missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BEILENSEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman is recognized for his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, am I correct in saying that the next vote will be on the previous question on the rule on legislative branch appropriations?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Continuing my inquiry, if I may, Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, will I be recognized to control the hour of additional debate time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member had led the fight against the previous question. The answer would be yes.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Continuing my inquiry, if I may, Mr. Speaker, if I control the time, would I be in a position to offer an amendment to the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A proper amendment would be in order.

PRINTING OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 169

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment that I would offer to House Resolution 169 be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the proposed amendment is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. . . Before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider the following two amendments in the order specified:

1. An amendment to be offered by Representative BREWSTER of Oklahoma and Representative HARMAN of California:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE IV—DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCKBOX

DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND; DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS

SEC. 401. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United

States a trust fund to be known as the "Deficit Reduction Trust Fund" (in this title referred to as the "Fund").

(b) CONTENTS.—The Fund shall consist only of amounts transferred to the Fund under subsection (c).

(c) TRANSFERS OF MONEYS TO FUND.—For each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Fund the aggregate amount of estimated reductions in new budget authority and outlays for discretionary programs (below the allocations for those programs for each such fiscal year under section 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) resulting from the provisions of this Act, as calculated by the Director.

(d) USE OF MONEYS IN FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amounts in the Fund shall not be available, in any fiscal year, for appropriation, obligation, expenditure, or transfer.

(2) USE OF AMOUNTS FOR REDUCTION OF PUBLIC DEBT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall use the amounts in the Fund to redeem, or buy before maturity, obligations of the Federal Government that are included in the public debt. Any obligation of the Federal Government that is paid, redeemed, or bought with money from the Fund shall be canceled and retired and may not be re-issued.

(e) DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—Upon the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall make downward adjustments in the adjusted discretionary spending limits (new budget authority and outlays) as set forth in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998 by the aggregate amount of estimated reductions in new budget authority and outlays transferred to the Fund under subsection (c) for such fiscal year, as calculated by the Director.

2. An amendment to be offered by Representative BALDACCIO of Maine:

Page 49, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 312. None of the funds made available in this Act may be provided for any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that such Member, officer, or employee has accepted a gift, knowing that such gift is provided directly or indirectly by a paid lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or an agent of a foreign principal.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of ordering the previous question on House Resolution 169.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule

XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 106, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

AYES—232

- | | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Allard | Frelinghuysen | Myrick |
| Archer | Frisa | Nethercutt |
| Armey | Funderburk | Neumann |
| Bachus | Gallegly | Ney |
| Baker (CA) | Ganske | Norwood |
| Baker (LA) | Gekas | Nussle |
| Balenger | Gilchrest | Oxley |
| Barr | Gillmor | Packard |
| Barrett (NE) | Gilman | Parker |
| Bartlett | Goodlatte | Paxon |
| Barton | Goodling | Petri |
| Bass | Goss | Pombo |
| Bateman | Graham | Porter |
| Bereuter | Greenwood | Portman |
| Bilbray | Gunderson | Pryce |
| Bilirakis | Gutknecht | Quillen |
| Bliley | Hancock | Quinn |
| Blute | Hansen | Radanovich |
| Boehlert | Hastert | Ramstad |
| Boehner | Hastings (WA) | Regula |
| Bonilla | Hayworth | Riggs |
| Bono | Hefley | Roberts |
| Boucher | Heineman | Rogers |
| Brownback | Herger | Rohrabacher |
| Bryant (TN) | Hilleary | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Bunn | Hobson | Roth |
| Bunning | Hoekstra | Roukema |
| Burr | Hoke | Royce |
| Burton | Horn | Salmon |
| Buyer | Hostettler | Sanford |
| Callahan | Houghton | Saxton |
| Calvert | Hunter | Scarborough |
| Camp | Hutchinson | Schaefer |
| Canady | Hyde | Schiff |
| Castle | Inglis | Seastrand |
| Chabot | Istook | Sensenbrenner |
| Chambliss | Johnson (CT) | Shadegg |
| Chenoweth | Johnson, Sam | Shaw |
| Christensen | Jones | Shays |
| Chrysler | Kasich | Shuster |
| Clinger | Kelly | Skeen |
| Coble | Kim | Smith (MI) |
| Coburn | King | Smith (NJ) |
| Collins (GA) | Kingston | Smith (TX) |
| Combest | Klug | Smith (WA) |
| Cooley | Knollenberg | Solomon |
| Cox | Kolbe | Souder |
| Crane | LaHood | Spence |
| Crapo | Largent | Stearns |
| Cremeans | Latham | Stockman |
| Cubin | LaTourrette | Stump |
| Cunningham | Laughlin | Talent |
| Davis | Lazio | Tate |
| Deal | Leach | Taylor (NC) |
| DeLay | Lewis (CA) | Thomas |
| Diaz-Balart | Lewis (KY) | Thornberry |
| Dickey | Lightfoot | Tiahrt |
| Doollittle | Linder | Torkildsen |
| Dornan | Livingston | Traficant |
| Dreier | LoBiondo | Upton |
| Duncan | Longley | Vucanovich |
| Dunn | Lucas | Waldholtz |
| Ehlers | Manzullo | Walker |
| Ehrlich | Martini | Walsh |
| Emerson | McCrery | Wamp |
| English | McDade | Watts (OK) |
| Ensign | McHugh | Weldon (FL) |
| Everett | McInnis | Weldon (PA) |
| Ewing | McIntosh | Weller |
| Fawell | McKeon | White |
| Fields (TX) | Metcalf | Whitfield |
| Flanagan | Meyers | Wicker |
| Foley | Mica | Wolf |
| Forbes | Miller (FL) | Young (AK) |
| Fowler | Molinari | Young (FL) |
| Fox | Moorhead | Zeliff |
| Franks (CT) | Morella | |
| Franks (NJ) | Myers | |

NOES—196

- | | | |
|-------------|--------------|-----------|
| Abercrombie | Baldacci | Beilenson |
| Ackerman | Barcia | Bentsen |
| Andrews | Barrett (WI) | Berman |
| Baesler | Becerra | Bevil |

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

NOT VOTING—6

- | | | |
|---------|-----------|---------------|
| Edwards | Jefferson | Moakley |
| Flake | McCollum | Peterson (FL) |

□ 1323

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McCollum for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. BREWSTER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ROHRABACHER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 191, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

AYES—236

Allard	Franks (NJ)	Myrick
Archer	Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt
Armye	Frisa	Neumann
Bachus	Funderburk	Ney
Baker (CA)	Gallegly	Norwood
Baker (LA)	Ganske	Nussle
Ballenger	Gekas	Oxley
Barcia	Gilchrest	Packard
Barr	Gillmor	Parker
Barrett (NE)	Gilman	Paxon
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Petri
Barton	Goodling	Pombo
Bass	Goss	Porter
Bateman	Graham	Portman
Bereuter	Greenwood	Pryce
Bevill	Gunderson	Quillen
Bilbray	Gutierrez	Quinn
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Radanovich
Bliley	Hancock	Ramstad
Blute	Hansen	Rogers
Boehlerlert	Hastert	Rohrabacher
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonilla	Hayworth	Roth
Bono	Hefley	Roukema
Boucher	Heineman	Royce
Brownback	Hergert	Salmon
Bryant (TN)	Hilleary	Sanford
Bunn	Hobson	Saxton
Bunning	Hoekstra	Scarborough
Burr	Horn	Schaefer
Burton	Hostettler	Schiff
Buyer	Houghton	Seastrand
Callahan	Hunter	Sensenbrenner
Calvert	Hutchinson	Shadegg
Camp	Hyde	Shaw
Canady	Inglis	Shuster
Chabot	Istook	Sisisky
Chambliss	Johnson (CT)	Skeen
Chenoweth	Johnson, Sam	Skelton
Christensen	Jones	Smith (MI)
Chrysler	Kasich	Smith (NJ)
Clinger	Kelly	Smith (TX)
Coble	Kim	Smith (WA)
Coburn	King	Solomon
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Souder
Combest	Klug	Spence
Cooley	Knollenberg	Stearns
Cox	Kolbe	Stockman
Crane	LaHood	Stump
Crapo	Largent	Stupak
Cremeans	Latham	Lazio
Cubin	LaTourette	Leach
Cunningham	Laughlin	Lewis (CA)
Davis	Lazio	Lewis (KY)
Deal	Leach	Lightfoot
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Linder
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Livingston
Dickey	Lightfoot	LoBiondo
Doolittle	Linder	Longley
Dornan	Livingston	Lucas
Dreier	LoBiondo	Manzullo
Duncan	Longley	Martini
Dunn	Lucas	McCrery
Ehlers	Manzullo	McHugh
Ehrlich	Martini	McInnis
Emerson	McCrery	McIntosh
English	McHugh	McKeon
Ensign	McInnis	Metcalf
Everett	McIntosh	Meyers
Ewing	McKeon	Mica
Fawell	Metcalf	Miller (FL)
Fields (TX)	Meyers	Molinari
Flanagan	Mica	Montgomery
Foley	Miller (FL)	Moorhead
Forbes	Molinari	Morella
Ford	Montgomery	Myers
Fowler	Moorhead	
Fox	Morella	
Franks (CT)	Myers	

NOES—191

Abercrombie	Bonior	Clay
Ackerman	Borski	Clayton
Andrews	Brewster	Clement
Baesler	Browder	Clyburn
Baldacci	Brown (CA)	Coleman
Barrett (WI)	Brown (FL)	Collins (IL)
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Collins (MI)
Beilenson	Bryant (TX)	Condit
Bentsen	Cardin	Conyers
Berman	Castle	Costello
Bishop	Chapman	Coyne

Cramer	Kennelly	Rahall
Danner	Kildee	Rangel
de la Garza	Klecza	Reed
DeFazio	Klink	Reynolds
DeLauro	LaFalce	Richardson
Dellums	Lantos	Rivers
Deutsch	Levin	Roemer
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Rose
Dingell	Lincoln	Roybal-Allard
Dixon	Lipinski	Rush
Doggett	Lofgren	Sabo
Dooley	Lowe	Sanders
Doyle	Luther	Sawyer
Durbin	Maloney	Schroeder
Engel	Manton	Schumer
Eshoo	Markey	Scott
Evans	Martinez	Serrano
Farr	Mascara	Shays
Fattah	Matsui	Skaggs
Fazio	McCarthy	Slaughter
Fields (LA)	McDermott	Spratt
Filner	McHale	Stark
Foglietta	McKinney	Stenholm
Frank (MA)	McNulty	Stokes
Frost	Meehan	Studds
Furse	Meek	Tanner
Gejdenson	Menendez	Tauzin
Gephardt	Mfume	Taylor (MS)
Gerren	Miller (CA)	Tejeda
Gibbons	Mineta	Thompson
Gonzalez	Minge	Thornton
Gordon	Mink	Thurman
Green	Mollohan	Torres
Hall (OH)	Moran	Torricelli
Hall (TX)	Murtha	Towns
Hamilton	Nadler	Tucker
Harman	Neal	Velazquez
Hastings (FL)	Oberstar	Vento
Hayes	Obey	Visclosky
Hefner	Olver	Volkmmer
Hilliard	Ortiz	Ward
Hinchee	Orton	Waters
Holden	Owens	Watt (NC)
Hoyer	Pallone	Waxman
Jackson-Lee	Pastor	Williams
Jacobs	Payne (NJ)	Wilson
Johnson (SD)	Payne (VA)	Wise
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Woolsey
Johnston	Peterson (FL)	Wyden
Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Wynn
Kaptur	Pickett	Yates
Kennedy (MA)	Pomeroy	Zimmer
Kennedy (RI)	Poshary	

NOT VOTING—7

Edwards	Jefferson	Moakley
Flake	McCollum	
Hoke	McDade	

□ 1333

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McDade for, with Mr. Moakley against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 204(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3015(a)), as amended by section 205 of Public Law 102-375, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment to the Federal Council on the Aging for a 3-year term on the part of the House to fill the existing vacancy thereon the following member from private life: Mr. Charles W. Kane of Stuart, FL.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Committee on Commerce; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on International Relations; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Resources; Committee on Science; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and Committee on Agriculture, chaired by that great American and former marine, the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. PAT ROBERTS.

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

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the distinguished gentleman is absolutely correct. The Democrat minority has been consulted on all of these and has no objections.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on both House Resolution 168, which is the corrections day resolution, and House Resolution 169, the legislative branch appropriations rule, the two resolutions just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 1817) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and that I may be permitted to include tables and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 167 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. 1817.

□ 1341

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. 1817) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, June 16, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment through page 2, line 20.

Are there further amendments to this paragraph?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NADLER: On Page 2, line 12, insert "(less \$10,000,000)" before ", to remain".

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I am appalled that in this time of ever increasing concern over our burgeoning national debt, the committee has chosen to include in this bill an appropriation of \$10 million as a second down payment on a \$32 million project for a project which is at best of dubious necessity. At worst, it is a \$32 million total boondoggle with no legitimate purpose.

My amendment would cut this wasteful and unnecessary spending and ultimately save the taxpayers \$32 million. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you the twisted tale of this waste of money that is proposed to be taken from the pockets of working Americans.

Once upon a time there was a facility to train Army units at Fort Irwin, CA. But alas this facility had no airport. Personnel had to be trucked 170 miles from the nearest available airfield in Nevada. We can all agree that this was a situation that needed to be remedied.

This House several years ago initiated a study to find a more efficient way to transport trainees. At one point, the Army designated Barstow-Daggett Airfield, currently a Marine Corps logistics facility, as the best available option to upgrade that facility.

The House initiated action to get funds for a \$32 million project to upgrade Barstow-Daggett. But in the meantime, Edwards Air Force Base, 30

miles away from Fort Irwin, became available for this purpose as in downsizing the workload there was reduced and we are informed that the Air Force is amenable to the Army's use of Edwards for this purpose.

George Air Force Base, another local facility 60 miles from Fort Irwin, which has been a closed military facility pursuant to the base closing situation is currently operating as a civilian airport.

Ten million dollars was included in the fiscal year 1995 appropriation to upgrade Barstow-Daggett. It has not been spent. This bill now proposes to appropriate an additional \$10 million for Barstow-Daggett, although construction will not begin until 1997.

In addition, the bill contains language that will instruct the Army to reopen the closed George Air Force Base, reopen a closed base in this time of closing bases, to be used as the interim air base for Fort Irwin until Barstow-Daggett reaches initial operational capability. I will be offering an amendment later to delete that language.

Why should the taxpayers be forced to pay who knows how much to reopen a closed Air Force base when an operating Air Force base, Edwards, can be used instead?

In the meantime the Army has been working on a study which is due to be released in August, 2 months from now, to assess the various options and recommend the proper course of action. Construction at Barstow-Daggett is not due to begin until 1997.

Why cannot we wait until the study is completed in 2 months before deciding which is the best most cost-effective way to proceed? Some will argue that the roads between Fort Irwin and Edwards Air Force Base are unsafe, compared to the roads between George Air Force Base and Fort Irwin. A study by the Army indicates the opposite.

The American Automobile Association, with whom we spoke in Redlands, CA, has provided to us the following information. From Fort Irwin to Edwards Air Force Base is 90 miles, almost entirely freeway driving. No unsafe roads were mentioned.

I have a chart here that illustrates what I am saying. From Fort Irwin to George is 60 miles. Edwards, 90 miles freeway driving; Barstow-Daggett, 35 miles. Is this somewhat shorter distance, 35 miles as against 90, when the 90 miles is freeway driving, an hour and a half, worth \$32 million of taxpayer funds to upgrade Barstow-Daggett to have a 10,000-foot runway, plus the cost of reopening a closed military Air Force base at George for temporary use? I doubt that.

Now, it may be that the Army study due out in August will show that for reasons unknown to us, that is the best way. But why not wait until August to determine that?

This bill contains an appropriation of \$10 million more for Barstow-Daggett, though as I said construction cannot

begin until 1997. So if we do not fund it now it would not delay it. And the committee further instructs the Army to reopen George Air Force Base which has been closed as a part of downsizing.

Mr. Chairman, this is not cut and save. This sounds a lot more like the old tax and spend. What happened to downsizing? What happened to the rhetoric heard in this Chamber while we were slashing programs for children, the needy, veterans, and the elderly? Yes, we have to make tough choices, but our story could have a happy ending if we passed this amendment and saved the taxpayer this money.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that the need to provide an airfield for Fort Irwin has been an issue since the first round of base closure in 1988, when Norton Air Force Base was closed.

The committee has appropriated funds since fiscal year 1994 to bring about the arrangement to locate the air unit at Barstow-Daggett. This will permit 60,000 troops per year to continue to receive state-of-the-art maneuver and training for close combat heavy brigades. The committee's recommendation includes the second phase of funding for a project to meet this requirement.

This is a good solution and deserves the support of this body. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in very, very strong opposition to this proposal by my colleague from New York. I do not know if the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] has had the opportunity to travel to the National Training Center for the Army. It is without any question the most important and valuable asset that our military has anywhere in the world.

It is the place where we train and retrain our troops in real live war circumstance and prepare them for perhaps the worst they might face out in the battlefield. This is the base about which General Schwarzkoff said,

I commanded the 24th Mechanized Division during seven different rotations at Fort Irwin.

It is the best investment the Army has made in 35 years. The reason we did so well in Desert Storm and Desert Shield is because almost every commander we had over there had some kind of involvement in the NTC.

□ 1345

It is suggested that his amendment saves money by stopping the previously authorized project in mid-stream. This amendment, ladies and gentlemen, wastes money already approved by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the need to have a permanent airhead will not go away. The primary cost factor, distance from the national center, will not change; that is, troops are brought in numbers of 60,000 a year from various bases

around the country. They come in rotations to train at the national training center for the Army. They must be flown in to somewhere.

In the past, we have flown them into Las Vegas, where they got on buses and rode for 4½ hours, an ongoing expense. The last rotation had them coming from Edwards Air Force Base.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] probably ought to come to the territory and actually see the region we are dealing with here. A portion of it is on freeway, but approximately a third of the transportation takes place on a two-lane highway, a very, very dangerous highway in which the accident rate is something like 50 times greater than on a normal freeway; very important to recognize that in the past we have been looking for a temporary facility, Norton Air Force Base; they are considering George. That does not open up that base or reopen it. It may allow for a lease short term.

In the meantime, the Army, after a 5-year study, has come to the conclusion that, No. 1, they need a permanent airhead for bringing those troops in for this vital training; and, second, that Barstow-Daggett is the logical location which will not only serve the needs of the national training center but will also save a lot of money over the life of this very important facility.

Since 1989, I have been working with the Army to establish a permanent airfield to support the NTC rotations. We have been back and forth over all of those years.

There is little question that those who do not understand the mission of the NTC could hardly understand the importance of this facility. But, ladies and gentleman, there is absolutely no doubt that the most important thing we can do for our men and women in the armed services is to make sure that they are ready, that they are prepared by the best of training. The NTC is the best available. They need this facility desperately.

I would suggest to the gentleman that in the future, insofar as this Member is concerned, I will follow with great care what has long been a standing policy of mine that if I have a concern or an issue that affects a specific Member's district about which I do not have great expertise myself, before I carry an amendment on the floor regarding that district, I will at least show that Member the courtesy of a conversation regarding the problem. Sometimes a little light helps a lot with the discussion around here, and in this case, I must say, after 5 years of very intense work with the Army, it is very apparent that most people do not understand the vastness of this territory.

The national training center for the Army is located in a desert territory in which you can put five eastern States easily, and, in turn, the NTC is the perfect facility for live warfare kinds of games to provide the readiness we need. If you believe it is critically im-

portant that our troops be ready and prepared and well trained, vote "no" on the Nadler amendment.

Vote in support of the national training center for the Army.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] is recognized.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Has the gentleman spoken?

I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

I will not take the full 5 minutes.

As chairman of the authorizing committee, we looked at this very, very carefully, and I would concur with what the gentleman from California had to say about the training facility. It is the premier training facility of its kind probably in the entire world.

I like to say that about the training facility at Colorado Springs, and they say, "Yes, it is, but the one in California, that is the one that here the premier facility of its kind."

And we do bring, the figure was used, 60,000 troops, plus or minus a few, in there every year to rotate in for training, and we need the kind of facilities necessary to get them in and get them out safely.

So I think what we are talking about here distance. The idea of moving them in and taking them for 4½ hours on a bus, this number of people simply makes no sense whatsoever. I think it is a matter of time, and I think it is a matter of safety.

So I would hope that we would oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from California very carefully, and I agreed with everything that was said about the national training center at Fort Irwin. It is the finest facility, an essential facility, et cetera.

We are not talking in this amendment about Fort Irwin or the National Training facility. We are talking about Barstow-Daggett, whether we should spend \$32 million, at Barstow-Daggett to make a modern airfield there and whether we should reopen George Air Force Base as a temporary facility.

The fact of the matter is the NTC is a wonderful training facility and an essential one, and we rotate 60,000 troops in there every so often and out of there every so often.

The question is: Is it worth the investment to rotate them into Barstow-Daggett instead of through Edwards Air Force Base? I agree, if it were a 4½ hour journey from Las Vegas, I probably would not offer this amendment. When this was started, when this project was initiated, when the studies were undertaken initially, Edwards Air

Force Base was not available as an option, because it was busy, busy with Air Force business.

Circumstances have changed. Now it is available. The Army has not requested this money.

The study that the gentleman holds up, the Army study that supposedly justifies this, is unavailable. It has never been released publicly. We could not get a hold of it. I do not know what it says.

We do know the Army is coming out with its study as to the best way to rotate troops into and out of Fort Irwin in 2 months. So what is the rush? Two months from now the Army will release its study as to the best way, and maybe the information that I have, and we called up the AAA and we said, "How do you get from Redlands, where this Fort Irwin is, to Edwards Air Force Base, and vice versa?" "Oh, no problem. Ninety minutes on the freeway." They did not tell us anything about a third of the way on 2-lane roads. We asked them specifically. They said it is all freeway driving, 90 minutes, you are there.

For 16 years, I commuted 140 miles up to Albany from New York, where the State legislature meets, freeway driving, no problems. Most people do that.

It will not degrade on military capability on which the gentleman was so earnest, if the troops rotating in and out of Irwin Air Force Base every few months take an hour and a half on a bus and on a freeway from Edwards Air Force Base to Fort Irwin, and the other way around, a few months later, however long a period of time they stay at Fort Irwin. We are not talking about a daily commute. We are talking about rotating in for exercises and a few weeks later rotating out and a 90-minute drive each way.

Maybe what I just said is wrong. Maybe the Army study that is due out in August will show that is wrong for some reason that we do not know here on this floor, at least we on this side do not know, in which case, fine, maybe we should develop the Barstow-Daggett base, and that information in that report will show us that we should.

But we have plenty of time. They cannot start construction until 1997, in any event. To appropriate \$10 million now is totally unnecessary, even if it is necessary to develop Barstow-Daggett. The \$10 million appropriated last year is unspent. Now we will have \$20 million unspent or wasted. Why cannot we wait 2 months until that study comes out to show what the best course of action is?

Remember, this money, for all the eloquence of the people saying how important the NTC is, this money is not requested or wanted by the Army. It should be dispositive and, therefore, this amendment should pass in the interests of saving the taxpayers' money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just would like to respond to my good friend from New York. He raised a question as to what we might know that people on the other side of the aisle do not, and I am not sure that we know anything that the people on the other side of the aisle do not, but there are some very important facts here that I think are interesting to consider in light of the fact that we are going through currently the last stage of a major reorganization of our base structure, and that organization and reorganization has been going on now for some 6 years.

From the Army's point of view, this relationship that will exist between Barstow-Daggett and Fort Irwin is a very, very important relationship.

Let me just try to point out where there are some other relationships that exist like this. For example, Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base enjoy a relationship that is quite similar to this, for perhaps a different purpose, but a very similar kind of a thing, and as a result of that relationship, as far as I know, the Base Realignment and Closing Commission process, BRAC, has never begun to address either Fort Bragg or Pope Air Force Base because of the relationship of the role they play with each other.

More recently, of course, Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base have been together for many years, but more recently the Base Realignment and Closure Commission realized the importance of these kinds of relationships when they realigned McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey and realigned Fort Dix in New Jersey to carry forth the relationship of jointness much as is proposed by the mil con bill in creating a relationship at Barstow-Daggett and Fort Irwin.

Fort Irwin, in my opinion, is never going to go away, and if anybody knows a little bit about base structure, they know Fort Irwin, the national training center, is huge, a huge base, thousands of acres, a national training center where 60,000 troops came each year to train to hone their skills, and a relationship with an Army air base where additional training can take place and the ease of transportation is provided to provide for a more cost-efficient mode of operation is part of this consolidation that is taking place through the BRAC process and through the process of mil con bill that we are here discussing today.

And so I think from a point of cost effectiveness, from a point of distance in getting people to and from where they need to be, from the standpoint of training opportunities that are provided with close proximity of an air base and other training facilities and from commonsense opportunities that are offered and looked upon favorably by the base realignment and closure commission in each of the base closure actions that have taken place since 1989, I think it would be foolhardy for us to side with the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] in spite of the

fact that I think he has great intentions. I think the consolidated effort under way here a very essential part of the base reconfiguration project.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAXTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate my colleague yielding.

He makes a number of important points.

First, let me mention in the last year, I personally have escorted the Secretary of Defense as well as the Secretary of the Army to this very field. It was not 6 months ago the Secretary of the Army looked me in the eye, standing on the tarmac at Barstow-Daggett, and said, "This is exactly where we should have this permanent airhead."

When we went through the process of trying to figure out where to land these 60,000 troops in rotations every year, we looked at a number of facilities. Very early on, Edwards Air Force Base was taken off the list. They were not even among the remaining five being considered. Most important, they were taken off the list because of a conflict of mission. Edwards Air Force Base presently is the home of the 117 fighter bomber, home location of the B-1, where the B-2 lands, where the shuttle lands from time to time.

Indeed the C-17, will use that facility in the future, but most importantly, as the Army evaluated this question, this is what they said about Edwards Air Force Base: "Mission compatibility is of the utmost importance. This unquantifiable benefit could determine the degree of success in the NTC training mission. Unforeseen delays, postponements to the training exercises, deployment and redeployments, schedule changes and conflicts in use of air space would greatly detract from the overall benefits of the training mission exercise. The domino effect of mission incompatibility with other tenants at an airhead location would effectively smother the entire operation."

□ 1400

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SAXTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, just let me say very briefly, and then I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER], that I believe that what the Army is after here is the recognition of the fact that training in large part relates to deployment, and, if one is going to deploy efficiently, we must have the facilities together through which deployment takes place. That is true at Fort Dix and McGuire. That is true at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, and it is equally true at Barstow-Daggett and Fort Irwin. So I think it is something we cannot ignore.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. I have one simple question:

Given all the things I said, why has the Army not requested this?

Mr. SAXTON. We cannot speak for the administration and their budget. This is obviously something that makes a great deal of sense and something that military planners do not disagree with. Every branch of the service has its priorities, and we are told that this is a priority of some magnitude.

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

Mr. SAXTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I am reminded that some 60,000 troops rotate through this area for training, that there is a constant flow of troops coming from all over the Army establishment throughout the country for this unique desert training at Barstow, and this location is rally within minutes of where they actually train.

Is that accurate?

Mr. SAXTON. That is the understanding that I have, and I would just add to that that the relationship between an airport where deployment actually takes place and the training facility at Fort Irwin is an additional reason for this consolidation to take place.

Mr. HUNTER. And the last documentation that the Army did on this did recommend Barstow-Daggett, at least from the documents that I have seen.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing that to our attention, and that would provide a more full answer to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be brief on this because I think most of it has already been said, but again listen to what the proponents of this arrangement and of this appropriation are saying. They are saying Fort Irwin, the National Training Center, is very important. Granted. They are saying that the Army at one point asked for funds to upgrade Barstow-Daggett. Granted, when they could not use Edwards Air Force Base. They are saying that Edwards Air Force Base cannot be used, it is not good enough. It is being used now. In fact there is mission incompatibility, but there is decreased Air Force use of Edwards because of less Air Force use. That we know for the last few years, and the fact of the matter is again, the Army is doing a study of what the best available options are, what is the best way of rotating troops in and out of Irwin, the most cost-effective way and the best way for mission readiness at

Fort Irwin. That study is coming out in August. But we do not want to wait for that study. We want to jump the gun. That is silly because that risks wasting a lot of taxpayers' money. None of the money appropriated here in this bill on this subject can be spent at Barstow-Daggett before 1997, which is to say before the next appropriation bill will have been passed in any event, so why not remove this money, wait for the August study, and if they still have the mind that this is the way to go, fine. Next year they can appropriate it, and they can build it just as fast, but if that study shows, as apparently the Army thinks it may, because the Army is not requesting this money. With all of this rhetoric we have heard on this floor about how important this money is, that our combat capability will be degraded without it and so forth, the Army has not asked for this money, and in this climate, when we are taking money away from food stamps, from school lunches, from Medicare, from Medicaid, from college loans, from just name it, we are proposing to give the Army \$32 million it does not say it needs, and it does not request, and it does not want because we cannot wait 2 months for a study that may show us a cheaper, better way to do it sounds to me like pork, not military readiness.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Mr. Chairman, no State has been impacted by the base closure process more than the State of California. Many of the programs and personnel associated with former military installations in California have either been eliminated or transferred to other States. That being said, there are still fundamental missions which occur at facilities such as the National Army Training Center at Fort Irwin. The Army has spent considerable time and resources addressing the need to establish a permanent airfield to support Fort Irwin and is now moving forward with a cost-effective plan that has been endorsed by Congress and the Secretary of the Army. Voting in favor of the gentleman's amendment will only result in needless delays in meeting this critical requirement.

The Nadler amendment unravels 5 years of the Army's planning for a permanent airfield to support Fort Irwin. The decision to study California alternatives for the NTC airhead was undertaken by the Army at its own initiative beginning on December 13, 1989. The analysis of alternative study was completed in October of 1993. Here is the specific finding of that study before it went to Forscam and the Military Traffic Management Command:

Fort Irwin does not have a reliable, full-time tactical airfield usable by fixed-wing, heavy-life, and wide-body aircraft. Long-term operation at McCarran is questionable. If this

project is not provided, air operations at the NTC will continue to be sub-standard. Limited Army funding will continue to be spent to bring troops overland from great distances, training time will be lost, and command and control will be difficult. The Barstow-Daggett alternative was found to be the most economically cost-efficient as calculated over the life of the project.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here now just a couple of years. The gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] and I came at the same time. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has the district next to mine. We both represent people from the desert. We understand the desert probably a little better than someone from across the country. We know what the road is like driving from Fort Irwin over to Edwards, and it is a dangerous road, and I think that this amendment should be defeated.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Nadler amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize the point that gentleman just made.

Up until this most recent rotation where troops came from Edwards to the training center, the troops were being sent by bus for 4½ hours from Las Vegas. To say the least, it was a long ways away from the way they should have come to arrive in a training setting, a war kind of setting.

Recently for a short time Edwards Air Force Base became an experiment as a temporary airhead, but the people who designated that temporary airhead have no idea what that road is really like. One-third of the distance, about 33 miles, is along a very, very dangerous two-lane highway. It is only some time when someone is going to rush around and run into one of those caravans of troops.

Mr. McKEON. Reclaiming my time, again, both of us coming from that area, we know when we talk about a two-lane road it is a little different out there than it is here. Two lane road there, it is up and down because of the flash flooding coming off the hills, and they have to leave low spots in the road, and so we get ups and downs, and I have had friends killed on that highway. I understand the danger there.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Exactly, and if the gentleman continues to yield, I must say that I can understand in part, I suppose, what the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] is saying, but, if he would ride that roadway, he would understand the difference. What we need to do is have a permanent facility where these troops can come and be in the training environment. Barstow-Daggett is the ideal location. It is the cheapest solution, short-term and long-term, without any question. This is the most important training center in the world, and a no vote on the

Nadler amendment indeed is in support of the National Training Center for the Army, and I encourage my colleagues to recognize just how critical this training center is to our national defense.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speaker from California and to say that I oppose the Nadler amendment and that I hope my colleagues will join in supporting the hard work of the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], and her subcommittee. Their decision with regard to this airstrip was based on the facts, and the facts are that the National Training Center is a major contributor to the national defense mission. The transport of our service men and women in and out of there is a very important component of their mission, and, if the Nadler amendment is adopted, instead of a convenient airstrip 37 miles away, however, far the distance, it will be a much farther distance that they will have to be transported.

So I will say the facts are with the committee on this decision. I hope that the Members of this body will support the chairwoman, support the committee, and vote no on the Nadler amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman. I rise today to voice my opposition to the amendment to strike funding for the expansion of Barstow-Daggett Airfield in San Bernardino County, CA.

The expansion of the runway of Barstow-Daggett Airfield is needed to accommodate aircraft that will bring in the thousands of Army troops that annually train at Fort Irwin in the California desert. Barstow-Daggett Airport is located only 30 miles from Fort Irwin. Since the closure of Norton Air Force Base in San Bernardino, the Army has not had a permanent site to fly in troops for transport to the Fort Irwin training area.

As we all know, desert training is more critical than ever for our Nation's troops. Without Barstow-Daggett Airport, our troops will lose valuable training time being transported by bus from more distant airfields.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons that I am persuaded to support this military construction project is that it has been authorized as part of the Defense Authorization Act for 2 straight years. I also understand that the Secretary of the Army supports the project. These facts persuade me that this project is worthwhile and has received the proper scrutiny and approval of the relevant authorizing committee, during times of both Democratic and Republican committee leadership.

For these reasons, I will support this project and vote against the amendment to strike the project's funding, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 100, noes 329, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—100

Andrews	Hinchev	Pastor
Baldacci	Hoekstra	Payne (NJ)
Barrett (WI)	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Becerra	Jacobs	Petri
Bentsen	Johnston	Ramstad
Bonior	Kanjorski	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (MA)	Reynolds
Cardin	Klug	Rivers
Christensen	LaFalce	Roukema
Clayton	Levin	Royce
Collins (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Collins (MI)	Lincoln	Sanders
Conyers	Lipinski	Schroeder
Cooley	Lofgren	Schumer
DeFazio	Lowey	Scott
Dellums	Luther	Sensenbrenner
Deutsch	Maloney	Skaggs
Dingell	Markey	Slaughter
Doggett	McKinney	Stark
Duncan	Meehan	Studds
Ehlers	Menendez	Thurman
Engel	Mfume	Torricelli
Eshoo	Miller (CA)	Tucker
Evans	Minge	Velazquez
Fattah	Mink	Ward
Fields (LA)	Moran	Waters
Filner	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Furse	Neal	Williams
Ganske	Neumann	Woolsey
Gephardt	Nussle	Wyden
Green	Obey	Yates
Gutierrez	Olver	Zimmer
Hastings (FL)	Orton	
Hilliard	Owens	

NOES—329

Abercrombie	Chapman	Flanagan
Ackerman	Chenoweth	Foglietta
Allard	Chrysler	Foley
Archer	Clay	Forbes
Armey	Clement	Ford
Bachus	Clinger	Fowler
Baesler	Clyburn	Fox
Baker (CA)	Coble	Frank (MA)
Baker (LA)	Coburn	Franks (CT)
Ballenger	Coleman	Franks (NJ)
Barcia	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Combust	Frisa
Barrett (NE)	Condit	Frost
Bartlett	Costello	Funderburk
Barton	Cox	Gallegly
Bass	Coyne	Gekas
Bateman	Cramer	Geren
Beilenson	Crane	Gibbons
Bereuter	Crapo	Gilchrest
Berman	Cremeans	Gillmor
Bevill	Cubin	Gilman
Bilbray	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Bilirakis	Danner	Goodlatte
Bishop	Davis	Goodling
Bliley	de la Garza	Gordon
Blute	Deal	Goss
Boehlert	DeLauro	Graham
Boehner	DeLay	Greenwood
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart	Gunderson
Bono	Dickey	Gutknecht
Borski	Dicks	Hall (OH)
Boucher	Dixon	Hall (TX)
Brewster	Dooley	Hamilton
Browder	Doolittle	Hancock
Brown (CA)	Dornan	Hansen
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Harman
Brownback	Dreier	Hastert
Bryant (TN)	Dunn	Hastings (WA)
Bryant (TX)	Durbin	Hayes
Bunn	Edwards	Hayworth
Bunning	Ehrlich	Hefley
Burr	Emerson	Hefner
Burton	English	Heineman
Buyer	Ensign	Herger
Callahan	Everett	Hilleary
Calvert	Ewing	Hobson
Camp	Farr	Hoke
Canady	Fawell	Holden
Castle	Fazio	Horn
Chabot	Fields (TX)	Hostettler
Chambliss	Flake	Houghton

Hoyer	Mica	Shuster
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Sisisky
Hutchinson	Mineta	Skeen
Hyde	Molinaro	Skelton
Inglis	Mollohan	Smith (MI)
Istook	Montgomery	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (CT)	Moorhead	Smith (TX)
Johnson (SD)	Morella	Smith (WA)
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Solomon
Johnson, Sam	Myers	Souder
Jones	Myrick	Spence
Kaptur	Nethercutt	Spratt
Kasich	Ney	Stearns
Kelly	Norwood	Stenholm
Kennedy (RI)	Oberstar	Stockman
Kennelly	Ortiz	Stokes
Kildee	Oxley	Stump
Kim	Packard	Stupak
King	Pallone	Talent
Kingston	Parker	Tanner
Klecza	Paxon	Tate
Klink	Payne (VA)	Tauzin
Knollenberg	Peterson (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Kolbe	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (NC)
LaHood	Pickett	Tejeda
Lantos	Pombo	Thomas
Largent	Pomeroy	Thompson
Latham	Porter	Thornberry
LaTourette	Portman	Thornton
Laughlin	Poshard	Tiahrt
Lazio	Pryce	Torkildsen
Leach	Quillen	Torres
Lewis (CA)	Quinn	Towns
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Traficant
Lightfoot	Rahall	Upton
Linder	Reed	Vento
Livingston	Regula	Visclosky
LoBiondo	Richardson	Volkmer
Longley	Riggs	Vucanovich
Lucas	Roberts	Waldholtz
Manton	Roemer	Walker
Manzullo	Rogers	Walsh
Martinez	Rohrabacher	Wamp
Martini	Ros-Lehtinen	Watts (OK)
Mascara	Roth	Waxman
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Weldon (FL)
McCarthy	Sabo	Weldon (PA)
McDade	Salmon	Weller
McDermott	Sanford	White
McHale	Sawyer	Whitfield
McHugh	Saxton	Wicker
McInnis	Scarborough	Wilson
McIntosh	Schaefer	Wise
McKeon	Schiff	Wolf
McNulty	Seastrand	Wynn
Meek	Serrano	Young (AK)
Metcalf	Shadegg	Young (FL)
Meyers	Shaw	Zeliff
	Shays	

NOT VOTING—5

Gejdenson	McCollum	Rose
Jefferson	Moakley	

□ 1438

Mrs. CHENOWETH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Messrs. BRYANT of Texas, COBLE, WHITFIELD, BARCIA, TOWNS, McDERMOTT, and SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. PELOSI, Messrs. MFUME, WATTS of North Carolina, PETRI, ORTON, NEAL of Massachusetts, SCOTT, and DELLUMS, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the

purposes of this appropriation, \$588,243,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$66,184,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROYCE: Page 3, line 3, strike "\$588,243,000" and insert "\$571,843,000".

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment targets two construction projects which were not requested by the Pentagon but were added on by the committee. The first item spends \$6 million to repair a foundry at a shipyard which Congress voted to close in the 1991 base closing round.

Why are we upgrading this foundry and this propeller shop when the Navy has not made a request? If the hope is that the Pentagon will keep this one foundry at the yard open for the long haul, does it not make sense to, at least, wait to see if the DOD makes a request before approving a \$6 million upgrade? This sets a bad precedent for all base closures past and future and opens up a Pandora's box for Congress. So let us take it out of the bill.

Let me repeat one point: DOD has confirmed that this is not in the future years' defense plan from 1996 to 2001.

The second item also not requested spends \$10.4 million for a new gymnasium at a base which already has a gym. The Puget Sound Naval Shipyard has racquetball. It has a gym with Nautilus equipment and free weights. It has basketball courts, volleyball, tennis courts, three softball fields.

We are going to spend here \$10.4 million for a facility which will add badminton, squash, aerobics, and paddleball when there are already 10 private gyms within 5 miles of the base?

I can only tell my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that with a base at Bangor Submarine Base 15 miles away with a gym, a gym free to all Active duty personnel, maybe we should buy a bus if there is overflow. But there is no evidence that there is overflow at the existing gym. There is a YMCA less than a mile away. Maybe we should look at contracting out for the overflow. But again, we have no evidence of it. This is \$10.5 million that could be spent for more urgent projects.

Mr. Chairman, there are many supporters of a strong national defense in this House, defense hawks, and I am one. But many of you are also deficit hawks here. And these projects are not needed. They will not add to our national security. They were not requested. In fact, the overall \$500 million added by the committee comes on

top of \$500 million added last year but not requested last year, and the total bill is now \$2.4 billion more than the 1995 appropriation.

This is an ominous trend, colleagues. The Department of Defense already has a \$1 billion backlog in deferred maintenance. We should not be spending money on unrequested projects. So join with the Pork Busters, the National Taxpayers Union, the Business Executives for National Security, Citizens Against Government Waste and Citizens for a Sound Economy in supporting this amendment. This is the first test of an appropriations bill on the floor this year. Let us not fail that test. Let us vote to try to reduce this spending and move towards a balanced budget.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am curious why out of all projects included in this bill, the gentleman chose these two. I would guess he thinks the mandated physical fitness and recreational activities of 12,500 naval personnel is of no importance. Because when the committee asked the Navy if this project was mission essential or critical in this fiscal year the Navy's response was yes—that it was essential to provide for quality of life and physical fitness of service members.

And, I would like to take this opportunity to tell the gentleman that our subcommittee held 14 hearings this year and our major focus was on "what is quality of life?" When asked, Sergeant Major Kidd of the Army told the committee that it was "a good place to work, a good place to train, a good place to live, and a good place to have recreation."

Does the gentleman oppose our naval personnel being well fit to serve this country when called?

And does the gentleman not believe it is essential that the individuals working in the foundry in Philadelphia—which is to remain active after the yard's scheduled closure—should be threatened by the many environmental, safety, and health problems associated with the facilities deficiencies? When the committee asked the Navy their answer was, absolutely not. That the combined serious deficiencies in industrial ventilation, lighting, stress relieving ovens, and weight handling equipment greatly increase the chances of a catastrophic accident and personal injury. And, on top of that a recent inspection revealed the foundry is in immediate jeopardy of being cited by EPA and OSHA.

Mr. Chairman, why these two projects have been targeted, I do not understand. I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

□ 1445

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear that I think this bill contains far too much spending. I intend to vote

against the bill, because it is far in excess of the President's request, as well as last year's budget. However, I think the attack on this particular facility at Bremerton is unfair.

In this bill, there are an awful lot of items which are labeled "quality of life." Unfortunately, many of those items are targeted to improve the life of people who already have a pretty high quality of life. That is why I support most of the amendments that are going to be made to cut this bill. That is why I support the Neumann-Furse amendment, for instance, which tries to strike construction for units costing more than \$200,000 each.

However, this proposal, in my view, strikes at the needs of the people in the services who most need our help. As I understand the situation, there are over 12,000 seamen who are located in this facility in Washington. Many of them live on board ship for at least 6 months at a time. They live in very cramped quarters, and when they do get to shore, they need some recreational opportunities.

As my staff has been able to determine, the recreational opportunities for the enlisted people at the lower pay grades are far less than what they need, given the demands put on them in that area.

Therefore, it seems to me that if we are going to go after projects in this bill, we ought to go after projects for the most comfortable, not for the most uncomfortable, not for the enlisted guy at the bottom of the totem pole who very seldom gets very much attention paid to his or her needs.

Mr. Chairman, I would also simply ask why it is that these two projects have been especially singled out by the sponsor of the amendment. I would point out that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], who is offering the amendment, wrote the committee last year requesting funding for two projects at the Los Alamedos Reserve Center totaling \$11.9 million.

The committee, which was then under my chairmanship, with the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] as well as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] on the subcommittee in the two lead spots, approved \$4.2 million to provide for a new logistics facility for him. I wonder if the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] recalls this committee's favorable response to his request to meet a special need in his district at that time?

Mr. Chairman, I do not mind the gentleman going after projects unneeded. I am going to vote against plenty of them myself this afternoon. As I said, I am going to vote against this entire bill because it is far too high. However, in this instance, I find going after the project, especially in Washington, to be especially quaint, given the needs of the enlisted people in that area. I think we ought to turn this amendment down, in the interests of fairness.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, as a point, I had a letter last year from the author of this current amendment for two projects. The gentleman made the point that these projects were not requested by the administration, they were not requested by the Pentagon.

We have two projects here that the gentleman requested last year that were not requested by anybody. We funded the projects, because we felt the gentleman knew what was good for his district, and something that was needed for the people in his district.

It seems to me it is a little bit unusual for the taxpayers, Citizens Against Government Waste, to go through all this bill and find two projects, find two projects in the Navy, that were worthy of having the gentleman's sponsorship of these amendments. I strongly oppose these amendments.

I think it is ridiculous that we would even be discussing them here on the floor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply close by saying that I think we owe more to those 12,000 seamen in this case than to simply tell them that when they come on shore from their ship, that they ought to use the Y.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Minge-Royce amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a case of mistaken identity colleagues. The propeller shop at the site of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard is open and its working men and women are busy today providing for the defense of our Nation. They perform some of the most sensitive and important work in developing finely manufactured propellers for submarines and surface combatants.

The Philadelphia Naval Shipyard was ordered closed by the Base Closure Commission. We, in Philadelphia, accept that, though we continue to believe it was the wrong decision.

We are working to convert the yard to become a commercial shipyard. Two companies—one, an international shipbuilder and another a respected U.S. ship overhauling firm—are deeply interested in creating at least 4,000 new jobs at the yard.

But the propeller shop at the Navy yard was never part of the order to close.

Manufacturing propellers for carriers, subs and other Navy vessels is a vital endeavor. The Navy must maintain that capacity.

This winter, I wrote to the Navy concerned about rumors that it was considering moves to sell off the propeller shop and foundry.

Not true, said Assistant Navy Secretary Pirie. He said, "We share your view that the propeller shop and foundry are required to support our operational forces in the future. Thus, we did not recommend their closure."

Based on that continued commitment by the Navy, I worked with the Navy to develop this project to renovate the propeller facility.

This project was authorized in the bill we passed, just last week. The Navy has already completed the 35 percent design for the bulk of this project. That is the threshold requirement demanded by our subcommittee as well as by the National Security Committee. Our subcommittee has confirmed this with the Navy. Thus, the argument that this is not wanted by the Navy is wrong.

This project would construct new stress relieving ovens to insure the structural integrity of modern propellers. In addition, the project would improve worker safety by meeting OSHA requirements. This is dangerous work. Maybe that is not something that the porkbusters are interested about. I have a list of at least 26 workers who have sustained injuries at the prop shop. A pattern maker and a molder who had molten metal splash in their eye. A rigger who was stuck by metal pieces. How can they call protecting workers from serious injury pork?

In this case, the porkbusters have, again, identified the wrong man, at the wrong time, at the wrong place. Do they want to give up our edge in the sensitive technology of developing and manufacturing propellers to the Japanese and Europe? That is what they would do by not investing the money to keep this facility—which is an open facility—state of the art.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. It defies the intent of this Congress of maintaining our national security.

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will include for the RECORD a letter from Cheryl Kandarar of the Navy to the honorable chairman of the subcommittee which says that this shop and foundry "provide essential services to the fleet, much of which is classified and cannot be supported by another source." This letter is dated June 20, 1995.

For any Member of this body to stay on the floor and infer that somehow the Navy is considering closing this is certainly shortsighted at best, and beyond that, just trying to demagogue on an issue where we have done a good job in removing those items from defense spending that are clearly not wanted by the military.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, June 20, 1995.

Hon. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH,
Chairman, Military Construction Subcommittee,
House Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request for information re-

garding Navy's plans for facilities that remain open after implementation of BRAC actions at Naval Shipyard Philadelphia.

The Propeller Shop and Foundry will remain open to support our operational forces for the foreseeable future. These facilities provide essential services to the fleet, much of which is classified, and can not be supported by another source. Accordingly, they were not recommended for closure to the 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

As always, if I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

CHERYL KANDARAS,
Principal Deputy.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have to take a back seat to anybody for coming down here time and time again with amendments to strike things that I think are pork in appropriation bills, and we will do it some more, probably.

That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, that, as I assumed the chairmanship of the authorization committee for Milcon, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and I worked very, very carefully together to systematically make sure that we had very strict criteria, because we know these particular bills are bills that are subject to pork enough. We did not want that to happen. We wanted to make sure that did not happen. We were very careful to do that.

The bill that we produced and that we passed here last week and the bill that we are considering today, are mirror images of each other. There is nothing in this bill that we are considering today that was not authorized in the bill last week.

Mr. Chairman, on these two projects we are talking about, I think the gentlemen that have spoken before me have made the case pretty well that the propeller shop is something that is absolutely crucial. It is the only facility of its kind that we have in the United States. Yes, it was not requested this time because this is a phase 3 project. This is the third phase of three phases of a project, and it is a very crucial project.

As for the physical fitness facility out in Washington, there was a great case made for that physical facility out there. Mr. Chairman, these things, even though they were not requested this year, they were on the priority list.

I would like to note that I also have the request from last year of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], and not only were these not requested last year, but they were not on anybody's priority list last year, and yet the gentleman from California felt they were very important. They may have been very important. I have not looked into it to see if they were or not. However, the ones we did, they had to be on a priority list or they did not get funded. These were on the priority list.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members to vote "no" on the Royce amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA], and my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON]. This is an example of diligent research that has reached the wrong conclusion.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I am one who has, in fact, voted against and worked against projects that bring money to my own State and to my own district. I will take a back seat to no one in standing in opposition to the expenditure of funds that I think are unnecessary.

I think I understand what happened in the offering of this amendment. There was a review of the military construction appropriation bills, and someone looked at this and quite plausibly drew the conclusion that here is a project that is not wanted by the Navy, that is going to be located in a base that is going to be closed under the 1991 BRACC decision.

Both of those two assumptions are wrong. No. 1, this project is wanted by the Navy. Believe me, the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard is no friend of the Navy brass. We have been involved in litigation all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, in which I was a plaintiff and many of our colleagues here were plaintiffs, fighting tooth and nail the Navy's recommendation and decision to close the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

In 1991, when that recommendation was made, the Navy expressly and specifically excluded the propeller shop and all of the things that serve the propeller shop. They looked at the whole base. We think they made the wrong decision about the whole base, but we certainly agree they made the right decision about preserving this from the 1991 decision.

The Navy has drawn the conclusion, as we have heard the authorizer say, the appropriators say, the Navy has reached the decision that this infrastructure is essential to the maintenance of the fleet. The Navy wants the project.

No. 2 is the assumption that this is pouring Federal tax dollars into a base that is on the base closure list. It is true that the naval shipyard is on the base closure list. It is true that the naval base is on the base closure list. It is not true that the propeller shop is on the base closure list.

Mr. Chairman, what was diligent work to look at this I think, respectfully, became the wrong conclusion. This is not a project that has been rejected by the Navy, it is not a project that is on a closed base, it is an ongoing project that has been reported by the Navy. I think it is worthy of the

recommendation that the Committee on Appropriations has made.

Mr. Chairman, I say this one more time. I know it is the practice of people to come to the floor and be against expenditure of funds in everyone's district except their own. That is a time-honored practice here. I have gone on record with my vote and my voice in my efforts to oppose some expenditure of dollars in and around my district. I would be happy to supplement the RECORD here with a list of times I have done that. I am not so foolish to actually say it on the floor, but I would be happy to supplement the RECORD with a list.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I would urge all of my colleagues who are concerned, as we all are, about the size of the Federal Government not to make the wrong decision here and support this amendment. They should oppose the amendment being offered.

□ 1500

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, one of the responsibilities that we in the Congress have is to take the recommendations of the administration and then act to authorize and appropriate various levels of dollars. That is our fundamental responsibility.

If the sponsor of this amendment thinks that we should not fund anything except what the administration asks for, then in fact this year he will be opposing \$9.7 billion of items that this Congress added in to defense spending, both in the bill that we passed last year and in the MILCON bill that we are about to act on today.

What I find a little bit disingenuous here is that the gentleman who offered this amendment last week voted in favor of the B-2 bomber, which I happen to oppose, by the way, despite the support of my party. He voted in favor of a \$533 million add-on that the administration did not request. If you are going to be consistent, be consistent across the board.

In addition, my good friend and colleague came into my office on May 23 at 4 in the afternoon bringing in some constituents from California, and asked me as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development to put in \$34 million this year for the DAGGRS program, which would cost \$25 million next year, \$25 million in 1998 and \$50 million in 1999. So here is a gentleman offering an amendment to eliminate \$16 million that has been authorized and is about to be appropriated, when he himself came into my office and said,

Well, Mr. Chairman, this hasn't been approved yet, and it's not been requested by the Pentagon, but could you see your way fit to put \$34 million in this year's bill because it will really help me out back in my district.

Mr. Chairman, I have a problem with that. I have a problem with Members of

Congress who want to have two standards. I have fought long and hard as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development to take out items that were not justified by the military. That is not the case here.

Anyone who works with our Navy knows that the advantage of our Navy over the former Soviet fleet and Russian fleet is our quietness, the ability to go through the oceans of the world and operate in a quiet manner. That is almost totally due to our propellers. Our propellers are only made in one shop, owned by the Government, in the entire country. That one shop, with a foundry, is in Philadelphia. As a matter of fact, the Russians have stolen the technology for our propeller operations, sold it to the Chinese, and are now competing with us in terms of quietness.

What we have on the floor today is an amendment that takes \$6 million away from improving that capability. This is not some pork project for some company. This is not some add-on. This is to improve a facility that today is costing American lives, in working to give our Navy the best technology available in terms of quite submarines and quiet ships.

Mr. Chairman, I have a real problem with this. I take a back seat to no one when it comes to budget cutting. I will invite our colleagues to my office to show them my "Golden Bulldogs" which I too take great pride in receiving from Citizens Against Government Waste and the other watchdog groups.

But we have to look beyond simplistic answers in trying to control spending. That is what this is. It is a simplistic notion that is not based on fact.

The Navy has stated on the record that this facility is vital for our national security interests. It is vital for our Navy and our submarines to be the quietest in the world. This \$6 million item is to improve the safety of those workers who work at that shipyard facility. It has nothing to do with base closing.

The Philadelphia Navy Shipyard and the Philadelphia Naval Base, as my colleague said earlier, is in fact closing this September. But the Navy has never recommended closing the propeller shop because it is the only Government-owned and operated facility of its kind in the entire country.

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage our colleagues to stand up and do the right thing here and to vote against this amendment because it is wrongheaded. It is not in the best interests of our country, it is not in the best interests of our Navy.

And if we want to be consistent, perhaps I would ask the authors if they are going to stand up and oppose all \$9.7 billion that this Congress last week put in, above and beyond what President Clinton's administration requested for defense spending. Because if you are going to be consistent, then that is exactly what you should do, and

that is not in fact what the responsibility of this body and the other body is.

Our responsibility is to take the recommendations, the requests of the administration, to hold hearings and to finally act on those. In this case, we have projects that the administration says are warranted but just those that were not originally requested.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment and to vote "yes" for what is important, as determined by the distinguished chairwoman of this subcommittee and the ranking member of this subcommittee, who have both done such an admirable job with the minimal amount of defense dollars that we have available to spend in this fiscal year.

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

Mr. Chairman, to me this is an amendment that just cannot be defended. It is my understanding that this is the only place that we make these propellers anywhere in the United States. What are we going to do if we do not have this facility? Where are we going to get them, from China or the Russians who stole our technology?

To me this just borders on being ridiculous. It is very easy to come in here and talk about, let us make some cuts here, Did it ever occur to you that it just might be possible that the Citizens Against Government Waste do not know what they are talking about when they target and say this is a good project to cut?

We are talking about quality of life. I have been on this committee for many, many years and we have fought for quality of life for our men and women in the services for all these years. The gymnasium that we are talking about, this is a quality of life.

This helps us with retention. This helps us with morale for our men and women, and especially our sailors that go out and spend so much time on submarines and aircraft carriers. When they come in, they don't need to be having to go join up with a temporary membership in the Y or go to some public playground. These are things that are vital to the quality of life for our men and women in the service.

It seems to me that this is something that is totally out of place. On the one hand we are looking at closing a facility that Bragg did not say you are going to close. This is a facility that makes something that is vital to the defense of this country. On the other hand, you are talking about a facility that is vital for the morale and for the retention of the people in our Armed Forces.

Ladies and gentlemen, you folks that are not here to listen to this debate, I hope wherever you are that you will come and you will soundly, soundly defeat this amendment, because in my view this committee has done an admirable job, not only on this bill but over the years. We have had a committee that is so bipartisan doing the things

that we think are best for this great country.

This is one committee, to my knowledge since I have been in the Congress, we have not appeared one time that I know of in the *National Enquirer*, any of the tabloids or any of the exposé programs on television. This is a committee that has worked in a bipartisan way to try to accommodate Members for the betterment of the men and women in the service and do the things that are best for the defense of this great country of ours. I would urge a strong, overwhelming, majority vote against this ludicrous amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think that the time has come when we should recognize really what is the issue that we will be voting on shortly. The issue is not whether a propeller shop should be maintained or improved. The issue is not whether we should have improved recreation facilities. The issue is whether the funds should be appropriated in the summer of 1995 to do that. What I would like to do is take the time available to me to outline why it is that the Pork Busters are submitting that this is not the time to appropriate these funds.

The Pork Busters Coalition recently adopted a 5-point military construction criteria. These are taken from the 1995 defense authorization bill, fiscal year 1995, which was passed in 1994.

Using this objective 5-point test, we found that there were several add-on projects, but these were two of the more curious. Neither of the projects were requested by the Department of Defense and both fail, as I have indicated, the 5-point statutory test. My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] and I are offering these amendments to eliminate funding for these projects.

I would like to first look at the foundry. We are simply proposing that \$6 million be eliminated from the appropriations. We are not requesting that the Navy close the foundry. That is a mischaracterization of the amendment.

This foundry project is estimated by the appropriations and the authorizing committee to cost \$6 million. The fact of the matter is, the design work is only 15 percent complete, and even that 15 percent work indicates that is a \$6.8 million project. We face the prospect that there will be substantial overruns, and that this Congress will be asked time and again to authorize and appropriate yet more money. Let us wait until the design work is complete.

Going beyond that, the money is requested for an upgrade. The shipyard was approved for closing but the foundry, which is to survive, is the sole source of submarine propellers. We certainly recognize that.

But after the shipyard is to close, according to the Business Executives for National Security, this is to provide

surge production capability. Spending \$6 million before the Defense Department requests it to enhance surge capability, at a time when submarine production is hardly a growth industry, seems an expense of luxury that detracts from more pressing defense needs.

Going beyond that, the defenders of these projects have said they do not have the money to put into the projects unless they are approved this year. The fact of the matter is the Defense Department's future years defense program does not include these projects. According to the Business Executives for National Security, again, or BENS, these future years defense programs do not include this project at all.

What we ought to do is to wait until the Defense Department has its act together and has made the formal request to the committee.

I would like to turn briefly to the facility in Bremerton, WA. Neither the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] nor I are saying that the men and women that use that base should not have more recreation facilities. We are not here to pass judgment on that. We are not here to lower the morale of the men and women in our Armed Forces.

What we are simply saying is we have to make tough choices. If we have a year-by-year budget, and if the Defense Department and the administration are coming in with priority projects, let us honor those priorities. Let us work in that fashion.

This is perhaps an appropriate upgrade to the facilities for 1996 appropriations consideration. But as we add these in year by year in the authorizing and the appropriating committees, what do we find? We find that these projects are going predominantly to the districts of the Members on the committees. In fact, in terms of location by home districts, the Members gave themselves 52 percent of the projects and 53 percent of the cash that were needed for the unrequested construction efforts.

This, I think, is a telling reason why we should schedule these projects at a time when the Defense Department itself has requested that the projects be given priority.

In closing, I would urge that my colleagues join with the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] and myself and the pork busters in saying no to these projects in fiscal year 1996 appropriations.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

I am from Bremerton, WA. I was born about 250 yards from the current facility in the Puget Sound Naval Base Hospital. There are no recreational facilities within 1 hour's walk of the shipyard. We have 8,000 sailors in Bremer-

ton, with the *Nimitz* coming back in a few months with another 3,500.

It is so easy to get up here and to take on a project like this. I called the base commander and I asked him, I said, "Admiral Designate Yount, is this project required?" He said, "It is absolutely required." He said, "I don't have the facilities for these young men and women. We now have women on every one of these ships that is in Bremerton, seven ships, so we have to have new facilities for the women as well."

□ 1515

"And the pool here was built in 1922." I mean, it is absolute disaster. And this is one of those things where we have just got to try to do the right thing. We have got to, I think, support our committees. We have had people here from both the authorization and appropriations committee who looked at it.

I called the Naval Audit Service who had just been out there 2 weeks ago and I asked them, "You guys look at these things independently, right?" And they said, "Yes, for Secretary Perry, we look at them independently." And I said, "Is this physical training facility needed?" And they said, "Congressman, it was an embarrassment to look at this facility. It is needed." And I said, "Well, that is good enough for me."

I have seen it. It is in my community. There are no facilities that have been mentioned that have any space available for additional people. I just hope we can support our committee leadership. This is why we have a committee system here. Both the authorizing and appropriations committee support it. Let us vote down this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise this morning to strongly object to this amendment which would eliminate funding for a critical fitness facility center at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

This is unfortunately a cynical attempt by some of my colleagues to kill what is a legitimate program in an effort to gain some cheap, short-lived notoriety for being alleged budget cutters. This is outright demagoguery and I believe it is time to set the record straight on this matter. Let me begin by clearing up a couple of assertions being thrown around by the authors of this amendment.

First of all, the gentlemen offering this amendment have stated that the Navy has not identified this as a priority. Not true. The fitness facility is in fact budgeted and is included in the Navy's 5-year defense plan. Moreover, a recent study done by the Navy audit service which assesses the legitimacy of Navy MILCON projects has determined that this project is needed and that current facilities are woefully inadequate.

Another internal Navy document says that if the fitness facility is not constructed " * * * personnel will continue to be forced to use the extremely overcrowded facilities. Access to recreational activities will be greatly restricted producing a negative impact on the morale and physical conditioning of Navy personnel."

The chairwoman of the MILCON subcommittee has advised that additional money spent on MILCON beyond what was requested by the President be used for projects

that both improve the quality of life for Armed Forces personnel and that are supported and required by the Services. This project meets those two criteria.

So let me set the record straight in this regard by saying that the assertion that the Navy does not consider this project a priority, does not have it in their budget plan, or does not want it, is all patently false.

The second assertion made by the authors of this amendment is that this facility is not really needed because the sailors can go to one of four private fitness facilities in the surrounding area.

Here are the facts. There is not one fitness facility that is less than a 1 hour walk from the base. And of the fitness facilities in the area, only one—the Kitsap County Golf and Country Club—has no waiting list for those who wish to join. This may be fine for the officers stationed at the shipyard, but 85 percent of the young men and women stationed there are of enlisted rank. I would suggest to my colleagues that we cannot have it both ways. We cannot pay our enlisted men and women the paltry salaries that we do and at the same time expect them to finance a membership at the local country club.

Mr. Chairman, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard was designed and constructed to be just that, a shipyard. What exists today however, is more on the order of a homeport, with seven ships berthed in what had initially been a busy overhaul and repair yard up until 1987. Before then, the number of military personnel residing at the shipyard numbered less than 1,000. Since the assignment of the *Nimitz* carrier in 1987, the number of military personnel in the shipyard has risen to between 7,000–8,000. This number will continue to rise as the Puget Sound area accepts more and more personnel as a result of BRAC realignment.

Because of the intended mission of PSNS, there is simply not the kind of infrastructure on the base to accommodate anywhere near the number of personnel that exist there now. As such Mr. Chairman, I have done my best over the past couple of years to see to it that the sailors stationed there have access to adequate housing, medical, day care, and other quality of life facilities that Secretary Perry has deemed so critical to the readiness of our Armed Forces.

Access to fitness facilities is clearly something the Defense Department considers to be a high priority in order to ensure a desirable quality of life for our young men and women serving in the Armed Forces. Moreover, in addition to quality of life considerations, fitness is now a mission requirement for all navy personnel with each sailor required to pass a physical fitness test twice annually.

The current facility—built in 1942—does not even begin to meet the needs of the sailors in the shipyard. It is dilapidated and woefully inadequate in size to accommodate the 8,000 personnel stationed at PSNS. In fact, over 50 sailors are turned away from the facility each day because of space considerations.

In my judgment, this is no way to treat our young men and women serving their country. As we continue to ask those serving in the Armed Forces to do more with less, we must provide them with access to facilities that provide the best possible quality of life. That is what the military constructions subcommittee has attempted to do and I commend the gentlewoman for her efforts. Don't listen to those

who—for purely political purposes—would turn their backs on the quality of life of our soldiers and their families.

Vote with the MILCON mark and vote against the Minge-Royce amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 270, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—158

Allard	Gunderson	Paxon
Archer	Gutierrez	Peterson (MN)
Armey	Gutknecht	Petri
Ballenger	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Barcia	Hancock	Portman
Barr	Hastert	Poshard
Barrett (NE)	Hayworth	Pryce
Barrett (WI)	Herger	Quinn
Barton	Hinchey	Radanovich
Bass	Hobson	Ramstad
Boehner	Hoekstra	Regula
Brewster	Hoke	Reynolds
Browder	Horn	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Inglis	Roberts
Brownback	Istook	Rohrabacher
Bryant (TN)	Jacobs	Ros-Lehtinen
Bryant (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Roth
Bunn	Kasich	Roukema
Bunning	Kildee	Royce
Burr	Kim	Salmon
Camp	Kingston	Sanford
Chabot	Klecza	Schaefer
Chapman	Klug	Schiff
Christensen	Kolbe	Schroeder
Chrysler	LaHood	Schumer
Coburn	Largent	Seastrand
Collins (GA)	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Condit	LaTourette	Shadegg
Cooley	Laughlin	Shaw
Cox	Levin	Shays
Crane	Lewis (GA)	Smith (MI)
Creameans	Lincoln	Smith (WA)
Danner	Linder	Souder
Davis	Lipinski	Stearns
Deal	LoBiondo	Stockman
Deutsch	Luther	Stump
Doggett	Manzullo	Talent
Dooley	Martini	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	McCarthy	Thomas
Dornan	McDermott	Thornberry
Dreier	McInnis	Thurman
Duncan	Menendez	Tiahrt
Ehlers	Meyers	Torrice
Ewing	Miller (FL)	Torricelli
Fawell	Minge	Upton
Fields (TX)	Morella	Wamp
Foley	Myrick	Watt (NC)
Frank (MA)	Neal	Weller
Gallegly	Neumann	Williams
Ganske	Ney	Woolsey
Gillmor	Norwood	Wyden
Goodlatte	Nussle	Zeliff
Green	Parker	Zimmer

NOES—270

Abercrombie	Bevill	Buyer
Ackerman	Bilbray	Callahan
Andrews	Bilirakis	Calvert
Bachus	Bishop	Canady
Baesler	Bliley	Cardin
Baker (CA)	Blute	Castle
Baker (LA)	Boehlert	Chambliss
Baldacci	Bonilla	Chenoweth
Bartlett	Bonior	Clay
Bateman	Bono	Clayton
Becerra	Borski	Clement
Beilenson	Boucher	Clinger
Bentsen	Brown (CA)	Clyburn
Bereuter	Brown (FL)	Coble
Berman	Burton	Coleman

Collins (IL)	Hilliard	Payne (VA)
Collins (MI)	Holden	Pelosi
Combest	Hostettler	Peterson (FL)
Conyers	Houghton	Pickett
Costello	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Coyne	Hunter	Porter
Cramer	Hutchinson	Quillen
Crapo	Hyde	Rahall
Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Reed
de la Garza	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Riggs
DeLauro	Johnston	Roemer
DeLay	Jones	Rogers
Dellums	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Rush
Dickey	Kelly	Sabo
Dicks	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Dingell	Kennedy (RI)	Sawyer
Dixon	Kennelly	Saxton
Doyle	King	Scarborough
Dunn	Klink	Scott
Durbin	Knollenberg	Serrano
Edwards	LaFalce	Shuster
Ehrlich	Lantos	Siskys
Emerson	Lazio	Skaggs
Engel	Leach	Skeen
English	Lewis (CA)	Skelton
Ensign	Lewis (KY)	Slaughter
Eshoo	Lightfoot	Smith (NJ)
Evans	Livingston	Smith (TX)
Everett	Lofgren	Solomon
Farr	Longley	Spence
Fattah	Lowey	Spratt
Fazio	Lucas	Stark
Fields (LA)	Maloney	Stenholm
Filner	Manton	Stokes
Flake	Markey	Studds
Flanagan	Martinez	Stupak
Foglietta	Mascara	Tanner
Forbes	Matsui	Tate
Ford	McCollum	Tauzin
Fowler	McCrery	Taylor (MS)
Fox	McDade	Tejeda
Franks (CT)	McHale	Thompson
Franks (NJ)	McHugh	Thornton
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Torkildsen
Frisa	McKinney	Torres
Frost	McNulty	Towns
Funderburk	Meehan	Traficant
Furse	Meek	Tucker
Gejdenson	Metcalf	Velazquez
Gekas	Mfume	Vento
Gephardt	Mica	Vislosky
Geren	Miller (CA)	Volkmer
Gibbons	Mineta	Vucanovich
Gilchrest	Mink	Waldholtz
Gilman	Molinari	Walker
Gonzalez	Montgomery	Walsh
Goodling	Moorhead	Ward
Gordon	Murtha	Waters
Goss	Myers	Watts (OK)
Graham	Nadler	Waxman
Greenwood	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)
Hall (OH)	Oberstar	Weldon (FL)
Hamilton	Obey	White
Hansen	Olver	Whitfield
Harman	Ortiz	Wicker
Hastings (FL)	Orton	Wilson
Hastings (WA)	Owens	Wise
Hayes	Oxley	Wolf
Hefley	Packard	Wynn
Hefner	Pallone	Yates
Heineman	Pastor	Young (AK)
Hilleary	Payne (NJ)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Jefferson	Moakley	Moran
McIntosh	Mollohan	Rose

□ 1536

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McIntosh for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Messrs. OWENS, BUYERS, RUSH, BECERRA, COSTELLO, and MEEHAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. FOLEY, INGLIS of South Carolina, ZIMMER, ZELIFF, LEVIN, DOOLITTLE, and HERGER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HORN

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORN: Page 3, line 3, strike "\$588,243,000" and insert "\$489,093,000".

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, and that the time be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

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

There has been a lot of discussion about the need for better quality housing for those in the armed services, Mr. Chairman. We heard that Friday. We have heard that today. And those who have argued that are absolutely right.

This amendment involves cutting \$99 million \$150 thousand out of military construction. It is the spending proposed by the Navy to berth three nuclear aircraft carriers at North Island. Ultimately, that is going to cost the taxpayers of the United States \$1 billion.

Most of that money would be better sent on military housing. This spending duplicates facilities that already exist either at Alameda or Long Beach in California or Puget Sound in Washington.

The Navy has requested the \$99 million \$150 thousand for the first phase of this project in fiscal year 1996. The Navy has submitted several substantially different estimates for the total costs of this project. They submitted and had such confusion over the amount that even the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee questioned it. That is why on page 16 of the committee report, the members of the subcommittee noted that they have referred the matter to GAO and hope to resolve it in conference.

I say when the Navy has misled Members of this Chamber, misled its committees, misled GAO, that we should send them a signal that that type of behavior will not be tolerated by the House of Representatives.

The estimate that the Navy submitted to the House Military Construction Subcommittee is \$267.8 million. They submitted a much higher estimate once

the General Accounting Office, the major audit agent of Congress, got into it, \$546.1 million, and they have probably submitted a new estimate in their draft environmental impact statement which, unfortunately, I have not been able to get yet, but it has been filed.

□ 1545

One may question the ethics of submitting one set of cost estimates to the Military Construction Appropriation Subcommittee, another substantially different set of estimates to the Government Accounting Office. A difference of \$278.3 million is significant and raises the question of whether the Navy has used a valid data base or simply obtained their estimate out of thin air. Two admirals have told me privately that the total cost of homeporting two nuclear air carriers at North Island will ultimately be well in excess of \$1 billion. If an environmental suit is filed, and I believe one will be filed—and I want to include after my remarks, Mr. Chairman, a letter from a number of the environmentalists in San Diego, if that is appropriate—then this project will go nowhere for a year, or perhaps more than a year, and, as I say, we should not appropriate the money now.

We should not reward the misleading of the House of Representatives and its Members. The members of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, as I noted, found sufficient reason to question these estimates in their report, and that is why the subcommittee asked the General Accounting Office to conduct a further investigation. I believe that while that investigation is in order, the appropriate action is to strike the funds. That will get the Navy's attention, perhaps it will get the whole Pentagon's attention, because, as I talked to Members, I find similar behavior has come from some of the other services. Bad behavior should not be rewarded. If the Navy ever submits realistic and honest numbers, the House could always reinstate the funding.

So vote for the Horn-Minge-Royce amendment and send a message that this Congress cannot be lied to.

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

My colleagues, this is a fight between two communities on the surface, San Diego and Long Beach, but it is really a lot more than that for everybody here who has some interest in the integrity of the Base Closing Commission and that operation because we have been through this fight before. The gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] has his numbers, San Diego has their numbers, Alameda has their numbers, the Navy has their own analysis, but in the end the Base Closing Commission in which we vested a great deal of trust closed the Naval Station at Long Beach, and I have the report here, the report that over the 20-year period they are going to save about \$2 billion. The Naval Yard at Long Beach, which

is pending closure according to the recommendation for closure, will save the taxpayers an additional \$2 billion. So we are talking about \$4 billion in savings for the taxpayers.

Now the Navy made this decision to close Long Beach, and I am sorry, I feel for the gentleman, I think everybody that was involved in this situation in this program took some shots. We all took some body blows. We lost a naval training center to Illinois. We fought hard for it, Orlando fought hard for it, but with respect to the carriers, that Commission set down in a hard-nosed way and did evaluation of a number of areas. They did evaluation with respect to mission, and mission capability of the service was the most important thing. They said that having the aircraft replacement and repair yard right next to the carriers in San Diego was important because we have about 110 planes a year that have to be lifted by crane literally, damaged planes, off the carriers and repaired at the facility right there in North Island. They said the idea that we had the hospital at San Diego was good for families; that was important to them. They said that having the carrier training range right off San Diego, where cargo ships cannot go and impede naval operations, was important to have that colocation.

So, for all those reasons BRACC made a decision to close Long Beach.

I say to my colleagues, "Don't involve yourself in an amendment that opens up the BRACC process. That is bad news for this House. Let's keep that naval station at Long Beach closed, let's keep the naval hospital closed, and let's keep this thing on track."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have asked the Secretary of the Navy to reaffirm the decision to homeport the nuclear carriers at North Island and would like to share his response. He states many other things in this letter, but the most important thing he says:

The total estimated construction and dredging costs to enable NAS North Island to homeport up to three NIMITZ class carriers is \$268 million. This plan is completely on track to support the arrival of the first NIMITZ class carrier in August 1998. To stay on track, the approval of the Berthing Wharf and Controlled Industrial Facility projects in the FY 1996 budget is essential.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to my good colleague from San Diego. The gentleman has made a very interesting presentation. The only thing is it has nothing to do with this issue. This is not a BRACC [Base Realignment and Closure Commission] issue. The Navy says it is not a BRACC issue. Who did they say it to? They said

it to the Base Realignment and Closure Commission.

What this is is a spending issue, pure and simple. What this is is the honesty of the numbers. That is why the subcommittee has asked the Government Accounting Office to go after that. I asked them several months ago to go after it. What happened? They were stonewalled. I was stonewalled, the Comptroller General of the United States was stonewalled. They should have subpoenaed the report. They did not. They have to live with these people because, if they get too tough on them, they will not get the information the next time they are around, and it is nothing to do with BRACC. It has simply honesty of numbers, and I ask, "What do you tell the House of Representatives and its subcommittees as well as its Members?"

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a little time for myself, as much time as I may consume, and ask the gentleman to respond briefly. I ask, If this isn't a BRACC issue, and you've already closed the naval station at Long Beach, and the shipyard closure is pending, what are you going to do with these carriers if you send them back up to Long Beach?

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

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HORN. No. 1, all of the facilities that were at the naval station in essence are mothballed. They have not been disposed of yet. There is a wharf there, there is an officers club, there is housing, there is a fire department, and the industrial facilities. Now—

Mr. HUNTER. Reclaiming my time—reclaiming my time, and I would just conclude, the gentleman obviously is saying, You're going to have to build a naval base. You can't have 15,000 people; that's three carriers' worth, and their dependents, and not have a naval base.

So the gentleman is either going to have to reopen the Long Beach Naval Station—I say to the gentleman, You can't homeport these at the Dairy Queen; you're going to have to reopen the Long Beach Naval Station, or you're going to have to keep the shipyard open, and that's what your group, Save our Shipyards, is trying to do, and I commend them for it. It is very creative, but it is going to blow away the integrity of the BRACC process.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I would not normally involve myself in a dispute between two good friends, but in this case this is really all of our business.

I have here the base realignment closure report from 1991, and it says quite clearly, "Recommendation: Close

Naval Station Long Beach and transfer the ships—reassign ships to other specific fleet home ports," but what the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is trying to do here is defund the other homeport so there is no place for the ships to go so they stay in his homeport. That is pretty neat if it can be done, but I think it is the wrong thing to do.

Second, a four star general said to me recently, "Do us one favor. Don't make any changes in what BRACC has already done. People who wear the uniform deserve the right to have some stability in the force," and this would create, I believe, instability.

Third, let me make a point that, if we move this concept to the East Coast where I live, Philadelphia Shipyard has been closed, other east port shipyards are open. I ask, Why don't ROB ANDREWS, CURT WELDON, and TOM FOGLETTA and JIM SAXTON just get together and introduce a bill to defund them? That is not a logical way for us to proceed. So I oppose the amendment, and I ask others to join me.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I need to make a point here.

No. 1, no one is talking about reopening the Long Beach Naval Station. I said housing is there; in fact 27,000 houses exist in noncrime areas to house the people. San Diego is a couple of years behind in housing. But that is not the point. Those carriers could, A, stay at Alameda; B, go to Puget Sound; they could go to Long Beach; they could go to Pearl Harbor; they could go anywhere they want. What is at stake here is the amount of money to suddenly rebuild the facilities that are at Alameda, build the facilities that are at Puget Sound, build the facilities that were closed at Long Beach. That is what is at stake, and it is the honesty of the numbers that are at stake.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, Members, I would hope that we would resist this amendment. All carriers have to have some place to go. I say, If you are going to close, as the BRACC commission has recommended, Long Beach Naval Shipyard, then close Long Beach Naval Station. To defund the places to which those carriers have to be set on the Pacific Coast would, I think, represent bad policy, especially if its aim or underpinning of it is to undo legislatively the BRACC process.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from San Diego, CA [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, this facility is in my district. It also happens to be the Navy base where I was born. But let me just say that my colleague talks about this whole process. It is the whole process of the BRACC that says the most cost-effective way of defending our Nation was to take a certain strategy. It did not fit in with Long

Beach. I understand that, but I do have to call attention to my colleague from California that the co-called environmentalists that he referred to happened to be the same people who were litigating right now to stop us from treating sewage from a foreign country that is polluting this area, too.

So I say to my colleagues, "Please don't refer to these people as environmentalists. They think of themselves as that. This whole issue is one of those ugly little games that gets played, and I hope we don't allow certain pressure groups to get involved in that. I'm asking you to take a look at the fact that BRACC process came down, my district was hurt by the loss of the naval training facility, but it also, in that work, was saying that the consolidation of these facilities in one area will save the United States' people money, and I think that is a critical part about this when we talk about the dredging, the improvements and everything else that has gone on in San Diego. It will continue to do it regardless of this."

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

Let me just say in answer to my friend from San Diego that what we are talking about here is the fact that the station is not being reopened, the facilities are available on the west coast, and the billion dollar boondoggle that we will ultimately have in San Diego means not only that 70 percent of the Pacific surface fleet is there, but most of the carriers will be there, and what a wonderful target for terrorists, for other nations, whatever, and it just seems to me that the Navy ought to be rethinking its basic strategy anyhow. In addition, when we think of the earthquake fault and all the rest that they are going to have to build this on, I do not think the project will ever be done. But if Congress wants to spend that money on something other than military housing, I cannot prevent a majority from doing it.

I would just say we would more wisely spend the money on military housing throughout the world and throughout this country so that our sailors, our air personnel and our military would have decent housing while they serve their Nation.

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

□ 1600

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes 45 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the top gun.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I have operated out of all of these bases, and I resent, and I say I resent the gentleman from California establishing and saying that the Navy is pulling these figures out of the air. Evidently the GAO is wrong, the Navy is wrong, the Taxpayers Union is wrong, the committee is wrong, the Secretary of Defense is wrong, and even the President that asked for these

dollars is wrong. He sets himself up. Someone that has spent their life staying out of the military, now sets himself up as the sole executor of what is right for the Navy.

Well, it is flat wrong. You talk about billions of dollars. We save \$2 billion by closing Long Beach. You say it has nothing to do with that. Only a fool would believe that, to the gentleman of California. We saved not only billions of dollars there, when you send a sailor out to sea, which we have done since World War II, out of San Diego, we have three carriers ported there right now. You talk about environmentalists? Give me a break. We have carriers established there. We will in the future.

We need to take a look at what it takes to reduplicate. We have one of the most modern hospitals, base housing, 100 training facilities, all of the fire-fighting facilities. Why do you think they call it a megaport? That is Oceania should never have closed down, because it is the megaport on the east coast. Only a fool would want to change and deal with that. That is why every single committee, this committee and all the way down from the Secretary of the Navy and the President say this is a foolhardy amendment.

I take a look at what we have gone through in the past with looking at base closures. Every base closure has said, and this is the final one that says, "Long Beach needs to close." Why? Because their cost for repairing a ship is three times what it is at any other facility. It is gone. It is history. And yet I applaud the gentleman for trying to save it. He says this has nothing to do with that. It is absolutely wrong, and it is not the fact.

Let me quote from the 1993 base closure commission report. Substantial military construction is occurring at Everett, North Island to replace a portion of nuclear carrier berthing capacity that exists in Alameda. These MILCON projects are being accomplished separate from the base closure process ultimately result in the Navy's ability to home port aircraft carriers at a reduced cost.

Now, the gentleman wants to increase and incur \$2 billion from the closure of Long Beach. He also wants another \$4 or \$5 billion to duplicate all of these training facilities, hospitals and everything else. When he says he wants to save, that is a liberal's way of saying "I want to spend more money."

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman again tries to make an issue out of the BRACC process. The issue is exactly what the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations found. The numbers are soft. They cannot get a straight answer. So instead of taking the money out, they said "Well, we have referred it to GAO, let us work it out in conference."

I am saying based on my experience, when Members of this House are

stonewalled by the Navy, not given the accurate numbers, they sit on them until they finally feel they have to give some number, and that is exactly what has happened. I am saying the way you deal with that is not go advocating parochial pork in your district. You deal with it by saying "look, this project is going nowhere right now, once the lawsuits get done on the environment alone." Why not take the money out, get their attention, and let us get them serious, to submit the numbers to the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations that could be put in a supplemental, that could be put any number of places.

But the fact is what the gentleman says about the Long Beach Naval Shipyard is just dead wrong. All you have to do is look at which shipyard gave money back to the Treasury of the United States and the Navy over the last several years. The only one was the Long Beach Naval Shipyard.

Now, I do find it ironic, and I think the taxpayers will find it ironic, that suddenly it appears on the list of the Navy, when it has never been there before, ranked a strong third as a shipyard, with only Puget Sound and Norfolk ahead of it.

But that is not the issue. The issue is lousy numbers, misleading the Congress, misleading GAO. I think the only way you teach better behavior of spoiled little children is to take something away from them for a while.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has been refighting BRACC. For mission effectiveness, for the men and women in uniform, for the taxpayers saving \$4 billion under the base that has already been closed at Long Beach and the base to be closed at Long Beach, and for the integrity of the base closing process, vote against this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, again, this has nothing to do with BRACC. We have heard a lot of figures. All that happened before I was a Member of the House 2 years ago. That is the closing of the Long Beach naval station. No one can retrieve that. What we can do is make economies where we see them, and if we can get above the parochialism of all of our districts, we will say when have you three aircraft carriers that need to be berthed somewhere, look at Puget Sound, keep them at Alameda, put them in San Diego, put them in Long Beach. But when you do that, give the Congress some honest figures of what it is going to cost. And if you are closing a naval shipyard at Long Beach with one hand, and secretly opening enough of comparable facilities in San Diego with another, I would say the Navy is not coming before this body with clean hands.

I would ask the Congress to strike this money, just as the Subcommittee

on Military Construction Appropriations has already noted, they got lousy numbers out of the Navy, and they want to know what the story is. The difference is, they would like to know by conference;

I am saying let us get it out on the floor.

I include for the RECORD the following information:

June 19, 1995.

Chairman ALAN J. DIXON,
Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission, Arlington, VA.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DIXON: We read in the June 15, 1995 San Diego Union Tribune that issues related to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) regarding the CVN Homeporting in San Diego had been discussed by BRAC members. We are in the process of commenting on the DEIS and wanted to share with you some of our concerns regarding this document.

These concerns are shared by the undersigned organizations. It is our analysis that the DEIS is significantly deficient in a number of areas which are listed below and in the attachment. If the issues raised below are not fully resolved and corrected in the final DEIS, it is our belief that the DEIS will be in direct violation of NEPA.

The deficiencies in the DEIS are numerous and significant. For the sake of brevity, we have listed the major problematic areas below with more specific problems attached. Our complete comment letter will be available on June 26, 1995, the date of closure of public comment. We will be happy to send you the complete list of deficiencies and problems in more detail at that time.

Our concerns are as follows:

1. *Inadequate analysis of alternatives*

The DEIS lacks an adequate examination of alternatives and there are several that are possible. The Code of Federal Regulations states that agencies shall: "(a) Rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated.

(b) Devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits.

(c) Include reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.

There are a number of alternatives that are viable for the homeporting project. None of these were evaluated or even mentioned in the DEIS. This is a significant failing of this document.

A decisionmaker must explore alternatives sufficiently to "sharply define the issues and provide a clear basis for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public." 40 C.F.R. §1502.14. Because of the absence of a satisfactory evaluation of alternatives, the Navy has failed in its duty to foster informed decision-making and public participation in the NEPA process. This DEIS ignores reasonable, viable alternatives and therefore is inadequate.

2. *The DEIS does not examine the full impacts of the entire project*

The DEIS does not examine the impacts of 3 CVNs even though it stated, in a number of Navy documents and memos in our possession, that 3 CVNs will be homeported here. In addition, the number of and impacts from additional transient CVNs is not adequately discussed in the DEIS. The DEIS is inadequate in that all aspects of the proposed project are not analyzed. For example, the DEIS does not discuss the extent to which

support ships for the homeported CVN's will also be homeported in San Diego. NEPA requires that, [p]roposals or parts of proposals which are related to each other closely enough to be, in effect, a single course of action shall be evaluated in a single impact statement." 40 C.F.R. §1502.4(a). Thus, the EIS must analyze *all* impacts of the homeporting of three CVNs in San Diego, not just those associated with the first CVN.

3. DEIS lacks mitigation for environmental impacts of dredging

The DEIS cites the intent to dredge 9 million cubic yards of bay bottom. No mitigations are offered for the impacts of the dredging, attendant impacts on fish and wildlife and impacts on those who consume the fish. Council on Environmental Quality regulations require every EIS to include a discussion of means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts. 40 C.F.R. §1502.16(h). In fact, the adequacy of an EIS rests upon the completeness of the mitigation plan. *ONRC v. Marsh*, 832 F.2d 1489, 1493 (9th Cir. 1987).

Because the EIS lacks a detailed description of mitigation measures for the impacts of dredging and an analysis of their effectiveness, the Navy fails to meet its criteria obligation of fostering informed decision-making and informed public participation. *State of California v. Block*, 690 F.2d 753, 767 (9th Cir. 1982).

Thank you for your interest in the environmental process as it relates to the CVN Homeporting project.

Sincerely,

LAURA HUNTER,
San Diego Military
Toxics Campaign;

Z KRIPKE,
Physicians for Social
Responsibility;

ROY LATAS,
Chairperson, San
Diego County
Chapter Surfrider
Foundation;

CAROL JAHNKOW,
San Diego Peace Re-
source Center;

LORRAINE DEMI,
Committee Opposed
to Militarism and
the Draft;

JOSÉ BRAVO,
Southwest Network
for Economic and
Environmental
Justice.

ATTACHMENT #1 TO JUNE 16, 1995 LETTER TO CHAIRMAN DIXON OF THE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE COMMISSION

Additional issues and concerns that will be raised in the June 26, 1995 from the San Diego Military Toxics Campaign letter to the DEIS include:

DEIS does not address the cumulative effects of homeporting the 3 CVNs to the effects of the already homeported nuclear-powered submarines at Ballast Point.

DEIS does not adequately assess the transportation routes, holding areas, and ultimate

disposal of hazardous and radiological waste. Designations of ultimate disposal sites are not made nor are arrangements made for permanent storage on site.

DEIS grossly underestimates the effects of the presence of an active fault line in the construction area.

DEIS proposes an inadequately designed confined disposal facility for containing toxic material in a marine environment.

DEIS does not include Health Risk Assessments to assess the increases in cancer risk and acute and chronic health hazard indices from homeporting of any CVNs.

The emergency plan for a major reactor accident discussed in the EIS is completely unworkable, requiring barging of the carrier only at a certain high tides.

The current project description appears to allow sediment that failed toxicity screening tests to be placed on the beaches. There is a lack of adequate metals chemistry testing done on turning basin material intended for beach disposal.

DEIS does not accurately reflect and underestimates environmental justice issues.

The EIS lacks information on and mitigation for the introduction of the major amount of radiological work that will be conducted as part of the servicing of the nuclear carriers.

While citing alleged safety of nuclear-powered vessels, provides neither adequate data regarding performance records of naval nuclear reactors so that an independent evaluation may be made, nor sufficient information regarding the nature of the reactors and the types of radioactive nuclides that might be released in the event of an accident.

Project description fails to include channel widening requests from the San Diego Harbor Safety Committee even though the recommendations were made to improve safety with existing traffic in the Bay. The homeporting of 3 CVNs would increase risk and traffic in San Diego Bay.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Horn amendment to cut \$99 million in wasteful, duplicative spending for Navy facilities in San Diego that already exist in Long Beach, CA. This amendment is much more important than just saving \$99 million. The \$99 million is just the first year downpayment of what is going to be close to \$1 billion in spending before the Navy is through.

This is the key vote on saving taxpayers money. If this money is appropriated there will be hundreds of millions to follow; none of which is needed.

In addition to saving money the Horn amendment also saves the environment. At the appropriate time during debate in the House I will ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter signed by the Surfrider Foundation of San Diego County and five other organizations that raises critical questions about the environment effects of this proposed \$1 billion in construction.

At the very least I urge my colleagues to vote to delete these funds from this year's bill

to allow full consideration of the impact on the environment of these massive construction projects. Vote "yes" on the Horn amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 137, noes 294, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No 395]

AYES—137

Allard	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Andrews	Hayworth	Obey
Baesler	Hinchee	Orton
Barcia	Hoekstra	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Horn	Pastor
Becerra	Houghton	Payne (NJ)
Bereuter	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Berman	Jacobs	Petri
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Rangel
Camp	Kennedy (MA)	Reynolds
Chapman	Kennelly	Rivers
Clay	Kildee	Roemer
Clayton	Kim	Rohrabacher
Clinger	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (IL)	Kleczka	Roth
Collins (MI)	Klug	Roybal-Allard
Costello	LaHood	Royce
Coyne	Lantos	Rush
Danner	Lazio	Sanders
Davis	Leach	Schroeder
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
Dixon	Luther	Sensenbrenner
Dooley	Maloney	Serrano
Dornan	Manzullo	Shays
Duncan	Markey	Smith (MI)
Durbin	Martinez	Souder
Ehlers	Martini	Stark
Engel	McCarthy	Stokes
Eshoo	McCollum	Studds
Farr	McDermott	Tanner
Fawell	McKinney	Torres
Fazio	Meehan	Torricelli
Fields (LA)	Meek	Towns
Foley	Menendez	Tucker
Ford	Miller (CA)	Upton
Frank (MA)	Miller (FL)	Vento
Franks (NJ)	Mineta	Waters
Furse	Minge	Watt (NC)
Ganske	Mink	Waxman
Gonzalez	Moorhead	Williams
Gordon	Moran	Wise
Green	Morella	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Nadler	Wyden
Gutknecht	Neal	Yates
Harman	Nussle	

NOES—294

Abercrombie	Baker (LA)	Barton
Ackerman	Baldacci	Bass
Archer	Ballenger	Bateman
Armey	Barr	Beilenson
Bachus	Barrett (NE)	Bentsen
Baker (CA)	Bartlett	Bevill

Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop
 Bliley
 Blute
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bonior
 Bono
 Borski
 Boucher
 Brewster
 Browder
 Brown (CA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownback
 Bryant (TN)
 Bunn
 Bunning
 Burr
 Burton
 Buyer
 Callahan
 Calvert
 Canady
 Cardin
 Castle
 Chabot
 Chambliss
 Chenoweth
 Christensen
 Chrysler
 Clement
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Coburn
 Coleman
 Collins (GA)
 Combest
 Condit
 Conyers
 Cooley
 Cox
 Cramer
 Crane
 Crapo
 Creameans
 Cubin
 Cunningham
 de la Garza
 Deal
 DeFazio
 DeLauro
 DeLay
 Deutsch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dickey
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doolittle
 Doyle
 Dreier
 Dunn
 Edwards
 Ehrlich
 Emerson
 English
 Ensign
 Evans
 Everett
 Ewing
 Fattah
 Fields (TX)
 Filner
 Flake
 Flanagan
 Foglietta
 Forbes
 Fowler

Fox
 Franks (CT)
 Frelinghuysen
 Frisa
 Frost
 Funderburk
 Gallegly
 Gejdenson
 Gekas
 Gephardt
 Geren
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gilman
 Goodlatte
 Goodling
 Goss
 Graham
 Greenwood
 Gunderson
 Hall (OH)
 Hall (TX)
 Hamilton
 Hancock
 Hansen
 Hastert
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hefley
 Hefner
 Heineman
 Herger
 Hilleary
 Hilliard
 Hobson
 Hoke
 Holden
 Hostettler
 Hoyer
 Hunter
 Hutchinson
 Hyde
 Inglis
 Istook
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kasich
 Kelly
 Kennedy (RI)
 King
 Klink
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 LaFalce
 Largent
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Laughlin
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Lightfoot
 Lincoln
 Linder
 Lipinski
 Livingston
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren
 Longley
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Manton
 Mascara
 Matsui
 McCrery
 McDade

McHale
 McHugh
 McClinnis
 McIntosh
 McKeon
 McNulty
 Metcalf
 Meyers
 Mfume
 Mica
 Molinari
 Mollohan
 Montgomery
 Murtha
 Myers
 Myrick
 Nethercutt
 Neumann
 Ney
 Norwood
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Oxley
 Packard
 Pallone
 Parker
 Paxon
 Payne (VA)
 Peterson (FL)
 Peterson (MN)
 Pickett
 Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Portman
 Poshard
 Pryce
 Quillen
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Ramstad
 Reed
 Regula
 Richardson
 Riggs
 Roberts
 Rogers
 Rose
 Roukema
 Sabo
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Sawyer
 Saxton
 Scarborough
 Schaefer
 Schiff
 Scott
 Seastrand
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shuster
 Siskisky
 Skaggs
 Skee
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Solomon
 Spence
 Spratt
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Stockman
 Stump
 Stupak
 Talent
 Tate
 Tauzin

Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Tejeda
 Thomas
 Thompson
 Thornberry
 Thornton
 Thurman
 Tiahrt
 Torkildsen
 Traficant
 Velazquez
 Vislosky
 Volkmer
 Vucanovich
 Waldholtz
 Walker
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Ward
 Watts (OK)
 Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 White
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson
 Wolf
 Wynn
 Young (FL)
 Zeliff
 Zimmer

NOT VOTING—3

Jefferson Moakley Young (AK)

□ 1628

Messrs. FOGLIETTA, HILLIARD, and CHRISTENSEN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. ESHOO and Mr. MOORHEAD changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1630

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, \$578,841,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$49,021,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committee on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$728,332,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided*, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as he may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$68,837,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of

both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$72,537,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUTIERREZ

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gutierrez: On page 5, line 4, strike "\$72,537,000", and insert "\$69,914,000".

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes or less, and that the time be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to offer an amendment today that helps the American taxpayer get some relief.

My amendment is simple.

It saves the American taxpayer \$2.6 million by eliminating funding for construction of a new outdoor firing range for the National Guard in Tennessee.

Why is this project a perfect example of congressional pork?

Because an indoor firing range already exists at the very same site.

And because the Army National Guard did not request the funding.

And because the Department of Defense did not even request the funding.

In fact, no one in the Defense Department has argued that this project is essential for reasons of national security. They did not put it in their request.

This unneeded project is a congressional add-on.

Now, a congressional add-on doesn't mean that the 435 Members of this body are going to pass the hat and take up a collection of \$2.6 million among ourselves to fund this program.

A congressional add-on is a bureaucratic way of saying that a bunch of politicians are ignoring the military request, who say we do not need this facility, and are sticking the American taxpayer with a bill for almost 3 million bucks.

In fact the only thing this bill is adding on is adding on the fiscal irresponsibility of the U.S. Congress and the unfair burden to working Americans.

It is certainly not adding to our national security.

Let me repeat and make clear—this project was not in the Department of Defense budget request for military installations.

That means that the people who plan and manage our defense budget have made a clear decision—this project is not a priority.

It is not needed.

Now, people who defend this pork might say, "Well, construction has already begun—what's another 3 million to finish it?" Or, "The indoor firing range isn't exactly perfect—it doesn't precisely meet our needs."

Well, in the desperate budget situation our Nation is facing, we cannot always precisely meet our needs.

We need to make decisions about priorities.

We make them every day.

In fact, the majority in this house has decided we can't precisely meet our Nation's needs for more police officers on our streets, or more job-training programs for our workers, or more Head Start for our kids or protecting Medicare for our seniors.

But, they want to argue today, we can find \$3 million for a firing range the Defense Department doesn't want.

It is a question of priorities.

Today, let us listen to the priorities of the Department of Defense.

Their priorities are clear.

A brand new, outdoor firing range, in the same location where an indoor range already exists is not a priority to our Nation's military leaders. They made it clear in their budget request.

In fact, when we start tampering with the budget request of experts, we risk funding for programs that are in our Nation's vital national security interests.

A "yes" vote on this amendment simply says we are listening to the experts and standing up against pork. A "yes" vote says that we are listening to our constituents and putting the best interests of the American taxpayer first.

A "no" vote says that despite all the rhetoric, despite all the promises, despite the American voters' overwhelming desire to have us change business as usual inside the beltway—the pork is still sizzling.

Take the pork out of the frying pan today, please vote to support this important amendment.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT].

(Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Gutierrez amendment.

The defense bill we passed last week was a much needed first step toward restoring military readiness.

Nowhere is readiness more important than for the numerous State National Guards who serve this country.

The National Guard represents over half of America's military force.

I believe that the policies set forth by this Congress should certainly reflect the crucial importance of the National Guard for the security needs of this country.

But the Gutierrez amendment certainly does not reflect that belief, because it would eliminate a much needed training site located at Tullahoma, TN.

This amendment could effectively serve to damage and undermine the effectiveness and readiness of the Tennessee Army National Guard and the U.S. Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, the Tennessee National Guard, the U.S. military, and the millions of Americans who depend on both of them for protecting our interests at home and abroad need the training site at Tullahoma.

The Tullahoma facility certainly would serve a legitimate and strategic role for America's security interests. It would provide tough and realistic training conditions for our troops.

This facility would support the training of the 278th Armored Cavalry Regi-

ment—one of only 15 regiments which has been designated as an enhanced readiness brigade.

I might add that an enhanced readiness brigade is the highest level of readiness for deployment.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the Tullahoma site would serve to train the 196th Field Artillery Brigade—one of only two National Guard artillery brigades that served in the gulf war.

And it would be the training site for several other important troops and brigades as well.

Mr. Chairman, it is of vital importance that the soldiers of the Tennessee Army National Guard are provided with the proper training to allow them to carry out their mission.

When we turn to the Guard, it is with the understanding that they are properly trained and prepared to confront whatever the task at hand may be in a ready manner.

Mr. Chairman, to my fellow colleagues, I say let us not compromise military readiness and the security needs of America for the sake of politics.

Vote against the Gutierrez amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY].

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment lowers the appropriation in the Army National Guard portion of the bill from \$72,537,000 to \$69,914,000. This is clearly targeted at a vital project to maintain the readiness of the Army National Guard.

This portion of the military construction budget goes to a critical requirement for a modified record fire range. This project is a priority with the Army National Guard up and down the chain of command. This range will have a direct positive impact on readiness.

The National Guard has a proud tradition of service to the country. And I know I do not need to remind you of the important role the National Guard plays in our overall defense strategy. The soldiers of the National Guard must be trained to meet the mobilization mission for deployment in support of the U.S. Army. This range will assist in the readiness required to meet the individual, and collective, range training to meet the mobilization mission.

This site will support the training of the 278th Armored Cavalry Regiment,

one of only 15 scheduled for designation as an Enhanced Readiness Brigade, which is the highest readiness level for deployment. With the significant cut in force structure that has occurred in recent years, the capability and competence of the National Guard are more important than ever to maintain our edge.

The modified record fire range is not a glamour project. Ask anyone who has ever fired on one. It is a challenging, realistic battle training requirement. To put it plain and simple, it is the kind of training our soldiers need to fight and win wars. Please vote to support our Army National Guard and our Nation's military readiness by voting not on the Gutierrez amendment.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT].

I would ask the gentleman, what is the problem with the existing indoor firing range? How old is it and what is the problem? What is the justification, just for my information?

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

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, this is an outdoor training range that artillery can be used on that provides a realistic battlefield type situation. If we expect our citizens to be ready on a moment's notice to go to war, I think they deserve the same type of training that our citizens that are in the Armed Forces on active duty have, because they get this kind of training all the time.

I think it is just something that the men and women in the Guard and the Reserve, for that matter, deserve. From my participation in Desert Storm, I know this is the type of training we had.

Mr. HEFNER. My question, Mr. Chairman, is what is the status, and how old is the existing firing range. The firing range in Tullahoma, TN, is an indoor firing range, is that correct?

Mr. HILLEARY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, it is not adequate and will not provide the training. I am not sure how old it is, but it would not provide the type of training, as well as the type of readiness realistic training this would provide.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, how much territory will this new firing range take? How much property? Is it like 10, 20, 30 acres? The gentleman says they could use artillery. What artillery does the National Guard use?

Mr. HILLEARY. I am not exactly sure how many acres it would take, but it would not be that many, I do not believe.

Mr. HEFNER. The gentleman does not know how large an area this would encompass?

Mr. HILLEARY. No, sir, I do not.

Mr. HEFNER. Will it be constructed on existing property that belongs to the Tennessee State National Guard?

Mr. HILLEARY. It would be constructed on property already owned by the Department of Defense, yes, sir.

Mr. HEFNER. The Department of Defense?

Mr. HILLEARY. That is my understanding. That is correct, yes.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is, as the gentleman has indicated, an add on. It is an add on that was not requested by the President, but for crying out loud, we said in the Contract With America that the President is wrong in the level with which he wants to cut back the defense of this country, and that we were going to make some changes in that. We tried to make some changes, both in the authorization bill and now in the appropriation bill, to correct some of the things.

Yes, some of the things that are in here are not things the President requested, but of the add ons, over 70 percent of them are things just like Members see here, foundations in family housing being held up by jacks, and screens and doors coming off of windows. Over 70 percent are those kinds of things.

Mr. Chairman, if it was something that are not a quality of life or housing type of thing, we had to be absolutely, thoroughly convinced it was meaningful and significant, and that they could do it and it was on their list of high priorities, even though they did not ask it.

This was one of those projects. It was on their list of priorities. They had not requested it because they simply were not allowed by the orders they had from above to request everything on

their priority list, but it was on their list of priorities. They convinced us that it is something that they very badly needed for readiness, and we supported it and felt very good about supporting it.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members to vote against this amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and I reserve the right to close.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anybody is discussing the importance of the National Guard. I do not think that anybody can truthfully argue that the military preparedness of the Nation is on the line because of a firing range. We did take out a *Sea Wolf* submarine. I do not know about military preparedness and the defense of our Nation, a firing range in Tennessee and *Sea Wolf* submarine. I think I want the *Sea Wolf* submarine defending me if we are going to start looking at priorities in terms of this Nation and its defense.

Let me just reiterate, and I do not want to get into an argument about the President, it is always easy to bring him into a debate and the argument, it is as though all of our military staff, the generals, the Colonels, all of those people who give everything they can in defense of this Nation, just put their hands up in the air and said "The President did not allow us to include this essential piece of military preparedness, so we are just going to follow what he says, in spite of what is good for our troops."

Just a bunch of weaklings we have in our military is what we are supposed to believe, if that argument is supposed to be true. I do not believe that about the military in this Nation. I think if they thought this was an issue that was important, they would have included it there. I think it speaks less of them to think anything else of the military leadership of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, Members say it is a priority, but the fact is if it was such a priority, I just return, why did they not request the funding for this priority? We all can argue about priorities all day long. However, the priorities should have come from the Department of Defense, and they have already said it-is not a priority.

I look at page 22 of the military construction appropriations bill of 1996,

and it seems as though there were a lot of priorities in a lot of different districts.

□ 1645

It says Component, Army National Guard, the request was for \$18,480,000. Well, someone found a whole bunch of more priorities, all the way to \$72,537,000. That is a \$54 million jump in priorities.

I just think that we have to look at what our priorities are. It was not requested. The fact remains that there is an indoor facility right there at that National Guard where they can get trained. The money was not asked for. I think the reason a lot of people do not even know where the land is, where all of the stuff is at, is because it was put in late in the process.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close. If the gentleman has anything further, he should use his time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, let me just say, we all have priorities. If we want to talk about cuts, we have seen the kind of draconian cuts that we have had here in this Congress that are going to cause pain. Not educating the child is going to cause pain in the Head Start Program, a 3-year-old child. Cutting out a WIC program is going to cause pain. A senior citizen who may not be able to get proper medical attention because you increased their deductible under a Medicare reform program and cuts in Medicare are going to cause pain.

I think what we have to do is look at this pain and say to ourselves, let's look at that compared to the \$2.6 million that is here. The fact is, it is not a priority. The fact is, that we cut and have cut here in this Congress.

I think that the American taxpayers deserve \$2.6 million. It was not asked for by the military. They did not say it was a priority. Someone added it on. Unless we are going to pass the hat in this place and the 435 Members are going to pony up for the \$2.6 million, then let's give the taxpayers a little bit of relief.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say I am a little surprised that the gentleman does not seem to understand the chain of command in the military. It is not because they are sniveling cowards or they are not courageous. They fight like crazy for what they think is important over there inside the building. But they have bosses all the way up to the President of the United States.

If the President of the United States says this is the level and it does not come out of the building, then they cannot request it, even if it is a high priority. It has to do with the chain of command.

That is why you get these kinds of situations, high priorities, not requested, because they have limitations put on them by the boss.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, is recognized for closure.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This project for the Army National Guard will provide a standard 10-lane record firing range, designed for individual weapons proficiency and qualification. Currently there is no such range in the State of Tennessee to support the pre-mobilization training and annual individual weapons qualification requirements for 14,340 soldiers.

Without this project, day-to-day training objectives will be delayed, and this will increase the time that is required to meet basic qualifications when Guardsmen are called to active duty.

The committee has been notified that this project has project has been submitted within the Department on three separate occasions, only to be deferred due to budget constraint.

I know of no project that is more basic to the readiness of the Army National Guard than a project to provide for firing individual weapons at targets comparable to battlefield ranges, and to develop speed and accuracy in target engagement in a realistic environment.

The Army National Guard reports that this project is mission-essential, that it is 65-percent designed, that the estimate contract award date is May of 1996, and that construction can begin in fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good project and it deserves our support.

I ask for your vote against this amendment.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 216, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—214

Abercrombie	Barcia	Berman
Ackerman	Barrett (WI)	Boehlert
Allard	Barton	Bonior
Andrews	Bass	Borski
Baessler	Becerra	Browder
Baldacci	Beilenson	Brown (CA)
Ballenger	Bentsen	Brown (FL)

Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Brownback	Hefner	Payne (NJ)
Bryant (TX)	Hilliard	Pelosi
Bunn	Hinchee	Peterson (FL)
Camp	Hoekstra	Petri
Cardin	Holden	Portman
Chabot	Horn	Poshard
Chapman	Hoyer	Rahall
Christensen	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Chrysler	Inglis	Rangel
Clay	Istook	Reed
Clayton	Jackson-Lee	Regula
Clyburn	Jacobs	Reynolds
Coburn	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Coleman	Johnson, E.B.	Rivers
Collins (IL)	Johnston	Roemer
Collins (MI)	Kanjorski	Rohrabacher
Condit	Kaptur	Rose
Cooley	Kasich	Roth
Costello	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Royce
Danner	Kennelly	Rush
Davis	Kildee	Sabo
de la Garza	Klecicka	Sanders
DeFazio	Klug	Sanford
DeLauro	LaFalce	Sawyer
Dellums	Lantos	Schroeder
Deutsch	Largent	Schumer
Dickey	Leach	Scott
Dicks	Levin	Sensenbrenner
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Dixon	Lipinski	Shadegg
Doggett	Lofgren	Shays
Dooley	Lowe	Skaggs
Doyle	Luther	Slaughter
Durbin	Maloney	Smith (MI)
Edwards	Manton	Smith (WA)
Ehlers	Markey	Souder
Engel	Martinez	Spratt
Ensign	Martini	Stark
Eshoo	Matsui	Stokes
Evans	McCarthy	Studds
Farr	McDermott	Thompson
Fattah	McIntosh	Thurman
Fazio	McKinney	Torres
Fields (LA)	Meehan	Torricelli
Filner	Meek	Towns
Flake	Menendez	Tucker
Foglietta	Mfume	Upton
Ford	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Frank (MA)	Mineta	Vento
Furse	Minge	Visclosky
Ganske	Mink	Volkmer
Gejdenson	Moran	Ward
Gephardt	Morella	Waters
Geren	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Gibbons	Neal	Waxman
Gilchrest	Neumann	Whitfield
Gonzalez	Ney	Williams
Green	Nussle	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Wyden
Hall (OH)	Obey	Wynn
Hall (TX)	Olver	Zimmer
Hamilton	Orton	
Harman	Owens	

NOES—216

Archer	Clement	Fox
Armey	Clinger	Franks (CT)
Bachus	Coble	Franks (NJ)
Baker (CA)	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Baker (LA)	Combest	Frisa
Barr	Conyers	Frost
Barrett (NE)	Cox	Funderburk
Bartlett	Cramer	Gallely
Bateman	Crane	Gekas
Bereuter	Crapo	Gillmor
Bevill	Cremeans	Gilman
Bilbray	Cubin	Goodlatte
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Goodling
Bishop	Deal	Gordon
Bliley	DeLay	Goss
Blute	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Boehner	Doolittle	Greenwood
Bonilla	Dornan	Gunderson
Bono	Dreier	Gutknecht
Boucher	Duncan	Hancock
Brewster	Dunn	Hansen
Bryant (TN)	Ehrlich	Hastert
Bunning	Emerson	Hastings (WA)
Burr	English	Hayes
Burton	Everett	Hayworth
Buyer	Ewing	Hefley
Callahan	Fawell	Heineman
Calvert	Fields (TX)	Herger
Canady	Flanagan	Hilleary
Castle	Foley	Hobson
Chambliss	Forbes	Hoke
Chenoweth	Fowler	Hostettler

Houghton	Miller (FL)	Skeen
Hunter	Molinari	Skelton
Hyde	Mollohan	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (CT)	Montgomery	Smith (TX)
Johnson, Sam	Moorhead	Solomon
Jones	Murtha	Spence
Kelly	Myers	Stearns
Kim	Myrick	Stenholm
King	Nethercutt	Stockman
Kingston	Norwood	Stump
Klink	Ortiz	Stupak
Knollenberg	Oxley	Talent
Kolbe	Packard	Tanner
LaHood	Pallone	Tate
Latham	Parker	Tauzin
LaTourette	Paxon	Taylor (MS)
Laughlin	Payne (VA)	Taylor (NC)
Lazio	Peterson (MN)	Tejeda
Lewis (CA)	Pickett	Thomas
Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Thornberry
Lightfoot	Pomeroy	Thornton
Lincoln	Porter	Tiahrt
Linder	Pryce	Torkildsen
Livingston	Quillen	Traficant
LoBiondo	Quinn	Vucanovich
Longley	Radanovich	Waldholtz
Lucas	Riggs	Walker
Manzullo	Roberts	Walsh
Mascara	Rogers	Wamp
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	Watts (OK)
McCrery	Roukema	Weldon (FL)
McDade	Salmon	Weldon (PA)
McHale	Saxton	Weller
McHugh	Scarborough	White
McInnis	Schaefer	Wicker
McKeon	Schiff	Wilson
McNulty	Seastrand	Wolf
Metcalf	Shaw	Young (AK)
Meyers	Shuster	Young (FL)
Mica	Sisisky	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—4

Jefferson	Wise
Moakley	Yates

□ 1712

Messrs. PALLONE, KIM, and HOBSON, and Mrs. ROUKEMA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. MATSUI, KILDEE, GILCHREST, BASS, HOYER, DICKEY, ABERCROMBIE, and LARGENT, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this paragraph?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$118,267,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$42,963,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$19,655,000 to remain available until September 30, 2000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities

for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$31,502,000 to remain available until September 30, 2000.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized in military construction authorization Acts and section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, \$161,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$126,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000; for Operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$1,337,596,000; in all \$1,463,996,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$531,289,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000; for Operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$1,048,329,000; in all \$1,579,618,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$294,503,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000; for Operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$863,213,000; in all \$1,157,716,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEUMANN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NEUMANN: On page 8, line 2, strike \$1,157,716,000 and insert \$1,150,730,000.

□ 1715

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes or sooner, and that the time be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] will be

recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. The gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] and I are very, very concerned about housing for our military personnel.

The purpose of this amendment is to prohibit and stop the expenditure of \$6.9 million to build 33 housing units at an average cost of \$208,000 per housing unit. Buying housing units at an average cost of \$208,000 each is not an appropriate expenditure of our scarce tax dollars. This is especially true in view of the legitimate problems of substandard housing for our enlisted military personnel.

There are several key points that need to be made regarding this amendment. The first one is what we intend to do at these military bases is tear down housing built in the years 1957, 1958, 1959, 1968 and one report that simply says the 1950's. When I went back to my district this past weekend and I asked the folks in my district if they thought it was reasonable that we should tear down houses built in the 1950's and early 1960's and build brand new, they looked at me as though I was crazy.

The first point I would like to make, we are going to tear down housing built in the 1950's and 1960's and replace it with brand new. That is unacceptable in the world we live in.

I would reemphasize these housing units are only units that are going to cost the taxpayers an average cost of over \$200,000. Reports tell us there are 300,000 military families with inadequate housing, that there are 150,000 barracks spaces needed.

I would like to make a second major point on this amendment, that is, that we could take care of 437 barracks spaces with the same money we are going to spend on these 33 housing units.

This amendment is not about eliminating housing for our military but, rather, it is about spending the money in the most appropriate manner and making the best use of our tax dollars.

I would like my colleagues to carefully consider, when they go home to their districts, how they are going to respond to the charge that we have built these houses at over \$200,000 each, and now I am going to quote directly the reason for building these houses. This is directly from the Department of Defense reports. It says, and this is regarding the one at the New Mexico Air Force Base, "The condition of the house would reflect poorly on the many dignitaries that frequently are entertained in the house." The reason we are tearing down the old house and building anew is because it reflects poorly for entertainment purposes.

A second quote from the same report, "It is to build four-bedroom houses appropriate for family living and entertainment responsibilities for the wing

commander." Again, we see entertainment as the reason we are replacing this housing.

I quote from another report, and this is the North Carolina Air Force base, "This is to build housing appropriate for family living and the entertainment responsibility of the wing commander."

I would like my colleagues to think about our men and women in uniform who are living in substandard housing and think about how we are going to explain to our men and women in uniform why it is we spent over \$200,000 per housing unit at the expense of building 437 barracks spaces that could have been taken care of.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEUMANN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I just happened to be on the floor, and so I hope you will bear with these questions and bear with me.

I am noting in this amendment that there are several Air Force bases that are listed in which there would be a reduction here. Among them is Nellis Air Force Base, and I think it is \$1.375 billion, is it?

Mr. NEUMANN. Million.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Not nearly as much. But that Air Force base is in the district of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I presume you discussed this in some depth with her, did you not, before proposing this cut?

Mr. NEUMANN. No, sir, I did not. I simply looked for housing units that were going to cost in excess of \$200,000 per unit. I concluded it would not be a fair or good expenditure of our tax dollars to spend the money at a cost of over \$200,000 per unit when we could, in fact, be building barracks spaces to take care of our men and women in uniform, many units to replace this one.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I guess the reason for my question is that I have a great deal of respect for all of my colleagues, especially for the chairman of our subcommittee, and since it happens to be in her district, I would have thought you might have discussed it with her. But having said that, after the vote, I would suggest that you should discuss it with her, and I would urge a very, very strong no vote on the part of the House.

Mr. NEUMANN. I would just say that I have the greatest respect for my colleagues, as well, and to be perfectly honest with you, I did not check which district it was in. I simply identified them by the ones that were costing over \$200,000.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. At a time when Congress claims to be working hard at balancing the budget, I am really amazed the Military Construction Subcommittee has added over a half a billion dollars of projects making this bill 28 percent higher than last year's appropriation.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has described that we are offering to strike the funding for 33 expensive homes.

Now, many of us citizens are ill-housed. This Congress is cutting funding on affordable housing, homeless shelter and shelters for battered women.

When the median cost of constructing a home in all but one of these areas is below \$75,000, we should not be spending over \$200,000 on luxury military housing. These are not houses for enlisted men and women. These are top dollar residences for the top brass.

I would say the prestige of the United States military relies on the prestige of their leadership, not on the quality of the homes in which they entertain.

It is wrong that enlisted military people live in substandard housing while this Congress funds excessively expensive units. It is not right.

I urge my colleagues to remember that every tax dollar we spend must be sensible and every military dollar we spend must be defensible.

I urge you to support the Neumann-Furse amendment.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to an amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin. This amendment is flawed and if passed would only result in hurting morale and degrading the readiness of our armed forces.

Let there be no misunderstanding—this amendment attempts to throw away the hard work of both the authorizing and appropriations committees which have delivered to this House a bill that funds only military construction projects that are previously authorized, as part of a balanced budget by the year 2002. As my colleagues well know, the bill before us is an example of how things should work in Congress.

The military construction appropriations bill is the end result of the tireless work of Chairmen SPENCE, LIVINGSTON, HEFLEY, and VUCANOVICH, who have continually championed this Congress' support for our men and women in uniform. The amendment offered by Congressman NEUMANN not only undermines their hard work, but undermines the readiness of our Armed Forces.

When so many of our military families live in substandard homes and live off food stamps, I find it unconscionable that an amendment of this nature would be offered.

Let me also point out that the numbers used by my colleague from Wisconsin are incorrect. Hanscom Air Force Base, for example, is slated for replacement housing for enlisted personnel and junior officer families. According to this amendment, each home will cost \$208,000 apiece. I wish that were the case. In fact, according to the

Air Force, the average cost of each home is \$116,000. The difference in the numbers used by the Air Force and the sponsor of the amendment is that the Air Force has to account for extensive site preparation and demolition that includes removal of hazardous materials such as asbestos and lead paint. Costs associated with construction in Massachusetts are substantially higher than in Wisconsin—well over 20 percent higher, and 30 percent higher than the national average. Additionally, military family housing projects cannot depend on local or State entities to fund many of the services we take for granted—such as sewer connection lines, utilities, sidewalks, and recreation areas.

But let us not get bogged down in the abstract debate of numbers and statistics. What we are talking about here is people. At Hanscom, it is common for a five-person family to live in a cinder block home little more than 1,100 square feet. That's about the same size a Member has for a staff of 8 to 10 people. Can you imagine two parents and three children trying to live in that space?

The housing in question at Hanscom is known as some of the least desirable throughout the entire Air Force. Indeed, the service has identified it as a priority and has budgeted for its replacement in the next fiscal year. Both committees of jurisdiction have reviewed the project. Based solely on merit, those committees wisely expedited funding for this much-needed construction.

This is not a wish item, Mr. Chairman—this is vital to the service men and women and their families who are stationed at Hanscom. I ask all my colleagues to oppose this misguided amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this amendment.

I would like to point out that the approved projects to replace the general officers' quarters at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base is something the Air Force and the Administration asked for before I was elected. I did not add this project to the budget, but I do support its construction, after realizing the obvious need for it.

The building in question was built in 1956. This project, more than anything else, is a matter of replacing a house which is showing the age and wear of continuous heavy use. Most everything, from the walls to the foundations and the underlying pavement, requires major repairs or replacement. Plumbing and electrical systems are outdated and do not meet the current standards for efficiency or safety.

In addition, the heating and air conditioning system needs to be totally replaced.

I would like to add that every study that could be done to evaluate this project has been done. Studies show that replacing the house would cost less over the long run than constantly repairing this 40-year-old system.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to call for quality of life for our troops, I do not think it is too much to ask that the legitimate needs of our commanders be met.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Last week we were discussing the living conditions for enlisted people, the fact that we have more than 15,000 on food stamps and are living in substandard trailer parks. Today we are here debating housing that averages \$208,000 a unit, and generally, despite the earlier speaker, not to address the living needs of enlisted people.

Here is one example, Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas, we have a home here for the general officer housing. It is totally inadequate for the position and entertainment responsibilities of the installation. Perhaps the general could use the officers' club or the golf club to entertain if he finds his home inadequate.

The kitchen configuration creates a circulation problem. Well, a lot of us have that problem in our homes. Generally we remodel. We do not tear the house down and start over, but the taxpayers are not paying for our homes.

Here the four bedrooms and their closets are undersized. Is the general entertaining in the bedrooms? What sort of entertainment are we talking about here?

They have outdated ceramic tile floors. I do not know, in my part of the country, people consider that a feature, and they actually pay extra for ceramic floors.

Wainscoting, that is kind of considered a plus out my way, too.

The question here is: Are we going to spend an average of \$208,000 a unit to better house the general staff because they do not want to entertain at the officers' club and they want to live in spiffy new houses? They have already got cars, drivers; they have already got the helicopter rides from the Pentagon to Andrews Air Force Base, the private jets around the country. Now they need new houses at an average of \$208,000 each with no rent paid in return.

□ 1730

I think it is time to draw the line somewhere. Support housing for our enlisted folks, but no more for the generals and the top brass.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, would just like to close with the three main points. In this thing we are talking about eliminating 33 housing units at an average cost of \$208,000 per unit. The same money could take care of 437 spaces and barracks that currently are hous-

ing our men and women in uniform at substandard levels.

The second one is that we are going to tear down houses built in the late 1950's and early 1960's, and in America we would find that generally to be an unacceptable practice.

Most of all, this rifle shot kind of target in a few bases in our district was not selected based on whose district they were in, but rather it is selected based on the fact that they are excessive spending in a bill that is 28 percent over last year's number.

We are spending in this, our first appropriations bill, 28 percent more than what we spent last year, and I would like everyone to know that one of the main reasons we are standing here right now is because of the fact that a 28-percent spending increase in any category I find personally unacceptable.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a comment?

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, the problem here is not the fact that we do not need to do these houses. There is absolutely dilapidated quarters that need to be replaced in all quarters and what I would point out to the gentleman on the one point, when he said we had a 28-percent increase, and that is true, but if we go back to the past 10 years, military construction budget at best, at the very best, has been stagnant for the past 10 years. During the Bush administration we had one series that we were absolutely at a pause. We did not do one thing in family housing and military construction. We had a complete pause.

So I say to my colleagues, if you do the replacement, it would take us over 50 years at the replacement rate that we are going now, so the growth is warranted. We have been stagnant for 10 years. This is warranted, this increase.

Now we may need some oversight at the cost per square foot for family housing and for general housing, but that is the only place we need to look at because we do need to upgrade all the quarters, both enlisted men and general quarters, and I am going to reluctantly oppose this amendment.

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

First, Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify the cost of the units the gentleman from Wisconsin is referring to. He has incorrectly estimated the average cost to be \$208,000. The cost associated with these projects is not purely construction. It also includes: demolition of existing dilapidated units; asbestos removal; lead-based paint removal; utilities and site preparations. Eliminating these costs—assuming the gentleman would agree that asbestos and lead-based removal is of importance—the average construction cost per unit is \$120,829. This is below the 1994 median sales price of \$130,000 for all new homes nationwide.

Is the gentleman aware that prior to new construction the Department is re-

quired to conduct an economic analysis that compares the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing, and status quo? Based on the net present values and benefits, the Air Force found replacement to be the most cost efficient option over the life of these projects.

For some apparent reason, the gentleman has chosen to single out five projects which involve not only housing for senior officers, but also senior and junior noncommissioned officers.

I say to the gentleman, Mr. NEUMANN, we have an all volunteer force—and that includes noncommissioned officers as well as officers of any rank. Are you telling the Members of this body that the quality of life of any man of woman who serves this country and is prepared to risk his or her life is more important than another? Are you saying that those individuals who make a multiyear commitment to the defense of this country and who grow to become leaders do not deserve a decent place to live?

As a member of the National Security Subcommittee, I am sure the gentleman is aware that it costs roughly \$1.3 million to train a fighter pilot in today's Air Force. Is it not worth the minor expenditure to provide decent housing to keep that pilot in the Air Force?

And, Mr. NEUMANN, I remind you that this Nation is still on a high because of the courageous survival of Capt. Scott O'Grady and the success of the Marines who went into Bosnia to rescue him. Mr. NEUMANN, members of our forces—at all ranks—were involved in that mission. Are you telling me that those men and women who just happen to be officers don't deserve a decent place to live?

As long as I am chairman of this subcommittee, I will work to improve the housing of every individual who serves this country—they deserve no less.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 266, noes 160, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

AYES—266

Ackerman	Beilenson	Brown (OH)
Allard	Bentsen	Brownback
Andrews	Bereuter	Bryant (TN)
Archer	Berman	Bryant (TX)
Baesler	Bilirakis	Bunn
Baldacci	Blute	Burr
Ballenger	Boehner	Camp
Barcia	Bonior	Canady
Barrett (WI)	Boucher	Cardin
Bartlett	Brewster	Castle
Barton	Browder	Chabot
Bass	Brown (CA)	Chapman
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Chenoweth

Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Ehlers
English
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Ganske
Gephardt
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hinchee
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden

Horn
Houghton
Hutchinson
Ingليس
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Klecicka
Klink
Klug
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
LaTourrette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McInnis
McIntosh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Moran
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri

NOES—160

Abercrombie
Armye
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bateman
Bevill
Billray
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlerl
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert

Chambliss
Clay
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Cramer
Cunningham
DeLay
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doollittle
Dornan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich

Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Studds
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Vento
Volkmer
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Zeliff
Zimmer

Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hoke
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
King
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Latham
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Markey
McCollum
McCreary

Gilman
Heineman
Jefferson

NOT VOTING—8

LaFalce
Moakley
Velazquez

□ 1800

Messrs. NETHERCUTT, MARKEY, HASTINGS of Florida, MCDADE, WATT of North Carolina, FOGLIETTA, and SHAW, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GEJDENSON, TRAFICANT, FORBES, SPRATT, FIELDS of Texas, DE LA GARZA, HALL of Texas, CRAPO, and WARD, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mrs. CHENOWETH changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1800

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, and for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$3,772,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000; for Operation and maintenance, \$30,467,000; in all \$34,239,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, \$22,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, subject to thirty days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to this Fund from amounts appropriated in this Act for Construction in "Family Housing" accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to that Fund: *Provided further*, That appropriations made

Scarborough
Schiff
Seastrand
Shaw
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (TX)
Spence
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Torkildsen
Towns
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walsh
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

available to the Fund in this Act shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans or loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of, and amendments made by, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996 pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND, DEFENSE

For use in the Homeowners Assistance Fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3374), \$75,586,000, to remain available until expended.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART II

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-510), \$964,843,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$224,800,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART III

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-510), \$2,148,480,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$232,300,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART IV

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-510), \$784,569,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds will be available for construction only to the extent detailed budget justification is transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That such funds are available solely for the approved 1995 base realignments and closures.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work, where cost estimates exceed \$25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not apply in the case of contracts for environmental restoration at an installation that is being closed or realigned where payments are made from a Base Realignment and Closure Account.

SEC. 102. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to begin construction of new bases inside the continental United

States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. No part of the funds provided in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 per centum of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except (a) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court, or (b) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or his designee, or (c) where the estimated value is less than \$25,000, or (d) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used to (1) acquire land, (2) provide for site preparation, or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Military Construction Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 107. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 108. No part of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 111. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed \$500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any NATO member country, or in the Arabian Gulf, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in the Arabian Gulf, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed \$1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 per centum.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense is to inform the appropriate Committees of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel thirty days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed \$100,000.

SEC. 114. Not more than 20 per centum of the appropriations in Military Construction Appropriations Acts which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 115. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 116. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were appropriated if the funds obligated for such project (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects, and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 118. During the five-year period after appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense" to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 119. The Secretary of Defense is to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives with an annual report by February 15, containing details of the specific actions proposed to be taken by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to encourage other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, Korea, and United States allies in the Arabian Gulf to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991, to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

SEC. 121. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

SEC. 122. (a) In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be

purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 123. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred among the Fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374); the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991; and appropriations available to the Department of Defense for the Homeowners Assistance Program of the Department of Defense. Any amounts so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund, account, or appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 124. The Army shall use George Air Force Base as the interim airhead for the National Training Center at Fort Irwin until Barstow-Daggett reaches Initial Operational Capability as the permanent airhead.

SEC. 125. (a) In order to ensure the continued protection and enhancement of the open spaces of Fort Sheridan, the Secretary of the Army shall convey to the Lake County Forest Preserve District, Illinois (in this section referred to as the "District"), all right, title, and interest of the United States to a parcel of surplus real property at Fort Sheridan consisting of approximately 290 acres located north of the southerly boundary line of the historic district at the post, including improvements thereon.

(b) As consideration for the conveyance by the Secretary of the Army of the parcel of real property under subsection (a), the District shall provide maintenance and care to the remaining Fort Sheridan cemetery, pursuant to an agreement to be entered into between the District and the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary of the Army is also authorized to convey the remaining surplus property at former Fort Sheridan to the Fort Sheridan Joint Planning Committee, or its successor, for an amount no less than the fair market value (as determined by the Secretary of the Army) of the property to be conveyed.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property (including improvements thereon) to be conveyed under subsections (a) and (c) shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of such surveys shall be borne by the Lake County Forest Preserve District, and the Fort Sheridan Joint Planning Committee, respectively.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts: Page 19, after line 12, insert the following new section:

SEC. 126. The amounts otherwise provided in this Act for the following accounts are hereby reduced by 5 percent:

- (1) "Military Construction, Army".
- (2) "Military Construction, Navy".
- (3) "Military Construction, Air Force".
- (4) "Military Construction, Defense-wide".
- (5) "Military Construction, Army National Guard".
- (6) "Military Construction, Air National Guard".
- (7) "Military Construction, Army Reserve".
- (8) "Military Construction, Naval Reserve".
- (9) "Military Construction, Air Force Reserve".
- (10) "North Atlantic Treaty Organization—Security Investment Program".

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes or less and that the time be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut 5 percent from those accounts in this bill that do not affect housing or the Base Closing Commission. Those two accounts are most of the bill. The amendment is to almost 3 billion dollars' worth of new construction. The 3 billion dollars' worth of new construction, other than housing and other than base closing, includes regular military construction and it includes the NATO infrastructure. And it does seem to me, time NATO could come here and build some infrastructure. It would save \$148 million.

The bill is significantly over the President's recommendation. And even if my amendment is adopted, this bill will still, in these accounts, have more money than the President recommended. And it will also have a significant increase over last year.

We are talking here about military construction at a time when we are closing things down. I leave 95 percent in the bill. I leave more than the President asked for. I leave more than we had last year. I am struck, Mr. Chairman, by my own moderation in this particular amendment, but I am trying to get something accomplished.

This would go into reducing the deficit. It is an appropriation. If we save this \$148 million, the deficit at \$148 million less, housing is not affected, base closing is not affected, and I do not believe the American people will be one bit less secure.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, this is not a wise amendment. We have got a committee process, and that committee process is proceeding within the appropriations cycle to meet the recommendations reflected in the budget resolution adopted by this House of Representatives and a companion resolution adopted by the other body just a relatively few short weeks ago.

We are balancing the budget by the year 2002. The President says he does not want to balance the budget until the year 2005, but he has become a budget balancer and has become convinced of the need to avoid disaster for the future by making sure we get our spending in line with our revenues.

The Committee on Appropriations is meeting regularly. We are bringing forth bills within the House budget caps. The gentleman says, this bill is above the President's request. That is true. But this bill also addresses the needs for base closing; roughly 35 percent of the bill addresses the need to pay the money in order that we can close the bases.

This bill addresses the fact that 60 percent of our current military housing is inadequate, woefully inadequate in many instances. We are addressing the military construction demands of the armed services of this country. We are addressing the needs of the NATO commitments around the world. And this bill, along with its 12 counterparts in the appropriations process, will come under the budget allotments adopted by the House of Representatives a few short weeks ago.

If you want to scrap the budget; scrap the committee process; if you want to handle all of the business of the House of Representatives on the floor, then start with this amendment and let us add in a few others. Every time we come up with an appropriations bill, we can say we all are experts on every single issue, and we will just gut the hell out of the bills and the budget. But we may be causing ourselves great harm in the future.

I would say to my colleagues that the committee process works, if they will give it an opportunity to work. Unfortunately, there are those who think that their wisdom supersedes the committee process and maybe in some instances they do. Maybe they are very bright people. I give them credit.

But I want to commend the gentlewoman from Nevada and her staff and all of the members of the subcommittee who have worked very hard on this bill to meet the needs of this Nation. A mindless amendment of this sort, cutting across the board, even though it is confined to certain narrow categories, is not the way we should go about balancing the budget. If that is what we

need, then we should just not stop here. We should just close down the committees and all of us sit on the floor and each of us come up with a new idea on what we should cut.

Eventually, we will get the balanced budget, because we will not be spending any Federal money at all. But I dare say that will be because the U.S. Government and this great Nation of ours will come to a screeching halt, and we will be sorely ashamed of abdicating our responsibility to our people to represent them wisely and efficiently and with foresight and with good judgment. All of those are lacking in this amendment. I urge its defeat.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have not heard such a touching plea for the sacrosanct nature of anything a committee does since Jack Brooks left.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I must say I was amazed to hear this amendment classified as a mindless amendment, because I was getting ready to taunt the gentleman from Massachusetts that he had mellowed; this was a mellow amendment for the gentleman and that indeed middle age may be setting in. I do not know. But I rise in strong support of this amendment, and let us talk about it.

First of all, the gentleman from Massachusetts' amendment does not touch the base closing process over there, nor does it touch housing that is over there that is essential for troops. This only touches additional add-ons in the whole structure for NATO.

As one of the Members who has been talking about burdensharing forever and ever and ever and ever, and every time we come to this floor they say, great idea but now is not the time, this is not the day, when are we ever going to deal with this? The NATO infrastructure formula has not been changed since NATO began. Our allies have changed a lot. They have become a lot richer. In fact all of them together have a larger economy than ours.

But we still put in the same amount that we did right after World War II, when we were carrying a large share of the budget.

□ 1815

That formula did change in Japan and other countries. They have not gotten enough credit for it. They are picking up much, much more of the infrastructure budget. In fact, Japan is practically picking up the whole thing. However, no, not Europe. We would not want to tell the Europeans that they could now do a little more because they are a little richer.

The gentleman's amendment only cuts 5 percent non-base closing and non-housing, and yet it will save \$148 billion. One of the reasons this is higher than the President asked for and higher than the Pentagon asked for is

because, as we know, on this side of the Congress our budget is \$9.7 billion more than the Pentagon asked for, more than the President asked for, and more than the Senate did.

Since we do not have a budget resolution, this committee was forced to mark up to those higher levels. There is the padded budget, therefore.

If Members vote for the gentleman's amendment, which I am going to do, we are taking the padding out. We are taking some of the padding out, and getting back to the realistic number that the Commander in Chief and the Pentagon recommended.

Of course, the reason I think it is so mellow is the gentleman and I used to go after both the Pentagon and the Commander in Chief for asking too much. However, we are just saying here it is being padded ever more to kick it up that \$9-plus billion, because we have to use fillers in order to do that, to try and continue this budget negotiation with the Senate. If Members are into that, fine, vote against the amendment.

However, I think the time has come that reason should come forward, as we are slashing bases at home, as we are slashing the infrastructure at home, as we are harming all sorts of things. In fact, the base closure commission is meeting today, as it has been meeting every other day, and why in the world we cannot vote for a 5 percent cut in Europe that would be \$148 billion, I do not know. I do not get it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentlewoman made that point about the budget. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in his plea for not interfering with the sacred deliberations of the holy committee and not profaning it with our individual judgments, said "We are just doing what the budget said. First, the budget is a ceiling. It is not a floor, it is not a command. The budget is a ceiling."

Second, as the gentlewoman said, the House budget figure is almost certainly going to be higher than the Senate budget figure, than the final budget figure. The House is \$9 billion in this account, the overall military account, higher than the Senate. No one thinks the conference report is coming out at the House number.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules said there were delicate negotiations going on with the Senate now, so we are not going to have a final budget resolution that is at this higher number, and we are anticipating that in a reasonable way.

I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Basically, Mr. Chairman, it is not 1945, it is 1995. The formula does not look any different in 1995 than it did in 1945. The wall came down but the for-

mula did not change. The cold war is over but the formula did not change.

The question is, Mr. Chairman, what are they building over there? We are leaving 95 percent of it intact, not touching the base closure, not touching housing. If we stand here and say we cannot even cut 5 percent out of the stuff we are building in NATO under a post-World War II formula, we have never had the guts to tell them to change, we are really, I think, wimpish.

I have always felt we are really Europhiles, and that we really always kind of yield and defer to them. I have always seen that going on in all the burdensharing amendments. If we cannot ask for this little bit, especially since we are so over the budget, so over what everyone asks, I think we really look silly.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of this amendment and I hope people vote aye, very, very affirmatively.

Mr. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] who is ranking on our committee.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I admire people for wanting to cut the budget and save money that we can apply toward the deficit, but I think this is a little bit wrongly directed. We exempt the base closure, the BRACC, we exempt that. We exempt family housing, which is good. We have fought over the past 10 years to increase this budget. However, as I said earlier, it has been stagnant for 10 years.

Just let me tell the Members some of the things that are going to be affected with this 5-percent across the board. It is not going to affect family housing. It is not going to affect BRACC. However, let me tell the Members what it is going to do. It is going to go directly to quality of life, because we would affect the building of barracks.

The gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and I went to Fort Bragg in North Carolina. We went through some barracks in North Carolina, where if Members took their kids to camp or to college, and they took us in and said "This is where you are going to be living," we would load them up in the car, put the suitcases back in, and we would come home. We would not let them stay at camp for 2 weeks in the barracks which some of these people are living in.

That is one of the things it is going to affect. Also, child development. We have made some real strides in child development. It is going to affect child development, which directly impacts on retention to these men. In many cases both parents are in the service, or either one parent is in the service and the other is working, and they have the day care centers and the child development programs. We would be going to cut that.

Also, the hospitals and medical centers all across this country, and in Fort Bragg, NC, we have a new medical facility that is being built, and clinics all

across this country. We are experimenting with mental care in some of these bases all across the country. That is going to be cut.

We are also going to be cutting some other critical programs, like chemical weapons demilitarization. I know that this budget is more than it was last year, Mr. Chairman. Thank God for that, because we have been trying to beef up the military construction budget for years. It has been stagnant.

However, let me point out one other thing. If we do this 5-percent across-the-board cut, and then we get a budget agreement, we have \$500 million in this budget that was marked up on the basis of the budget that was passed in this House that we very easily could not have when we come to a compromise. We may have to lose another \$500 million, and if we add to that this 5 percent, plus we add to the cut that was just made on an earlier vote, this budget is going to be about stagnant again in this session.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot stand that, if we want to use this voluntary Army, we want to have retention, and we want to get the very best people that can operate these sophisticated weapons and serve us well.

The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] and I have talked many times about quality of life and about burdensharing. We are not going overboard for building facilities in Europe. We did beef up a little in Korea because we had a serious situation there, but if we take the cuts we have just made, and if we do this 5-percent cut and then we lose on top of that a half a billion dollars because of a compromise on the budget conference between the House and Senate, this budget once again will be a stagnant budget, and we will not be able to do the things we need to do for our men and women in the Armed Forces.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

First, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] is wrong when he says if we take this 5-percent cut and then have a budget conference reduction of a half a billion, they will be additive. No, this will be a way of reaching that.

The budget conference would lower the number that this goes to. My amendment would be a way of reaching that lowering, so they would not be added. It would not be cumulative. This would be a way of dealing with that.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, just a question. Once we have passed this bill, we go to conference with the Senate, and we come out with a bottom-line number, if it is \$500 million, is the gentleman saying that his 5 percent would go to that bottom line?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I assumed the gentleman

was talking about the budget conference. My point is the amount that we are going to be able to vote is contingent on the budget resolution, and the budget resolution is way above this.

Yes, the final figure will be a compromise in this particular account between what we vote and the Senate votes, but what I was talking about was the budget resolution. The budget resolution is the one where there is going to be a reduction on what the House voted, and this is not additive to that, this is going to be a way of reaching that.

Mr. HEFNER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, what I was getting at, when they reach a compromise on the budget, the 302 allocation, it is \$500 million less than we have now, then the 5-percent cut will go to that number?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. It would be a way of reaching that number. It would not be on top of that number, of course. It would not automatically reduce it by 5 percent plus \$500 million, of course not.

Mr. Chairman, let me continue with a couple of other points. The gentleman read some very appealing things here: child development. Child development is very appealing. It gets \$57 million out of the \$3 billion.

NATO alone, Mr. Chairman, NATO alone gets more money in this bill than the entire amount my amendment would cut. NATO in this bill get \$161 million. My total amendment cut is \$148. It is true, Mr. Chairman, if they decide, and the 5-percent cut leaves it to the discretion of the committee. It is 5 percent, not in every single number that the gentleman mentioned. It does not mandate a 5-percent cut in child development or in barracks. It says find 5 percent of cut. Cut NATO by half and we have met already 2½ percent. Cut some of the other construction.

What we are saying is, Mr. Chairman, they are going to spend \$161 million on NATO along when this House has felt that it is the Europeans who owe us, rather than the other way around. We think with some cut out of NATO and elsewhere we can find it.

Mr. Chairman, we have a terrible budget crisis, we keep being told. Yes, there are things we would like to do, but we cannot exempt any part of the budget, in my judgment, and then reach an sensible zero figure.

Just to reiterate, this does not affect family housing, it does not affect base closing. It need not affect hospitals or child development if the subcommittee does not want it to. We can make it all up out of NATO. We can make half up out of NATO.

Mr. Chairman, as far as the budget resolution is concerned, if the budget resolution reduces the budget authority, we are going to have to cut by more than this amendment. This amendment will not then be relevant if the budget authority is so substantially reduced, except it is a way of

saying yes, we are going to cut in the NATO account, but we are not going to cut family housing in BRACC.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, this body has exercised pretty sound judgment with regard to having an all-volunteer military. With that, and we talk about support for an all-volunteer force, it means the readiness. We have talked about it on the House floor often. It means training the force and equipping the force so they will be ready.

Second is pay and benefits for an all-volunteer force. Third is taking care of the military family, and what that encompasses. We talk about it on the House floor as the quality-of-life issues, whether it is housing and recreation, et cetera.

Mr. Chairman, this issue about let us do a 5-percent cut across the board, someone called it mindless. I am not going to call it mindless. I have voted in the past for across-the-board cuts. However, this one, I think the chairwoman and the ranking Member have done an excellent job in this military construction budget. There is no padding, as the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] said. There are some very important decisions that need to be done, and I think that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations did a very good job.

What are we cutting, when we talk about a 5-percent cut? That is new construction, whether it is for port facilities, a fire station, medical facilities, hospitals, dental clinics, outpatient clinics, recreational facilities; we are talking about child care centers, we are talking about barracks. When they say cutting for housing, I would like to ask the author of this amendment, he says it would not touch housing. Would his amendment affect military barracks?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman, not if the subcommittee does not want it to. My amendment gives full discretion to the subcommittee, and would not mandate any reduction in barracks at all.

Mr. BUYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it also would affect environmental compliance. When the gentleman talks also about its impact upon NATO and our security interests, chemical weapons, demilitarization, while I applaud across-the-board cuts, I think that the subcommittee has done an excellent job, and we should support the subcommittee.

When they say that this is not going to touch BRACC, when they say this will not touch BRACC, first of all, to

my colleagues, we have to remember there are a lot of things in motion out there, whether it is in NATO or here in the United States, with regard to consolidation of posts and the impact upon installations. There are a lot of decisions that base commanders out there have to make, whether it is the commander of a fort. To say it will not be affected by BRACC does not really take some rational thought. A lot of these military construction projects, especially in Europe, are based because of consolidation of the force.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

□ 1830

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking member.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I don't relish engaging in debate with the gentleman from Massachusetts or the gentlewoman from Colorado, but let me just tell you what this amendment says.

The amounts otherwise provided in this act for the following accounts are hereby reduced by 5 percent: military construction Army, military construction Navy, military construction Air Force, military construction defensewide, military construction Army National Guard, military construction Air National Guard, military construction Army Reserve, military construction Naval Reserve, military construction Air Force Reserve, North Atlantic Treaty Organization security investment programs. Each one of these would carry with it a 5 percent. I wish the gentleman, if it was possible, to take it all out of NATO if you are going to make the cut.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman would yield for a unanimous-consent request, I would ask unanimous consent that the amendment be amended so that at the subcommittee's discretion as much as possible could be taken out of NATO. I ask unanimous consent for that amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, I tried.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, as was just made clear, I was prepared to give the subcommittee more power to cut NATO but they do not want to do that.

This does not mandate cuts in barracks or child development. It does cut, and I agree, as worded it has less flexibility than it should have with regard to NATO. I would agree to changing that, but as I said, they don't want to do it.

Here is where we are. We have broad agreement that we are going to get to a balanced budget soon. We are in a zero sum situation. If we do not make

reductions here to get the deficit down, then either we raise taxes somewhere else, which is very, very unlikely, or the cuts in Medicare are deeper than they have to be, the cuts in aid to college students are deeper than they have to be, the money to reimburse communities trying to meet existing Federal mandates is less than it has to be.

We talk about no further unfunded mandates. I am for that, but the legislation we passed does not touch any of the existing Federal mandates that are unfunded. I would like to make some more money available to do that.

If we pass legislation like this without this amendment, if we lavish the \$161 million on NATO, if we go more than the Pentagon asked for for construction elsewhere, we mandate deeper cuts in all these other programs. Members will go to their districts and say, "Gee, I want to balance the budget, and I am sorry we have to really cut the National Institutes of Health. I am sorry we will do much less research on disease. I am sorry transportation will get hurt. I wish we didn't have to cut Medicare so much. I wish we did not have to insist that the cost of living increase for Social Security be reduced as their budget resolution says."

Well, this is why it happens. You cannot claim helplessness when you are talking about these cuts and then vote to insist on spending on military construction, other than housing and other than BRAC more than the Pentagon asks for. I am sure that many of these projects, most of this money, would be usefully spent, but that is no longer the criterion. What we have here is a view that says we will exempt the ordinary operations of the U.S. military from the discipline that everybody else gets.

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago a great thing happened in the world. The Soviet Union collapsed. Yes, it is still a threat in some ways, but our major enemy now just failed to take a military hospital, with their crack troops, manned by 50 irregulars.

There is simply no qualitative comparison to be made between the nature of the threats that face us today and those that faced us 10 years ago. There are bad people in the world, there are people who run countries who should not even be allowed to drive cars in a rational world, but they have not got the power to threaten us. What we are doing is acting as if the United States was still threatened.

I heard a Member say during the debate on the military bill, "Well, the world is a more dangerous place now because the Soviet Union collapsed." That nostalgia for a major enemy capable of destroying us is nonsensical in any other context than trying to put more money here, and more money here will inevitably mean less in Medicare, less in college student loans, less in the National Institutes of Health, less in helping people comply with en-

vironmental mandates, less in law enforcement.

Vote to give this \$148 million to the Pentagon, vote for the full funding of the NATO infrastructure gift from America to the economies of western Europe, vote for other additional military construction at a time when the threat has diminished, and you take away from every other account. You deprive yourselves of the argument that you regret the other cuts in important programs that help people because you are voluntarily taking the money from Medicare, taking the money from student loans, taking the money from the National Institutes of Health, taking the money from Head Start, taking the money from pollution enforcement, and putting it here where it is at a much lower level of social need.

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

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The committee has done its job and has been responsible.

This bill is about things the gentleman from Massachusetts should be able to support. It is about the soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and their families—that is what this bill is about. Providing for their working environment, their housing, their hospitals and clinics, their child care centers—the gentleman's amendment impacts all of these things.

Mr. Chairman, as we find ourselves with fewer personnel in the Armed Forces we are going to have to provide bases that are maintained in top order and personnel must be adequately housed.

Does the gentleman think our soldiers are overhoused—because his amendment could impact a total of \$636 million for troop housing. Does the gentleman not believe that child development centers are important to single military parents, dual military couples, and military personnel with a civilian employed spouse—because his amendment could impact a total of \$57 million for child development centers. Does the gentleman not believe the members of the Armed Forces and their families deserve to have updated hospitals and clinics because his amendment could impact a total of \$178 million to provide these facilities. Does the gentleman not believe that we should meet the requirements of the Federal Facilities Compliance Act because his amendment could impact a total of \$207 million for environmental compliance.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has been responsible and reviewed each project provided for in this bill. The gentleman is not being responsible by approaching his reductions in such a vague manner. I ask my colleagues to oppose his amendment and suggest if

he is serious about cutting this bill that he provide this body with the specific projects that would be related to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 290, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

AYES—131

Abercrombie	Ganske	Olver
Ackerman	Gejdenson	Owens
Andrews	Green	Pastor
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Barcia	Hamilton	Pelosi
Barrett (WI)	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Hinchey	Petri
Bentsen	Hoekstra	Poshard
Berman	Horn	Rahall
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Ramstad
Borski	Jacobs	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Johnston	Reynolds
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Kennedy (MA)	Rohrabacher
Cardin	Kennelly	Roukema
Clay	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Kleczka	Rush
Collins (IL)	Klug	Sabo
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Sanders
Conyers	Levin	Sanford
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Schroeder
Coyne	Lincoln	Sensenbrenner
Danner	Lofgren	Serrano
DeFazio	Luther	Shays
DeLauro	Maloney	Slaughter
Dellums	Markey	Smith (MI)
Deutsch	Martinez	Stokes
Dingell	Martini	Studds
Dixon	McCarthy	Stupak
Doggett	McDermott	Torres
Durbin	McHale	Torrice
Ehlers	McKinney	Towns
Engel	Meehan	Tucker
Eshoo	Menendez	Upton
Evans	Mfume	Volkmer
Farr	Miller (CA)	Waters
Fattah	Mineta	Watt (NC)
Fawell	Minge	Waxman
Filner	Mink	Williams
Foglietta	Moran	Wise
Ford	Nadler	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Neal	Wyden
Franks (NJ)	Oberstar	Zimmer
Furse	Obey	

NOES—290

Allard	Boucher	Coburn
Archer	Brewster	Coleman
Armey	Browder	Collins (GA)
Bachus	Brown (FL)	Combest
Baesler	Brownback	Condit
Baker (CA)	Bryant (TN)	Cooley
Baker (LA)	Bunn	Cox
Ballenger	Bunning	Cramer
Barr	Burr	Crane
Barrett (NE)	Burton	Crapo
Bartlett	Buyer	Creameans
Barton	Callahan	Cubin
Bass	Calvert	Cunningham
Bateman	Camp	Davis
Beilenson	Canady	de la Garza
Bereuter	Castle	Deal
Bevill	Chabot	DeLay
Bilbray	Chambliss	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Chapman	Dickey
Bishop	Chenoweth	Dicks
Bliley	Christensen	Dooley
Blute	Chryslers	Doolittle
Boehlert	Clement	Dornan
Boehner	Clinger	Doyle
Bonilla	Clyburn	Dreier
Bono	Coble	Dunn

Edwards	Kennedy (RI)	Reed
Ehrlich	Kim	Regula
Emerson	King	Richardson
English	Kingston	Riggs
Ensign	Klink	Rivers
Everett	Knollenberg	Roberts
Ewing	Kolbe	Rogers
Fazio	LaFalce	Ros-Lehtinen
Fields (LA)	LaHood	Rose
Fields (TX)	Largent	Roth
Flake	Latham	Royce
Flanagan	LaTourette	Salmon
Foley	Laughlin	Sawyer
Forbes	Lazio	Saxton
Fowler	Leach	Scarborough
Fox	Lewis (CA)	Schaefer
Franks (CT)	Lewis (KY)	Schiff
Frelinghuysen	Lightfoot	Scott
Frisa	Linder	Seastrand
Funderburk	Lipinski	Shadegg
Gallely	Livingston	Shaw
Gekas	LoBiondo	Shuster
Gephardt	Longley	Siskis
Geren	Lowe	Skaggs
Gibbons	Lucas	Skeen
Gilchrist	Manzullo	Skelton
Gillmor	Mascara	Smith (NJ)
Gilman	Matsui	Smith (TX)
Gonzalez	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Goodlatte	McCrery	Solomon
Gooding	McDade	Souder
Gordon	McHugh	Spence
Goss	McInnis	Spratt
Graham	McIntosh	Stearns
Greenwood	McKeon	Stenholm
Gunderson	McNulty	Stockman
Gutknecht	Meek	Stump
Hall (OH)	Metcalf	Talent
Hall (TX)	Meyers	Tanner
Hancock	Mica	Tate
Hansen	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Harman	Molinari	Taylor (MS)
Hastert	Mollohan	Taylor (NC)
Hastings (FL)	Montgomery	Tejeda
Hastings (WA)	Moorhead	Thomas
Hayes	Morella	Thompson
Hayworth	Myers	Thornberry
Hefley	Myrick	Thornton
Hefner	Nethercutt	Thurman
Heineman	Neumann	Tiahrt
Herger	Ney	Torkildsen
Hilleary	Norwood	Traficant
Hobson	Nussle	Visclosky
Hoke	Ortiz	Vucanovich
Holden	Orton	Waldholtz
Hostettler	Oxley	Walker
Houghton	Packard	Walsh
Hoyer	Pallone	Wamp
Hunter	Parker	Ward
Hutchinson	Paxon	Watts (OK)
Hyde	Payne (VA)	Weldon (FL)
Inglis	Peterson (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Istook	Pickett	Weller
Johnson (CT)	Pombo	White
Johnson (SD)	Pomeroy	Whitfield
Johnson, E. B.	Porter	Wicker
Johnson, Sam	Portman	Wolf
Jones	Pryce	Young (AK)
Kaptur	Quillen	Young (FL)
Kasich	Quinn	Zeliff
Kelly	Radanovich	

NOT VOTING—13

Duncan	Murtha	Wilson
Frost	Schumer	Wynn
Jefferson	Stark	Yates
Manton	Velazquez	
Moakley	Vento	

□ 1859

Mr. COX changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. RANGEL and Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1900

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NOR-

WOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, 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. 1817) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON BILL MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT, 1996

Mr. MEYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-147) on the resolution (H. Res. 170) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow 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 Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on International Relations; Committee on the Judiciary, and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, June 15, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my Committee has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by the Rule.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,
Chairman.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, June 15, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House, that the Committee on Small Business has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by the Rule.

Sincerely,

JAN MEYERS,
Chair.

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 will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LESSONS FROM THE HISTORY OF AGRICULTURE

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, you know, we are a young Nation, and our focus is forward with only an occasional glance back at the lessons of Athens or Rome or even the lessons of the dust bowl in this country.

But this House is soon going to consider an important issue that requires a deeper look back so we can better plan ahead.

We will soon consider a farm bill that warrants an examination of the history of agriculture and a study of the lessons learned. There is a lineage between the modern American farmer and the ancient Sumerian who worked the land between the Tigris and the Euphrates. It is an equality of importance. Both were responsible, indeed farmers throughout history have been responsible for their countries' civilizations.

It has been said that in the last reckoning, all things are purchased with food. This was true with the cradle of civilization, and it holds true now. Today, American agriculture is this country's largest industry. Agriculture accounts for a full 16 percent of our current gross domestic product, \$355 billion worth of food and fiber were produced this past year. That is more than any other industry.

And so it is especially critical that we learn the lessons taught by the successes and failures of the past. History is awash with the remains of societies that failed their farmers and ultimately failed to maintain their soil and who let it succumb to erosion and certainly that resulted in a fall of their civilization.

Cities like ancient Babylon, 2,600 years ago, developed a productive agriculture. It allowed their civilization to grow to 17 million people and a remarkably diversified society. King Nebuchadnezzar boasted, "That which no king has done before, I did. Great canals I dug and brought abundant waters to all the people." But agriculture and farmers became a lesser priority in that country, and ultimately failed.

Today, the site of Babylon is desolation, a dry land, and the promised land 3,000 years after Moses, he called it the land of milk and honey, now barren and rugged, the victim of soil erosion. Only dregs of fertile soil remain at the bottoms of narrow valleys.

But there are also successes. Societies with plans maintaining farmers and maintaining agriculture survived and flourished. For the last 1,000 years, farmers in the French Alps have terraced hillsides dramatically in an effort to prevent soil loss, resulting in continuously fertile soil, fertile agriculture and abundant production.

Essentially, countries that practice a careful stewardship of the Earth's resources through terracing, crop rota-

tion and other sound conservation measures have flourished for centuries, Dr. W.C. Lowdermilk, of the Soil Conservation Service, reported in 1953. Forty-two years have not changed that.

In the U.S. Congress we are now engaged in a great agricultural debate. We are deciding what proper role the Federal Government has in Federal agricultural policy.

It is important that the American people understand that agricultural programs have been designed to encourage a continuous, but slight, overproduction. Farm prices have been kept low.

Most farmers over the past 50 years have experienced subsistence standards of living, mostly because of the agricultural farm programs.

A goal of those programs has been to keep enough farmers and ranchers producing so that an abundant supply would result in not only lower food and fiber prices in this country, but huge exports of commodities that has eventually assisted in our balance of trade.

For 60 years, we have enticed farmers to become more and more dependent on Government subsidy programs. As we move to a more market-oriented farm policy, it is important that we do it gradually and we do it smartly to make sure we do not endanger this productive and efficient industry of American agriculture.

American consumers now spend 9.5 percent of their take-home dollars for food. With that 9.5 percent they are able to buy the best-quality, lowest-priced food anywhere in the world.

In our haste, we cannot jeopardize the survival of American agriculture or the economic strength of our country.

HONORING ST. LOUIS CITY HALL EMPLOYEES FOR THEIR EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF VICTIMS' FAMILIES OF OKLAHOMA CITY TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor St. Louis City Hall employees for their efforts on behalf of the victims and families of the Oklahoma City tragedy. The Recorder of Deeds, Sharon Quigley Carpenter, and her staff organized a fund-raiser in conjunction with other departments in City Hall and raised a total of \$3,415.50. In addition, city hall employees sent a sympathy card to Oklahoma City signed by hundreds of people who either worked or came into City Hall on business.

The initiative taken by the employees at St. Louis City Hall demonstrates their caring spirit. It is a model of action stimulated by compassion and empathy. I want to salute these employees for their selfless and generous contributions to the victims of Oklahoma City.

STATE OF EMERGENCY IN GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1996, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 1 hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, there is a state of emergency with respect to decisionmaking right here in this capital right now, and there are large numbers who do not recognize the fact that there is a state of emergency.

We are faced with an unprecedented situation. Government is about to make a dramatic change, and most people, most groups who are going to be victimized by this dramatic change, do not quite seem to understand that there is no miracle in the offing, nothing will save us from the kind of decisionmaking that is taking place now which will result in some devastating cuts in program that benefit large numbers of the American people.

There is a state of emergency, and we should understand that there is a state of emergency. Those who do not understand that we are caught up in extremism, driven by the radical right, public policy is being driven toward a dangerous cliff. We are going to go over that cliff if we do not summon our forces and begin to fight back and understand the kind of problem we face.

To approach extremism and to try to combat extremism with moderation is to guarantee defeat. We must summon up the same kind of intensity that is being summoned against us. We must defend ourselves with the same kind of intensity.

Let us take a look at the budget making process that is now begun. We have already passed the House of Representatives budget. The ruling majority, the Republicans, have passed a budget already. The Senate has passed a budget, and the Senate and House budgets do not differ dramatically. There are draconian cuts in both budgets.

Granted, the Senate's wisdom seems to be to move much slower than the House budget, and that is under negotiation now, the House budget versus the Senate budget, two Republican majorities negotiating with each other.

But there is extremism in both. Never before in the history of the country, this Nation has never seen before such drastic changes being pushed over such a short period of time.

There is a document that was issued by the Republican majority in the House called "Cutting Government," and I have it in my hand. Cutting Government was issued, and it is an indication of what was passed in the Republican majority's budget in the House of Representatives. Cutting Government summarizes extreme changes that are being proposed, extreme, and the sooner we all understand it, the better we will be able to marshal some kind of appropriate defense.

Let me just read the first paragraph of the Cutting Government document. It reads as follows: "The House committee on the budget proposes to terminate, block grant or privatize three Cabinet departments, 284 programs, 69

commissions, 13 agencies, and privatize three commercial activities in our 1996 budget resolution."

That is the opening statement of the document, *Cutting Government*, from the Republican majority in the House of Representatives.

□ 1915

Unprecedented. Where else in the history of the Nation have we seen a Congress propose such drastic, reckless changes in such a short period of time, to cut 284 programs, to eliminate three Cabinet departments? Sixty-nine commissions are to be eliminated, 13 agencies to be eliminated, all in a 2-year period—really it is 1 year because a budget is a 1-year document. It is hoped that once they accomplish this, you know, that this is the worst possible scenario, that next year there would not be another budget which will make additional draconian cuts. I do not know what else there will be left to cut in such an extreme matter. They have set out a pattern which I assume will be followed next year, and I assume the pattern will be followed for the next 7 years because there is a 7-year budget that has been proposed. These are extreme measures, you know.

They do not like to hear the word "extreme" around here. They do not like to have recognized exactly what is happening. These extreme measures are camouflaged under talk that makes it appear that this is all a matter of fiscal responsibility, that we are going to save the Government from bankruptcy. These extreme measures will hurt a great deal. They will hurt people in my district; they will hurt people right across the country.

These are extreme measures and represent war being declared on certain categories of people in our society. They do not like to hear class warfare. The Republicans are quick to respond to any notion of an attack on the working class. This is an attack on the working poor, it is an attack on the working middle class, it is an attack on people who are not working and poor. That is class warfare; it is clearly an attack.

You know, it is a blitzkrieg; that is a German word related to World War II that nobody wants to hear either. I am not implying that the Republicans are Fascists or Nazis. It is a figure of speech that I use when I say that they have launched a blitzkrieg because of the rapidity with which they are moving, and the destructive nature, the all-encompassing destructive nature, of the budget process that has been launched by the Republicans: 284 programs to be eliminated, 3 Cabinet departments to be eliminated, 69 commissions to be eliminated, 13 agencies to be eliminated; if this is not a blitzkrieg, then what is a blitzkrieg? You know, if this is not devastation that goes deep and is quite thorough, and to do it all within one budget over a 2-year period, 7 year period, to move that rapidly; if that is not a blitzkrieg, if

that figure of speech is not appropriate, I do not know what figure of speech would be appropriate.

On the other hand there are people who say we should not use such harsh language, that we are overdoing it when we talk about the fact that we are faced with an unprecedented situation in our history. We should respond in a more genteel terms. We should be civil in the face of uncivil actions that are uncivilly perpetrated against us. We should ignore the Speaker of the House when the Speaker of the House states that politics is war without blood.

The Speaker of the House says politics is war without blood. He has proceeded to set a tone in the House which runs parallel to that statement. It has been pretty clear that we have been pursuing business here in a manner which very much resembles war. War requires enemies. War requires losers. I do not think that we define what happens here in the Congress, or here in Washington in the past, as being war without blood. We have defined it as being a contest between two responsible parties. Whether they agree or not, at least we did not consider that there must be ultimate losers, casualties. We did not put it in terms that made it appear that, you know, the Nation is going to suffer, a large segment is going to suffer, as a result of one group trampling over another.

I said before we have been engaged in what I would consider to be a noble contest between two political parties. The contest is to determine who can provide the best possible government or what compromise will result—will result because you have two competing parties who both have the goal of improving the Government, of promoting the general welfare, of establishing an environment where people can pursue happiness in the easiest possible way with the least amount of impediments.

I assume that a noble contest is what we were talking about, and the tone of our deliberations in the House and the tone of the deliberation of the Government in Washington are affected by the fact that many of the leaders in the past have considered us to be engaged in a noble contest to determine how best we can improve our Government to keep the great American experiment going forward and getting better all the time. But Speaker GINGRICH has defined what is happening here as war without blood, and the attack launched by the budget process is a blitzkrieg, it is a war, it is scorched-earth warfare when you eliminate three Cabinet departments, you eliminate 284 programs, you eliminate 69 commissions, 13 agencies, and you privatize three major commercial activities all in a very short period of time. That is war, and, if we do not recognize, if the opposition, the Democrats, loyal opposition, does not recognize it, then they are doomed to failure.

The great majority of the American people are going to be impacted, and

the majority will be hurt, an elite group in the minority will benefit greatly from this blitzkrieg. They will be the winners. The majority of Americans will be hurt. They are going to be hurt, and we are going to have to hide our heads in shame if we do not offer a better defense.

We may lose; after all, the Republicans have the numbers in the Senate, they have the numbers they need in the House of Representatives. We may lose, but at least we ought to rally ourselves and not fool ourselves about what we are confronted with and make an appropriate response.

You know, to take another analogy from World War II, my father, who gave me the name "Major," so you know he must have been interested in war and soldiering a great deal; he followed events in World War II very closely in the newspaper and magazines. He only had an eighth-grade education, so he did not read scholarly journals, but I think he was as smart as anybody I ever met. He followed it very closely, and he explained to me at one point the tragedy of the blitzkrieg launched by Hitler against Poland and how they had these Panzer tanks. Hitler and his army mechanized, modernized, moving toward Warsaw, and the Polish sent the cavalry out to meet him. Poland sent men on horses, beautifully trained horses, beautifully trained riders, the old glory of the aristocracy riding with him. They sent horses out to meet tanks, and that is the danger that I see developing here, is that we are allowing ourselves to be lulled to sleep by some kind of gas or some kind of noxious fumes. Something is affecting us in ways which are inexplicable. We do not understand what we are up against. We are ready to send beautiful horses out to meet tanks, murderous tanks.

On the one hand we say, well, you have the Republicans propose this reckless budget, extreme budget. They cannot get away with that. But the Republicans in the House control the votes, have enough votes to do it. The Republicans in the Senate have enough votes to do it. That is on the one hand.

On the other hand you say, well, you got a Democratic President. A Democratic President will not let him get away with that, but recently the Democratic President says that he is in favor of moving in the same direction, not just moving toward a balanced budget, and wisely so. He makes a difference, that we will do it in 10 years, but the only difference that he proposes, that the cuts be a little less drastic, that the blitzkrieg be joined, not opposed, you know.

That is on the one hand, the other hand, and you know there is just no other hand if the President, the Democrat who has the power to veto—all expecting the veto of the President to put a check on extremism; the veto of the President will slow down this blitzkrieg. The veto of the President will

force a halt to the rapid movement toward the cliff, the dangerous cliff that our public policy is moving toward. The veto of the President would make it necessary to negotiate. There will be no unconditional surrender, but a negotiation which would at least preserve some of what is under attack here.

But the President has said that he will join the rapid movement, and the only difference is he wants to slow it down or he wants to spread it out. That is the only difference. The President wants to balance the budget, and he refuses to talk about the one item that we know one could use to balance the budget in 7 years or in 10 years. You could balance the budget; we have proven that. The Congressional Black Caucus budget, which was introduced here on the floor here, said, if you insist on balancing the budget, we think it is very unwise to try and do it in 7 years, but whether you do it in 7 or 10 years, the way to balance the budget without forcing the draconian cuts in Medicare, the draconian cuts in Medicaid, the terrible cuts in education, without cutting the throat of the effort to improve education, which is so vital to our society, without those drastic moves you could still balance the budget if you would raise the percentage of the tax burden which is borne by the corporations. You could raise the percentage of the tax burden borne by the corporations, and there would be very little pain out there because the corporations are making tremendous amounts of money in our society at this point. Our economy is booming. Part of our economy is booming. The Wall Street economy where investments are made and the profits of corporations are up; that side of the economy is booming.

There is another side of the economy, or another economy totally at this point which I call the job economy which has no relationship between the—there is no relationship between the booming Wall Street economy and the job economy. The job economy is suffering from less and less unemployment in certain places is quite high. Underemployment is rampant all over the country. People are working for less. When they have the good fortune to find a job and have a job, they are working for less, even in the ranks of middle management. They are working for much less. The downsizing, the streamlining, has driven down the quality of life and the standard of living of large numbers of middle-class people who seemed quite safe before in our economy. The very industries which would drive the need for people in an information economy, an information-driven economy, that industry is automating so fast, streamlining its communications technologies and its computerization that large numbers of employees who were needed before are not needed now, or they can take portions of their operations overseas for cheaper and cheaper labor, and the cheap labor is not necessarily only the

children in Bangladesh who make sneakers and who are forced to work long hours. Cheap labor sometimes are computer specialists, people who are programming computers in India and who are college graduates or from Eastern Europe who are college graduates, and they work for half of what the computer specialists or the computer programmers would make here in this country.

So there are many ways in which our industries, American industries, can earn huge profits without improving the job situation. So we need a program to correct that. We need to deal with how Americans are going to protect their standard of living the way the Japanese protect their standard of living, the way the Germans protect their standard of living. We need a program.

□ 1930

Before we get to a comprehensive program to do that, one obvious step we should take is to take advantage of the fact that our corporations are making a lot of money. The profits are up very high, and yet they are paying less of a tax burden than families and individuals.

In 1943, and I have a chart here which shows this, the Congressional Budget Office uses the same statistics. I think this chart came out of one of their documents, the Office of Management and Budget, nobody disputes the fact that these are facts. In 1943, 39.8 percent, of the tax burden, the revenue that runs our Government, came from corporations, corporate income taxes. In 1943, 39.8 percent almost 40 percent. At the same time, in 1943, 27 percent of the tax burden, the revenues that run the country, came from individuals and families.

I have repeated these facts several times here in this Chamber. You cannot repeat it too much, because at some time the American people have to wake up; at some time they have to realize they have a good reason to be angry. At some point they have to know where to direct their anger appropriately. The anger should be directed at the sellout that has taken place in this Congress, in this city, Washington, since 1943. The tax burden that is borne by the corporations dropped all the way from 39.8 percent, almost 40 percent, to 8 percent in 1982, 8 percent. It went all the way down from 40 percent to 8 percent in 1982.

Now, how did that happen, while at the same time the individual share of the tax burden went from 27 percent in 1943 to 48 percent in 1982? And in 1995 we are looking at a situation where the individual taxes, individual and family income taxes, are still at 43.7 percent in terms of the total amount of revenue raised to run the country, while the corporate share is down still, not quite as low as it was under Ronald Reagan in 1982, not at 8 percent, but it is at 11 percent. Eleven percent.

Now, if you want to balance the budget, then I was waiting for the

President to say, "Let's balance the budget by closing the corporate loopholes, by getting rid of the corporate welfare, by restoring a balance in the tax burden. Let's do it over 8 years." You could balance the budget and meet that need, if we consider that to be such a great need, without cutting Medicare 1 cent, without cutting Medicaid.

Medicare and Medicaid should go back to where Hillary Clinton placed them. In her health plan we were going to make cuts in health care, but we were going to make them in the context of a plan which would provide better health care for all Americans, and, most of all, would cover all Americans. Within the context of that kind of plan, we were also going to be able to slow the rate of the rise in the cost of health care, which is what is being talked about now. The cuts being proposed now are being proposed without any discussion of providing health care to all Americans who are uncovered, or without any discussion of how health care can be improved.

What am I talking about? I am saying that on the one hand, the Republicans in the House and the Senate propose to recklessly balance the budget by making cuts that are going to make large numbers of Americans suffer, by making cuts that are going to leave a mark on our infrastructure, our social infrastructure as well as our physical infrastructure, that will make it very difficult to overcome in future years. All of this is being done very rapidly, and nothing seems to be in place to stop it. The Republicans are moving rapidly, and the President now has joined the flow in the same direction, instead of being the opposition force, the one remaining opposition force we could rely on, the veto of the President.

I projected on the floor of the House a few weeks ago that we would have a situation where the President would stand between the American majority, the caring majority of Americans who are going to be hurt by these cuts, he would stand between them and the Republican blitzkrieg, and force the issue by vetoing the appropriations bill. He cannot veto the budget. That will be decided in the next few days probably by the House and Senate, and the budget will be there. But the budget only sets the upper limits as to how each Committee on Appropriations can operate.

The appropriations bills, one by one, go to the President. The President can veto them. The power to override the vetoes does not reside in either House, I do not believe. The Senate could override the vetoes and the House could not. The Democrats have enough coherence, unity, enough strength left to be able to assist the President in the veto process.

Then negotiations would be forced. You have to have negotiations. We all remember the famous negotiations at the White House when we had gridlock

with George Bush. George Bush, facing a democratically controlled House of Representatives and Senate, they had to negotiate a settlement. Each side had to give and take, and you had a balance coming out that nobody was really that happy with, but at least it did not wreck the country overnight. It was not extremism of the kind we are faced with here.

So if we do not have the hope that the President will stand against the blitzkrieg of the Republicans, then what do we have? All we have left is a possibility that the American people can be mobilized and public opinion can be so focused and so determined and communicated in such a forceful way that the President will wake up and change his course.

Our hope is we can have the executive branch of Government stand firm against these draconian, disastrous cuts that will drive our Nation over the cliff into an abyss that will be very difficult to get out of.

Let me just go into a little more detail, because people still do not believe that we are in a crisis. Nobody seems to understand what is in plain English. This is not so subtle. There is nothing hidden. It is all quite out in the open. There is no conspiracy. Republicans cannot be accused of a conspiracy. It is right out there in the open. Everybody has a copy of this list, "Cutting Government."

Departments to be eliminated: The Department of Commerce, the Department of Education, the Department of Energy. They are to be eliminated. That is the Republican proposal. I understand the Senate only proposes to eliminate the Department of Commerce. We can be hopeful in the negotiations between the Senate and the House that we are going to save, if not all three of these departments, at least two of them.

But that is a fact now. It is a very hard fact. One-half of the legislative process, one-half of the legislative branch of Government, is on record already to want to eliminate the Department of Commerce, the Department of Education, and the Department of Energy.

They want to eliminate 13 agencies. I invite anybody who wants to go along with me to take out a pencil and write it down. If you do not have the list, I will give it all to you in detail. Details sometimes are very important. Maybe the details will awaken the American people to the fact we have a crisis. We have a state of emergency in decision making.

The decisions that are going to be made in the next few months in Washington are going to leave us in a situation that will create massive amounts of pain and suffering. The decisions that are made are going to be very difficult to undo in the next few years. Something must be done to rally the American people, the public opinion, and communicate that to the executive branch, that they have to stand against

this blitzkrieg that is going to make for so much pain and suffering.

Agencies eliminated, 13. The Economic Development Administration, the Travel and Tourism Administration, International Trade Administration, Minority Business Development Administration, Maritime Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Agency for Health Care Policy Research, Corporation for National and Community Service, which was created by the National Community Service Act just 2 years ago, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting will be phased out over 3 years, Administrative Conference of United States, Legal Services Corporation, which has provided legal services for poor people since Lyndon Johnson created the Legal Services Program during the Great Society years in the 1960's. That is going to be wiped out completely, eliminated like all the other agencies that I have just named. The State Justice Institute, the Office of Technology Assessment. All eliminated.

Maybe this is too high up for most of you who are listening. You cannot comprehend what it means, because these are big agencies still. They are pretty big. Maybe you want to go to another level and let's talk about the 284 programs to be eliminated. The Housing Investment Guarantee Program, USDA's Strategic Space Plan, FMF, loans to Greece and Turkey, assistance to Eastern Europe and Russia, East-West Center, North-South Center, Office of the American Workplace, the SBA Tree Planting Program, DOT's Minority Resource Development Program, highway demonstration projects, mass transit operating assistance, Air Traffic Control Revitalization Act.

There is an article today on the front page of one of the magazines that asks is the Government doing all they can to protect us in the sky when we are flying? Their answer is no, the Government is not. We are going to eliminate a portion of the effort to make it safer for us to travel by air.

The National Highway Institute, the Office of Physical Fitness and Sports. Under Ronald Reagan I think we had a fitness program that was launched that has been quoted over and over again as having reaped great gains in terms of improvements in health and the movement in the direction which would lessen the cost of health care by having a more fit population.

There is an assumption that any small program, because it is small, is undesirable. Some of the programs I am reading here are small, and they are deemed to be automatically undesirable and unproductive because they are small. There is nothing rational about that. That is totally irrational.

I do not say that some of this reasoning does not come from the administration. The White House, the executive branch, started looking at everything small and deciding that we would consolidate. But every time they consolidate by bringing them together, one of

fice under one umbrella, they would eliminate some of the funding, which means that consolidation was really a way to cut out some of the programs.

It is like saying that fingers on your hand are undesirable and no good, unproductive, because they are smaller than the hand. We would be better off if we had just one lump here, consolidation. Let's consolidate all this stuff, and you have it all in one lump, and that is a great improvement automatically.

Well, the animals on the earth that do not have the kind of finger separation and these smaller items here are not able to compete at all with the manual dexterity of the species homo sapiens. God knew what he was doing, and can we not follow the example? We make the assumption because the fingers are smaller than the hand, we would rather consolidate it in order to improve it. Many of these small programs are far more effective and far more beneficial than large programs. The cost benefits ratio for what we pay for these small programs as taxpayers, we get a far greater benefit out of them than you get from some of the better known, larger programs that are being protected, of course.

The VISTA Program, volunteers in this country, originally created to sort of parallel the Peace Corps, where you would have volunteers in this country. Senior Volunteer Corps, Retired Senior Volunteer Corps, the Foster Grandparent Program, Senior Companion Program, Senior Demonstration Program, these programs are being eliminated because they are very small. They are very tiny, but they are very beneficial and nobody ever argues at any hearing or markup that the programs do not work.

□ 1945

They just are small, and they are going to be eliminated because they happen to be too small.

Goals 2000, State and local education programs. Goals 2000 national programs, Goals 2000, parental assistance, small efforts in the Department of Education that represent a great deal of time, energy, brainpower, devotion, patience, Goals 2000 resulted from a long effort that began under Ronald Reagan when he commissioned a group to study the state of American education, public education. They came back with a report entitled "A Nation at Risk." "A Nation at Risk" said that we are at risk in the modern world of not being able to compete globally with our competitors in trade, not being able to in technology or the use of technology match our competitors and produce the kind of products, the quality of products at the cost level necessary to be able to maintain our leadership in the world.

Goals 2000 is a result of a long process begun then. First, "A Nation at Risk" report was issued by Ronald Reagan, and then George Bush came along and issued a position statement

called American 2000. President Bush called a summit of Governors in Virginia, and the Governors decided to establish a six-point program, six goals for education. These are very, very energetic, knowledgeable people who participated in this process. More important than anything else, they were elected by the American people. They participated in the process together.

It was not to the credit of President Bush, it was not the White House handing down something from Olympia and expecting all the States to comply. There was instead a participation of all existing Governors, including Governor Bill Clinton. So when Governor Bill Clinton became President, he was in a position to follow through. There was continuity from a Republican President to a Democratic President on the all-important matter of education.

Yes, the emphasis was different in terms of the great emphasis on vouchers and privatization of education that was written into the American 2000 program by President Bush and Secretary Alexander. That emphasis was not there in Goals 2000. But much of what was in America 2000 under George Bush was retained in Goals 2000, especially the standard setting.

There was agreement, Republican and Democrats all Governors, that you need to have some standards set. You need to have standards set with respect to the kind of curriculum, the quality of curriculum, the purpose and goals of curriculum. You need to have standards set in terms of how you were going to assess the performance of students, and they did not decide this among the Governors but in the Education and Labor Committee. We introduced a third set of standards called opportunity to learn standards that in addition to standards for curriculum and standards for the assessment of the performance of students, tests, there also should be standards for opportunity to learn, all the young people in the States given an opportunity to learn.

All of these standards were set and would be voluntary. No State would have to do anything. The State has an option. The State would not have to accept the standards. The State would not have to accept standards for curriculum, standards for opportunity to learn. It is all voluntary, but even that, by the way, has been quite successful.

There has been a national math curriculum issue, a national arts curriculum issue. The curriculum standards have moved forward. There is a national history curriculum in the works now, a lot of controversy about it, but it is moving forward. And for the first time the effort to improve American schools is on a systematic upward, forward, progressive path. But now we are going to eliminate that effort. The heart of the effort will be eliminated in this budget that eliminates 284 programs.

Education is a particular target. If you recall, when I read the names of the departments to be eliminated, education was one of the departments, one of the three departments proposed by the Republicans in the House to be eliminated. That alone, when a civilized nation in 1995, given where the world is, how complicated it is, how competitive it is, when a civilized nation decides it wants to eliminate its Department of Education, then you have a state of emergency right there, even if it did no further damage.

If no other reckless proposals were made, that alone is enough for the American people to understand that something is seriously wrong here in Washington. How can any civilized nation say it does not want to provide some kind of direction and some kind of effort to influence the way education is undertaken in the whole nation.

We have a situation where local and state governments are primarily responsible for education. They always have been. There was an editorial in *The Hill* last week where one of the Members of the Education and Labor Committee argued that we have spent more and more on education, and education has gotten worse; and the Federal Government, therefore, should get out of the business of education. We spend more on education, but the money has come from the States and the local levels, and the States and the local governments have been in charge.

Local school boards and the States have been in charge of education. They have the power, \$360 to \$380 billion. That is a lot of money spent on education last year. But only about 7 percent of that was Federal money. The rest of it came from the States and the localities.

So 93 percent of the dollars, the cost is covered by State and local government. They have 93 percent of the power. The Federal Government is a small bit player in education. The largest program, the chapter 1 program, is a \$7 billion program out of that total of \$360 to \$380 billion. So the Federal Government cannot be blamed if we have spent more money on education and got poor results because it has been a bit player, a tiny player. Its influence is at this point quite minimal. I think it would be very appropriate, highly desirable if the Federal Government's role in education increased to about 25 percent and the federal funding for education moved in the same way.

If we were funding 25 percent of the total education budget of the country and we had 25 percent of the decision-making power, education would still be very much under the control of local governments, local school boards and the states. It would still be 75 percent. Anybody who has 75 percent of the power is in control.

The Federal Government would have some influence and that is all it has ever had, a tiny amount of influence. So if education is in trouble, things have gone wrong, it is not because the

Federal Government has had a major role and it is the cause. The Federal Government has come to this situation very late in the history of this nation. State governments have always been in control.

Even this tiny effort now would be wiped out in the pending budget. Education for disadvantaged concentration grants, wiped out; education for disadvantaged targeted grants wiped out; impact aid, wiped out; education infrastructure, small program which was to begin the process of providing some help to have poor local school boards to remove asbestos or lead where it is a problem and make schools more healthy in areas where they do not have the money and will never be able to raise the money to do it so that kids would go to safe schools or schools that are not so life threatening as lead poisoning and asbestos are to young children, that is eliminated.

Magnet schools assistance, eliminated; drop out prevention demonstrations, eliminated; bilingual education instruction services, eliminated; Galaudet University will not be eliminated but they must combine four programs into one. National Institutes for the Deaf combined three programs into one. This is small efforts for people with disabilities, and they are squeezed also.

The Eisenhower Leadership Program, the minority teacher recruitment, minority science improvement, innovative projects for community service, these are all tiny programs, but they have gone and assumed that because they are so tiny they are undesirable, unproductive and must be eliminated.

Federal TRIO programs are tampered with, five programs are eliminated: National Science Scholars, National Academy of Science, Space and Technology, Teacher Corps. I am not reading them all. I am just reading a few of those on the list. Harris fellowships, Javits fellowships, graduate assistance in areas of national need. These are all graduate programs that will be fashioned by members of the Education and Labor Committee in response to long-standing needs. They are tiny programs, but they meet specific kinds of needs that have been identified for more aid in certain areas.

Science is one of those areas. We need more aid for students who are studying, minority students studying science. Javits fellowships were a different kind of effort to aid minority students, not minority students, but students in general. Graduate assistance in areas of national need says it exactly as it is, areas of national need identified, public health people, people who could work with children with disabilities, various areas where you identify national need, there was an effort to target the funding. All of that eliminated. Too small.

Nobody has ever said it does not work, they just said, it must go.

Howard University academic program, Howard University endowment

program, elimination. We are talking about wiping out the Howard University academic program, Howard University research, Howard University Hospital, Howard University Clinical Center, Howard University construction, all that wiped out, about \$110 million wiped out of Howard University's budget, which wipes out Howard University, because Howard University is the only federally funded university for primarily, it was created primarily, after the Civil War, for the newly freed slaves. But it serves students of all colors, races and creeds now, but it is federally funded primarily.

It does receive funds from some other sources, but only tiny amounts. So when you take away federal funds from Howard University, you are saying we are wiping out Howard University. That is a serious action. That is certainly a state of emergency for Howard University, a state of emergency for education.

Star Schools, eliminated; Ready to Learn Television, the whole area of technology, the use of mass media to improve education, to lower the cost of education, all of that discussed for many years in the Education and Labor Committee, the old Education and Labor Committee, which is now called the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the representatives that you elect, the representatives that you send here who are placed on authorizing committees labor to get the best wisdom in the country through hearings, through reading papers. Staff organizes legislation, and we created these programs in response to real needs.

But now the power is in the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations to wipe all this out, and it proceeded to destroy it. When I use the word blitzkrieg or scorched earth, it is quite appropriate. This is very thorough. This is very devastating, very destructive. It is public policy decisionmaking, but it is as deadly as knives and guns are on a smaller level.

What is being done to our society, the torture and the maiming of our society is incomprehensible to most people. We do not think in those terms. One of the problems with the species *Homo sapiens* is that they are very physical. Species *Homo sapiens* only reacts to what it can see and feel, what our senses can identify.

The cognitive process is more difficult to comprehend than we allow, and we allow it to be fooled and manipulated and misused by people who understand the cognitive processes better, who understand futurism and how to project and create new systems. And they understand the result of the systems that they create.

They talk about a balanced budget amendment, but what they are doing is presenting a situation or creating a situation and an environment which will be hostile to social programs and sets up a situation which allows them to

squeeze the social programs that they do not want out of existence.

□ 2000

Granted, another group could do that, and squeeze the defense programs and some of the undesirable programs that are being funded out of existence also, but the process is in the control of those who want to go after the programs that benefit the great majority of the American people.

These people who are doing the squeezing, this list of programs to be eliminated and destroyed, which I will discontinue reading at this point, this list is promulgated by people who know very well what they are doing, and have targeted people programs, programs that do benefit the working poor, the working middle class, the poor who have no jobs, and large numbers of the upper middle class will also be hit.

The professional classes will also be hit. The government workers, they are going after their pensions, and going to squeeze those. They know what they are doing. It is not by accident. Nothing has happened by accident. It is clearly understood what the process is.

When they decide to do something in the opposite direction, which is clearly going to cost a lot of money, but they want to do it, they can be very reckless about doing it, very open.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the discussion on the budget and the discussion on appropriations and the discussion about where the country is going with respect to fiscal responsibility, what the danger of bankruptcy might be, that discussion ought to be divided into two parts: before the B-2 bomber vote that took place last week, and after the B-2 bomber vote. The B-2 bomber is a defining point in this whole discussion. The funding for the B-2 bomber, the authorizing of the funding for the B-2 bomber, was on the floor. There was an amendment to eliminate the funding for the B-2 bomber.

What is the B-2 bomber? It is a dream machine for people who want to sneak into areas through a stealth process with a bomber and drop bombs. It was originally conceived to go into the Soviet Union during a nuclear war and drop bombs on selected targets, and it would do this during a nuclear war by using the state-of-the-art stealth technology. It would not be observed. It could sneak in there and do it. With the whole world exploding around us, we would send this bomber in there and it would finish off targets in the Soviet Union.

We say we still need it. It is under production already. The item on the floor was whether or not they should add additional B-2 bombers. The cost was about \$30 billion, when we add the production costs and operations costs. The figure of \$30 billion sticks out. We are talking about \$30 billion in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying the discussion before and after the B-2 bomber

tells us a great deal, because there were large numbers of people who insisted that they came here to cut government, to get government off the backs of people, to make government more effective and more efficient.

There was a discussion on the floor of the B-2 bomber costing \$30 billion. Thirty billion dollars can buy a lot of hospital beds, it can buy a lot of school lunches. Thirty billion dollars can build beautiful new schools where there are unsafe schools with asbestos and lead poisoning. Thirty billion dollars can accomplish a great deal in our society in any of the areas of need.

However, \$30 billion was on the floor, and the deliberation was shall we go ahead with this madness and keep this \$30 billion in the budget, or shall we be reasonable and sincere and show that we are honest about wanting to improve the efficiency of government, about wanting to save the Nation from bankruptcy, about wanting to keep our children from having to bear the burden of paying the debt we build up. All the rhetoric that has come around the balanced budget and the need to move forward to make these draconian cuts was on the table.

The B-2 bomber, the Pentagon says they do not need it. The Secretary of Defense said "We do not need the B-2 bomber." Nobody in the military wants the B-2 bomber. The President does not want the B-2 bomber. The people who are the experts, people who have to fight the wars, say "We do not need a B-2 bomber." Yet, \$30 billion is on the table that we can realize and regain to do other things with, to go toward helping the deficit, to keep our children from having to pay these gigantic debts in the future.

All of the rhetoric could be realized. All of the things promised in the rhetoric could be realized to a great degree with \$30 billion on the floor. The military does not want it, the Air Force does not want it, the Secretary of Defense does not want it; yet, the majority of the people on the floor of the House of Representatives voted to keep the \$30 billion in the budget for the B-2 bomber.

Before the B-2 you might have said "Some of these people are really sincere, especially the freshmen." The freshmen came with their eyes popping with sincerity, bright with sincerity. They said "We do not care what it is, if it is wasteful, we will eliminate it."

Here is an example on the floor, a concrete physical example, a \$30 billion example of what you can do to help eliminate waste, make government more effective and efficient, and reduce the deficit. All the objectives can be met to the tune of \$30 billion on the floor. Yet, the vote was that the majority says "No, we will keep the B-2 bomber," for whatever reasons.

I do not stand here to impugn the motives of my colleagues, and Congressmen are not in the business of explaining the votes of other Congress persons. They can explain their own

vote, but I think you ought to call up each one who voted to keep the B-2 bomber to explain "What is the magic, what is it that we cannot see through simple, ordinary logic?"

There may be some special kind of reasoning and logic, or some deep-seated wisdom that the people who voted to keep this \$30 billion monster in the budget have that the rest of us do not have. Let them explain. I see no rush to explain by many who voted.

Of course, there were people who argued on the floor that we need to give our troops the very best, and the stealth bomber would help make it safer for our fliers, et cetera, et cetera. The fliers do not say that. The experts in the military do not say that. The generals do not say that. The Secretary of Defense does not say that. They all gave these arguments, running counter to the people we trust and pay to run our defense.

Therefore, let the B-2 bomber be the deciding point in terms of determining the integrity and the consistency, the truthfulness of anybody who stands on this floor and calls for budget cuts. Let that be the determining, defining moment. It is worthy of saying "Before the B-2 I saw you this way. After the B-2 you are exposed."

Across the B-2, across the spectrum, there are some other B-2 bomber types of votes. We are voting to keep in the F-22, a fighter plane that is the most sophisticated fighter plane ever conceived. It is not needed, also. There are many others. Then we are going to be considering very soon a reorganization of the agricultural bill, continuation of agricultural welfare. Here you have very dishonest discussions about to shape up, similar to the B-2 in terms of the rhetoric is in one place and the action is in another.

If we want to eliminate welfare as we have known it, if we want to change welfare and eliminate welfare as we know it, then let us eliminate agricultural welfare as we know it. From New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, there are thousands, millions of people who would love to go to Kansas and be able to enjoy the benefits that Kansas farmers enjoy from the taxpayers. They get \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000 checks each year of doing nothing. They get checks for not plowing the soil, for not growing grain. The checks are without question. They do not have to prove that they are poor.

If you go in any city and say that you are desperately poor, you have no other means to feed your children, then you have to fill out forms. You have to have an audit of your expenses. Somebody has to investigate you before you get a penny. The average welfare check for Aid to Dependent Children recipients, for a family of three, is about \$300 a month across the Nation, it being much lower in certain places, like Mississippi, and higher in places like New York. However, the average check is \$300 a month for a family of three. Yet, you have to fill out numerous forms, be

investigated, and establish the fact that you really need it. There is a means test.

There is no means testing for farmers. There is no means testing. The rich farmers will get the same check that the poor farmers get. There is no means testing. Yes, true, when Franklin Roosevelt first established the program there were poor farmers in the Nation, and it served the purpose. That is no longer the case. We have rich farmers as well as poor farmers getting this welfare.

My time is up, Mr. Speaker, but my point is we are on the verge of a major catastrophe here in Washington. A state of emergency exists. All of America should wake up, particularly the caring majority, the large majority of people who are going to have a great deal of pain and suffering generated for them as a result of these terrible decisions that are being made here.

I hope people understand that in the final analysis, the war that is raging is for us to win. We are still a majority. We are not beggars. We are not in a situation where we have no arms to fight back with. We are still a majority. The caring majority can rally its forces and still prevail. We have to understand first that we are in a state of emergency, that we are threatened, before we rally, but we can and we shall overcome.

CONGRESS MUST LEAD BY EXAMPLE IN DEFICIT REDUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we address the House tonight on some important issues, many of which are coming up tomorrow. The fact is, in the legislative branch of the Government, if we are going to lead by example, we need to reduce our own expenditures.

We have already seen in this 104th Congress, Mr. Speaker, there have been tax reductions. We have had spending reductions of \$190 billion. We have had a deficit reduction of \$90 billion. We have had regulatory relief to try to eliminate the unnecessary regulations on businesses and individuals, so they have a chance to succeed in life and be able to create jobs. Now we are talking about downsizing Government.

We talked about eliminating some Federal agencies and reducing others, privatizing still others and consolidating their functions, making sure that we have more direct services for people but less bureaucrats we are supporting. That is what the people of the United States want.

We see historically tomorrow a very important day in the life of this 104th Congress in the House, because House Republicans will continue to keep their promise to the American people by

making Congress smaller, more efficient, more accountable, and less costly.

In H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill will bring to an end 40 years of largesse in the bloated congressional bureaucracy. By ending business as usual, the GOP bill slashes wasteful congressional spending and ensures that Congress will show its fair share of deficit reduction on the road to a balanced budget.

With me tonight is the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. GIL GUTKNECHT. He will be working with me in discussing with the American people a number of issues where we can see the downsizing. For instance, Congress must lead by example in its quest to balance the budget by the year 2002. H.R. 1854 will cut congressional spending by \$155 million below the fiscal 1995 levels, and we think that is a step in the right direction.

Once the Senate considers its changes, Mr. Speaker, the total savings just within the Congress could be \$200 million. I would like the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] to in fact outline for those Members of the House who are present and listening tonight and others who are joining with us the kinds of changes we are fundamentally making in the way the House runs itself.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] to outline for us some of those points which are radically different than any prior Congress.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, my grandmother used to say it was wrong to tell our children that they should do as I say, not as I do. I think it is important, as the gentleman has indicated, that we lead by example.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased and terrified on my very first day in this body to stand in this very place and be the freshman lead sponsor on the adoption of the rules for the Congressional Accountability Act, which essentially said that Congress is going to have to start to play by the same rules as everybody else. That, I think, was the first step in saying that we are going to lead by example in the 104th Congress.

The bill that probably has more to do with actual Members of Congress than any other bill we will deal with this year, the legislative appropriations bill that will be on the floor tomorrow, really begins to make a very important start, and more importantly, an important statement about what we are going to do.

Let me quote one other person who it may seem unusual for someone on our side of the aisle to quote, but one of my favorite quotations is from a gentleman by the name of Jesse Jackson. Several years ago Jesse Jackson said "If you want to change the world, you have got to first change your neighborhood."

I think if we are going to downsize the Federal Government, we have to start with our own House appropriations bill, and I am very pleased with the bill that the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and others have put together. I think it reflects what the American people voted for back in November 1994. I think it reflects what the American people want. I think it reflects what the American people expect.

□ 2015

Let me just talk about some of those things you have already mentioned and I don't want to be redundant but I think it bears repeating, that this legislative branch appropriations bill is going to spend \$155 million less in fiscal year 1996 than we are spending in fiscal year 1995. I think that people need to put that in perspective.

If in fact we did that throughout the entire Federal budget, if we reduced the Federal budget in every category as much as we are reducing our own budget, it would mean that we would cut over \$130 billion from the Federal deficit next year. I think that is important. I think the American people need to know that.

Among some of the things that they have included in this bill, and again I congratulate the committee and the staff and all the Members who have been working so hard, and frankly I think maybe, JON, you and I can take some credit as Members of the freshmen class in the 104th Congress, we have been applying pressure from day one to make certain that these kinds of changes were made. But let me just read a few of the changes that are included in this important bill. First of all we eliminate the funding for the Office of Technology Assessment. Second, we eliminate the Joint Committee on Printing, because there is an awful lot of duplication. We will still be able to get our documents printed. It is just eliminating some of the waste and duplication here in the House. We eliminate one House parking lot. I think long term we are looking at a plan perhaps of privatizing all the House parking lots and making it pay its own way. We eliminate complimentary Historical Society calendars. We eliminate the complimentary volumes of the United States Code for Members. We eliminate constituent copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In other words, people who want this information are going to have to help pay for it. We privatize the Flag Office. Many constituents write in and they want flags that have been flown over the Capitol. We are still going to make that available but we are not going to do it as a Government-run operation. We are going to privatize. We are going to privatize the House Folding Room which has been a sore spot I think particularly with many of the reformers for a number of years. We are also going to reform, we are going to go right where it hurts, we are going to

privatize the House barber shop and the House beauty shop. More important probably than anything else, we are going to begin to consolidate all of these various Members' allowances into a single account.

Again let me just restate. I think this is what the American people wanted back in November when they sent such a clear message that they wanted to downsize the Federal Government. I think they want the Congress to live by example. I think they have seen over the years the number of abuses that Members of Congress have piled upon themselves in terms of perks and advantages that we enjoy, and I think this is a giant step in the right direction in returning some of the credibility to the U.S. House of Representatives and making us much more accountable and making us live within the means that we can afford.

Again, finally, let me just restate something else. If we downsize the rest of Federal spending as much as we are downsizing legislative appropriations in this bill that we will hear tomorrow, we will be saving the taxpayers over \$130 billion. I think that is a giant step forward.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT]. I think the fact is that you have displayed repeatedly on the House floor and in committee your resolve as well as the Speaker's that we move forward in making those kinds of fundamental changes.

As we look to this budget for this year, and we look to reconciliation and the appropriations process, we have to keep asking ourselves, because our constituents will be asking us as well, is this a legitimate function for government? Could the private sector better handle it? If it should be government, could it be done with less money? And if it should be government, should be it the Federal Government? Could it be better handled by the State government or local governments which are closest to the people?

Extending if I may beyond what you have said already on some of the savings, the Printing Office would be reduced as far as what their actual budget items would be. The Office of Technology Assessment. The Architect of the Capitol would be reduced by \$9.9 million. I think part and parcel of reducing the legislative expense of running this House and of running the Senate which could, like you said, be sizable figures, part of what the freshman class has been doing, and you may want to expand on this, Congressman, after I reflect on it, that is, we have talked already and have obviously acted to reduce by at least one-third to 50 percent our amount of money for franking, that is the mail that is paid for by citizens to receive information which is supposed to be factual data but reducing that budget by a great extent which makes it better for challengers and more fair to the process. We have reduced already the pensions

which I would like to see reduced further. We have a bill to ban gifts from lobbyists, which is certainly appropriate and in line with our reforms. We are also looking to eliminate the frequent flier miles, as no one should personally benefit from the fact they have to fly home or fly back or go to a committee meeting, those personal flier miles should not go to the Congressman, they should go back to the Federal Government in savings for travel.

We also should be looking to election and lobbying reform. I think people want to see reform of political action committees and their involvement and influence in elections. This is just one more dimension as I see it in making sure we in fact reform the House, reform its operations, and reform the procedure by which Congressmen run their offices and run the Government to the extent that legislative branch impacts on the total Federal arena.

I would like to yield back to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] to reflect further if you have comments on these reform procedures beyond the downsizing of the House itself.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I remember on that very first night, I was just thinking about it as we were standing here, one of the people I quoted, another person that I have a tremendous amount of respect for, is Vaclav Havel, the first free elected President of Czechoslovakia. I will never forget he came to Minnesota a number of years ago and he said something incredibly profound. Actually he was quoting Thomas Jefferson. He said, "Words are plentiful but deeds are precious."

I think the important thing about the 104th Congress whether we are talking about the Legislative Branch appropriations, a lot of the other reforms you are talking about, as a matter of fact, I think sometimes people say, "Well, what have you done for us lately?"

We are trying every day to press for these reforms, whether it is campaign finance reform, ethics reform, lobbying reform. I think those items are still on the agenda and obviously we would like to work together with our friends on the other side of the aisle and the President if possible on some of those things, but if they are not willing to work with us, I think we are willing to take those bulls by the horns as well and do it ourselves. But the important thing is I think we are leading by example, particularly with this legislative branch appropriation and I think the American people need to know that. I think they need to know that we are working to keep those promises that many of us made back in the campaigns last year that we do want to downsize the Federal Government, we want government to do what they have to do and that is to live within its means, that is why we fought for term limits, that is why we fought for all these other reforms.

Tomorrow I think is a very important day and marks one more milestone in this historic reform-minded 104th Congress.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I appreciate the gentleman's quote from important individuals around the world who recognize the importance of the actions as opposed to just the words that we speak here on the House floor. Frankly we have been meeting in more days and more hours and more votes than any prior Congress in recent memory, and our work is obviously not completed. While we have done much to set the stage by reducing by one-third of House committee staff, eliminating 3 committees, 25 subcommittees, on the opening day \$93 million alone in savings, we are now looking to downsizing the Federal Government so that we have more for direct services and less in bureaucracy and paying for bureaucrats.

One of my pieces of legislation that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is working with me on and many of the freshmen, that is, to have a sunset review of Federal agencies within an every 7-year cycle. This worked very successfully in Pennsylvania where each agency, bureau and department would have to justify their existence on a regular basis and to the extent they are not really fulfilling their original objectives or is duplicating another level of government service, it gets eliminated. The employees would move on to other agencies or into the private sector.

The fact is we need to downsize the Government which has to a great extent created a cottage industry of just more regulations, and more bureaucrats to in fact carry them out. We have legitimate services for which government is important but not just to have more regulations that cost individuals and cost businesses.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] has been working closely with me in our Government Reform and Oversight Committee. Some of the accomplishments we have already had is to make sure we have legislation when there is regulation? And correspondingly, what benefit will they get out of this new regulation? In fact, we have passed in this House this year a moratorium on new regulations until the inventory that we already have on the books and whether or not enforcing them is in the public interest.

We have also had a Paperwork Reduction Act, now trying to reduce our paperwork by at least 10 percent. The Government has not been really user-friendly. What we need to do is make sure that like as a business, we justify every dollar we spend, every service we are trying to perform and if the private sector can do it better, then the private sector ought to be left to doing it because the Government usually is slower, more costly, creates more barriers and does not reward initiative.

I know the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is a leader in

his State in this movement. The gentleman might want to reflect on regulations and where we have come thus far in the 104th Congress and where you see us going from this point.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would just go back to a couple of points you made as well. Not only I think has this Congress been reform-minded, we have also been about opening up the process to the public, reminding Members of exactly who pays the bills and who we work for.

Despite some of the cuts, I want to point out that in this legislative branch appropriation, one point that I missed and I do want to come back to that, that we fully fund projects to bring Congress into the information age, including Office 2000 Network and the National Digital Library. We want to encourage all agencies to move towards electronic formatting of documents. We want to make it easier for people to get information about what is happening here in the People's House. I know the Speaker has set that as the standard from day one and I think that is something we are going to continue to work for.

Despite some of the budget cuts that we are going to sustain here in the legislative branch appropriations bill, we are not going to close the process to the American people.

One of the other reforms that we passed on the very first day, we said we are going to open all the meetings, so the meetings that we are having now are open to the public. One other thing we have found now as we have been through these markups, and I know the gentleman has been in some, I was in one most of the day and will be in one most of tomorrow. We do not have proxy voting anymore. Members actually have to be in those committees and we have to actually cast our own votes.

I think many folks would come in from other parts of the country, would come to Washington, they would see some of these committee meetings where almost no one was actually there to listen to the testimony or to participate in the process in terms of marking up these bills and actually voting on amendments, where the committee chairman would sit with a handful of proxies and literally vote half of the members of that particular committee or subcommittee. I think we all knew that that was wrong, and it took the 104th Congress to begin to end that.

Despite the cuts that we are making, we are going to continue to press to make this much more open, much more user-friendly and much more available to the average American so that they know what is happening with their government here in the People's House.

I wanted to mention that. I also want to get back, you began to talk a little about being more businesslike and doing some things as relates to regulatory reform. There is no question that one of the things that we need in

this country is regulatory reform and if I might just continue on the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] for just a little bit, talk about one of the committees that I serve on and why I believe it is important that we continue to press for regulatory reform.

I happen to serve on the McIntosh subcommittee that deals with regulatory reform. It has got a name much longer than that but the short title around here is the Regulatory Reform Subcommittee. Let me just share some of the things that we have learned in testimony in that committee so far. One think tank told us that they believe that the cost of unnecessary Federal regulations to the average consumer in the United States per household works out to about \$4,000 per household. It totals about \$400 billion a year, according to that one particular think tank.

Federal spending to run regulatory agencies in 1994 was \$144 billion. We have approximately 130,000 Federal employees, some might call them bureaucrats, but 130,000 people whose principal job it is to write, interpret or enforce new rules. What we hear from many small business people that have come in to testify, and we have had field hearings around the country, is that they really cannot bear the cost of all of these new Federal regulations. Let me give a few examples.

When we talk about the FDA. It is estimated that on average it will cost a drug manufacturer, a pharmaceutical company over \$350 million and 10 years of time to come out, to get approval for FDA of one new drug. Sometimes we wonder why our drug prices are so high. I certainly would not be one that would defend some of the high drug prices, but certainly the amount of regulation and redtape that the pharmaceutical companies have to go through to get one new drug approved is almost staggering. In fact, one estimate said that 25 cents of every dollar spent by consumers on new drugs falls within the FDA empire. This is the largest consumer protection agency in the world and sometimes we have to ask ourselves, how much protection can we afford?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, the fact is we just had a hearing in my district on FDA reform. Most of the new miracle, life-saving, life-extending drugs that are created in the country, in fact in the world are created here in the United States.

Many of our experts in the biotech and pharmaceutical companies have informed us that in fact we may be the last recipients, our constituents, of these miracle lifesaving and life-extending drugs because of all the delays in approvals.

□ 2030

And people who are waiting for the drugs say, "Well, if my insurance company will not approve it because the

FDA has not, in fact, sanctioned it, then we cannot get it." We had witnesses who had ALS, epilepsy, cancer, or AIDS, all waiting for drugs that, frankly, have gone through appropriate protocols, have had the clinical trials, which most countries might approve.

We are just saying in new legislation we are trying to get passed is, "please speed up the process of approving or disapproving the drugs." We want them to be pure. We do not want overregulation. That is what you are getting at. When we overregulate, we delay the time period by which our constituents might be able to extend lives or the quality of their years.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. It is not just in terms of the number of lives and people waiting for new drugs and chemicals and new procedures, new technologies. I must say that is an issue that is relatively near and dear to our heart back in the State of Minnesota. Obviously, the largest employer in my district is the Mayo Foundation. We are very keen in making certain we have the latest technologies, latest developments for patients who come to visit Mayo Clinic.

As a matter of fact, I like to share the story; it is told that shortly before he retired, one of the Mayo brothers gave a speech. He said, "The plain truth is the average American becomes seriously ill 11 times during their lifetime. They recover 10 times. The reason they recover as many times as they do is because we know as much as we know. When we know more, they will recover more times."

The problem we have in the United States, as it relates to new technologies, new drugs, new procedures, it takes so long from the time they have been developed until they are on the market and the result of which is not only are we losing the benefit of some of those new technologies, in many cases they are very cost-effective as well, but we are also losing some of the jobs that go with producing those new devices and those new technologies.

The medical advice business is more and more being exported to Europe and Japan where they can get approval much faster. They do not have to go through as many hoops, and, as a result, the manufacturers are saying, "I am not going to fool with the FDA. We can get approval much faster in Sweden, Germany, France and Great Britain, and so forth."

So we are not only losing the advantage of having those technologies and drugs available to the American consumer, we are also losing all of that economic growth and development, the jobs that go along with that very important biotechnical industry.

So that is another thing we are losing, and as we talk about the rules and regulations, and we have had so many examples, it is not just FDA.

I will give you one more example about the FDA. The last food additive that was approved by the FDA was in 1990, 5 years ago. When you talk to the

food processors in the Midwest or anywhere, they tell us that you know, it is next to impossible because you have to almost prove or disprove the negative. I mean it is next to impossible.

In fact, just a few years ago, we had a scare, you may remember about Alar in apples, and everybody thought, well, we should not eat the apples because some of the apples have had, you know, a very minute amount of Alar applied to them.

Well, only late did we find that the average consumer would have to consume 28,000 pounds of apples a day for 70 years to have something like a 1-in-a-million chance of additional cancer in their particular body.

The point, I guess, of all of this is we can never make things that are completely 100 or 1,000 or whatever, 1-in-a-million percent safe. And so I think we have to have some reasonable regulation, and it is going to be placed upon us to change some of those things.

And, you know, it is like the Alar example, there are lots of examples. Just because we can measure in parts per billion does not necessarily mean that a drug or a chemical is completely unsafe for the American consumer. At some point I think we are going to have to deal with that.

I think American consumers are ready for that.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. One of the things I wanted to say is the fact that on all of these items we are dealing with, whether we are dealing with reform or dealing with items of reduction of our spending or tax cut adoption, or whether we are talking about deficit reduction in this House, the 104th Congress, I am very heartened to tell you and those who are listening, in fact, reforms have been bipartisan, that it has largely been the majority of both sides of the aisle. I think that tells us a lot about the fact that our agenda has been pro-people, pro-active, pro-jobs, pro-business, because the American business cannot depend on having all of these regulations. If we have to over regulate ourselves, as you just said, our jobs are going overseas. We have to make sure regulations are reasonable, not overly expensive, overly intricate. They have to be related to safety and not related to a bureaucratic maze.

I have just seen in my own district, where a gentleman wanted to deal with the Federal Government, but there were 187 pages of forms, a small contract, \$25,000. He would have had to hire an architect, an engineer, attorney, to get through the maze of those documents. He said to me, "Well, you know the Federal Government is not user-friendly."

And, you know, the fact is if the Federal Government was a business, it would be out of business. So we have to make sure we continue our bipartisan situation where we are looking at the focus of the country and saying what can we do to make sure the Government is really delivering the services the people want, that they cannot al-

ready take care of themselves, that the private sector is not taking care of.

FDA reform, I believe, is one of the major areas, not only in your district, but my district as well. Some 12,000 jobs are dependent just on pharmaceutical and biotech areas where they helped to make people live longer, live better, and actually provide employment for a great number of high-tech jobs.

So I believe that in this Congress you are going to find some reform legislation adopted which will make the system work better.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I wanted to restate something else about that. It is not just the jobs and all the other things, but in many cases, the use of some of these new technologies, new drugs, pharmaceuticals and so forth, are very cost-effective, even though the cost of that drug, even at today's prices, because of all the regulations and, to a certain degree, because of the litigation that goes on, we are paying probably for more than we should pay for those drugs, it is still more cost-effective than a hospital stay or the alternative that people might have to confront.

So it is not just that. There are a lot of factors here. I do not think we want to leave the impression with the American people we want no regulations. All we want is reasonable regulations, and we cannot prove something is safe to 1 in 1 million or 1 in a billion. At some point we have to understand that there are some risks. Every morning when we get up in the morning, we take a certain amount of risk. When we get in our car, we take a certain amount of risk. Some of us fly home almost every weekend. We take a certain amount of risk.

I wanted to also share a story of some things I have learned here recently, for example, about the Department of Defense. I believe these numbers are correct, and this is all about all of regulations that, in part, we create, but, more importantly, are created by the various other Federal agencies.

But I am told we have working for the Department of Defense 106,000 people, now, you almost have to be sitting down to hear this, 106,000 people whose principle job it is to be buyers. In other words, they buy things for the Department of Defense, everything from toilet paper to F-16 fighters.

In fact, F-16 fighters are a good example. I think we have something like 1,646 people to buy one F-16 fighter. Now, we pretty much know what one looks like. We know what it is supposed to do. I understand there are certain specs. We have got to make certain the contractors are meeting those specs. But it is hard for me to believe we need 1,646 people to buy one F-16 a week.

Now, 106,000 buyers seems a bit exorbitant, at least it did to me. What bothered me even more, as a matter of fact, I think the story is bad but it gets worse, I am told they have over 200,000

managers to manage the 106,000 buyers. Largely, it is because we have this convoluted set of rules and regulations and regulations piled on top of regulations.

As a matter of fact, I have to tell this story. This morning I gave a talk to a group of electronics folks who were in town. One of them gave me this little circuit board. This circuit board, I guess, goes into an M-1 tank, and it helps to monitor the fuel supply in an M-1 tank. It is a very simple, and I am not an expert on circuit boards but I know just about enough to be dangerous, but this is a very simple circuit board. In fact, the gentleman told me it costs about \$3. But because of all the Federal regulations and all the hoops they have to go through, when they sell this circuit board, I think General Dynamics, they sell it for \$15.

He said the biggest reason is we have to deal with all the various rules and regulations of the Federal Government, the procurement process and everything that goes with it, and they have to certify, and now, this has a life cycle of about 20 years, but they have to certify at the end of 20 years that this will have no detrimental impact on the environment.

Now, this is going into a machine whose principal mission it is to destroy the environment, a tank; I mean, what it does is break things and destroy things, and yet this circuit board has to prove beyond any doubt that it will do no environmental damage, and, you know, again, I want to say that we want regulation. We need regulation, and there certainly is a role for the Federal Government to play, and I know that left to its own devices, the free markets will not take good care of our environment. I understand that.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. The point you make is well taken. The fact is that this U.S. Congress and this House and Senate will have to take those kinds of examples you just showed us with regard to what one circuit board for \$3, that we need to reexamine every single department. What we are talking about with sunset review might eliminate some useless jobs, some duplicating jobs, some positions that are really redundant.

We certainly need to make sure our defense is combat-ready and that our people have the technology and training that goes with having a job with the military, and we have the finest units in the world. There is no question about it.

But to have us spend \$12 extra for overregulation, environmental conditions that really not applicable, shows to me that the sunset review legislation would certainly be an idea whose time has come.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would say absolutely it is just indicative; I think it does tie together with this whole legislative branch appropriations.

I think we are showing that if we operate our House more efficiently and show how it can be done, if we begin to reduce the needless regulations that

the Federal Government has created over the years, and I sometimes do not like this term, if we begin to run the Government more like a business, maybe a better way to say it is we ought to say use more business principles and common sense in achieving some of the things the American people want us to do, I think, and I am an incurable optimist, I believe you can balance the budget. I believe you can make the Federal Government live within its means. I believe you can have reasonable regulations. I think you can have a strong economy.

I do not think these are mutually exclusive. It is just that it takes a little bit of common sense. I think that is what the American people want. That is what we promised, and, as I say, I think that is what we are delivering every day for the American people here in the 104th Congress, and it has been a privilege for me to be a part of it, and it has been a privilege for me to have been working with people like you, and I think we are making a difference, and this legislative branch appropriation is important tomorrow because it sends the right kind of signal.

It is going to demonstrate to the American people we can run the Congress on a much smaller budget. If we can do it in the House of Representatives, it can be done in Federal agencies all over. We can reduce the bureaucracy in the Department of Defense. We can have a strong national defense. We do not have to spend 70 percent more than we have to when we buy circuit boards, whether we are buying toilet paper, toilet seats. You know, the examples go on. Many times, though, those things happen because of all the regulations that we have piled onto the bureaucracy, and it is not just on the Federal Government. We are piling those kinds of regulations on the private sector as well.

So if we unleash some of those powers, use business principles, use common sense, I think we can balance the budget. We can have a clean environment. We can have safe drinking water. We can have new drugs and pharmaceuticals. We can have a growing industry in all kinds of fields. We can have all those things the American people want.

We do not have to sacrifice. We just have to have some common sense.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. What you stated is very much on point. The fact is what we need to do is have a new orientation. Your positive aspect I certainly applaud, and I think the enthusiasm is infectious.

Beyond that, what is even more important is the commonsense ideas, good business ideas. We can take a look at industry and say what have they done well. Frankly, business people have to balance the bottom line every day. If something is not working, is not profitable, they eliminate it. In the government, if it is not profitable we just send it onto the taxpayers, more taxes, more regulation, more waste,

and, the American people are tired of that. They want less waste, more accountability, less taxes, less wasteful spending, more direct service they need which the private sector cannot take care of themselves.

I am very happy tomorrow, you will you and I will be leading the charge, along with our colleagues here in the House, to make sure the kinds of changes fundamental to the running of the House, to downsizing, privatizing and consolidating will be the hallmark for the future on how we look to each Federal agency.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would only say in closing, I thank the gentleman for giving this opportunity to speak for a few moments here on the House floor, and some of our Members who may be watching back in their offices, that downsizing the Federal Government is a very difficult task, and I think as freshmen we are beginning to learn how difficult that can be, as the various groups come in and say, "Well, but do not cut this program, do not cut this program."

We can reduce the size of Government. We can reduce many of the things that the Government does without hurting people, and unfortunately sometimes the debate we hear is if you reduce this, it means people are going to get hurt.

One of the examples you used, and I just want to come back to it very briefly, you talked about in the private sector if something is not working and it is too expensive, it is downsized or eliminated. Unfortunately, what happens so often in the Federal Government, they do not downsize anything, do not eliminate anything, but come out with a new program and fund the old program at even larger scale. As a matter of fact, I think that is one of the reasons we have something like 160 different job training programs which are subsidized in whole or in part by the Federal Government, and we have been told by private consultants that most of those job training programs really do not work.

□ 2045

But the answer is never to eliminate any. It is to come out with more programs and prop up the ones that are not working, and I think we have to have the courage as we go forward to do what we are doing with the legislative branch appropriations, and that is to make real cuts, to make some of those tough decisions, and to force the use of technology and other ways to get more efficiency so that we can get more bang for the buck because again I think that is what the American people want, that is what they expect, and hopefully this is just one more example of our promises made and promises kept.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I say to the gentleman from Minnesota, "Thank you, Congressman. I want to take this opportunity to thank you for participating in this colloquy and dialogue with the American people on how

to make sure the Federal Government, through the Congress, can be more accountable to the people and to make sure we stay openminded to hear new ideas from our constituents whether it be by town meetings, by letter, or by phone call. We certainly will be responsive as our colleagues have been in the past."

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence in giving us this opportunity to speak out on some important issues of the day.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. UNDERWOOD of Guam (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, 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 Mr. BECERRA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND, for 5 minutes, on June 21.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. CLYBURN.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. NADLER.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. TOWNS.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. SKAGGS.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas in two instances.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. SHAW.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. FUNDERBURK.

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. HOUGHTON.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington.

Mr. WAMP.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee.

Mr. GILLMOR.

Mr. PACKARD.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT.

Ms. NORTON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 21, 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:

1074. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, the "District of Columbia Emergency Highway Relief Act"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 170. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1686) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-147). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 558. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact (Rept. 104-148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MYERS: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 1905. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 1889. A bill to encourage organ donation by enclosing information in income tax

refund check mailings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. FARR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MILLER of California, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1890. A bill to establish a California Ocean Protection Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. HAMILTON:

H.R. 1891. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Ohio River Corridor Study Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. GILLMOR):

H.R. 1892. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the requirements applicable to hearing aid compatible telephones in workplaces; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 1893. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude length of service awards to volunteers performing fire fighting or prevention services, emergency medical services, or ambulance services from the limitations applicable to certain deferred compensation plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 1894. A bill to amend title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding impact aid payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 1895. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, relating to a vehicle weight and longer combination vehicles exemption for Interstate routes 29 and 129 in Iowa; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 1896. A bill to waive requirements mandating that States use the metric system in erecting highway signs and taking other actions relating to Federal-aid highway projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Science, 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 Ms. LOFGREN (for herself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 1897. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to assure immigration priority for unmarried sons and daughters of citizens of the United States over unmarried sons and daughters of permanent residents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. MINETA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WOOLSEY, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. BEILENSON):

H.R. 1898. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cease mineral leasing activity on submerged land of the Outer Continental Shelf that is adjacent to a coastal State that has declared a moratorium on such activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1899. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain conduct relating to civil disorders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NUSSLE:

H.R. 1900. A bill to amend the Clear Air Act to exempt agriculture-related facilities from certain permitting requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 1901. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to delay the implementation of remedial action and design for a particular Superfund site for 1 year while undertaking monitoring and testing to determine whether further action is needed; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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.

H.R. 1902. A bill to remove the New Hanover County airport burn pit Superfund site from the national priorities list under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. SKAGGS (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 1903. A bill to provide health insurance benefits to certain former employees at defense nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy for injuries caused by exposure to ionizing radiation; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1904. A bill to provide for various programs relating to improving the health of rural populations; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 104: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 127: Mr. ZIMMER and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 156: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 218: Ms. DUNN of Washington.

H.R. 219: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 263: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 264: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 311: Mr. NEY and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 312: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 364: Mr. MARTINI.

H.R. 390: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 407: Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 488: Ms. RIVERS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 500: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 528: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 574: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 732: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 733: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 734: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 752: Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. EHLICH, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCRERY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 789: Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 797: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 798: Mr. HEFNER, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 810: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 843: Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 863: Ms. LOFGREN and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 896: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 909: Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 913: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 994: Mr. WELLER, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. CANADY, Mr. EHLICH, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 995: Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 996: Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 1021: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1023: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 1085: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1100: Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 1114: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. NEY, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 1130: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 1138: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1143: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1144: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1145: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1192: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1193: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1222: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 1229: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1235: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1268: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1299: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1339: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1385: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1386: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 1400: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1406: Mr. KLINK, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CLINGER and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1448: Mr. KASICH and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 1450: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1496: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1512: Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1546: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1594: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. NEY, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. THOMAS.

H.R. 1610: Mr. HOBSON and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1617: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1670: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. FOX.

H.R. 1677: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1739: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 1744: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 1768: Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 1791: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1794: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1799: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1810: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 1821: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1834: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. WHITE.

H.R. 1837: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1876: Mr. FARR and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.J. Res. 93: Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mr. HERGER.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. PICKETT.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. KLECZKA and Mr. HOKE.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. OWENS and Mr. HOKE.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. HOKE and Mr. PALLONE.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. MANTON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. SCHUMER.

H. Con. Res. 76: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MCHALE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. SOLOMON.

H. Res. 153: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WARD, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KLINK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. ORTON.

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 February 13, 1995]

H.R. 521: Mr. BEILENSEN.

[Omitted from the Record of March 10, 1995]

H.R. 24: Mr. FOX.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: Mr. BROWNBACK

AMENDMENT No. 13: Page 8, line 16, strike "\$669,000,000" and insert "\$645,000,000".

Page 12, line 8, strike "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$3,000,000".

Page 13, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 14, line 11.

Page 16, line 24, strike "\$595,000,000" and insert "\$643,000,000".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: Mr. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT No. 14: Page 13, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 14, line 11.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: Mr. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT No. 15: Page 77, line 3, insert before the period the following:

or full access for human rights organizations to areas where there exist human rights problems

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: Mr. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT No. 16: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES THAT RESTRICT ACCESS OF HUMAN RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 564. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for assistance in support of any country when it is made known to the President that the government of such country prohibits or otherwise restricts, directly or indirectly, full access for human rights organizations to

areas where there exist human rights problems.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to assistance in support of any country when it is made known to the President that the assistance is in the national security interest of the United States.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. DELAY

AMENDMENT No. 17: Page 29, line 1, strike "\$50,000,000" and insert "0".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. DELAY

AMENDMENT No. 18: Page 29, line 1, strike "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. DELAY

AMENDMENT No. 19: Page 29, line 1, strike "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$30,000,000".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. HALL OF OHIO

AMENDMENT No. 20: Page 7, strike line 18 and insert the following: "CHILDREN AND DISEASE PROGRAMS FUND".

Page 7, line 23, strike "\$484,000,000" and insert "\$592,660,000".

Page 8, line 6, strike "and (7)" and insert "(7) basic education programs, and (8)".

Page 8, line 16, strike "\$669,000,000" and insert "\$655,000,000".

Page 14, line 22, strike "\$2,336,700,000" and insert "\$2,310,000,000".

Page 30, line 17, strike "\$167,960,000" and insert "\$100,000,000".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. HALL OF OHIO

AMENDMENT No. 21: Page 7, strike line 18 and insert the following: "CHILDREN AND DISEASE PROGRAMS FUND".

Page 7, line 23, strike "\$484,000,000" and insert "\$592,660,000".

Page 8, line 6, strike "and (7)" and insert "(7) basic education programs, and (8)".

Page 8, line 16, strike "\$645,000,000" and insert "\$631,000,000".

Page 14, line 22, strike "\$2,336,700,000" and insert "\$2,310,000,000".

Page 30, line 17, strike "\$167,960,000" and insert "\$100,000,000".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. HEFLY

AMENDMENT No. 22: Page 16, line 24, strike "\$595,000,000" and insert "\$296,800,000".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. KLUG

AMENDMENT No. 23: Page 5, line 9, strike "\$79,000,000" and insert "\$60,629,334".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. KLUG

AMENDMENT No. 24: Page 5, beginning on line 10, strike "", to be derived by transfer from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Noncredit Account".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. KLUG

AMENDMENT No. 25: Page 5, line 9, strike "\$79,000,000" and insert "\$60,629,334".

Page 5, beginning on line 10, strike "", to be derived by transfer from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Noncredit Account".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MRS. LOWEY

AMENDMENT No. 26: Page 23, line 19, insert "or Indonesia" after "Zaire".

Page 23, line 21, strike "Indonesia and".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. MARTINI

(Amendment to the Amendment Offered By Mr. Sanders)

AMENDMENT No. 27. Strike "\$1,000,000" each place it appears in the amendment and insert "\$0".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. PORTER

AMENDMENT No. 28: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

Sec. 564. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" may be made available to the Government of Turkey.

(b) Not more than the amount under the heading "FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM SUBSIDY APPROPRIATIONS" necessary to subsidize loans to the Government of Turkey in the amount of \$213,000,000, may be made available to the Government of Turkey unless it is made known to the President that the Government of Turkey has—

(1) formulated and begun implementing a plan to ensure the economic, political and human rights of the Kurdish community in Turkey through political, economic, and other nonviolent means;

(2) lifted all restrictions on free expression in Turkey which controvert Turkey's human rights commitment as stated in OSCE documents and the United Nations Human Rights Convention;

(3) completely lifted its blockade of Armenia; and

(4) begun a comprehensive withdrawal of its troops from Cyprus.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. PORTER

AMENDMENT No. 29: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

Sec. 564. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" may be made available to the Government of Turkey.

(b) Not more than the amount under the heading "FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM SUBSIDY APPROPRIATIONS" necessary to subsidize loans to the Government of Turkey in the amount of \$240,000,000, may be made available to the Government of Turkey unless it is made known to the President that the Government of Turkey has—

(1) formulated and begun implementing a plan to ensure the economic, political and human rights of the Kurdish community in Turkey through political, economic, and other nonviolent means;

(2) lifted all restrictions on free expression in Turkey which controvert Turkey's human rights commitment as stated in OSCE documents and the United Nations Human Rights Convention;

(3) completely lifted its blockade of Armenia; and

(4) begun a comprehensive withdrawal of its troops from Cyprus.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. PORTER

AMENDMENT No. 30: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

Sec. 564. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" may be made available to the Government of Turkey.

(b) None of the funds under the heading "FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM SUBSIDY APPROPRIATIONS" may be made available to assist the Government of Turkey unless it is made known to the President that the Government of Turkey has—

(1) formulated and begun implementation a plan to ensure the economic, political and human rights of the Kurdish community in Turkey through political, economic, and other nonviolent means;

(2) lifted all restrictions on free expression in Turkey which controvert Turkey's human

rights commitment as stated in OSCE documents and the United Nations Human Rights Convention;

(3) completely lifted its blockade of Armenia; and

(4) begun a comprehensive withdrawal of its troops from Cyprus.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. PORTER

AMENDMENT No. 31: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

CONDITIONS ON ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 564. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" may be made available to the Government of Turkey unless it is made known to the President that the Government of Turkey has—

(1) formulated and begun implementing a plan to ensure the political, economic, and human rights of the Kurdish community in Turkey through political, economic, and other nonviolent means;

(2) lifted all restrictions on free expression in Turkey which controvert Turkey's stated human rights commitment as stated in OSCE documents and the United Nations Human Rights Convention;

(3) totally lifted its blockade on Armenia; and

(4) begun a comprehensive withdrawal of its troops from Cyprus.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. PORTER

AMENDMENT No. 32: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 564. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" may be made available to the Government of Turkey.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. PORTER

AMENDMENT No. 33: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS ON ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 564. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" may be made available to the Government of Turkey.

(b) CONDITIONS.—None of the other funds appropriated in this Act may be made available to the Government of Turkey prior to April 1, 1996, prior to which the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall have submitted to the Committees on Appropriations a report detailing the Government of Turkey's progress in—

(1) formulating and implementing a plan to ensure the political, economic, and human rights of the Kurdish community in Turkey through political, economic, and other nonviolent means;

(2) lifting all restrictions on free expression in Turkey which controvert Turkey's stated human rights commitment as stated in OSCE documents and the United Nations Human Rights Convention;

(3) lifting its blockade on Armenia; and

(4) removing its troops from Cyprus.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. PORTER

AMENDMENT No. 34: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 564. Not more than \$21,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" may be made available to the Government of Turkey.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. PORTER

(Amendment to the Amendment Offered by Mr. Smith of New Jersey)

AMENDMENT NO. 35: In addition, \$25,000,000, to be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Development Assistance Fund".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. PORTER

(Amendment to the Amendment Offered By Mr. Smith of New Jersey)

AMENDMENT NO. 36: At the end of the amendment, insert the following: In addition, \$25,000,000, to be available only if there takes effect a reduction in United Nations Population Fund amounts provided for under this heading in the event of noncompliance with certain requirements specified under this heading, and to be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Development Assistance Fund".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. RICHARDSON

AMENDMENT NO. 37: Page 14, line 22, strike "\$2,326,700,000" and insert the following "\$2,325,500,000".

Page 21, line 7, strike "\$671,000,000" and insert "\$672,000,000".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. RICHARDSON

AMENDMENT NO. 38: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR BURMA

SEC. 564. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for International Narcotics Control or Crop Substitution Assistance for the Government of Burma.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. RICHARDSON

AMENDMENT NO. 39: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON IMET ASSISTANCE FOR GUATEMALA

SEC. 564. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "International Military Education and Training" shall be available for Guatemala.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

AMENDMENT NO. 40: Page 16, line 24, strike "\$595,000,000" and insert "\$355,000,000".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

AMENDMENT NO. 41: Page 16, line 24, strike "\$595,000,000" and insert "\$416,500,000".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

AMENDMENT NO. 42: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS BY RUSSIA FOR CONSTRUCTION OF JURAGUA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT IN CIENFUEGOS, CUBA

SEC. 564. None of the funds made available in this Act for assistance in support of the Government of Russia may be used for the construction of the Juragua nuclear power plant in Cienfuegos, Cuba.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

AMENDMENT NO. 43: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

REDUCTION OF FUNDS FOR RUSSIA IN AMOUNT PROVIDED FOR CONSTRUCTION OF JURAGUA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT IN CIENFUEGOS, CUBA

SEC. 564. (a) IN GENERAL.—The funds otherwise provided in this Act for the Government of Russia under the heading "Assistance for the New Independent States of the Former

Soviet Union" shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount of funds provided by such Government for the construction of the Juragua nuclear power plant in Cienfuegos, Cuba.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The reduction provided for by subsection (a) shall not apply if the President certifies to the Congress that a restoration of the funds is required by the national security interest of the United States.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 44: Page 4, line 26, strike "\$26,500,000" and insert "\$1,000,000".

Page 5, line 9, strike "\$79,000,000" and insert "\$0".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. SAXTON

AMENDMENT NO. 45: Page 72, line 5, strike "for the" and all that follows through line 16 and insert a period.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

AMENDMENT NO. 46: Page 20, line 25, strike the semicolon and all that follows through "Code" on page 21, line 5.

Page 21, line 7, strike the final comma and all that follows through line 9 and insert the following:

: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for salaries and expenses of personnel assigned to the bureau charged with carrying out the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act.

OFFERED BY: MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

AMENDMENT NO. 47: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR ABORTION

SEC. 564. (a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities may be made available for any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it does not now, and will not during the period for which the funds are made available, directly or through a subcontractor or sub-grantee, perform abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

(2) Paragraph (1) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

(b) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities may be made available for any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it does not now, and will not during the period for which the funds are made available, violate the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited, or engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

(c) COERCIVE POPULATION CONTROL METHODS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund

(UNFPA), unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that (1) the United Nations Population Fund has terminated all activities in the People's Republic of China; or (2) during the 12 months preceding such certification, there have been no abortions as the result of coercion associated with the family planning policies of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China. As used in this section the term "coercion" includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressure.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 48: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS

SEC. 564. (a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 10 percent.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the following:

- (1) "Export and Investment Assistance" (title I of this Act).
- (2) "Development Assistance Fund".
- (3) "Development Fund for Africa".
- (4) "International Disaster Assistance".
- (5) "African Development Foundation".
- (6) "Inter-American Foundation".
- (7) "Peace Corps".
- (8) "International Narcotics Control".
- (9) "Anti-Terrorism Assistance".
- (10) "Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund".

(11) "Contribution to the International Development Association".

(12) "Contribution to the Asian Development Fund".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 49: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS

SEC. 564. (a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the following:

- (1) "Export and Investment Assistance" (title I of this Act).
- (2) "Development Assistance Fund".
- (3) "Development Fund for Africa".
- (4) "International Disaster Assistance".
- (5) "African Development Foundation".
- (6) "Inter-American Foundation".
- (7) "Peace Corps".
- (8) "International Narcotics Control".
- (9) "Anti-Terrorism Assistance".
- (10) "Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund".

(11) "Contribution to the International Development Association".

(12) "Contribution to the Asian Development Fund".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 50: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS

SEC. 564. (a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this

Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 5 percent.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the following:

- (1) "Export and Investment Assistance" (title I of this Act).
- (2) "Development Assistance Fund".
- (3) "Development Fund for Africa".
- (4) "International Disaster Assistance".
- (5) "African Development Foundation".
- (6) "Inter-American Foundation".
- (7) "Peace Corps".
- (8) "International Narcotics Control".
- (9) "Anti-Terrorism Assistance".
- (10) "Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund".
- (11) "Contribution to the International Development Association".
- (12) "Contribution to the Asian Development Fund".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 51: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS

SEC. 564. SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. VISCLOSKY

AMENDMENT NO. 52: In Title V Section 507 strike "Provided further," and all that follows in Section 507.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. VISCLOSKY

AMENDMENT NO. 53: In Title V Section 507 strike "Provided further," and all that follows in Section 507 and insert "Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, non-governmental organizations and private voluntary organizations operat-

ing within Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabagh shall be eligible to receive funds to be used for humanitarian assistance for refugees displaced by the conflict in Nagorno-Karabagh and also for technical assistance for election observers and other assistance to facilitate free and fair parliamentary elections in Azerbaijan scheduled for November 12, 1995. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated directly to the government of Azerbaijan.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. WOLF

AMENDMENT NO. 54: Page 23, line 19, insert "or Indonesia" after "Zaire".
Page 23, line 21, strike "Indonesia and".

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. WOLF

AMENDMENT NO. 55: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON IMET ASSISTANCE FOR INDONESIA

SEC. 564. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "International Military Education and Training" shall be available for Indonesia.