



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 10, 1995

No. 110

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. EVERETT].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 10, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable TERRY EVERETT 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 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority and minority leaders, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

COMPACT-IMPACT AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again call attention to an issue which combines all of the worst elements of a failed Federal policy in immigration which has resulted in huge unfunded mandates and stands as an example of how to make and break a promise. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of the Federal Government's failure to compensate the people of Guam for expenses incurred as a result of a treaty we on Guam had no part in shaping.

Mr. Speaker, do Members of this body or the citizens of this country know that there are countries in this world, independent nations which have free and unrestricted access to the United States?

Mr. Speaker, do Members of this body or the citizens of this country know that there are nationals of other countries who can walk through immigration checkpoints with only an identification card; with no visa requirement, with no passport, with no restriction on their movement or time of stay?

Mr. Speaker, do Members of this body or the citizens of this country know that there are citizens of other countries who can come into the United States and work, receive public assistance and other benefits available to citizens and permanent residents apparently without restrictions?

It is true that citizens of the newly independent countries of the former Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, under a treaty relationship between their countries and the United States, can come and have come to the United States, primarily to the State of Hawaii and the Territory of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas. And many have come to work and be productive participants in the economy.

But there is the matter of the Federal Government making a commitment to unrestricted access for foreign nationals via a treaty which falls disproportionately on local governments like that of Guam. This is not new to many areas of the country where a similar situation has resulted in "unfunded mandates." Bear in mind that this is legal immigration with no restrictions—no paperwork and no documentation, and all that is required for entry is an identification card from their own country—not even Canada, which has open borders with the United

States, has such favorable immigration treatment.

This is a serious enough situation, but in the case of Guam—it is far more egregious in its negative impact because of our small size and limited population. And in terms of the issue of the unfunded mandates, the commitment was not made verbally or through exchanges of letters by the Federal Government—it was authorized in statute passed by this body in Public Law 99-239.

Public Law 99-239, section 104(e)(6) states:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, such sums as may be necessary to cover the costs, if any, incurred by the State of Hawaii, the territories of Guam and American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands resulting from any increased demands placed on educational and social services by immigrants from the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia.

We call this reimbursement compact-impact-aid—the assistance due local governments for the financial impact of the Compact of Free Association. Guam, due to its proximity, has received the greatest share of this immigration. Since the treaties went into effect, we now estimate that 6 percent of the total population of Guam is from these freely associated states. If the same percentage of immigrants were applied to the United States, there would be 15 million immigrants. And what is more startling is that this unrestricted immigration is entirely legal.

The total cost to the Government of Guam since the inception of this immigration is in excess of \$70 million. The Guam Memorial Hospital estimates an impact of \$750,000 in costs in fiscal year 1994, and \$2.55 million since 1986 to the Medically Indigent Program due to compact immigrants. Public housing assistance cost Guam \$2 million in fiscal year 1994 and \$7.5 million since 1986.

□ 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

H6701

I have also heard reports from one elementary school principal who must devote three classrooms, with teachers and aides, just to teach English and reading skills to immigrants.

The total reimbursement given to Guam based on the law has been \$2.5 million.

This is all that has been given to Guam in reimbursement for this dramatic impact on our society and economy. Mr. Speaker, given this legacy of the Federal Government's inability to make good on its promises, we should ask the question, What is Guam asking for in the Interior appropriations and what is Guam getting in the Interior appropriations?

These are easy questions. Guam is asking only that the Federal Government start living up to its commitment by putting in \$4.58 million that the administration requested for fiscal year 1996. Guam is not asking for Government assistance; Guam is not asking for special projects; Guam is only asking for a down payment of a long overdue bill.

And what is Guam getting? Well, the answer is simple. Currently, the Interior budget is giving Guam zero, zilch, zip, nothing, nada, tayá—no money, however you want to say it. It is time to begin paying the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this week I intend to offer an amendment to H.R. 1977, the Interior appropriations bill, to restore the funding requested by the administration for the cost of this immigration. The Federal Government cannot have a free ride at Guam's expense, on a policy Guam had no part in shaping. The Federal Government cannot open Guam to unrestricted immigration and then stick us with the bill. The Federal Government cannot pass on this unfunded mandate to Guam while leaving us alone to deal with the impact of this immigration. I urge my colleagues to support Guam's compact-impact reimbursement.

COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY 1995

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, today is the first day that the American citizens start working for themselves. What do I mean by that:

Yesterday was the Cost of Government Day. The American people worked from January 1 of this year to July 9 of this year for the government. I say to my colleagues, "If you add up all the taxes paid on the local, State, and Federal level, and the cost of regulation, 52 cents out of every hard-earned dollar that the American people earn goes to the government. Out of the 365 days in the calendar year, the American people worked 189.9 days for the government and the regulatory bureaucracy. They worked 15.3 days for defense, 13½ days for interest on the

national debt, 28.7 days for Social Security and Medicare, 51.1 days for State and local taxes and regulations, 41.7 days for Federal regulations, and 35.6 days for other Federal programs."

I ask my colleagues, "Did you know that more than half of the money that you earn goes to the government? Actually 52 cents of every dollar, every dollar earned by the average worker, is spent on government, tax and regulations? This means that you spend more time working for the government than you do for yourself and your family. It means that only 48 cents out of every dollar earned by the American family is available to pay for housing, food, education, transportation, and other essentials."

Mr. Speaker, this is unconscionable and immoral. By recognizing government-imposed costs and regulations, we can begin to increase public awareness of the 52-cent swindle.

As chairman of Cost of Government Day I say to my colleagues, "I urge you to join me in highlighting the cost of government to the average American family by giving a 1-minute or participating in the press conferences to come, and I urge all my colleagues to do so."

True, this year, the total cost of government is estimated to be \$3.3 trillion. Nearly \$1 trillion of this is the result of regulation. The Federal Government alone is responsible for \$720 billion in hidden taxes through regulation this year. That amount equals \$2,800 for every man, woman, and child in America.

Although the burden is immense, it can be lessened quickly. If the House Republican budget proposal were to be implemented, the Cost of Government Day would be 17 days earlier by the year 2002. That would allow Americans to work 2½ weeks longer for themselves and their families. Regulatory and legal reforms could move the Cost of Government Day to even earlier.

Mr. Speaker, we need these budget, legal, and regulatory reforms in order to reduce the Government's negative impact on the American family.

Mr. Speaker, July 9 marks the third annual Cost of Government Day. Cost of Government Day is an excellent opportunity to drive home the need for less government spending and more regulatory reform. The 104th Congress has made an excellent start. Passage and implementation of the House Republican budget will make Cost of Government Day come much quicker and the American family be able to spend more of its hard-earned dollars for things they think are important rather than for what some bureaucrat thinks is important.

Mr. Speaker, over in the other body they are starting the debate on regulatory reform, and the first thing out of the box for the last week has been an absolute unheralded attack on Members of Congress that are trying to bring some good science and common sense to regulations in this country.

We have been attacked with the notion that we are destroying the environment, that we are removing safety. Indeed people are attacking us for even costing lives. What we are talking about is bringing reasonableness to regulations.

Let me just go over a couple of these issues that show how crazy and extreme the regulatory environment in this country has gotten. In Sacramento, CA, residents are reeling over a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ruling last fall which added three varieties of fairy shrimp to the endangered species list. The agency relied on a one-paragraph petition submitted by a Davis, CA, botanist in 1990 even though millions of hardy shrimp can be found in California, Europe, Asia, Australia, and Africa. The decision has shut down a pony ranch that housed a Sacramento program for the needy and disabled children and could cost the Sacramento area housing industry \$500 million.

That is the kind of regulation that we are trying to stop. That is the kind of regulation that we are trying to bring reasonableness to. That is the kind of regulation that we are trying to bring forward, regulatory reform to bring forward, to stop the cost. That is a direct cost to the American people, thereby a direct cost to the American family.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is really sad that yesterday was the Cost of Government Day, that the American family has to work more than half the year for the government. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we need to put policies forward in this country that lessen the number of days that the American family has to work for their Government and increase the number of days that the American family can work for themselves.

GLOSSING OVER THE ROUGH SPOTS

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, when credible and respected observer organizations, notably the International Republican Institute, returned from the June 25 elections in Haiti to report their documented observations—both the good and the bad—they were not received with open arms. It was more like a shoot-the-messenger situation here and elsewhere in Washington because at that time international organizations, the Clinton administration officials, and some of the national media even were too busy painting rosy pictures of what was going on in Haiti—glossing over widespread irregularities in the elections that actually happened hailing the relatively non-violent atmosphere on election day as the measure of a successful electoral

process in Haiti, never mind the widespread and serious mismanagement, chaos, confusion, and disorganization that disenfranchised so many candidates and so many voters.

Now the flurry of election reports of 2 weeks ago in Haiti has dwindled to a few inches of space in the major papers. Last Friday, for example, the news that the run-off elections, the important run-off elections scheduled for the end of this month were being pushed back to August. This was buried in the deepest recesses of the major papers. Even the New York Times barely gave it mention, and none among the major media dared question the wisdom of the provisional electoral council's intention to announce results on this past Saturday despite the protests of most of the parties that participated in the election on June 25.

This week, the news that 23 of the 27 parties who actually participated in the elections of June 25 in Haiti have signed official communiqués calling for the elections to be annulled, and that still has not made the cut in the smattering of the Haiti-related articles in the major press outlets in this country either.

The New York Times did take the time to editorialize and declare the delay of the run-offs as a step that will give officials time to learn from their mistakes. Of course, some might question whether or not it is appropriate to hold a run-off for an election that is being challenged by almost all the participants, because it was characterized by the widespread disenfranchisement of voters and candidates alike, as we now all know.

But the Clinton administration marches onward down the yellow brick road. At the State Department briefing this weekend, Spokesman Burns declared that Haiti "now has a functioning democracy * * *" and that the administration believes " * * * the Haitians did rather well, if you look at this election as it should be properly viewed in the context of the environment in Haiti and the history of Haiti."

Well, indeed, it is good news that democracy has come to Haiti. Now perhaps we can bring back thousands of troops that are down there at taxpayers expense providing security and stability in that country and perhaps we can cut back on the hundreds of millions of dollars being sent to Haiti every day to help get democracy started.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is the Haitian people who toiled long and hard on election day trying to make the best of a bad process deserve more than the cursory analysis and condescending statements of support we have been hearing from the administration and the media in this country.

Rather than pressure to simply move on, Haitians need the support of the White House, the State Department and the American media to find the truth of what actually went wrong in

the elections on the 25th—and to get it fixed. And before this December's Presidential elections because they are going to be very important, and more importantly for the American people, we need to be kept abreast of where are the taxdollars the Clinton administration has been doling out for the elections and for U.S. operations in Haiti? And what good, if any, they are doing? It is a lot of money. The White House owes us an accounting and it is overdue.

At the most basic level, these elections were about Haitians being free to elect the entire local governmental structure in Haiti and a new national parliament, a congress, being free to construct in those offices the checks and balances envisioned and provided for in the new Haitian constitution. The success of the process will determine how soon we can bring our troops home and whether or not anything lasting, in fact, does come out of all the money, time, and effort the American people have poured into that small friendly Caribbean nation.

Glossing over the rough spots in this process does not help any of the parties involved.

I say to my colleagues, "If you want to shoot the messenger, go ahead, but the fact of it is that there are some problems, and they need to be fixed."

Even the distinguished New York Times today has had the temerity to suggest what they would not suggest 2 weeks ago after the elections, and I quote from the editorial page from the Times today: "Haiti is wise to postpone its next round of elections. The first round, on June 25, was marred by massive disorganization," et cetera. They would not admit that, and now they admit it. We are making progress. We are getting at the truth.

COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY CELEBRATION

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, July 9, was the kind of day when you did not know whether you should laugh or cry. It was a kind of day when you did not know whether you should mourn or celebrate. You see yesterday, July 9, was Government Free Day. Up until yesterday every American worked full-time just to pay for the costs of government. Until about mid-May we all worked to pay the costs of Federal, State, and local taxes, and then incredibly, incredibly from mid-May until July 9, every American worked full-time just to pay the cost of unfunded Federal mandates. It was the day on which one would cry and mourn that he had spent so much of his time working for government. But it was also a day in which we could look forward to today; you might celebrate that, the

first day on which you could earn any money for yourself.

The average American this year worked a bit more than 189 days to pay for the cost of government. He has left just a bit more than 175 days to do all the things that one needs to do. Father and mother work to pay the mortgage, save money for an education, to prepare for their retirement, to take care of their sicknesses, and all of this has to be done in 175 days after working a bit more than 189 days for the government.

Let us kind of put this in perspective. According to Prof. Charles Adams, author of "For Good and Evil," which is a history of taxation published in 1933, peasant serfs in the Mongol Empire in the period of Genghis Khan had to give their feudal lords just one-tenth of what they produced. When you consider how oppressed we think those people were in giving one-tenth of their income, what do you have to say about us who had to work about 52 percent of this year to pay for the cost of government?

In the last two elections it was a revolution that began at the polling places, and all across America Americans said enough is enough, and they voted to begin to return this country to that vision of our forefathers. The kind of government that they envisioned was stated by Thomas Jefferson when he indicated that the government which governs best is the government which governs least. We have got to be about a million miles from that dream of Thomas Jefferson, and that Abraham Lincoln in a period of crisis in our country said it just as well. He said it differently. He said that government should only do for its citizens what they cannot do for themselves.

Someone has said that considering how ineffective government is, how much it has interfered with our families, how much it has depreciated the business environment, that we ought to be thankful that we do not get all the government that we pay for. If government was efficient and effective in doing what it does, it would have done even more damage to our families and to our economy.

Another thing that really causes one to stop and think is the realization that after 7 years of balancing the budget, as my colleague from Texas indicated just a little earlier, we will have moved back the Cost of Government Day just 17 days. I do not think that that is what Americans had in mind when they went to the polling places these last two elections and began this revolution.

Moving back the Cost of Government Day just 17 days after 7 years; that is not enough. That is not what Americans had in mind. We have just begun this battle to take back our country and to return it to the kind of country envisioned by our forefathers. Think about it, America.

Think about July 9. Think about spending 52 percent of your time working for government. Think about that when you go to the polls and the next election to continue this revolution.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 3:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 3:30 p.m.

□ 1530

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SHAYS] at 3:30 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Remind us, O gracious God, and teach us until we understand that each day is Your gift to us, a day which we receive without merit but we receive with gratefulness. As the psalmist has recorded, we ought make a joyful noise unto You and serve with gladness of heart, for Your steadfast love endures forever and Your faithfulness to all generations. May we keep these words before us as we get immersed in the duties of the time, that though our responsibilities are ever before us, we never lose sight of Your promises and Your grace. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. STUDDS. 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 1, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] come for-

ward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT 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.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 169(b) of Public Law 102-138, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment to the U.S. delegation to the parliamentary assembly of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe the following Members of the House: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, vice chairman; Mr. HOYER of Maryland; Mr. TORRICELLI of New Jersey; Mr. SAWYER of Ohio; Mr. COLEMAN of Texas; Mr. FORBES of New York; Mr. CARDIN of Maryland; and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

TOP 10 REASONS DEMOCRATS WANT TO TIE UP HOUSE WITH PROCEDURAL VOTES

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, from the home office in Scottsdale, AZ, the top 10 reasons Democrats want to tie up the House with procedural votes today:

- (10) Build up voting percentage.
 - (9) Journal vote important to the American people.
 - (8) Like to work hard at nothing all day.
 - (7) Manufactured rage makes me smile.
 - (6) They say they are not for sale. What they won't say is nobody's buying their line anyway.
 - (5) We don't want to work. We just want to bang on this gavel all day.
 - (4) Monday Night TV is just reruns anyway.
 - (3) Holding breath until blue in the face doesn't work.
 - (2) BONIOR told them to.
- And the number one reason Democrats want to tie up the House with procedural votes today:
- (1) They have fallen and they can't get up.

AMERICA'S TRADE POLICY—A WISH AND A PROMISE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. How soon we forget, Mr. Speaker. Another Japanese trade crisis, another Japanese promise, another Japanese victory.

Check this out: At the last minute, Japan promised to buy more cars, to buy more auto parts from America, and open up their markets for the 20th time. It seems like Japan said this time, "Scout's honor, America. This time we really mean it. Cross my heart and hope to die."

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. America's trade policy is nothing more than a wish and a promise—an American wish for American workers, and the Japanese promise after promise after promise. It was time to hit Japan in the pocketbook. We failed to do that. Two more years now, and we will see how the program goes.

STAND STRONG FOR AMERICA REGARDING VIETNAM

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT]. He is exactly correct. Promises, promises. Tomorrow President Clinton is expected to break yet another one of his campaign promises.

He promised American veterans and the families of those servicemen still missing in action that he would not normalize relations with Vietnam until we had a full and complete accounting of those still missing in action.

But now, with 55 cases still unsolved, he is going ahead with normalization, praising the Vietnamese for their so-called cooperation. But, in reality, between 1992 and 1994 they provided us more than 21,000 documents, photos, and artifacts. Only 1 percent have pertained to missing Americans.

The Vietnamese have not changed; if they had they would have already opened up all the records and we wouldn't be involved in bartering information for normalization.

You know, I don't expect us to be able to count on the Vietnamese. But, we should at least be able to count on our own President. He should take a strong stand for America, instead of caving in to narrow special interests and giving away America's integrity.

FRANCE NEEDS TO JOIN CONTINUING MORATORIUM ON NUCLEAR TESTING

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, French navy commandos seized the Greenpeace ship *Rainbow Warrior*

II, thwarting its attempt to land protesters on a South Pacific atoll where France plans to conduct nuclear tests.

With its latest commando raid, France has demonstrated once again that they will go to whatever lengths necessary to restart their nuclear testing program. Firing tear gas at 11 people, including journalists, and acting like thugs, is not the behavior that behoves a nation which fancies itself the epitome of civilization.

The problem is that France is digging itself into a bigger hole than the one they created in Muroroa in the face of universal opposition. Since President Chirac announced on June 13 that France will resume its nuclear test program with eight tests French officials have ignored world opinion.

But this do as we say, not what we do attitude ignores France's responsibility as a nuclear power. France needs to join with other major powers in continuing a moratorium on nuclear testing before, not after, it conducts tests in the South Pacific. Instead of boarding the ships of protesters, it is time for France to get back on board the nuclear test ban.

COMPROMISING INTEGRITY

(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, when we convened for the 104th Congress in January, we came with our word and honor to uphold. And we have done it. We promised the American people action toward a more responsive, efficient Government, and we came here with our honor and integrity on our minds, not the next campaign.

The President, however, doesn't seem to take his job as seriously. Instead, he compromises his integrity by using his office for personal political purposes. His agenda focuses not on service to the American people but on benefiting from special interest donations.

We can here with determination to do the work of the American people, not to sell our offices for political advantage. In his State of the Union Address, President Clinton implored politicians to just stop taking contributions from special interest donors. Now, several months afterward, he is blatantly practicing the very things he preached against. Unfortunately for him, actions speak louder than words.

COMMENDING PHILIP MORRIS CORP. FOR ACTION AGAINST ACCESS PROGRAM

(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 rise today to pay recognition to a program initiated by the Philip Morris Corp. to help prevent access to cigarettes by young people. I applaud their efforts.

The program, action against access, will involve placing minimum age signs and other materials in over 200,000 retail outlets throughout the United States. The program will also conduct compliance seminars for retailers and law enforcement officers.

In an effort to end smoking by young adults, the action against access program will discontinue free cigarette sampling and will place additional notices on cigarette cartons prohibiting sales to minors.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Philip Morris on their efforts to address a serious problem in our Nation—I hope that other cigarette manufacturers will follow suit.

SELF-RIGHTEOUS HAVE FALLEN

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, my, my, how the self-righteous have fallen. It was just a week ago that Democrats were beating their chests on this floor about Republicans daring to have a fund-raiser in New York City. Why, that is something Democrats have never done before, have a fund-raiser in New York City.

Well, I guess what they meant to talk about is saying they are going to move their yard sale from New York City down to the front lawn of the White House, because now the President and the Democratic Party want to conduct all of its fund-raising activities on the lawn of the White House.

Could this be the same President who a few years ago beat his chest and said, "We will not put a 'for sale' sign on the front lawn of the White House?" Could that be the same President of the United States who is now saying, "Hey, if you want to talk to me, pay me \$100,000? The Democratic Party will even give you a special advisor."

Well, my goodness, if this is putting an end to business as usual, I think we need to go another step further.

ANNUAL REPORT OF CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 396(i)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) for Fiscal Year 1994 and the Inventory of the Federal Funds Distributed to Public Telecommunications Entities by Federal Departments and Agencies: Fiscal Year 1994.

Since 1967, when the Congress created the Corporation, CPB has overseen the growth and development of quality services for millions of Americans.

This year's report, entitled "American Stories," is a departure from previous reports. It profiles people whose lives have been dramatically improved by public broadcasting in their local communities. The results are timely, lively, and intellectually provocative. In short, they're much like public broadcasting.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 10, 1995.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today.

EXTENDING MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO CAMBODIA

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1642) to extend nondiscriminatory treatment—most-favored-nation treatment—to the products of Cambodia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1642

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) Cambodia is now under democratic rule after 20 years of undemocratic regimes and civil war, and is striving to rebuild its market economy;

(2) extension of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment would assist Cambodia in developing its economy based on free market principles and becoming competitive in the global marketplace;

(3) establishing normal commercial relations on a reciprocal basis with Cambodia will promote United States exports to the rapidly growing Southeast Asian region and expand opportunities for United States business with investment in the Cambodian economy; and

(4) expanding bilateral trade relations that includes a commercial agreement will promote further progress by Cambodia on human rights and toward adoption of regional and world trading rules and principles.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT TO THE PRODUCTS OF CAMBODIA.

(a) HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE AMENDMENT.—General note 3(b) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by striking "Kampuchea".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) applies with respect to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the effective date of a notice published in the Federal

Register by the United States Trade Representative that a trade agreement obligating reciprocal most-favored-nation treatment between Cambodia and the United States had entered into force.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

The President shall submit to the Congress, not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report on the trade between the United States and Cambodia pursuant to the trade agreement described in section 2(b).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1642, legislation to extend permanent most-favored-nation [MFN] tariff treatment to the products of Cambodia. This legislation, which was introduced by myself and the ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade, Mr. RANGEL, is noncontroversial and was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee by a voice vote on June 20.

After two decades of civil war, Cambodia held democratic elections in May, 1993. Upon the formation of the freely elected Royal Cambodian Government on September 24, 1993, the United States and Cambodia immediately established full diplomatic relations. To normalize trade relations between our countries, the United States concluded an agreement with Cambodia in the spring of 1994 on bilateral trade relations and intellectual property protection that calls for a reciprocal extension of MFN status.

Since taking office, the Cambodian Government has taken steps, and planned additional action, to convert the Cambodian economy from one based on central planning to one based on market-oriented principles. Establishing normal commercial relations with Cambodia will assist in this transformation by making Cambodian exports to the United States more competitive in the global marketplace.

In addition, establishing normal commercial relations with Cambodia on a reciprocal basis will promote United States exports to the rapidly growing southeast Asian region and expand opportunities for United States businesses and investment in the Cambodian economy. Furthermore, expanding our bilateral trade relations with Cambodia will promote further progress by Cambodia on human rights and toward the adoption of regional and world trading rules and principles.

The Congressional Budget Office has determined that enactment of H.R. 1642 has no significant budgetary effect.

I urge my colleagues to support enactment of this legislation.

□ 1545

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] has adequately explained this piece of legislation. I want to just comment a little on the term "most favored nation."

First of all, I heartily endorse what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] has said. We need to grant most-favored-nation treatment to Cambodia. Now, I hate to explain this to my colleagues, but most favored nation does not mean that much. It just means normal trading status for an emerging country.

I mention this because every now and then somebody gets on the floor and says, oh, for that horrible country, and then they will name the country, you are giving them most-favored trading status, which sounds like you are really giving them something.

Well, we are not really giving them anything. We are giving ourselves access to their markets and them to our markets on the same basis that we give all the other nations on earth, with very few minor exceptions.

So I hope nobody will take umbrage by the fact that we are granting most-favored-nation treatment to little Cambodia. Cambodia has had a tortured career in the last few years. They have had terrible revolutions in their country and awful bloodshed, but they have signaled that they want to go right and want to do the right thing.

It is time that we welcome them into the family of trading nations. Perhaps as more of our people go there and more of their people come here and as we exchange goods with each other, we may exchange some ideas that will do us both some good.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse most-favored-nation treatment for Cambodia.

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our ranking minority member on the Committee on Ways and Means who has been a devotee of the advancement of free trade principles in all the years I have had the privilege of working with him. I think it illustrates the bipartisan support that we have on this proposal before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I year back the balance of by time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1642.

The question was taken.

Mr. GIBBONS. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on H.R. 1642.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO BULGARIA

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill—H.R. 1643—to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment—most-favored-nation treatment—to the products of Bulgaria.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1643

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND SUPPLEMENTAL ACTION.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that Bulgaria—

(1) has received most-favored-nation treatment since 1991 and has been found to be in full compliance with the freedom of emigration requirements under title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 since 1993;

(2) has reversed many years of Communist dictatorship and instituted a constitutional republic ruled by a democratically elected government as well as basic market-oriented reforms, including privatization;

(3) is in the process of acceding to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the World Trade Organization (WTO), and extension of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment would enable the United States to avail itself of all rights under the GATT and the WTO with respect to Bulgaria; and

(4) has demonstrated a strong desire to build friendly relationships and to cooperate fully with the United States on trade matters.

(b) SUPPLEMENTAL ACTION.—The Congress notes that the United States Trade Representative intends to negotiate with Bulgaria in order to preserve the commitments of that country under the bilateral commercial agreement in effect between that country and the United States that are consistent with the GATT and the WTO.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TO BULGARIA.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS AND EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any provision of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), the President may—

(1) determine that such title should no longer apply to Bulgaria; and

(2) after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to Bulgaria, proclaim the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of that country.

(b) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV.—On and after the effective date of the extension under subsection (a)(2) of non-discriminatory treatment to the products of Bulgaria, title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 shall cease to apply to that country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1643, which would extend permanent most-favored-nation [MFN] tariff treatment to the products of Bulgaria. This legislation, which was introduced by myself and the ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade, Mr. RANGEL, is noncontroversial and was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee by a voice vote on June 20.

At present, Bulgaria's MFN status is regulated by title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, the provision of U.S. law which governs the extension of MFN tariff treatment to nonmarket economies. Bulgaria was first granted MFN treatment by the United States in 1991 under a Presidential waiver from the freedom of emigration requirements contained in the Trade Act of 1974. Since 1993, Bulgaria's MFN status has been renewed after the President has found the country to be in full compliance with the requirements stipulated in U.S. law.

The political and economic circumstances in Bulgaria have changed considerably since the enactment of the Trade Act of 1974. The Communist dictatorship in Bulgaria has collapsed and a democratically elected government has taken office which has instituted basic market-oriented principles, including privatization, in the Bulgarian economy.

Normalizing United States trade relations with Bulgaria, as has been done of other Eastern European countries, by authorizing the removal of the application of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, from Bulgaria will enhance our bilateral relations with that country and foster the economic development of the region by providing the business community with greater certainty with respect to Bulgaria's status under United States law.

At the present time, Bulgaria is in the process of acceding to the World Trade Organization [WTO]. For this reason, the extension of permanent MFN tariff treatment to Bulgaria is also necessary in order for the United States to avail itself of all WTO rights vis-a-vis Bulgaria at the time of the country's accession to the agreement.

The Congressional Budget Office has indicated that its baseline revenue projections assume that Bulgaria's MFN status will be renewed annually by the President. Therefore, enactment of H.R. 1643 will not affect projected Federal Government receipts.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. CRANE] has adequately explained this legislation. I will be brief.

The trade subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means first visited Bulgaria as an official delegation in 1985. We were impressed then that Bulgaria was moving faster than most of the countries in the Eastern Bloc away from a centrally planned economy and toward a free and open economy. The evidence was clear then that that was their ultimate goal.

Bulgaria, like most Eastern European countries, has had a tortured history, occupied by many different foreign powers over a long period of time, most recently occupied by the Germans during World War II and, prior to World War I, by the Turkish Government, the Ottoman Empire, for 500 or 600 years.

They were abused greatly during their occupation, suffered a great deal, and have come out of it a wiser, but sadder nation.

Mr. Speaker, we should grant to this country most-favored-nation treatment; in other words, ordinary trade treatment for a civilized country. It will help us. It will help them.

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very able ranking minority member for yielding time to me.

I apologize for speaking a little bit out of order. If it is 4 o'clock, it must be Bulgaria, which means I missed Cambodia. I admire the dispatch. I do not mean to get in the way of it. I think we sometimes take too long on things, but I did want to address a couple of words to the situation in Cambodia and, with the indulgence that the ranking minority member has given me, I will do that now.

I was supportive of a letter that was sent by Lane Kirkland, president of the AFL-CIO, to the Government of Cambodia in which he makes some very cogent objections to the proposed labor law. The gentleman from Florida has quite correctly pointed out that most-favored-nation treatment is a misnomer, since it does not mean that you are given preferential treatment.

On the other hand, it is something which it is within our power to confer and you are better off with it than without it. And I do believe as a matter of course, we should now be doing everything we can to urge better labor laws among other things, better respect for working people in our trading partners as one way of preventing an erosion of the rights that have been gained by people here, in eastern Europe, and elsewhere.

I do not oppose the Cambodia resolution, which is a good thing, since it is already over, but I do want to take the opportunity to have in the appropriate RECORD my concern. I have been told that the Cambodian Government has given assurances to Mr. Kirkland and others that they intend to correct the labor law that they are going to promulgate so that we will genuinely reflect the rights of workers to make their own choices and to advocate for their own rights.

I would just note that many of us are supportive of the most-favored-nation treatment for Cambodia on that assumption. I hope that by the next time it comes up, when it is time to be renewed, if it has to be, we will have that assurance.

I thank the ranking minority member for yielding time to me.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1643, extending most-favored-nation status to Bulgaria. Bulgaria has made great strides in the areas of human rights, foreign policy, economic reforms, and Jackson-Vanik requirements. MFN has been granted to Bulgaria since 1991 and this bill will continue Bulgaria's commitment to minority rights and a free market with permanent and unconditional most-favored-nation trade status.

Mr. Speaker, since the fall of communism, Bulgaria has pledged progress toward democratic and economic reforms. They have met some significant barriers which have slowed the pace of some of these reforms, including a budget crisis and high inflation. It should be noted that much of the \$8 billion debt is due to its commitment to participate in the UN embargo against Yugoslavia.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, human rights are respected in this diverse country of ethnic Bulgarians, Turks, Gypsies, and Bulgarian Muslims. Ethnic Turks, in particular, have seen their situation improve considerably since the fall of communism and the Bulgarian Government has also displayed leadership in improving its traditionally rocky relations with Turkey. In virtually every area * * * freedom of movement, treatment of national minorities, and freedom of expression, Bulgaria has improved dramatically.

In the former Yugoslavia, Bulgaria continues to work for a peaceful resolution and was the first country to recognize all of the former Yugoslav republics, including Macedonia. With a resolution of this nightmare if and when it ends, Bulgaria will see much improved economic conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the future for Bulgaria is very bright. Their continued movement to a free market means a better standard of living for the Bulgarian people and improved relations with the United States. H.R. 1643 is a major step in the right direction toward reaching this end and I urge its passage. Thank you.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, today we are voting on granting MFN to Cambodia. Cambodia did not have MFN in the past because they were under Communist rule. Over the past few years the country has had democratic elections, and the new government has made steps toward a market economy.

I am concerned about granting MFN to Cambodia. This legislation provides Cambodia with permanent and unconditional MFN status. In my opinion, Cambodia needs to make

progress in two extremely important areas: Human rights and labor rights.

Democracy and human rights are continually under attack in Cambodia. The Royal Cambodian Government is persecuting journalistic critics, expelling government opposition members of Parliament, and creating an atmosphere of fear to stifle those who would speak up for democracy.

The granting of MFN does not mean Congress is not concerned about human rights violations. Congress will continue to monitor Cambodia's progress in this area.

Cambodia has still not passed a labor law that meets international labor standards. At this time, freedom of association for workers is not guaranteed. The right to strike does not exist. In addition, there are no minimum labor standards.

Recently, an opposition member of the Cambodia National Assembly, Sam Rainsy, was expelled from the assembly without a vote by the governing parties led by the co-Prime Ministers. Also, there is a rumor other human rights supporters might be expelled.

In recent months, the situation in Cambodia has not improved. I have raised these issues with USTR and the State Department and I will continue to follow them closely. We have to continue to monitor Cambodia and strongly encourage improvements.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1643.

The question was taken.

Mr. GIBBONS. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1643.

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

There was no objection.

SIKES ACT IMPROVEMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1141) to amend the act popularly known as the Sikes Act to enhance fish and wildlife conservation and natural resources management programs, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1141

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Sikes Act Improvement Amendments of 1995".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF SIKES ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Act entitled "An Act to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations", approved September 15, 1960 (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.), commonly referred to, and in this Act referred to, as the "Sikes Act".

SEC. 3. INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS GENERALLY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(a) (16 U.S.C. 670a(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "is authorized to" and inserting "shall";

(2) by striking "in each military reservation in accordance with a cooperative plan" and inserting the following: "on military installations. Under the program, the Secretary shall prepare and implement for each military installation in the United States an integrated natural resource management plan";

(3) by inserting after "reservation is located" the following: ", except that the Secretary is not required to prepare such a plan for a military installation if the Secretary determines that preparation of such a plan for the installation is not appropriate"; and

(4) by inserting "(1)" after "(a)", and adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) Consistent with essential military requirements to enhance the national security of the United States, the Secretary of Defense shall manage each military installation to provide—

"(A) for the conservation of fish and wildlife on the military installation and sustained multipurpose uses of those resources, including hunting, fishing, and trapping; and

"(B) public access that is necessary or appropriate for those uses.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Title I, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is further amended—

(1) in section 101(b) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "cooperative plan" and inserting "integrated natural resource management plan";

(2) in section 101(b)(4) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(4)) by striking "cooperative plan" each place it appears and inserting "integrated natural resource management plan";

(3) in section 101(c) (16 U.S.C. 670a(c)) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "a cooperative plan" and inserting "an integrated natural resource management plan";

(4) in section 101(d) (16 U.S.C. 670a(d)) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "cooperative plans" and inserting "integrated natural resource management plans";

(5) in section 101(e) (16 U.S.C. 670a(e)) by striking "Cooperative plans" and inserting "Integrated natural resource management plans";

(6) in section 102 (16 U.S.C. 670b) by striking "a cooperative plan" and inserting "an integrated natural resource management plan";

(7) in section 103 (16 U.S.C. 670c) by striking "a cooperative plan" and inserting "an integrated natural resource management plan";

(8) in section 106(a) (16 U.S.C. 670f(a)) by striking "cooperative plans" and inserting "integrated natural resource management plans"; and

(9) in section 106(c) (16 U.S.C. 670f(c)) by striking "cooperative plans" and inserting "integrated natural resource management plans".

(c) CONTENTS OF PLANS.—Section 101(b) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C) by striking "and" after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (D) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a comma; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(E) wetland protection and restoration, and wetland creation where necessary, for support of fish or wildlife,

"(F) consideration of conservation needs for all biological communities, and

"(G) the establishment of specific natural resource management goals, objectives, and timeframes for proposed actions;".

(2) by striking paragraph (3);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) shall for the military installation for which it is prepared—

"(A) address the needs for fish and wildlife management, land management, forest management, and wildlife-oriented recreation;

"(B) ensure the integration of, and consistency among, the various activities conducted under the plan;

"(C) ensure that there is no net loss in the capability of installation lands to support the military mission of the installation;

"(D) provide for sustained use by the public of natural resources, to the extent that such use is not inconsistent with the military mission of the installation or the needs of fish and wildlife management;

"(E) provide the public access to the installation that is necessary or appropriate for that use, to the extent that access is not inconsistent with the military mission of the installation; and

"(F) provide for professional enforcement of natural resource laws and regulations;".

(5) in paragraph (4)(A) by striking "collect the fees therefor," and inserting "collect, spend, administer, and account for fees therefor,".

(d) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Section 101 (16 U.S.C. 670a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide an opportunity for public comment on each integrated natural resource management plan prepared under subsection (a)."

SEC. 4. REVIEW FOR PREPARATION OF INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

(a) REVIEW OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Secretary of each military department shall, by not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) review each military installation in the United States that is under the jurisdiction of that Secretary to determine the military installations for which the preparation of an integrated natural resource management plan under section 101 of the Sikes Act, as amended by this Act, is appropriate; and

(B) submit to the Secretary of Defense a report on those determinations.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall, by not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Congress a report on the reviews conducted under paragraph (1). The report shall include—

(A) a list of those military installations reviewed under paragraph (1) for which the Secretary of Defense determines the preparation of an integrated natural resource management plan is not appropriate; and

(B) for each of the military installations listed under subparagraph (A), an explanation of the reasons such a plan is not appropriate.

(b) DEADLINE FOR INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Not later than 2

years after the date of the submission of the report required under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of Defense shall, for each military installation for which the Secretary has not determined under subsection (a)(2)(A) that preparation of an integrated natural resource management plan is not appropriate—

(1) prepare and begin implementing such a plan mutually agreed to by the Secretary of the Interior and the head of the appropriate State agencies under section 101(a) of the Sikes Act, as amended by this Act; or

(2) in the case of a military installation for which there is in effect a cooperative plan under section 101(a) of the Sikes Act on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, complete negotiations with the Secretary of the Interior and the heads of the appropriate State agencies regarding changes to that plan that are necessary for the plan to constitute an integrated natural resource plan that complies with that section, as amended by this Act.

(c) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide an opportunity for the submission of public comments on—

(1) integrated natural resource management plans proposed pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) changes to cooperative plans proposed pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS.

Section 101 (16 U.S.C. 670a) is further amended by adding after subsection (f) (as added by section 3(d) of this Act) the following:

“(g) REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—

“(1) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall, by not later than March 1 of each year, review the extent to which integrated natural resource management plans were prepared or in effect and implemented in accordance with this Act in the preceding year, and submit a report on the findings of that review to the committees. Each report shall include—

“(A) the number of integrated natural resource management plans in effect in the year covered by the report, including the date on which each plan was issued in final form or most recently revised;

“(B) the amount of moneys expended on conservation activities conducted pursuant to those plans in the year covered by the report, including amounts expended under the Legacy Resource Management Program established under section 8120 of the Act of November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-511; 104 Stat. 1905); and

“(C) an assessment of the extent to which the plans comply with the requirements of subsection (b) (1) and (2), including specifically the extent to which the plans ensure in accordance with subsection (b)(2)(C) that there is no net loss of lands to support the military missions of military installations.

“(2) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The Secretary of the Interior, by not later than March 1 of each year and in consultation with State agencies responsible for conservation or management of fish or wildlife, shall submit a report to the committees on the amount of moneys expended by the Department of the Interior and those State agencies in the year covered by the report on conservation activities conducted pursuant to integrated natural resource management plans.

“(3) COMMITTEES DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘committees’ means the Committees on Resources and National Security of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Armed Services and Environment and Public Works of the Senate.”.

SEC. 6. FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OF INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS; ENFORCEMENT OF OTHER LAWS.

Title I (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 106 as section 110; and

(2) by inserting after section 105 the following:

“SEC. 106. FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OF OTHER LAWS.

“All Federal laws relating to the conservation of natural resources on Federal lands may be enforced by the Secretary of Defense with respect to violations of those laws which occur on military installations within the United States.”.

SEC. 7. NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SERVICES.

Title I (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 106 (as added by section 6 of this Act) the following:

“SEC. 107. NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SERVICES.

“The Secretary of each military department shall ensure that sufficient numbers of professionally trained natural resource management personnel and natural resource law enforcement personnel are available and assigned responsibility to perform tasks necessary to comply with this Act, including the preparation and implementation of integrated natural resource management plans.”.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

Title I (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is further amended by inserting after section 107 (as added by section 7 of this Act) the following:

“SEC. 108. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) MILITARY DEPARTMENT.—The term ‘military department’ means the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

“(2) MILITARY INSTALLATION.—The term ‘military installation’—

“(A) means any land or interest in land owned by the United States and administered by the Secretary of Defense or the head of a military department; and

“(B) includes all public lands withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under public land laws and reserved for use by the Secretary of Defense or the head of a military department.

“(3) STATE FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCY.—The term ‘State fish and wildlife agency’ means an agency of State government that is responsible under State law for managing fish or wildlife resources.

“(4) UNITED STATES.—The term ‘United States’ means the States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions of the United States.”.

SEC. 9. SHORT TITLE.

Title I (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is further amended by inserting after section 108 (as added by section 7 of this Act) the following:

“SEC. 109. SHORT TITLE.

“This title may be cited as the ‘Sikes Act’.”.

SEC. 10. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

(a) COST SHARING.—Section 103a(b) (16 U.S.C. 670c-1(b)) is amended by striking “matching basis” each place it appears and inserting “cost-sharing basis”.

(b) ACCOUNTING.—Section 103a(c) (16 U.S.C. 670c-1(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “; and shall not be subject to section 1535 of that title”.

SEC. 11. REPEAL.

Section 2 of the Act of October 27, 1986 (Public Law 99-651; 16 U.S.C. 670a-1) is repealed.

SEC. 12. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

Title I, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in the heading for the title by striking “MILITARY RESERVATIONS” and inserting “MILITARY INSTALLATIONS”;

(2) in section 101(a) (16 U.S.C. 670a(a)) by striking “the reservation” and inserting “the installation”;

(3) in section 101(b)(4) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(4))—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “the reservation” and inserting “the installation”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking “the military reservation” and inserting “the military installation”;

(4) in section 101(c) (16 U.S.C. 670a(c))—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking “a military reservation” and inserting “a military installation”; and

(B) in paragraph (2) by striking “the reservation” and inserting “the installation”;

(5) in section 102 (16 U.S.C. 670b) by striking “military reservations” and inserting “military installations”;

(6) in section 103 (16 U.S.C. 670c) by striking “military reservations” and inserting “military installations”.

SEC. 13. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) PROGRAMS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—Subsections (b) and (c) of section 110 (as redesignated by section 6 of this Act) are each amended by striking “1983” and all that follows through “1993,” and inserting “1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998.”.

(b) PROGRAMS ON PUBLIC LANDS.—Section 209 (16 U.S.C. 670e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “the sum of \$10,000,000” and all that follows through “to enable the Secretary of the Interior” and inserting “\$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, to enable the Secretary of the Interior”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “the sum of \$12,000,000” and all that follows through “to enable the Secretary of Agriculture” and inserting “\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture”.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Sikes Act Improvement Amendments of 1995”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF SIKES ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Act entitled “An Act to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations”, approved September 15, 1960 (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.), commonly referred to, and in this Act referred to, as the “Sikes Act”.

SEC. 3. INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS GENERALLY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(a) (16 U.S.C. 670a(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “is authorized to” and inserting “shall”;

(2) by striking “in each military reservation in accordance with a cooperative plan” and inserting the following: “on military installations. Under the program, the Secretary shall prepare and implement for each military installation in the United States an integrated natural resource management plan”;

(3) by inserting after “reservation is located” the following: “; except that the Secretary is not required to prepare such a plan for a military installation if the Secretary determines that preparation of such a plan for the installation is not appropriate”;

(4) by inserting “(1)” after “(a)”, and adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) Consistent with essential military requirements to enhance the national security of the United States, the Secretary of Defense shall manage each military installation to provide—

“(A) for the conservation of fish and wildlife on the military installation and sustained multiple purpose uses of those resources, including hunting, fishing, and trapping; and

“(B) public access that is necessary or appropriate for those uses.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Title I, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is further amended—

(1) in section 101(b) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “cooperative plan” and inserting “integrated natural resource management plan”;

(2) in section 101(b)(4) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(4)) by striking "cooperative plan" each place it appears and inserting "integrated natural resource management plan";

(3) in section 101(c) (16 U.S.C. 670a(c)) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "a cooperative plan" and inserting "an integrated natural resource management plan";

(4) in section 101(d) (16 U.S.C. 670a(d)) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "cooperative plans" and inserting "integrated natural resource management plans";

(5) in section 101(e) (16 U.S.C. 670a(e)) by striking "Cooperative plans" and inserting "Integrated natural resource management plans";

(6) in section 102 (16 U.S.C. 670b) by striking "a cooperative plan" and inserting "an integrated natural resource management plan";

(7) in section 103 (16 U.S.C. 670c) by striking "a cooperative plan" and inserting "an integrated natural resource management plan";

(8) in section 106(a) (16 U.S.C. 670f(a)) by striking "cooperative plans" and inserting "integrated natural resource management plans"; and

(9) in section 106(c) (16 U.S.C. 670f(c)) by striking "cooperative plans" and inserting "integrated natural resource management plans".

(c) CONTENTS OF PLANS.—Section 101(b) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—
(A) in subparagraph (C) by striking "and" after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (D) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a comma; and
(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(E) wetland protection and restoration, and wetland creation where necessary, for support of fish or wildlife,

"(F) consideration of conservation needs for all biological communities, and

"(G) the establishment of specific natural resource management goals, objectives, and timeframes for proposed actions;"

(2) by striking paragraph (3);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

(2) shall for the military installation for which it is prepared—

"(A) address the needs for fish and wildlife management, land management, forest management, and wildlife-oriented recreation;

"(B) ensure the integration of, and consistency among, the various activities conducted under the plan;

"(C) ensure that there is no net loss in the capability of installation lands to support the military mission of the installation;

"(D) provide for sustained use by the public of natural resources, to the extent that such use is not inconsistent with the military mission of the installation or the needs of fish and wildlife management;

"(E) provide the public access to the installation that is necessary or appropriate for that use, to the extent that access is not inconsistent with the military mission of the installation; and

"(F) provide for professional enforcement of natural resource laws and regulations;"

(5) in paragraph (4)(A) by striking "collect the fees therefor," and inserting "collect, spend, administer, and account for fees therefor,"

(d) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Section 101 (16 U.S.C. 670a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide an opportunity for public comment on each integrated natural resource management plan prepared under subsection (a)."

SEC. 4. REVIEW FOR PREPARATION OF INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

(a) REVIEW OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Secretary of each military department shall, by not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) review each military installation in the United States that is under the jurisdiction of that Secretary to determine the military installations for which the preparation of an integrated natural resource management plan under section 101 of the Sikes Act, as amended by this Act, is appropriate; and

(B) submit to the Secretary of Defense a report on those determinations.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall, by not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Congress a report on the reviews conducted under paragraph (1). The report shall include—

(A) a list of those military installations reviewed under paragraph (1) for which the Secretary of Defense determines the preparation of an integrated natural resource management plan is not appropriate; and

(B) for each of the military installations listed under subparagraph (A), an explanation of the reasons such a plan is not appropriate.

(b) DEADLINE FOR INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the submission of the report required under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of Defense shall, for each military installation for which the Secretary has not determined under subsection (a)(2)(A) that preparation of an integrated natural resource management plan is not appropriate—

(1) prepare and begin implementing such a plan mutually agreed to by the Secretary of the Interior and the head of the appropriate State agencies under section 101(a) of the Sikes Act, as amended by this Act; or

(2) in the case of a military installation for which there is in effect a cooperative plan under section 101(a) of the Sikes Act on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, complete negotiations with the Secretary of the Interior and the heads of the appropriate State agencies regarding changes to that plan that are necessary for the plan to constitute an integrated natural resource plan that complies with that section, as amended by this Act.

(c) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide an opportunity for the submission of public comments on—

(1) integrated natural resource management plans proposed pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) changes to cooperative plans proposed pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS.

Section 101 (16 U.S.C. 670a) is further amended by adding after subsection (f) (as added by section 3(d) of this Act) the following:

"(g) REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—

"(1) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall, by not later than March 1 of each year, review the extent to which integrated natural resource management plans were prepared or in effect and implemented in accordance with this Act in the preceding year, and submit a report on the findings of that review to the committees. Each report shall include—

"(A) the number of integrated natural resource management plans in effect in the year covered by the report, including the date on which each plan was issued in final form or most recently revised;

"(B) the amount of moneys expended on conservation activities conducted pursuant to those plans in the year covered by the report, including amounts expended under the Legacy Resource Management Program established under section 8120 of the Act of November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-511; 104 Stat. 1905); and

"(C) an assessment of the extent to which the plans comply with the requirements of subsection (b)(1) and (2), including specifically the extent to which the plans ensure in accordance with subsection (b)(2)(C) that there is no net loss of lands to support the military missions of military installations.

"(2) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The Secretary of the Interior, by not later than March

1 of each year and in consultation with State agencies responsible for conservation or management of fish or wildlife, shall submit a report to the committees on the amount of moneys expended by the Department of the Interior and those State agencies in the year covered by the report on conservation activities conducted pursuant to integrated natural resource management plans.

"(3) COMMITTEES DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'committees' means the Committees on Resources and National Security of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Armed Services and Environment and Public Works of the Senate."

SEC. 6. FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OF INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS; ENFORCEMENT OF OTHER LAWS.

Title I (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 106 as section 110; and

(2) by inserting after section 105 the following:
"SEC. 106. FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OF OTHER LAWS.

"All Federal laws relating to the conservation of natural resources on Federal lands may be enforced by the Secretary of Defense with respect to violations of those laws which occur on military installations within the United States."

SEC. 7. NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SERVICES.

Title I (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 106 (as added by section 6 of this Act) the following:

"SEC. 107. NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SERVICES.

"The Secretary of each military department shall ensure that sufficient numbers of professionally trained natural resource management personnel and natural resource law enforcement personnel are available and assigned responsibility to perform tasks necessary to comply with this Act, including the preparation and implementation of integrated natural resource management plans."

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

Title I (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is further amended by inserting after section 107 (as added by section 7 of this Act) the following:

"SEC. 108. DEFINITIONS.

"In this title:

"(1) MILITARY DEPARTMENT.—The term 'military department' means the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

"(2) MILITARY INSTALLATION.—The term 'military installation'—

"(A) means any land or interest in land owned by the United States and administered by the Secretary of Defense or the head of a military department; and

"(B) includes all public lands withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under public land laws and reserved for use by the Secretary of Defense or the head of a military department.

"(3) STATE FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCY.—The term 'State fish and wildlife agency' means an agency of State government that is responsible under State law for managing fish or wildlife resources.

"(4) UNITED STATES.—The term 'United States' means the States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions of the United States."

SEC. 9. SHORT TITLE.

Title I (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is further amended by inserting after section 108 (as added by section 7 of this Act) the following:

"SEC. 109. SHORT TITLE.

"This title may be cited as the 'Sikes Act'."

SEC. 10. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

(a) COST SHARING.—Section 103a(b) (16 U.S.C. 670c-1(b)) is amended by striking "matching basis" each place it appears and inserting "cost-sharing basis".

(b) ACCOUNTING.—Section 103a(c) (16 U.S.C. 670c-1(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and shall not be subject to section 1535 of that title”.

SEC. 11. REPEAL.

Section 2 of the Act of October 27, 1986 (Public Law 99-651; 16 U.S.C. 670a-1) is repealed.

SEC. 12. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

Title I, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in the heading for the title by striking “MILITARY RESERVATIONS” and inserting “MILITARY INSTALLATIONS”;

(2) in section 101(a) (16 U.S.C. 670a(a)) by striking “the reservation” and inserting “the installation”;

(3) in section 101(b)(4) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(4))—
(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “the reservation” and inserting “the installation”; and
(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking “the military reservation” and inserting “the military installation”;

(4) in section 101(c) (16 U.S.C. 670a(c))—
(A) in paragraph (1) by striking “a military reservation” and inserting “a military installation”; and
(B) in paragraph (2) by striking “the reservation” and inserting “the installation”;

(5) in section 102 (16 U.S.C. 670b) by striking “military reservations” and inserting “military installations”; and

(6) in section 103 (16 U.S.C. 670c) by striking “military reservations” and inserting “military installations”.

SEC. 13. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) PROGRAMS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—Subsections (b) and (c) of section 110 (as redesignated by section 6 of this Act) are each amended by striking “1983” and all that follows through “1993,” and inserting “1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998.”

(b) PROGRAMS ON PUBLIC LANDS.—Section 209 (16 U.S.C. 670o) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “the sum of \$10,000,000” and all that follows through “to enable the Secretary of the Interior” and inserting “\$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, to enable the Secretary of the Interior”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “the sum of \$12,000,000” and all that follows through “to enable the Secretary of Agriculture” and inserting “\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H.R. 1141, I am pleased that we are considering this legislation to reauthorize and improve the effectiveness of the Sikes Act.

Since coming to Congress in 1973, I have led the fight to enhance and conserve the vital fish and wildlife resources that exist on our military lands. The Department of Defense [DOD] manages nearly 25 million acres at approximately 900 military bases nationwide. These lands contain a wealth of plant and animal life, they provide

vital habitat for thousands of migratory waterfowl, and they are home for nearly 100 federally listed species.

The Department does a superb job of training our young men and women for combat. Regrettably, they often fail to do even an adequate job of comprehensive natural resource management planning. At far too many installations, management plans have never been written, are outdated, or are largely ignored. Furthermore, when these plans do exist, all too often they are not coordinated or integrated with other military activities.

While H.R. 1141 will make a number of improvements in the Sikes Act, the bill does not undermine in any way the fundamental training mission of a military base.

What the bill does is expand the scope of existing conservation plans to encompass all natural resource management activities, require management plans for all appropriate installations, mandate an annual report summarizing the status of these plans, require that trained personnel be available, and ensure that DOD shall manage each installation to provide for the conservation of fish and wildlife, and to allow the multipurpose uses of those resources. In addition, the bill extends the act's authorization for the next 3 years at half of the current funding level.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial bill that has been thoroughly considered in both the Resources and National Security Committees. I want to thank FLOYD SPENCE, JIM SAXTON, JOEL HEFLEY, and GERRY STUDDS for their leadership and for joining with me in this important conservation effort. I am confident that our bill will greatly assist DOD in the management of those natural resources under their jurisdiction.

I urge my colleagues to vote “aye” on H.R. 1141.

□ 1600

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I note with some trepidation the violent beginning of the gentleman's week. His assault on the desk and podium I hope does not bode ill for the remainder of the evening and of the week.

Mr. Speaker, interestingly, some of the most controversial issues facing us in this Congress are embodied in this noncontroversial bill: the most appropriate uses for federally owned lands, how best to protect wildlife habitat, and public/private partnerships to manage lands and protect endangered species.

Under the provisions of the Sikes Act, the military is required to manage its 25 million acres for fish and wildlife conservation, including the protection of critical habitat for almost 100 endangered and threatened species. That is a big job, and the military has often

worked closely with nongovernment partners to provide efficient, cost-effective management. I am pleased to point out that this bill encourages the continued use of those partnerships.

In short, this legislation provides a good working model for compromise on many of the difficult issues we will be facing over the next several months, and I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska for his efforts in bringing a truly bipartisan bill to the floor.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] mentioned, this is a bipartisan bill. This is not the first time that he and I have addressed this issue. We want to stress that 25 million acres of land now is under military jurisdiction for training of our personnel for military purposes. What we are trying to do in this bill and with the original bill was to make sure the military recognized the extraordinary value. Most military bases are in the proximity of urban areas. They are truly the wildlife refuge areas of the urban people. They are also very valuable for those resource activities, which I think are also very valuable for the maintaining and the management of those species; that is, in fact, the wildlife itself, for fishing and hunting and recreational purposes.

Mr. Speaker, under this act, with the help of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do believe we strengthen the DOD and in fact direct them to better manage those resources available to them. The 25 million acres of land, refuge land that is under military jurisdiction today, is actually more land than we have in any other part of our natural Federal use lands in the lower 48. Therefore, I do urge the passage of this legislation. It is good legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I fully concur with the gentleman, especially with regard to the good things that have been said about us.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 1141, the Sikes Act Improvement Amendments of 1995, introduced by DON YOUNG and me in March of this year. The Sikes Act was enacted in 1960 to provide a mechanism for cooperative wildlife management on U.S. military installations. H.R. 1141 will make the Sikes Act more effective in several important respects.

First, existing conservation plans which deal exclusively with fish and wildlife habitat improvements will be replaced with integrated natural resource management plans which encompass all natural resource management activities. Second, natural resource management plans will have to be prepared for all military installations, except those without any significant fish, wildlife or natural resource management plans. Third, the Secretary of Defense will be required to submit an annual report to

Congress summarizing the status of implementation of the integrated natural resources management plans. Finally, the bill extends authorization of appropriations, which expired on September 30, 1993, for the next 3 fiscal years.

This legislation is noncontroversial and important to the training units of our Armed Forces. I urge my colleagues support of H.R. 1141.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1141, the Sikes Act Improvement Amendments of 1995. H.R. 1141 would enhance and improve natural resource management practices on military installations and lands under the control of the Secretary of Defense. This legislation has received overwhelming bipartisan support by the Committee on Resources and the Committee on National Security.

At Fort Carson, CO, the Army's premier tank training ground, the concept of wildlife management and training going hand-in-hand is put to the test. On the Pinon Canyon maneuver site at Carson, red fox holes are roped off, the division-size maneuvers are conducted around them. This is just one example of how the Army is striking the balance between environment and military training. This legislation will improve the ability of Fort Carson and all other military installations to preserve this balance.

H.R. 1141 strikes an appropriate balance between natural resource management and the defense mission conducted at all military installations. The bill is fully supported by the Department of Defense. As a member of both committees of jurisdiction, I have had an opportunity to pass judgment on H.R. 1141 on a number of occasions this year. I can assure the House that the bill is worthy of each Member's support. I am pleased to recommend this legislation and urge it adoption.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1141, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. STUDDS. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of order of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1141, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

COLORADO BASIN SALINITY CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 523) to amend the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act to authorize additional measures to carry out the control of salinity upstream of Imperial Dam in a cost-effective manner, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 523

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENTS TO THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL ACT.

The Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act (43 U.S.C. 1571 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 202(a)—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking "the following salinity control units" and inserting "the following salinity control units and salinity control program"; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting a colon; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(6) A basinwide salinity control program that the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, shall implement. The Secretary may carry out the purposes of this paragraph directly, or may make grants, commitments for grants, or advances of funds to non-Federal entities under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require. Such program shall consist of cost-effective measures and associated works to reduce salinity from saline springs, leaking wells, irrigation sources, industrial sources, erosion of public and private land, or other sources that the Secretary considers appropriate. Such program shall provide for the mitigation of incidental fish and wildlife values that are lost as a result of the measures and associated works. The Secretary shall submit a planning report concerning the program established under this paragraph to the appropriate committees of Congress. The Secretary may not expend funds for any implementation measure under the program established under this paragraph before the expiration of a 30-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits such report.";

(2) in section 205(a)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking "authorized by section 202(a) (4) and (5)" and inserting "authorized by paragraphs (4) through (6) of section 202(a)"; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(i), by striking "section 202(a) (4) and (5)" each place it appears and inserting "paragraphs (4) through (6) of section 202";

(3) in section 208, by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated \$75,000,000 for subsection 202(a), including constructing the works described in paragraph 202(a)(6) and carrying out the measures described in such paragraph. Notwithstanding subsection (b), the Secretary may implement the program under paragraph 202(a)(6) only to the extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts."; and

(4) in subsection 202(b)(4) delete "units authorized to be constructed pursuant to para-

graphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5)" and insert in lieu thereof "units authorized to be constructed or the program pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado River Compact negotiated in 1922 by all seven Basin States, divided the river into two basins, the Upper Basin and the Lower Basin, with each basin receiving the right to develop and use in perpetuity 7.5 million acre-feet annually from the Colorado River system, although not all States are currently using their full apportionment.

In addition, the 1994 Mexican Water Treaty committed 1.5 million acre-feet of water annually to users in Mexico. The quality of that water is also prescribed by the treaty. The quantity and quality of water to be delivered to Mexico are our obligation, and the cost is not to be borne by the seven Basin States.

In addition to United States-Mexican Treaty obligations, water users in the Lower Basin are concerned about the higher salinity of the Colorado River water they receive, because it reduces their ability to reclaim the water for reuse. The more saline the water is originally, the more it costs to treat it for reuse.

To address the salinity problem, the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act was enacted in 1974. Title 1 of the bill addressed the Mexican Treaty obligations by authorizing the Yuma Desalting Plant and certain other actions to be taken in the Lower Colorado River Basin. Title 2 of the act, which this bill, S. 523, seeks to amend, authorized the investigation and construction of salinity control projects in the Upper Basin in order to protect the quality of water delivered to the Lower Basin.

S. 523 would amend section 202(a) of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act to authorize a program of salinity control in addition to the specific projects in the existing statute. The new program would enable Reclamation to accept proposals from non-Federal entities for salinity control measures, and then provide funding to the most cost-effective proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill and in place of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO], who takes the lead for our Members on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Colorado River is the only source of water for millions of people. Both agriculture and growing

urban areas in the West depend on the river as their only water source. The measure before us has been described well by the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE]. The issues arise, of course, because water is being introduced in dry areas where it activates, it is carried and picks up the salinity or salt from those dry areas, adding to the load in the river. Consequently, of course, that river water, the Colorado River Basin River and its tributaries, become a waterway with a much greater concentration of salt than otherwise would be the case. It needs to obviously be reduced.

Mr. Speaker, the intent of this legislation is to look at less intrusive ways, less high-cost ways of reducing the salinity, looking at creative solutions. There are several important issues that were discussed during the hearing held on this measure on May 11. I believe the bill and the assurances we have received from the administration adequately address those concerns. First of all, the bill specifies that new salinity control solutions must meet a test of cost effectiveness. The Bureau of Reclamation will develop the new guidelines for evaluating proposed salinity control measures. It is my understanding that these guidelines will be developed in consultation with interested parties, and that every effort will be made to ensure that innovative and cost-effective solutions to salinity control are encouraged.

Second, the bill specifically provides the Secretary may approve salinity control projects to reduce salinity from a variety of sources, including irrigation sources. It is my expectation that the Bureau of Reclamation's guidelines for implementing this law will not unreasonably preclude proposed solutions to the Basin's salinity problems. We should not continue to rely on pouring more concrete if it can be shown that other water or land management alternatives will do the job just as well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the measure, S. 523, has the potential to directly improve the existing programs for reducing salinity in the Colorado River, and I urge support of the bill.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the time to thank subcommittee Chairman JOHN DOOLITTLE and Chairman DON YOUNG for their assistance in moving this important piece of legislation in such a timely fashion.

The Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program has been authorized by Congress and implemented by federal and state entities for the last 20 years. There is now a need to update and revise the authorizations provided for in the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act so that the Bureau of Reclamation can move forward in a

more responsive and cost-effective manner.

The bills that Senator BOB BENNETT introduced in the Senate and I introduced in the House this year are very similar to the bills that we introduced last Congress. Although the bill passed the Senate last Congress, due to last minute politics, the full House never addressed the bill. It is important that we take this opportunity to pass this legislation and fully authorize this crucial program.

The bill before the House today would authorize additional measures to carry out the control of the Colorado River's salinity in a cost-effective manner. Such measures would lead to reductions of salinity from all sources basinwide. The bill would also provide flexibility to the program by simplifying the process for the Bureau of Reclamation to obtain congressional approval for new salinity control measures.

An appropriations ceiling level increase has been needed for some time. The level would be increased by \$75 million in order to carry out salinity control measures. The Bureau of Reclamation expenditures are nearing the ceiling established by Congress over 20 years ago.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my good friends, Chairmen YOUNG and DOOLITTLE for their diligence. Passage of this legislation is very important to all the upper and lower basin Colorado River States and I urge my colleagues to support S. 523.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 523.

The question was taken. Mr. VENTO. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of order of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 5 p.m.

Accordingly at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m. the House stood in recess until 5 p.m.

□ 1701

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WALKER] at 5:01 p.m.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the motion at the desk?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. It is in writing at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

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

Mr. GOSS. 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. The gentleman's motion would not be in order as under the rules a quorum is not necessary.

Does the gentleman ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 139, nays 234, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 469]

YEAS—139

Ackerman	Gordon	Owens
Andrews	Gutierrez	Pallone
Baesler	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Baldacci	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Barcia	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bentsen	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Bevill	Hilliard	Pickett
Bishop	Hinchesy	Pomeroy
Bonior	Hoyer	Reed
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Richardson
Browder	Johnson (SD)	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Kanjorski	Rush
Cardin	Kaptur	Sabo
Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Clement	Kennelly	Sawyer
Clyburn	Kildee	Schroeder
Coleman	Klink	Schumer
Collins (IL)	LaFalce	Scott
Condit	Levin	Serrano
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Coyne	Lofgren	Skaggs
Cramer	Maloney	Skelton
Danner	Manton	Slaughter
de la Garza	Markey	Spratt
DeFazio	Martinez	Stark
DeLauro	Mascara	Stokes
Deutsch	Matsui	Studds
Dicks	McCarthy	Stupak
Dingell	McDermott	Thompson
Durbin	McKinney	Thurman
Eshoo	McNulty	Trafficant
Evans	Meehan	Vento
Farr	Meek	Vislosky
Fattah	Mineta	Volkmer
Fazio	Minge	Ward
Fields (LA)	Mink	Watt (NC)
Filner	Mollohan	Waxman
Flake	Montgomery	Williams
Ford	Moran	Wilson
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Nadler	Wyden
Gephardt	Neal	Wynn
Geren	Obey	Yates
Gibbons	Olver	
Gonzalez	Orton	

NAYS—234

Allard	Funderburk	Molinari
Army	Gallegly	Moorhead
Bachus	Ganske	Morella
Baker (LA)	Gekas	Myers
Ballenger	Gilchrest	Myrick
Barr	Gillmor	Nethercutt
Barrett (NE)	Gilman	Neumann
Barrett (WI)	Goodlatte	Ney
Bartlett	Goodling	Norwood
Bass	Goss	Nussle
Beilenson	Green	Ortiz
Bereuter	Greenwood	Oxley
Bilbray	Gunderson	Packard
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Parker
Bliley	Hall (TX)	Paxon
Blute	Hamilton	Petri
Boehlert	Hancock	Pombo
Boehner	Hansen	Porter
Bonilla	Hastert	Portman
Bono	Hayworth	Poshard
Borski	Hefley	Quillen
Brewster	Heineman	Rahall
Brownback	Herger	Ramstad
Bryant (TN)	Hilleary	Regula
Bunning	Hobson	Riggs
Burr	Hoekstra	Roberts
Burton	Hoke	Rogers
Buyer	Holden	Rohrabacher
Callahan	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Hostettler	Roth
Camp	Houghton	Royce
Canady	Hutchinson	Salmon
Castle	Hyde	Sanford
Chabot	Inglis	Saxton
Chambliss	Istook	Scarborough
Chapman	Johnson (CT)	Schaefer
Chenoweth	Johnson, Sam	Schiff
Christensen	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Chrysler	Kasich	Shadegg
Coble	Kelly	Shaw
Coburn	Kennedy (MA)	Shays
Combest	Kim	Shuster
Cooley	King	Skeen
Costello	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Cox	Klecza	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Klug	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Knollenberg	Smith (WA)
Cubin	Kolbe	Solomon
Cunningham	LaHood	Souder
Davis	Largent	Stearns
Deal	Latham	Stockman
DeLay	LaTourette	Stump
Diaz-Balart	Laughlin	Talent
Dickey	Lazio	Tanner
Doggett	Leach	Tate
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Tauzin
Dornan	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (MS)
Doyle	Lightfoot	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	Lincoln	Tejeda
Duncan	Linder	Thornton
Dunn	Livingston	Tiahrt
Edwards	LoBiondo	Torkildsen
Ehlers	Longley	Upton
Ehrlich	Lucas	Vucanovich
Emerson	Luther	Walker
English	Manzullo	Walsh
Everett	Martini	Wamp
Ewing	McColum	Watts (OK)
Fawell	McCrery	Weldon (FL)
Flanagan	McHale	Weller
Foley	McHugh	White
Forbes	McInnis	Whitfield
Fowler	McIntosh	Wicker
Fox	McKeon	Wolf
Franks (CT)	Menendez	Young (AK)
Franks (NJ)	Metcalf	Young (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Meyers	Zeliff
Frisa	Miller (FL)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—61

Abercrombie	Ensign	Moakley
Archer	Fields (TX)	Oberstar
Baker (CA)	Foglietta	Payne (VA)
Barton	Frost	Peterson (FL)
Bateman	Furse	Pryce
Becerra	Graham	Quinn
Berman	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Brown (CA)	Hayes	Rangel
Bunn	Hunter	Reynolds
Clay	Jacobs	Rose
Clinger	Jefferson	Roukema
Collins (GA)	Lantos	Seastrand
Collins (MI)	Lipinski	Spence
Creameans	Lowey	Stenholm
Dellums	McDade	Thomas
Dixon	Mfume	Thornberry
Dooley	Mica	Torres
Engel	Miller (CA)	Torricelli

Towns	Waldholtz	Wise
Tucker	Waters	
Velazquez	Weldon (PA)	

□ 1721

Messrs. HAMILTON, BURR, EWING, TAUZIN, and HYDE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. VENTO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE VIC FAZIO, CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable VIC FAZIO, chairman of the Democratic Caucus:

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 27, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to inform you that Representative Greg Laughlin is no longer a member of the Democratic Caucus.

Sincerely,

VIC FAZIO,
Chairman.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 30, 1995.

Hon. LARRY COMBEST,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to advise you that Representative Greg Laughlin's appointment to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has been automatically vacated pursuant to clause 6(b) of rule X, effective today.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 30, 1995.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to advise you that Representative Greg Laughlin's election to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has been automatically vacated pursuant to clause 6(b) of rule X, effective today.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 183) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 183

Resolved, that the following named Member be, and he is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. Laughlin of Texas, to rank following Mr. Portman of Ohio.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 3 of rule XVI, I raise the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: Will the House now consider House Resolution 183.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 176, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 470]

YEAS—220

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

Riggs	Smith (MI)	Waldholtz
Roberts	Smith (NJ)	Walker
Rogers	Smith (TX)	Walsh
Rohrabacher	Smith (WA)	Wamp
Ros-Lehtinen	Solomon	Watt (NC)
Roth	Souder	Watts (OK)
Royce	Stearns	Weldon (FL)
Salmon	Stockman	Weldon (PA)
Sanford	Stump	Weller
Saxton	Talent	White
Scarborough	Tate	Whitfield
Schaefer	Tauzin	Wicker
Schiff	Taylor (NC)	Wolf
Sensenbrenner	Thomas	Young (AK)
Shadegg	Thornberry	Young (FL)
Shaw	Tiahrt	Zeliff
Shays	Torkildsen	Zimmer
Shuster	Upton	
Skeen	Vucanovich	

NAYS—176

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

NOT VOTING—38

Abercrombie	Hastings (WA)	Pryce
Archer	Hunter	Quinn
Becerra	Jacobs	Radanovich
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Reynolds
Clinger	Lantos	Rose
Dellums	Lipinski	Roukema
Dixon	McDade	Seastrand
Dooley	Mfume	Spence
Ensign	Mica	Stenholm
Fields (TX)	Moakley	Torricelli
Foglietta	Oberstar	Towns
Frost	Payne (VA)	Tucker
Graham	Peterson (FL)	

□ 1742

So the House agreed to consider House Resolution 183.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the question of consideration was decided.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. BOEHNER

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote whereby the question of consideration was decided.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] to reconsider the vote.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 179, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]

AYES—222

Allard	Cubin	Hefley
Armey	Cunningham	Heineman
Bachus	Davis	Herger
Baker (CA)	Deal	Hilleary
Baker (LA)	DeLay	Hobson
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Barr	Dickey	Hoke
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Horn
Bartlett	Dornan	Hostettler
Barton	Dreier	Houghton
Bass	Duncan	Hutchinson
Bateman	Dunn	Hyde
Bereuter	Ehlers	Inglis
Bilbray	Ehrlich	Istook
Bilirakis	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Bilezikian	English	Johnson, Sam
Blute	Everett	Jones
Boehlert	Ewing	Kasich
Boehner	Fawell	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	Gallegly	Laughlin
Camp	Ganske	Lazio
Canady	Gekas	Leach
Castle	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Chabot	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Chambliss	Gilman	Lightfoot
Chenoweth	Goodlatte	Linder
Christensen	Goodling	Livingston
Chrysler	Goss	LoBiondo
Coble	Greenwood	Longley
Coburn	Gunderson	Lucas
Collins (GA)	Gutknecht	Manzullo
Combest	Hall (TX)	Martini
Cooley	Hancock	McCollum
Cox	Hansen	McCrery
Crane	Hastert	McHugh
Crapo	Hayes	McInnis
Creameans	Hayworth	McIntosh

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

NOES—179

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

NOT VOTING—33

Abercrombie	Frost	Menendez
Archer	Graham	Mfume
Becerra	Hastings (WA)	Moakley
Brown (CA)	Hunter	Oberstar
Clinger	Jefferson	Payne (VA)
Dellums	Lantos	Peterson (FL)
Dixon	Lipinski	Pryce
Dooley	McDade	Quinn
Ensign		
Fields (TX)		
Foglietta		

Reynolds
Roukema
Seastrand

Spence
Stenholm
Torricelli

Towns
Tucker
Williams

Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)

Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey

Wyden
Wynn
Yates

□ 1819

Mr. VOLKMER changed his vote from "present" to "aye."

So the motion to table was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Objection is heard.

Mr DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. BOEHNER

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker. I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 180, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 473]

YEAS—230

Allard	Deal	Horn
Army	DeLay	Hostettler
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Houghton
Baker (CA)	Dickey	Hutchinson
Baker (LA)	Doolittle	Hyde
Ballenger	Dornan	Inglis
Barr	Dreier	Istook
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Johnson (CT)
Barton	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Bass	Ehlers	Jones
Bateman	Ehrlich	Kasich
Bereuter	Emerson	Kelly
Bilbray	English	Kim
Bilirakis	Everett	King
Blute	Ewing	Kingston
Boehler	Fawell	Klug
Boehner	Flanagan	Knollenberg
Bonilla	Foley	Kolbe
Bono	Forbes	LaHood
Brewster	Fowler	Largent
Brownback	Fox	Latham
Bryant (TN)	Franks (CT)	LaTourette
Bunning	Franks (NJ)	Laughlin
Burr	Frelinghuysen	Lazio
Buyer	Frisa	Leach
Callahan	Funderburk	Lewis (CA)
Calvert	Gallegly	Lewis (KY)
Camp	Ganske	Lightfoot
Canady	Gekas	Linder
Castle	Gilchrest	Livingston
Chabot	Gillmor	LoBiondo
Chambliss	Gilman	Longley
Chenoweth	Goodlatte	Lucas
Christensen	Goss	Martini
Chrysler	Greenwood	McCollum
Clinger	Gunderson	McCrery
Coble	Gutknecht	McDade
Coburn	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Collins (GA)	Hancock	McInnis
Combust	Hansen	McIntosh
Cooley	Hastert	McKeon
Cooly	Hastings (WA)	Metcalf
Crapo	Hayes	Meyers
Crane	Hayworth	Mica
Crapo	Hefley	Miller (FL)
Creameans	Heineman	Molinar
Cubin	Herger	Moorhead
Cunningham	Hilleary	Morella
Davis	Hobson	Myers
Deal	Hoekstra	Myrick
DeLay	Hoke	Nethercutt
Diaz-Balart		
Dickey		
Doolittle		
Dornan		
Dreier		
Duncan		
Dunn		
Ehlers		
Ehrlich		
Emerson		
English		
Everett		
Ewing		
Fawell		
Flanagan		
Foley		
Forbes		
Fowler		
Fox		
Frank (MA)		
Franks (CT)		
Franks (NJ)		
Frelinghuysen		

NOES—229

Allard	Frisa
Army	Funderburk
Bachus	Gallegly
Baker (CA)	Ganske
Baker (LA)	Gekas
Ballenger	Gilchrest
Barr	Gillmor
Barrett (NE)	Gilman
Bartlett	Goodlatte
Barton	Goodling
Bass	Goss
Bateman	Greenwood
Bereuter	Gunderson
Bilbray	Gutknecht
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)
Bliley	Hancock
Blute	Hansen
Boehler	Hastert
Boehner	Hastings (WA)
Bonilla	Hayes
Bono	Hayworth
Brewster	Hefley
Brownback	Heineman
Bryant (TN)	Herger
Bunn	Hilleary
Bunning	Hobson
Burr	Hoekstra
Burton	Hoke
Buyer	Horn
Callahan	Hostettler
Calvert	Houghton
Camp	Hutchinson
Canady	Hyde
Castle	Inglis
Chabot	Istook
Chambliss	Johnson (CT)
Chenoweth	Johnson, Sam
Christensen	Jones
Chrysler	Kasich
Clinger	Kelly
Coble	Kim
Coburn	King
Collins (GA)	Kingston
Combust	Klug
Cooley	Knollenberg
Crapo	Kolbe
Creameans	LaHood
Cubin	Largent
Cunningham	Latham
Davis	LaTourette
Deal	Laughlin
DeLay	Lazio
Diaz-Balart	Leach
Dickey	Lewis (CA)
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)
Dornan	Lightfoot
Dreier	Linder
Duncan	Livingston
Dunn	LoBiondo
Ehlers	Longley
Ehrlich	Lucas
Emerson	Walker
English	Walsh
Everett	Martini
Ewing	McCollum
Fawell	McCrery
Flanagan	McDade
Foley	McHugh
Forbes	McInnis
Fowler	McIntosh
Frank (MA)	McKeon
Franks (CT)	Metcalf
Franks (NJ)	Meyers
Frelinghuysen	Mica
	Miller (FL)
	Molinar
	Moorhead
	Morella

NOT VOTING—27

Abercrombie	Hunter	Pryce
Archer	Jefferson	Quinn
Becerra	Lantos	Reynolds
Brown (CA)	Lipinski	Roukema
Dooley	Menendez	Spence
Fields (TX)	Mfume	Stenholm
Foglietta	Moakley	Torricelli
Frost	Payne (NJ)	Towns
Graham	Peterson (FL)	Tucker

So the motion to lay the motion to reconsider the vote on the table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO LAY THE RESOLUTION ON THE TABLE OFFERED BY MR. WATT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WATT of North Carolina moves to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] to lay the resolution on the table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 229, not voting 27 as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

AYES—178

Ackerman	Ford	Mink
Andrews	Furse	Mollohan
Baesler	Gejdenson	Montgomery
Baldacci	Gephardt	Moran
Barcia	Geren	Murtha
Barrett (WI)	Gibbons	Nadler
Beilenson	Gonzalez	Neal
Bentsen	Gordon	Oberstar
Berman	Green	Obey
Bevill	Gutierrez	Olver
Bishop	Hall (OH)	Ortiz
Bonior	Hamilton	Orton
Borski	Harman	Owens
Boucher	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Browder	Hefner	Pastor
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Payne (VA)
Brown (OH)	Hinchev	Pelosi
Bryant (TX)	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Cardin	Hoyer	Pickett
Chapman	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Clay	Jacobs	Poshard
Clayton	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Clyburn	Johnston	Reed
Coleman	Kanjorski	Richardson
Collins (IL)	Kaptur	Rivers
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
Condit	Kennedy (RI)	Rose
Conyers	Kennelly	Royal-Allard
Costello	Kildee	Rush
Coyne	Kleczka	Sabo
Cramer	Klink	Sanders
Danner	LaFalce	Sawyer
de la Garza	Levin	Schroeder
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
DeLauro	Lincoln	Scott
Dellums	Lofgren	Serrano
Deutsch	Lowey	Sisisky
Dicks	Luther	Skaggs
Dingell	Maloney	Skelton
Dixon	Manton	Slaughter
Doggett	Markey	Spratt
Doyle	Martinez	Stark
Durbin	Mascara	Stokes
Edwards	Matsui	Studds
Engel	McCarthy	Stupak
Ensign	McDermott	Tanner
Eshoo	McHale	Tejeda
Evans	McKinney	Thompson
Farr	McNulty	Thornton
Fattah	Meehan	Thurman
Fazio	Meek	Torres
Fields (LA)	Miller (CA)	Trafficant
Filner	Mineta	Velazquez
Flake	Minge	Vento

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

□ 1837

Mr. NEUMANN and Mr. SMITH of Texas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. ENSIGN changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the minority leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican Conference, I am pleased to welcome the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GREG LAUGHLIN, to our party. Mr. LAUGHLIN saw fit several weeks ago to change parties here in the House of Representatives, and we are glad to have him on our side of the aisle.

As a result, about a week and a half ago, the Republican conference did in fact vote by unanimous vote to place the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] on the Committee on Ways and Means. To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who appear to have some chagrin over the fact we are placing Mr. LAUGHLIN on the Committee on Ways and Means, I would point out that today Republicans hold about 58 percent of the seats on the Committee on Ways and Means. It has been since 1923 that the majority party has had less than 60 percent of the votes on the Committee on Ways and Means. Historically, that percentage has been a 60 to 40 split between the majority and minority on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Even after we add Mr. LAUGHLIN to the committee, we will still be slightly less than the 60 percent that has been the historical average over the last 70 years. As a matter of fact, in 1955 when the Democrat Party took control of this House, and they happened to have 232 Members, the same amount that Republicans have today, they had a 60-40 majority on the Committee on Ways and Means.

I would further point out that in December of this year, when the Republicans took control of the House, it was the decision of the Republican leadership that there should in fact be a 60 to 40 split on the Committee on Ways and Means again. After that decision was made, the minority leader, in consultation with the Speaker and the majority leader, and, frankly, after much whining about it, we decided that to ease their pain in terms of the number of Democrat members who were going to lose their position on the Committee on Ways and Means, that we would change from the 60 to 40 split that we had decided on, in order to add just a Democrat member to their side of the aisle on the Committee on Ways and Means, dropping that percentage down to well less than 60 percent. So I would

remind all Members that it has been a longstanding tradition and precedent of the House that each party respects the rights of the other in appointing its own Members to standing committees of the House.

What has gone on tonight in the politicization of this process by the minority party I think makes a sad day for this institution. While the minority party may think they are scoring political points or are somehow engaged in some highly principled moralistic action, I think the facts speak otherwise.

Perhaps the saddest part of the charade tonight is that the minority party seems to have no concern that their dilatory tactics hurt not us in the majority, but instead grind to a halt the consideration of the people's business here in the people's House.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, let me be perfectly clear. We will not see this institution or this Nation's business grind to a halt because of the childish temper tantrum by some Members on the other side of the aisle. We will do what is necessary to assure an orderly consideration of the people's business here in the people's House.

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

□ 1845

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the case that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has made on behalf of the Republican side. I would like to respond to both what is happening here procedurally and what is happening substantively.

First, the procedure: The gentleman is correct in saying that in past Congresses there has been a desire on the part of the majority party on certain key committees to have a larger ratio than the ratio represented by the members of the House. Many times in the past, we have had 60 percent, as Democrats on the Committee on Ways and Means and on the Committee on Rules. But I would point out that in all of those times, the ratio that the Democrats represented in the House was higher than the 53 percent that the Republicans now represent as part of the House.

Second, when this year started, I did go to the Speaker and I said, as a result of the change, we have got five members of the Committee on Ways and Means who are Democrats who will come off. We understood that. That was part of changing the guard. But I asked if the committee could be enlarged so that more of the then-sitting members of Ways and Means could be kept on Ways and Means. And, yes, one was allowed to stay, and four were knocked off.

But when we had that discussion, it was represented to me that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas, very much wanted the committee to stay at

NAYS—180

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

NOT VOTING—24

Abercrombie	Graham	Peterson (FL)
Archer	Hunter	Pryce
Becerra	Jefferson	Quinn
Brown (CA)	Lantos	Reynolds
Dooley	Lipinski	Roukema
Fields (TX)	Mfume	Torricelli
Foglietta	Moakley	Towns
Frost	Payne (NJ)	Tucker

the number 21 and 15 represents or 36 and that he in no way would allow the committee to get any larger than that. But yet here we come, a few weeks later, when there is the possibility of someone switching and this action is taken.

My colleagues, I think it is wrong. I think it is wrong from a procedural standpoint. It is wrong in terms of the precedents of this House. And I think it is wrong for people to be moving with this out there.

I am not impugning anyone's motives. Anyone can switch parties at any time. That is a legitimate thing to have happen. But it should be for the right reasons, not for the wrong reasons. And as long as I am leader on the Democratic side, I am going to fight for the rights of the minority on procedure and on ratios on committees, and we will continue that fight.

Let me talk about the substance. What I think is really going on here is an attempt, as was pointed out in the Washington Times on Friday, June 30, 1995, to add a Republican member of senior status to shield freshman Republicans from having to vote for deep, deep cuts in Medicare.

I quote, "Mr. Laughlin likely will provide support for potentially unpopular reductions in Medicare benefits, should GOP leaders give three committee freshmen, all of whom won with less than 51 percent of the vote, permission to vote 'no.'"

My colleagues, what is about to happen in Medicare are the largest changes to Medicare in the history of the program. If the hints we are reading in the weekend press are right, we are talking about huge increases in the premiums for Medicare recipients. If that is what is going on here, a stacking of the committee in order to make sure those cuts go through, then this is substantively wrong. If Members on your side of the aisle believe in these kinds of changes in Medicare, everybody should vote for it. Why should we be shielding Members from voting for these kinds of cuts?

Finally, let me tell you what I really think is going on here. In reading the comments of leaders on the Republican side for some time now, not just lately, I think there is an effort here to make Medicare a voluntary program. I think there is an effort to get rid of Medicare. I think that is what is really at stake.

What I am really concerned about is that these deep, important changes in Medicare are going to try to be slipped through in 3 or 4 days in September. If we are going to have changes in this program of this kind, bring the changes out now in July. Give the American people the right to know what is happening to this program. Make them part of this debate. Let them be part of the vote of what happens to Medicare.

We should not change this program and make it voluntary without involving the American people. And I can tell you, this party will fight those changes every step of the way.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that the debate on this issue should be confined to the resolution that is on the floor of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rules and precedents of the House would indicate that debate on the matter should relate to the matter before the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

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

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

I, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, am delighted today to welcome our newest Republican, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GREG LAUGHLIN, to the committee and welcome him to the Republican majority in the House. I fully expect that this resolution will pass and, as a member of the committee, we are all looking forward to working with him on the important issues that we know we need to face this year.

He has been superb and hard working and we know he is going to be a very articulate member of the committee. As we participate in this debate today, I think it is important to address some of these trumped-up and now glossed-over charges, trying to deflect the debate from the resolution today to scare tactics to senior citizens instead of what we ought to be talking about, and that is the ratio on the Committee on Ways and Means, not some trumped-up political charge that the minority leader or anybody else decides that they are going to do today.

Mr. Speaker, our chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], has been and will continue to be very fair to the Democrats, more fair than they were to us when we were in the minority. Despite the hysteria coming from some on the minority side, we do not intend to let those distortions and exaggerations stop us from managing the committee in a fair-minded and a fair-handed way that earns the respect of the American people.

First let us talk about the record, about the history of this committee, which was so glossed over in the last statement. Let me state for the record that the addition of Congressman LAUGHLIN to the committee will hold Republicans to 59 percent of the seats on the Committee on Ways and Means. Not since 1923—the Republicans were in the majority, by the way, 1923—has the majority party enjoyed less than 60 percent of the seats on the Committee on Ways and Means, regardless of the majority ratio in the House of Representatives.

Even when the Democrat majority held just 51 percent in the House, they received 60 percent of the committee seats. With Congressman LAUGHLIN on the committee, we will only be at 59. Again, we are being fairer to them than they ever were to us.

But they say we have 53 percent on the floor and 59 percent in the committee. That is unfair they say. Well, let me point out that in 1981, following the Reagan landslide, they had 56 percent on the floor and 66 in committee, a spread of 10 points. We again are fairer to them than they were to us.

Eighteen times, eighteen times in this century the spread between the floor and the committee has exceeded or been equal to six points; the most recent being 1986. Today's spread is exactly six points. Again, we are fairer to them than they were to us.

I think it also should be noted that in 1955, the last time the Democrats had 232 seats, which is what we have, the Democrats held 60 percent of the committee. Once more, we are fairer to them than they were to us.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is going to be very simple. They have been stung by defects, and they need to move on to the business of this country.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. Speaker, let us not kid ourselves this evening. This debate is about one simple thing. And while we may talk about representation on the committee, which, in fact, I believe has been skewed, this debate is about Medicare. It is about whether or not we should cut Medicare to provide tax cuts for the wealthiest people in our society. It is about whether or not we should double Medicare premiums to give a tax break to the wealthiest corporations in America.

The Republicans have proposed massive tax breaks for the wealthy, and they came out of the Committee on Ways and Means. To pay for them, they have proposed the biggest cuts in Medicare, the biggest cuts in Medicare in the history of this Republic.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the relevant issue at hand. I make a point of order that the gentleman in the well, the minority whip, is not talking to the relevant issue at hand that is in the debate today. The issue is the seating of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] on the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman proceeded, as others before him have, to talk about the issue of Medicare, which is not the subject of debate. As I understand the rules of the

House, the gentleman should be required to speak to the issue that is on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman makes a point of order that engaging in debate should be on the topic before the House. The gentleman in the well is reminded that the debate topic before the House is the resolution with regard to membership on the committee and debate should be confined to that subject matter.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Members that the members who serve on that committee will determine that fate of literally 40 million Americans on Medicare. There is no way you can divide or divorce the issue of who sits on that committee and the issue of what tax breaks are given, what tax breaks are taken away, what Medicare benefits are given, what Medicare benefits are taken away, what Medicaid benefits are given, what Medicaid benefits are taken away. They are bound together.

As last Saturday's Washington Times pointed out, they want to raise the Medicaid premiums, those who serve on that committee, by 110 million a month, my Republican colleagues, that is. And to pass their plan, they are trying, Mr. Speaker, to stack the committee that will vote on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is requested by the Chair to proceed in order.

Mr. BONIOR. As this Washington Times article points out, "Mr. Laughlin will provide support for potentially unpopular reductions in Medicare benefits, should the GOP leaders give three committee freshman, all of whom won with less than 51 percent of vote, permission to vote no." Which raises the question, which raises the question, what will Mr. LAUGHLIN do on this committee? Will he cover for these three freshmen? It is an interesting question. Mr. LAUGHLIN ought to tell the American people. He ought to tell the people of the district what are his intentions with respect to Medicare, if he is going to serve as a member of this committee.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman in the well is questioning the motives of the gentleman that is in question on the resolution appointing him to the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman at this point has not named any member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman is reminded, however, that he has an obligation to the rules of the House to proceed in order.

Mr. BONIOR. The gentleman from Michigan is indeed proceeding in order. He is proceeding in order of the needs and the will of 40 million Americans who are concerned about Medicare. He

is proceeding in order to take care of the needs of the people in this country who depend upon Medicaid.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded that proceeding in order is proceeding under the rules of the House, and the Chair would request the gentleman to abide by the rules of debate in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the Speaker then. The question is this, how does the Speaker intend to separate those who serve on the committee from the jurisdiction which they have on that committee? What is the dividing line? Would the Chair give a ruling to this Member on where the dividing line is?

□ 1900

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The resolution before the House is on the election of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] to the committee. The subject matter before the House is not what he plans to do once he joins the committee. The gentleman will confine himself to the issue before the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the Speaker yield to pursue that question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] controls the time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOYER. He does not have to, I do not believe, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan controls the time. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to ask the gentleman to use his time for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan controls the time. According to the rules of the House, the gentleman from Michigan will have to yield.

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is it the Speaker's ruling that I cannot raise a parliamentary inquiry unless the gentleman yields to me? Is it the Speaker's ruling that somebody cannot make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is correct. As long as the gentleman from Michigan controls the floor, he would have to yield to the gentleman from Maryland for a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] raised a point of order, after his parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] would have to yield for the purpose of a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think people are getting the message here. The message

that the majority is raising is that we have been shut out from active participation on this committee as a result of the ratios in which the minority, which was represented, by the way, by the comments of the Speaker just a few seconds ago, which have shackled the Members of the minority from expressing their views on these key questions. We are here to say that the questions on that committee, the jurisdictional questions of Medicare and Medicaid, are too important, Mr. Speaker, for us to be shackled.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE] came to the well a few minutes ago and gave some statistics. What he did not tell us is that in the last 10 years, the difference between the majority representation and the number of people on the Committee on Ways and Means is much, much, much different than what he alluded to. In the 100th Congress, Democrats had 59 percent of this body, and in that same Congress, we had 62 percent on the Committee on Ways and Means, a difference of about 3 percent.

In the 101st Congress the difference was 5 percent. In the 100 and 102d it was 2.35 percent, and in the 103d Congress it was 3.9 percent. In this Congress, with the addition of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] to the committee, it will be 6.4 percent. That is not fair. That is not right.

I would say to the Speaker that he, as well as others in this party, have said on numerous occasions, numerous occasions to this body, that there should be an equal proportionate representation between the number of Members who are in this full body and those who serve on committees. Yet, here we go, with an egregious padding or stacking of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say on behalf of my colleagues that we will not stand, we will not stand, to have \$40 million Americans disenfranchised on key votes with respect to their health care. We will not stand for the same type of activities with respect to tax cut for the very wealthy in this country, and on Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude my suggesting that we say no to this resolution, and that the leader and the Speaker and the majority leader get together and figure out a way to give fair representation, in the spirit in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] advocated that representation to the many years that he was in the minority.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely fascinating to listen to the guardians of the old order, the new minority, espouse a form of institutional amnesia. I may not have been here in previous Congresses, but thanks to C-

SPAN and thanks to the history books, we can take a look and we can see what happened time and again in this Chamber. Debate was shut up. People were stifled. We had a decision that existed that was egregious.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BONIOR. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman is not talking about the resolution and he is off the issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] must confine himself to the subject matter of the resolution before the House.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest, and I thank the ruling of the Chair, and I thank my friend who is the whip on the other side.

I would also point out that what is past is prologue. That is written across the forum in the National Achieves, and it is true. The fact is, and this is absolutely germane, not since 1923 has the majority party enjoyed less than 60 percent of the seats on the Committee on Ways and Means. Mr. Speaker, with the addition of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] we are at 59 percent.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely germane to realize this fact. There is a new majority exercising the will of the American people. Get over it. Help us govern.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

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

Mr. Speaker, this may not be about Medicare, and I do not think it is about party affiliation or moving between parties. After all, Mr. Speaker, most Americans vote for a variety of candidates. Most Americans claim they are, in fact, independent. The election and the polls show, of course, that most people, when they make those choices, associates most closely with Democrats in their votes, and when you poll most independents, they say they believe they lean mostly to the Democratic Party. But this is not about affiliation. People move between parties all the time. I will bet all of Members' constituents, almost without exception, refuse to vote a straight party line.

This is not about candidates in one part or the other, one region or the other of the country, moving from one party to the other, although I must say that both the overtones and the undercurrent of the use of race in the South by the right is troublesome, and it should be beneath the party of Eisenhower and Lincoln.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH].

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and as a freshman, to welcome the gentleman

from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] to our committee and to our party, an event so seismic that it has made the minority leader an advocate of minority rights on the House floor, and made the minority leader a reader of the Washington Times, which is extraordinary.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that some of the speakers on the other side have tried to stay on message and frighten senior citizens, but what they have omitted and what I would like to say is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] is qualified, he is a principled advocate of taxpayers, and that is why so many here are opposed to him. He is an effective leader who has a skill that he demonstrated, prior to switching, of working across party lines, and that is something that ought to be learned on the other side.

Additionally, they have left out the fact that this ratio is fair, even if it is annoying to the advocates of higher taxes and the opponents of welfare reform. The American people will not be fooled.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of letting my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the Speaker at the present time in the House of Representatives, know of the words of his friend, the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

The gentleman from Georgia said on September 27, 1990, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I quote:

I would think that the Chair would want to accept the fact that in a free country, people often talk very widely about a wide range of issues. We think that freedom of debate and freedom of speech are not only important when burning the flag, but they are even important on the House floor. I hope that for the rest of the day the Chair, in the spirit of good humor, will tolerate a certain level of freedom of speech to reflect the nature of the House at its best.

I would hope that the Speaker would take his good friend's words at heart.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON].

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, when the Democrats give a big tax liberal a seat on the Committee on Ways and Means, they call it good government. However, when Republicans give a smaller tax, smaller government conservative a seat on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Democrats say something is wrong with that. The truth is today's debate has nothing to do at all with selling out or with Medicare or anything else. It has to do with sour grapes.

For years the Democrats' liberal leadership has used conservatives. They have promised them seats on important committees, like the Committee on Ways and Means, but when it came time to deliver, it was not done.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. My point of

order is that unless the Speaker has taken the words of the gentleman from Michigan to heart, that violates the subject of the Speaker's previous instructions, Mr. Speaker. It is off the point of the issue of appointing the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON] is reminded he must proceed in order.

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, the truth about this whole committee's assignment brouhaha brought up by our friends across the aisle is that the liberal leadership wants conservative bodies in their caucus but does not want to deliver for them on this House floor. Now they are angry that the gentleman from Texas, GREG LAUGHLIN, the gentleman from Georgia, NATHAN DEAL, RICHARD SHELBY, Senator CAMPBELL, and about 100 State and local Democrats have switched parties. That is what this debate is about here.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. This clearly violates the spirit of the Speaker's previous instructions. I would like to be clear that unless we are going to have one test of rules for this party and another set of rules for the other, that clearly violates what the gentleman stated to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair had reminded Members on both sides of the aisle when the question has been raised that they are to proceed in order. The Chair would continue to say to both sides of the aisle in fairness that they must proceed in order on the resolution. The subject matter under discussion is the election of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] on the Committee on Ways and Means. That should be the subject of the discussion on the floor.

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, the election of the gentleman from Texas, GREG LAUGHLIN, to a seat on this committee is about putting people on this committee who will stand up for the right things in this community, in this country, and on this floor. I support strongly the resolution before us today.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we need to do is remember and remind the folks at home who are watching, at least in Louisville, KY, it is just after dinner-time and they may have surfed and ended on C-SPAN, or they may be watching it on purpose. No matter which, what we need to remind them is the Committee on Ways and Means, who knows what these words mean, but we know it means the Medicare committee, because that is what is going to be dealt with in the next 30 days in that committee. That, according to the Washington Times, is one reason that

is suggested that the Republican majority has changed the rules in mid-stream.

As I understand it, never before had the majority changed the world in mid-stream, changed the number, added somebody, just added somebody to the committee in the middle of the Congress. No. The ratios were set at the beginning and they were kept, so we have to ask ourselves, was it done, as the Washington Times suggested, in order to save a freshman a tough vote?

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is the resolution in front of us is whether or not the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] shall be assigned to the Committee on Ways and Means.

At the beginning the 104th Congress the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] was a Democrat. He currently is a Republican. The ratio on the Committee on Ways and Means is 21 to 15. I know for a fact that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], argued long and hard for a ration of 21 to 14. He was denied his wishes of that committee ratio by the wisdom of leadership, because the minority leader begged him to put another Democrat on. So when we started, it was 21 to 15. They got their Democrat at the beginning. It was not what we wanted.

If we add the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] as a Republican, the ratio will be 22 to 15. That is still not 60 percent; 21 to 15 is not 60 percent; 22 to 15 is not 60 percent. I have been on the Committee on Ways and Means since 1983. It has been between 63 and 66 percent loaded in favor of the majority in that entire time, so it is not about ratio.

One of the difficulties we have in examining this business of party switchers is because in the brief 17 years that I have been in Congress I have never seen anybody from this side of the aisle decide not be a Republican and go over there. In the time that I have been here, I have seen a number of Democrats come over here.

One of the reasons we are pleased to welcome the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] is that we like his position on the issues. I do not see anything wrong at all in taking someone that you like on the issues and giving them a position of prominence in areas in which we are going to have significant votes.

The Committee on Ways and Means in this jurisdiction is, with all due respect as a member of the committee, an important committee. It deals with all the taxes. It deals with Social Security. It deals with welfare. Yes, it deals with Medicare.

What we want to do is take the issues position of the gentleman from Texas

[Mr. LAUGHLIN], who was recently a Democrat, and now a Republican, and meld him with all of the other Republicans on the committee, who I might remind the Members represent a percentage of the total committee less than the Democrat-Republican ratio when they were a majority for the entire time I have been on the committee.

□ 1915

What is your problem? That you want more Republicans to reflect the ratio that used to be there? We are not doing that. That you want Democrats to quit leaving your party and become Republicans? Then change your positions. If you do not, if you keep the same leadership, advocating the same position, there are going to be more Republicans over here before the election by virtue of people continuing to switch.

Is that your problem, that you do not like switchers, or is it that you have no substantive point to make and so you are arguing items that are irrelevant?

Let's make the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield our remaining 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for the moment about the scope of debate on the floor of the House and to defend it against the attitude of the acting Speaker. The resolution before the House is the election of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] to the Committee on Ways and Means.

When someone is up for election, he is a candidate. The candidate's views are relevant, the candidate's intentions are relevant. The fact that the intentions of those who are putting him there may be to make it easier to enact great cuts in Medicare, they are relevant. The fact that the intentions of those who are putting him there may be to put someone there who is opposed to taxes, that is relevant. The fact that they may be doing that because they enticed him and because they are selling committee seats for switches in party, if someone wants to say that, that would be relevant. I am not saying those things, though I think they are true.

The fact that this leadership is doing these things is all relevant.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself our remaining 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are this: The facts are that since January of this year, four Democrats, two in the House and two in the Senate, have switched parties, more than in any 2-year cycle in the history of our country. As long as they continue to switch parties, guess what? We as Republican Members, as the majority, have to find a committee to put them on. Tonight we are proud to bring to this floor a resolution putting the latest Democrat to switch parties on the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

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

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

Mr. BOEHNER. 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 Chair may reduce to 5 minutes the vote on passage of the resolution, if ordered.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 179, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

YEAS—233

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

Shuster
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate

Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp

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

NAYS—179

Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Ford
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons

Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz

Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—22

Abercrombie
Becerra
Brown (CA)
Dooley
Fields (TX)
Foglietta
Forbes
Frost

Hunter
Jefferson
Lantos
Lipinski
Mfume
Moakley
Moran
Peterson (FL)

Pryce
Reynolds
Smith (MI)
Stark
Towns
Tucker

□ 1937

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

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. BOEHNER
Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 15-minute vote followed by a possible 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 181, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

AYES—233

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

English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette

Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays

Shuster
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate

Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp

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

NOES—181

Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons

Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz

Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—20

Abercrombie
Becerra
Brown (CA)
Dooley
Fields (TX)
Foglietta
Frost

Hunter
Jefferson
Lantos
Livingston
Mfume
Moakley
Pryce

Reynolds
Skaggs
Smith (MI)
Stark
Towns
Tucker

□ 1955

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

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

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 162, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—248

Allard	Foley	Metcalf
Archer	Forbes	Meyers
Army	Fowler	Mica
Bachus	Fox	Miller (FL)
Baesler	Franks (CT)	Molinari
Baker (CA)	Franks (NJ)	Montgomery
Baker (LA)	Frelinghuysen	Moorhead
Ballenger	Frisa	Morella
Barr	Funderburk	Murtha
Barrett (NE)	Gallegly	Myers
Bartlett	Ganske	Myrick
Barton	Gekas	Nethercutt
Bass	Geren	Neumann
Bateman	Gilchrest	Ney
Bereuter	Gilman	Norwood
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Nussle
Bilirakis	Goodling	Packard
Bliley	Goss	Parker
Blute	Graham	Paxon
Boehlert	Greenwood	Payne (VA)
Boehner	Gunderson	Peterson (MN)
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Petri
Bono	Hall (TX)	Pickett
Brewster	Hancock	Pombo
Browder	Hansen	Porter
Brownback	Hastings (WA)	Portman
Bryant (TN)	Hayes	Quillen
Bunn	Hayworth	Quinn
Bunning	Hefley	Radanovich
Burr	Heineman	Rahall
Burton	Herger	Ramstad
Buyer	Hilleary	Regula
Callahan	Hobson	Riggs
Calvert	Hoekstra	Roberts
Camp	Hoke	Rogers
Canady	Horn	Rohrabacher
Castle	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Houghton	Rose
Chambliss	Hutchinson	Roth
Chapman	Hyde	Roukema
Chenoweth	Inglis	Royce
Christensen	Istook	Salmon
Chrysler	Johnson (CT)	Sanford
Clinger	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Coble	Jones	Scarborough
Coburn	Kasich	Schaefer
Collins (GA)	Kelly	Schiff
Combest	Kim	Seastrand
Condit	King	Sensenbrenner
Cooley	Kingston	Shadegg
Cox	Klug	Shaw
Cramer	Knollenberg	Shays
Crane	Kolbe	Shuster
Crapo	LaHood	Sisisky
Cremeans	Largent	Skeen
Cubin	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Cunningham	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Davis	Laughlin	Smith (WA)
Deal	Lazio	Solomon
DeLay	Leach	Souder
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Dickey	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Doolittle	Lightfoot	Stockman
Dornan	Linder	Stump
Dreier	Livingston	Talent
Duncan	LoBiondo	Tanner
Dunn	Longley	Tate
Ehlers	Lucas	Tauzin
Ehrlich	Manzullo	Taylor (MS)
Emerson	Martini	Taylor (NC)
English	McCollum	Thomas
Ensign	McCrery	Thornberry
Everett	McDade	Tiahrt
Ewing	McHugh	Torkildsen
Fawell	McInnis	Traficant
Fields (TX)	McIntosh	Upton
Flanagan	McKeon	Vucanovich

Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson

Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—162

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Oberstar
Andrews	Gordon	Obey
Baldacci	Green	Olver
Barcia	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Hall (OH)	Orton
Beilenson	Hamilton	Owens
Bentsen	Harman	Pallone
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Bevill	Hefner	Payne (NJ)
Bishop	Hilliard	Pelosi
Bonior	Hinchev	Peterson (FL)
Borski	Holden	Pomeroy
Boucher	Hoyer	Poshard
Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Jacobs	Reed
Bryant (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Clay	Johnston	Roemer
Clayton	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Clement	Kaptur	Rush
Clyburn	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Coleman	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Collins (IL)	Kennelly	Sawyer
Collins (MI)	Kildee	Schroeder
Conyers	Kleczka	Schumer
Costello	Klink	Scott
Coyne	LaFalce	Serrano
Danner	Levin	Skaggs
de la Garza	Lincoln	Skelton
DeLauro	Lipinski	Slaughter
Dellums	Lofgren	Spratt
Deutsch	Lowey	Stenholm
Dicks	Luther	Stokes
Dingell	Maloney	Studds
Dixon	Manton	Stupak
Doggett	Markey	Tejeda
Doyle	Martinez	Thompson
Durbin	Mascara	Thornton
Edwards	Matsui	Thurman
Engel	McCarthy	Torres
Eshoo	McDermott	Torricelli
Evans	McHale	Velazquez
Farr	McKinney	Vento
Fattah	McNulty	Visclosky
Fazio	Meehan	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Meek	Ward
Filner	Menendez	Waters
Flake	Miller (CA)	Watt (NC)
Ford	Mineta	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Minge	Williams
Engel	Mink	Wise
Gejderson	Mollohan	Woolsey
Gephardt	Moran	Wyden
Gibbons	Neal	Wynn

NOT VOTING—24

Abercrombie	Hastert	Oxley
Becerra	Hunter	Pryce
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Reynolds
DeFazio	Lantos	Smith (MI)
Dooley	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Foglietta	Mfume	Towns
Frost	Moakley	Tucker
Gillmor	Nadler	Yates

□ 2005

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia and Mr. ROSE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR ALL COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT FOR REMAINDER OF WEEK DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to Clause 2(I) of rule XI, Mr. ARMEY moves that all committees and subcommittees of the House be permitted to sit for the remainder of the week while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the 1 hour.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset, this is a rather routine request. The request is made necessary by our desire to keep floor consideration of spending bills as open as possible and accessible to all the Members of the body, while at the same time, of course, committee work must go on. We feel like this is a necessary accommodation, and appreciate the fact that the committees are so willing to accommodate our need to maintain a floor schedule and move our spending bills.

I should like to tell the Members of the body that after a very brief debate on this motion, we will have a vote, and it will be the last vote of the evening.

Mr. Speaker, with those comments, I yield for 5 minutes for purposes of debate only to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do take note of the fact that the majority has decided we will do no further legislative business today of any sort, and that will allow us to leave. But I was particularly struck when the majority leader said this is a routine request. Indeed, it has become so.

It has become routine for the Republican Party to ignore the rules it so proudly proclaimed at the first day of the session, because one of the great reforms that they brought to us, one of the new ways of doing business, was the one that was to say that the House will not sit simultaneously with the committees.

You would not, if you were on the Committee on the Judiciary, have an important markup on the terrorism bill at the same time a constitutional amendment is on the floor. You would not, if you were on the Committee on Appropriations, have a full committee markup while a bill is on the floor. That was one of the great reforms the Republicans were bringing us, and as the gentleman from Texas has honestly said, it has now become—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend until we get some order.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the Speaker for his efforts, but it has been my experience that when people do not want to hear something, you cannot make them listen.

The Republicans do not want to hear the reminders of how short-lived their promises were about running the House. This is an example. They made a big deal about how they were changing its rules so we would not have that

conflict between committee business in the House, and it is now routine to change it. When that is changed, of course, they make a mockery of the rule on proxies.

We were told you cannot have proxy voting; be there in committee. But what do you do when a bill that you are seriously interested in is being debated on the floor and the committee on which you are a member is simultaneously meeting? Maybe it is a bill on which that committee has jurisdiction. How do you avoid missing one or the other?

So what we have had is, at least in the committees I have seen, a very creative contest by the chairs of the committee on how to get around the proxy rule. Let's roll the votes. Let's hold the votes. Let's reconsider. Let's have some mock votes.

In area after area, we have seen the rules disregarded. We were told we would have a strict limit on the number of subcommittees a member can be on. We are. Members are strictly limited on the Republican side to the number of subcommittees on which they wish to serve and no more. And that need bear no relationship to the basic rule.

We have been told, in the substantive areas as well, that the Republican Party will honor the right of the States. They do. They honor the right of the States to make any decision with which the Republican Party is in agreement. But where the States may misdecide, they will overrule those decisions.

We are here talking about a very fundamental issue.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am listening intently to the gentleman and having difficulty hearing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The House is not in order. The House will be in order.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I appreciate the solicitude and care with which the gentleman from Texas has helped me get attention.

I would appreciate even more, however, some solicitude for the ability of the House to legislate in a sensible way. The Committee on Appropriations members will be put to the problematic task of sitting in full committee while they are in fact having bills on the floor. The Committee on the Judiciary has now called a markup on the very sensitive subject of abortion, and members of the Committee on the Judiciary will be asked to be at that full committee while there is legislation on the floor.

It is a very clear example. Politicians who have been caught being inconsistent like to misquote Ralph Waldo Emerson, they leave out a couple of adjectives, about how consistency is for the small-minded. I want to congratulate my colleagues on the other side. They must feel large-minded indeed these days, because there is scarcely a principle which they brought forward on the opening day of the session which

they have not violated, as the gentleman from Texas has said, routinely.

Routinely we get the proxy cut aside. Routinely the notion of family friendly is ignored. Routinely the committees meet while the House is in session. Routinely, if you do not like what the States do, States rights become something you put back under the rug.

Mr. Speaker, this is one more example of a failure to live up to those professions of concern.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is more than just a process issue. The way the House has been run has denied Members their ability to adequately represent their constituency. Being a Member of Congress puts you in an area where you have many responsibilities. One is on the floor. As legislation moves through the floor that you are particularly involved in, you have a responsibility to be here on the floor. But you are also a member of several committees, and under this new process, where there is no proxy voting, where sometimes the votes are held until the end of the committee, sometimes they are not, this is not simply a change in process. It is actually again stacking the deck against Members.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do want to say I appreciate the kind remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and also want to express my appreciation for the kindness of the gentleman from Connecticut as well. But I do feel compelled, which is a rare opportunity for anybody in this body, to correct the gentleman from Massachusetts.

□ 2015

The quote that the gentleman struggled for is, in fact, "a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, charlatans and divines," if I can get that corrected.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The question is on the motion.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 176, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

AYES—234

Allard	Arme y	Baker (CA)
Archer	Bachus	Baker (LA)

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

NOES—176

Ackerman	Clay	Doggett
Andrews	Clayton	Doyle
Baesler	Clement	Durbin
Baldacci	Clyburn	Edwards
Barcia	Coleman	Engel
Barrett (WI)	Collins (IL)	Eshoo
Beilenson	Collins (MI)	Evans
Bentsen	Condit	Farr
Berman	Conyers	Fattah
Bevill	Costello	Fazio
Bishop	Coyne	Fields (LA)
Bonior	Cramer	Filner
Borski	Danner	Flake
Boucher	de la Garza	Ford
Brewster	DeFazio	Frank (MA)
Browder	DeLauro	Furse
Brown (FL)	Dellums	Gejdenson
Brown (OH)	Deutsch	Gephardt
Bryant (TX)	Dicks	Geren
Cardin	Dingell	Gibbons
Chapman	Dixon	Gonzalez

Gordon	McCarthy	Rose
Green	McDermott	Royal-Allard
Gutierrez	McHale	Rush
Hall (OH)	McKinney	Sabo
Hamilton	McNulty	Sanders
Harman	Meehan	Sawyer
Hastings (FL)	Meek	Schroeder
Hefner	Menendez	Schumer
Hilliard	Miller (CA)	Scott
Hinchey	Mineta	Serrano
Holden	Minge	Skaggs
Hoyer	Mink	Slaughter
Jackson-Lee	Mollohan	Spratt
Johnson (SD)	Moran	Stenholm
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Stokes
Johnston	Nadler	Stupak
Kanjorski	Neal	Tanner
Kaptur	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Kennedy (MA)	Obey	Tejeda
Kennedy (RI)	Olver	Thompson
Kennelly	Ortiz	Thornton
Kildee	Orton	Thurman
Kleczyka	Owens	Torres
Klink	Pallone	Torrice
LaFalce	Pastor	Traficant
Levin	Payne (NJ)	Velazquez
Lewis (GA)	Payne (VA)	Vento
Lincoln	Pelosi	Visclosky
Lipinski	Peterson (FL)	Volkmer
Lofgren	Peterson (MN)	Ward
Lowe	Pickett	Waters
Luther	Pomeroy	Watt (NC)
Maloney	Poshard	Wilson
Manton	Rangel	Wise
Markey	Reed	Woolsey
Martinez	Richardson	Wyden
Mascara	Rivers	Wynn
Matsui	Roemer	

NOT VOTING—24

Abercrombie	Hunter	Smith (MI)
Becerra	Jefferson	Stark
Brown (CA)	Lantos	Studds
Dooley	Mfume	Towns
Foglietta	Moakley	Tucker
Frost	Oxley	Waxman
Gillmor	Pryce	Williams
Hastert	Reynolds	Yates

□ 2033

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that further proceedings on the postponed suspension motions are further postponed until tomorrow.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 30, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (5) of the Rules of the House that my office has received a subpoena for testimony and documents concerning constituent casework. The subpoena was issued by the Superior Court of New Jersey in Morris County.

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

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,
Member of Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12 and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The 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.]

REPUBLICAN BELIEFS AND GOVERNMENT RUN AMOK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine, State Representative Garland Penhalsen recently asked me why I was a Republican, and what we were doing up here, and what this think was all about. Garland is a State representative who has been doing a tremendous job in Atlanta in the State capitol down there making changes. He just wanted to hear it from me what he already knew, I guess.

What I replied is that generally what the Republican Party believes up here is believing in people versus believing in Georgia. We support private sector solutions to problems, not Government solutions to problems. We stand for less regulation. We stand for less taxes, less bureaucracy, less micromanagement out of Washington, and certainly, more personal freedom.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, there are so many great examples of micromanagement out of Washington and Government run amok, if you will. A book has been written recently entitled "The Death of Common Sense,"

and many people have read the book. Recently, the mayor of Kingsland, GA, Keith Dixon, gave a copy of it to me. Just thumbing through there, there were a lot of great examples of crazy things that our Government does.

One of the examples took place in Yorktown, NC, with the Amoco Oil Co. The EPA came in there, and because there was a pollutant in the air called benzene, and benzene is an extremely dangerous pollutant, EPA ordered Amoco to install a new type of filtering system to their smokestacks. It cost Amoco \$31 million. As we know, Americans all over the country paid for that in higher gas prices at the pump. Let us not fool ourselves that Amoco paid more dividends to their stockholders because of that. They did what any business would do and they passed the cost on to consumers.

The irony of it was that the smokestacks were not emitting benzene. The benzene was coming from the loading dock area. That problem could have been easily remedied by changing the loading procedure. The only problem, Mr. Speaker, was that the EPA did not have jurisdiction over the loading dock, so the benzene is still in the air, and yet Amoco oil had to pay \$31 million for it.

Mr. Speaker, there are other examples of that. I see the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is here and wants to join us. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I think the point is well made by him, and I appreciate him being a champion here for small business and for the importance of the individual. I had a situation in my district in Montgomery County, PA, where we had a gentleman who was trying to work with the Federal Government, a \$25,000 contract. The problem he had was 187 pages of Federal documents to be filled out. The problem with 187 pages was not just the number of pages, but also it would require him to hire an accountant, an attorney, and an engineer. What little profit there is in a \$25,000 contract, there was not really much for him.

The fact is, he told me, and he was right, the Government, the Federal Government, is not user-friendly. It does not make sense for him to try to give the best product at the best price to the Federal Government when he can sell it elsewhere without all the needless regulation and the burdensome paperwork that made it actually a disincentive to deal with our Federal Government.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is ridiculous, because I think the bureaucracy in many, many cases, and even probably in most cases, wants to do the right thing. The problem is these very laws, and we are going from manuals now that have a 4,000, 5,000, 10,000 pages to do anything, and these laws that are well-intended

and regulations have become stumbling blocks, and because of that, we do not have common sense anymore in our process.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I believe the 104th Congress, especially with many of the freshman Republicans, and you have joined as an honorary Member of the freshman Republicans, although you are a more senior Member, we have tried to have what we could call the new approach to Government, in which we call for Government to downsize, privatize, consolidate, and where possible, eliminate.

We do not believe, as you do not, that we need to have the Federal Government do things that are best left to the private sector. We believe that the private sector has the best chance to create jobs. If we can have an environment with less regulation and less taxation, we can have businesses provide for our local people the kinds of jobs that are lasting, meaningful, and important jobs that mean a lot to folks back home.

I think we are on the right track to reduce needless regulations that do not really improve the quality of life, and to make sure we do what we can to sunset Federal agencies that are not doing their job, like we did in Pennsylvania, and eliminate the wasteful bureaucratic system that exists here in Washington as a culture.

GOVERNMENT RUN AMOK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] to further this colloquy we were discussing about regulations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me give another example of government just not using quite common sense. I have in my hand a letter from Lee Heyer. Lee Heyer is a student at Georgia Southern University. He is actually the student body president. He sent to me a letter he got from the U.S. Post Office declaring June 12 to June 17 National Dog Bite Prevention Week. It tells people how to prevent their dog from biting a letter carrier. Again, it is well-intended, but, he said, he called the office.

First of all, this mail that was delivered at taxpayer expense went to his apartment complex where they do not allow dogs, so everybody in the apartment complex got notified how to tie their dog up, which they are not allowed to have.

The second part, he called the actual office in his area and found out there were zero dog bites in that particular area in the previous year. Again, Mr. Speaker, the private sector would not do that. They would think it through twice.

I see the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] has joined us. I do not control the time.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's efforts here today to do something, to speak out about doing something for the terrible problem of excessive regulation, and the impact that has a job creation. This is a very important issue in my district, Mr. Speaker, where the defense cutbacks have put a lot of people out of work, but there are a lot of people trying to set up new businesses and trying to be independent, and the Government regulations that are required in setting up a new business, and just hiring a new person, is actually stifling business creation all across our country, including in my district.

□ 2045

We as Republicans, I believe, need to continue the effort to try to not only downsize Government but make the Government as the gentleman said, more user-friendly and more open to job creation.

One thing I do want to add to this discussion, which I think is very important, is the need to deal with our terrible problem of excessive litigation.

I know a business in my district approached me, and this particular business, they had been in the printing press business for a time way back in the early part of the century, but they are now out of that business. There was a printing press that had been in use, safely in use, for 70 years, that an employee at a company had recently been injured on, and that company was, now that they have been out of the printing press business for something like 25, 30 years, they are now being sued for a product that has been in safe use for something like 70 years.

I just think that is wrong, it is unreasonable. We need our tort reform legislation to get through the Senate and we probably need more provisions to be passed in the future.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think the support that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has given as well as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] for our products liability reform legislation will go a long way in helping businesses. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] just talked about, we certainly need to have less regulation.

Another area I would like to have us consider, not only the regulatory reform and legal reform but what about making sure we provide those investment tax credits, the research and development tax credits, which will encourage businesses to expand, produce and hire and not have those jobs go overseas but keep those jobs here in America for companies and employees who really want to make sure that we grow. That I think along with reform dealing with the ability to obtain cred-

it, I think we can keep our businesses viable here in the country and move along.

Mr. KINGSTON. I was meeting this last weekend with the Georgia Hospitality and Travel Association. One of the battles they just fought with regulatory reform is that on the back of your hotel door, they have escape plans. I was in the insurance business and I am one of these nerds, I guess, who always reads those things. But 99 percent of the people who stay in hotels, particularly at Days Inn on a ground level, don't read how to escape from the room. They can kind of figure it out on their own. But new regulation, you have to print that bilingual.

In south Georgia, where you don't get that many people speaking Spanish, they wanted to put it in Spanish language, as well as English language. You cannot even tell if the door is wooden or painted already because you have all these different instructions on what to do in a hotel room.

The Hospitality Association was able to kind of break that, postpone the regulation, I would say, just break the thinking pattern there. In Los Angeles County, they have to put the voting ballot in 7 different languages.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] has a bill entitled "English First" which addresses this. I believe he is on the floor.

MAKING ENGLISH OFFICIAL AMERICAN LANGUAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the dialog that just took place here.

We Americans are very fortunate because we represent the most diverse country in the world. We are a people from every corner of the globe, every religious, every ethnic, every linguistic background right here in America. Yet we are one Nation and one people. Why? Because for over 200 years, the history of our country, when people came here, they adopted English as the official language. While we were from every corner of the globe, and every background, we are all Americans because we have this common glue, this commonality.

Today in America we are splitting our country up. We are no longer the melting pot, but we are becoming, as the anti-English establishment would have us, as a salad bowl. I don't believe America is a salad bowl. I don't believe in hyphenated Americans. I believe we are all Americans. That is why this issue of the English language is so important.

Teddy White, who has written "The Making of a President" any number of times from 1960 on, before he passed away, he wrote this book, "America in Search of Itself." He talks about as we come to the new century, to the new

millennium, that his greatest concern is for America breaking up into groups.

Arthur Schlesinger has also written a beautiful little book I would like to recommend, "The Disuniting of America," where he talks about the cultural changes and, for example, what bilingual education is doing to American citizens and what is happening in America today. It is very well done, and I recommend that to our citizens.

Recently, I think, closer to home, right here in the House of Representatives, our Speaker has written a book, and for the people who read the Speaker's latest work, the Speaker understands this problem very well because in chapter 15 of the book, he talks about America breaking up into groups, and English as the American language.

The Speaker points out that there are nearly 200 different languages spoken here in America. He makes the observation that nearly all business, politics, education, and commerce is conducted in English.

We want Americans to have an understanding of other languages, but that is a different issue. I have 3 children. All of them have taken foreign languages or are taking a foreign language today. The point is, is that we have to keep our commonality and our common glue, so that if people want to speak one language at home or promote their culture, keep their culture, I think that is great and laudable and we want to continue that. But we have a melting pot here in America, so we do not break up into groups.

Look what is happening in Canada, where you have the heart being taken out of that country. Here in America, we have our country breaking up into groups and we cannot allow that to continue.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, I would just like to share with the gentleman that my mother grew up in an Italian home and she learned to speak Italian along with her 3 sisters and her brother and they were all proud to go out on the streets and learn English. My mother went on not only to get a good command of English but to get through the public school systems of the city of New York and get a college degree and go on to become a teacher. She was a strong advocate for English as a common language in the United States, because she saw firsthand the importance of knowing the language and the need to know the language to be able to get ahead. She taught me the importance of what you are talking about. That is why I am a sponsor of the bill of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], and I am proud to be a sponsor of that legislation.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the gentleman and I appreciate the testimonial, because what the gentleman is saying, I think, is what many, many Americans can say, that when our immigrants came, they adopted English as their language so we became a melting pot.

What is happening today, thanks to the misconceived policies back in the 1960's, we have whole sectors of our society now being brought up in school in bilingual education. Most of the time the kids do not have an education in either language.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I am on the Committee on Appropriations. We have spent a tremendous amount of time reducing spending. Along the way I saw a statistic that we spend \$242 million, I think, on one program for bilingual education.

Does the gentleman know how much we spend totally?

Mr. ROTH. On State, national and local, according to USA Today in a recent article they did, it is something like \$12 billion we spend on bilingual education. There is nothing that harms youngsters or holds them back, makes them second-class citizens as much as bilingual education.

We have got to have people melt into our society. That is why this bill is so important.

SALUTING NASA ON RECENT SHUTTLE MISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak out and to salute the people at Kennedy Space Center as well as the officials in NASA and those at the other centers as well as our astronauts in particular and additionally our cosmonauts on the tremendously successful recent *Mir* rendezvous mission.

I went down, Mr. Speaker, to see the shuttle take off for that particular flight. Unfortunately we got canceled because of rain the few days I was down there and I had to return back here because the House went back in session.

But then we had a flawless liftoff and the mission, I can only say, was a tremendous success. Not only did the commander of the mission, Hoot Gibson, do a fabulous job, but so did the entire crew. It was a historic mission. It was the 100th space flight for the United States, and it was the first rendezvous mission involving our space shuttle, clearly demonstrating the technology that is needed for our space shuttle not only to continue to go up and link up with the *Mir* space station but in a few years to be able to go up and link up with our future space station.

I think it is a tremendous testimonial to the efforts of all the workers there at Kennedy Space Center as well as at Johnson Space Center and the other NASA centers that this mission went off flawlessly.

I was delighted to be able to be there to see the shuttle land and to meet with some of the Russian officials. I could not help but think how our nations, the United States and the former

Soviet Union, what is now Russia, enemies for so many years, for so many years engaged in an escalation of hostilities, how we can now in this arena join together and to show that through cooperation and trust that we can achieve great things.

I, by no means, Mr. Speaker, mean to imply that I feel that we should let down our defenses. I am personally an advocate for a very strong national defense. I think what is going on now with the Soviet Union today, or the Russian people today, is something new, we need to take 1 year at a time and see how it goes. But I think this was a tremendous testimonial to the success of a cooperative effort.

I also think it was inspiring to all our young people. Today our young people are looking for role models. So many of their role models in society let them down. When they look at the success of this mission and the astronauts in this mission, it is something they can look up to.

As the Speaker knows, we have to compete in the international marketplace and we need to have the best in science and technology if we are going to be able to be competitive. I think through our space program, that is a key way in which we can continue to maintain our strong posture, leading the world in research and in science.

This space station holds out the prospect for some tremendous breakthroughs in areas of medicine that I happen to be very familiar with as a former physician. I spent many years treating many women with osteoporosis and additionally treating many senior citizens who had problems with fainting or syncopal episodes.

With the medical research that we are going to be doing on the space station made possible with our shuttle, we should be able to unlock some of the secrets that led to this disease and how to achieve some meaningful cures to some of these problems.

To be there at the landing of this shuttle was just very inspiring. I had seen many shuttles take off before from my parking lot at work in Melbourne, FL, but I had never actually been there at Kennedy Space Center to see one of them land.

It comes in over the coast of Tampa at about 200,000 feet. By the time it arrives over at the east coast at Kennedy Space Center, it is at 50,000 feet. Within 4 minutes, it is landing on the ground. It drops and drops and drops and drops, and then when it is just a few hundred feet off the ground, the pilot noses the shuttle up, the landing gear comes down, and it comes in for a landing just like an airliner.

As it landed, Mr. Golden was there, the administrator of NASA, turned to me and he said, "No other country in the world can do that."

He was right. No other country in the world can send a spacecraft up with a crew and bring that spacecraft back and have it land on an airstrip safely.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the astronauts and cosmonauts on this mission, and I

salute all the workers at the space centers that were involved in this project.

□ 2100

A TRULY TRAGIC DAY IN AMERICAN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow may be a truly tragic day in American history, because a person who avoided serving his country three times during the bloodiest subaction of the whole cold war, the conflict that raged on for a decade in Indochina, a person who avoided the draft when he graduated from Georgetown, speaking about Mr. Clinton, who avoided service in his first year as a graduate student at Oxford, when all graduate deferments were taken away and then who, after he actually had a call-up notice, a report date to join the U.S. Army as a buck private soldier and an induction date of 29, excuse me, 28 July 1969, used political pressure, the liberal Republican Governor's office in Arkansas, Winthrop Rockefeller, with the draft board, the head of the draft board, and two or three members of the draft board, personal meetings, 2 hours each, to beg them to allow him to join after the fact the ROTC at the University of Arkansas; then he had a U.S. Senator, Senator Fulbright of Arkansas, phone in to the head of the ROTC.

And then I learned at a dinner with the distinguished American, Distinguished Service Cross holder of the second medal down from the Medal of Honor, who had commanded ROTC units, whole sections of the country, commanded ROTC for many colleges, Col. Eugene Holmes, a Bataan death march survivor, he told me when I had dinner with him and his wife, Irene, down in Fayetteville, AR, last February, that Clinton was the only student in more than a decade, as a commander and professor of military science, the only student who ever showed up at his house. He said he did not let him in, but for 2 hours in the front yard, backyard, back and fourth 23-year-old Bill Clinton begged Colonel Holmes to let him into the ROTC as a 2-year postgraduate student if he entered law school to go back on a special 2-year crash course with the undergraduates at the University of Arkansas and get in the ROTC so he could avoid the draft, and Colonel Holmes told me, against his better judgment, with more political pressure than he had ever thought possible, Senators, Governors, draft board members, Buick dealerships, all putting the pressure on him, he signed up a man who graduated from college over 1 year and 2 months before into the special program and, of course, Clinton never spent a day in the ROTC at Arkansas.

But now here he is, the Commander in Chief, and if all the stories are true, tomorrow at noon he is going to normalize relations, give diplomatic recognition honors and recognition to the war criminals, the Communist leaders, in Hanoi who killed better men than he, probably three high school students from the Hot Springs area of Arkansas went into the service to meet those three draft calls in June 1968, the spring of 1969, and then that summer of 1969 when someone had to fill the Clinton slot, late July 1969, and then Clinton went off to Moscow a few weeks later.

Colonel Holmes had not even known this. He went through Oslo, Stockholm, Helsinki, Leningrad, took the train overnight to Moscow and was put up, when he claimed he had no money, at the best hotel in town on January 1, 1970, because there was so-called peace banquet for Hanoi in the National Hotel on the night of January 2, 1970.

A former Member of the other body who had a rather distinguished career for 12 years, he was in his last year, had chosen not to run again, who did, I think, a very dishonorable thing. Senator Eugene McCarthy was a guest of honor at the peace banquet. He was one of the 23-year-old student organizers from England who had conducted teach-ins at the London School of Economics, where he called Ho Chi Minh the George Washington of his country and the United States the interventionist imperialist power, the evil force in Vietnam, suppressing a revolution, and had, of course, led demonstrations at Grosvenor Square on November 15 and a warm-up on October 15, 1969.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, that November 15 demonstrates that Clinton was the leader of, in London, was termed the fall offensive by the Communists in Hanoi. There were sympathetic demonstrations in Paris, in Stockholm, London, New York, of course, here in Washington, DC, people trashing the streets, Miami, I believe, I know for sure San Francisco, Chicago, and Los Angeles, all coordinated by people working to give comfort to the communists in Hanoi who prevailed after 10 long years of struggle against a superpower, the United States, and the superpower on the other side, the Soviet Union, had more staying power, and the oppressive forces of communism won.

Two years after we had pulled out of our military effort, we left so precipitously in such a disgraceful way that our embassy had open file drawers with the files of all the people who had worked with us up and down that beautiful little country of South Vietnam, and the Vietnamese years later wrote, General Giap, wrote in his book, that they just came in picked up papers off the floor, from the file cabinets, put them on clipboards, went out and executed 68,000 people. General Giap, who was hugging Senator HARKIN on July 4, General Giap is a war criminal. General Giap was on the politburo.

General Giap signed off on the execution of 68,000 people. In some cases, their only crime was to be a secretary, a man or a woman typing on an American typewriter at one of our multiple military bases up and down from the DMZ to the Mekong Delta. Unbelievable. Sixty-eight thousand people killed, but even that horrendous figure, 10,000 more than our men and 8 women whose names are on the Vietnam Memorial, that figure is dwarfed by the 700,000 to 800,000 people who drowned on the South China Sea trying to escape from communism.

My oldest daughter worked in the camps at Snap Nikam, Nam Aret, Aryana Pretit, and the people that survived the high seas, the South China Sea, the sharks, dehydration, drownings, they would carve little plaques. I have two of them in my den at home.

It says, "liberty or death on the high seas." Sounds like Patrick Henry, somebody they never heard of. Another one said, "Some of us are here in the camps. The rest are with God."

Then what about the 1 million, 2 million, or as one of my interns, Vuth, told me the other night, tears running down his face, "Maybe 3 million of my people died, Congressman. And is Mr. Clinton going to normalize relations with the war criminals who did this?" He was speaking of the killing fields of Cambodia.

What a horror that took place. Very few speeches, if any, in this well or on the Senate floor by those who are taking the lead now with normalization with the war criminals in Hanoi; I did NBC's "Meet the Press" yesterday, and a friend of mine who is on the other side of this issue, and to try and put this balance, I read the stories of his horrendous torture in this book, "POW," the definitive book that came out in 1976, the month that I won my first election to Congress, November of 1976. This book came out, and the torture stories in here, the war crimes in here just stagger your imagination. It is medieval. It is Nazi Germany at Auschwitz. It is poor Bosnia a few years ago with the ethnic cleansing. It is just horrible.

And I read the story of how this now U.S. Senator was tortured, how he would not accept parole, how when his father was moved from being the commander of the Navy in NATO in Europe to being commander in chief of all of our Pacific forces, and the head, the combat commander, of the bombing operation, how they kept offering this young Navy attack pilot early release to go home to get his terrible wounds taken care of, and it gave me renewed respect for him.

But I am still boggled at his appearance on "Meet the Press" where, if I had had the time, I could have refuted every single solitary thing he said.

The Vietnamese have not given a full accounting of our missing-in-action. Last year the byword with those who are sympathetic to the Communist war

criminals in Hanoi, the byword was that they were giving us unprecedented cooperation. That simply was not so.

Last year and early this year the word was superb cooperation. My friend from the other body said it was substantial. It is not. He said that on "Meet the Press" yesterday.

And the Washington Post a week ago today ran an editorial so that a congressional delegation of all liberals without a single Republican Member or staffer on this minority trip, at taxpayer expense with one of the luxurious airplanes out of the 89th Squadron at Andrews; it has become a disgrace, Air Force officers carrying the bags of people who avoided service and the cost when there are commercial flights available to go to even Hanoi, and we will have legislation on that this year, I can promise the taxpayers that, this delegation in Hanoi, one of the Senators holds up last Monday's Washington Post with a kind of a coordinated editorial, and it said, how is this for reaching for words, "prodigious diligence, prodigious diligence, in moving toward an accounting of our missing-in-action."

What an absolute distortion of the truth.

Now, I have before me a letter that our Speaker, Mr. GINGRICH, is presenting to the Commander in Chief as we speak, Mr. Speaker. They are having dinner tonight, NEWT GINGRICH and William Jefferson Blythe Clinton, and NEWT is going to tell him it is going to be a rough road in this Congress, in this House, and in the U.S. Senate, to try and find the money under our foreign affairs bills to fund any normalization or set up an embassy in Hanoi.

I think this House is going to overwhelmingly vote to kill any money under the appropriations bills process. We all know the language, Mr. Speaker, "No money under this bill shall be expended to do such and such." A negative amendment is always ruled in order, and I think the President is in for a big surprise. Mr. Clinton is in for a surprise, because the statistics that I gave on "Meet the Press" that my friend from the Senate said he did not buy are absolutely correct.

I said, first of all, the families who have suffered long over these years, they have suffered under an anti-Geneva Convention war crime where the communist victors in Hanoi have psychologically tortured the family members, the children who have grown from little toddlers and babies up into their late 20's, 30's, and some in their 40's, the teenagers, the parents who are now aging into their 70's and some into their 80's, many of them passing on to go to Heaven, the widows, some who have married and have never forgotten that first young hero of their early life, others who have never ever found a replacement for their heroic young knight of the sky or that handsome young special operations sergeant special forces, young enlisted man, young grunt, young marine up and down Viet-

nam fighting for freedom, fighting to contain communism, they have never found a match for that young hero of their early life. All of these people have been manipulated, because the communists in Hanoi have slowly, like an ugly time capsule, released boxes of our heroes' remains.

Now, I can remember in 1979 having before our International Relations Committee a mortician from Vietnam who passed multiple polygraph lie detector tests; I recommended he even take truth serum. He was willing to do that. I do not know if he did. He was of Chinese heritage because Vietnam, after the war, in a vicious human rights crusade of violence, threw out all of the Vietnamese of Chinese heritage, and that is why he, as a top doctor, a mortician, was thrown out of the country, but he had prepared for storage in a big warehouse near Hanoi over 400 sets of American remains.

This has been admitted to me by the highest people in the Reagan administration and by President Reagan himself, who believed this, that they had 400 boxes of our heroes' remains. President Bush believed this. I discussed it at length with him. I have discussed it with three directors of the CIA. They all believed it. Defense Intelligence, back to the late Eugene Tye, my good friend from Loyola University, he also believed it. I have never met anybody in the entire intelligence community, and I am on my seventh year in the Intelligence Select Committee, I have never met anybody who did not believe this mortician's story.

□ 2155

And at the central investigative laboratory at Hickam Air Force Base in Hawaii, which I have visited about eight times over the years, they said, Yes, we have gotten back selectively over the last 10 years, about 160 remains that we can tell were warehoused, even if they were dug up out of the ground a year or two after a crash, they were still processed.

Some of these were people who obviously died in captivity. The light color of the bones and their condition and the chemical substances on the bones, we know they were prepared for storage. And 160 from over 400 brings us roughly a number of over 260.

I said at a press conference on the grassy triangle in front of this Capitol that it is an act of treachery to normalize relations without demanding the 260 remaining boxes of remains. I predicted that they will be thrown into the Red River and flushed out into the Tonkin Gulf, or worse, thrown in a pit all of these heroes' bones, knights of the sky, these young aviators, these special forces officers and sergeants. Their bones will be thrown in a mass grave, covered with lime, lye, and they will be forgotten, except to God, in that mass atrocity grave.

If are there any Americans still alive, particularly in Laos, which I have visited four times. I have been to Vietnam

10 times and Cambodia three times. I have worked this issue for 30 years and 1 month since my best friend, David Herdlicher, was shot down, May 18, 1965.

And I still wear his bracelet and this No. 1 Hmoung bracelet, H-m-o-u-n-g, the French word was Montagnard, mountain people. Since I put that on in Kontum in the central highlands in September 1968, it has never been off my wrist since. I alternate POW bracelets. No, this is not David Herdlicher's; this is a young sergeant from Hope, AR. I wear that symbolically sometimes, James Holt, missing in South Vietnam, September, excuse me, February 7, 1968, the beginning of the Tet offensive.

The first week of the Tet offensive, that week, we lost 1,111 Americans killed in action. That was the month that Robert Strange McNamara quit on leap year day, so he would only have to remember it every 4 years; resigned 29, February 1968.

It rained all over this big ceremony on the lawn in front of the river entrance to the Pentagon. They canceled the fly-by. How fitting that God saved four Air Force pilots the ignominy of flying by, probably all of them Vietnam vets, in tribute to a man who had betrayed the fighting men on the field.

Well, here is McNamara's book, Mr. Speaker. That is how I spent part of my district work period; working my way through this tragic book of evil revelations on how McNamara never even believed in the cause in 1962 or 1963, when there were less than 50 Americans killed in action. Not 58,000; less than 50. He did not believe in what we were doing there.

And McNamara tells in this book what he did after that fly-by was canceled and it rained all over this retirement ceremony. Where LBJ rewarded him with 13 years as head of the World Bank, where he made \$250,000 a year without ever paying a nickel of taxes on it. That is what a lot of U.N. jobs, and the job at World Bank, pays.

McNamara in his book says the next day, on March 1, he left for a month of skiing at Aspen. We had hundreds of people in prison in Hanoi. Twelve of them had been beaten to death inside their prison cells. One man, Maj. Earl Cobeal, beaten senseless and incoherent. Never got his sanity back and died alone in some cell without any other American there to hold him and nurture him as he died. We have gotten back his remains. While he was being tortured by three Cubans imported by the good graces of Castro to teach the Vietnamese how to torture with more severity the way Castro was cutting up people and letting them rot, stark naked, in black cells without a shred of light for up to 25 years.

He was showing the South Vietnamese that they had forgotten in the Orient what the "death of a thousand knives" was like, I guess. And McNamara was skiing.

Imagine how many young men and women we had in hospitals from one

end of Vietnam to another, after the horror of that Tet offensive named after a religious holiday that they decided to attack on, imagine how many triple amputees, quadruple amputees. I visited one quadruple amputee at a hospital in September of that year and I talked to some of the nurses that said these are the cases that would just tear your heart out. How many people had given their arms and legs during that Tet offensive?

I remember going in the big refrigerated morgue at Bien Hoa in that year, 1968. And I said to this young corporal, first asking him how he could work in a place like this, and he said, "Mr. Reporter, I spent six months in the bush shooting at Charlie and getting shot at. And when they offered me a chance at the midpoint to work in this morgue, I took it because I know I am going home. And I cry a lot in here looking at all these men, many younger than I, who are on the way back to the United States in green body bags."

And I said, "What is in that huge bag over there?" He said, "That, sir, that bag is all the arms and legs cut off our men in the hospitals around here and we treat it with respect. We are going to take it out in a helicopter and bury their arms and legs at sea soon."

I will never forget that story. Tears were running down my face in this cool, refrigerated little corner of Bien Hoa Air Base in an extremely hot summer day in 1986. Thinking about this particular corner of the world's struggle against communism. Again, to quote Kennedy, a "twilight struggle" It was not so much twilight in Korea and Vietnam.

And I would like to read a line, Mr. Speaker, from McNamara's book. It used an expression that I used on this House floor on the day after the State of the Union speech. And I said I would revisit this again and again and that if I ever got a ruling from the Chair again that aid and comfort to the enemy was not a legitimate historical expression for debate on this floor, that I would appeal the ruling of the Chair. And if my party voted against me and did not sustain me, I would resign from Congress on the spot.

It is not tonight. That day is coming earlier in the day. And I will find the right moment. I will know it. I will smell it when it comes. And I will do it in the well with plenty of Democrats and I will give Mr. FAZIO and Mr. VOLKMER, and a lot of my other colleagues, a big chance to take down my words again.

But those words, "aid and comfort to the enemy," have popped up twice just in the last couple of weeks. Mr. Clinton used the words against people who want to vote out the assault weapon ban. He said that is giving aid and comfort to the criminals in the street, the enemy in the streets, to vote against the assault ban. So Mr. Clinton has aid and comfort to the enemy in his head. He knows what that expression means.

Here is what McNamara writes on page 105 of his book. Fitting number of the page, since we lost more F-105s than any other airplane in the Vietnam conflict.

By the way, to set the scene, let me take out my little U.S. Constitution and read where this line comes from. Article III, section 3 of the U.S. Constitution, and why treason is not applicable without a declaration of war to using this term.

Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them. Remember, until the Civil War, we always referred to ourselves as individual States. The Civil War brought us together into one unit as a country.

In levying war against the individual States, or in adhering to their enemies, and our Founders and Framers of the Constitution capitalized Enemies. Giving them Aid, capital A, and Comfort, capital C. Giving them Aid and Comfort.

No person shall be convicted of treason, unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or on confession in open court.

Now, that is where that term, aid and comfort to the enemy, comes from. That is where Clinton, although he did not realize it, got it when he referred to people who strictly interpret the second amendment as giving aid and comfort to the enemies in the streets, the criminals.

Here is Mr. McNamara in this profoundly evil, self-aggrandizing, nonatoning book; over 58,700 dead Americans, 8 of them women. McNamara says, "Upon my return to Washington, DC, on December 21st," and he is talking now about 1963, just a month after, one day less than a month after Kennedy's horrible assassination. He talks about secret missions up to the North.

And this is courageous South Vietnamese who were captured, tortured to death, because it was poorly organized and planned. It was endorsed by what we call the 303 Committee under Ambassador Lodge, an interagency group charged with reviewing such top secret plans, following recommendations from Secretary of State; from McCone, head of the CIA; from George McBundy, National Security Advisor; and me, Robert McNamara, the President approved a 4-month trial program beginning on February 3, 1964, so it hadn't started yet. Its goal was to convince the North Vietnamese that it was in their self-interest to desist from aggression in South Vietnam.

Looking back, it was an absurdly ambitious objective. For such a trifling effort, it accomplished virtually nothing.

McNamara probably went skiing or mountain climbing that winter and here were young Vietnamese that we trained, sent north, bailed out of our secret, unmarked airplanes into North Vietnam, most of them compromised and captured and viciously tortured to death, and we wrote them off like they

were just expendable pawns at the beginning of this conflict.

But here he is, before these men have bailed out to their certain death, none of them ever came back as prisoners, these Vietnamese. "Upon my return to Washington, DC on December 21st, 1963, I was less than candid when I reported to the press. Perhaps a senior government official," McNamara goes on, "could hardly have been more straightforward in the midst of a war."

Here he is calling it, in 1963, a month after Kennedy is dead, a war. A full-blown war. And his heart is not in it, but it took him 5 more years to resign. Incredible. Four and a half.

I could not fail to recognize the effect discouraging remarks might have on those we strove to support the South Vietnamese. He does not give them the time of the day all through this book, our allies. Some corrupt; most very brave dying for their country. As well as those we sought to overcome. The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese.

Now, get this Mr. Speaker. Bob McNamara: "It is a profound, enduring and universal ethical and moral dilemma: How, in times of war and crisis, can senior government officials be completely frank to their own people without giving aid and comfort to the enemy?"

So, Robert McNamara, in December of 1963, one month and 21 days after the tragic assassination of President Ziem and his brother, after they were sprayed with machine guns in the back of an American-supplied armored personal carrier, an M-13. A tragic, a beheading of a Nation under Communist assault from the north, he considers it a full war and talks about giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

Well, if he did not want to give aid and comfort to the enemy, what about the demonstrators that he put up on the floor of his house, friends of his son, Craig, who never wore the uniform of his country. And he tries to weasel around that in here. This is McNamara who said, "We must not draft our college kids, because they are tomorrow."

Well, what about the college graduates from West Point, Annapolis, Air Force Academy, Texas A&M, North Georgia, Citadel, VMI? Or all of the ROTC units like mine at Loyola U. all around the country? What about those college graduates? What about the young farm kids who were going back to the family farm, but first were subject to a draft?

What about the 100,000 young black men who had been denied a good education in all of the poor schools and ghetto areas around this country, where we lowered the school standard and the tests you had to pass to bring them in? What were they? Cannon fodder?

□ 2130

What about all the Hispanic-American families, particularly in California, which had such a family tradition for generations of joining the Marine

Corps? You know, all of our services used to reflect our religious background in our country. But the Marine Corps is about 33 percent Catholic, compared with a 24-percent population, because West Coast Hispanic families, generally Catholic, like the Marine Corps. What about all of them? Were they just cannon fodder? What about the honor graduates from West Point, the Naval Academy, and the Air Force Academy, who got a Rhodes Scholarship and went to what the skipper of the *Kitty Hawk* told me was the worst hate-America environment he had ever been in his life for 2 years, and he overlapped Clinton by a year at Oxford, except he went to class and graduated, while Clinton was ditching class, never went the second year at all, and did not graduate, 1 of only 6 in his class of 32 who did not graduate. What about all those people?

Like the recent commander, that just made three stars, of the 1st Cavalry Division down at Fort Hood who graduated before Clinton got there, he was back in June of 1968 at Leavenworth, and then went to Vietnam and won two silver stars. Were they the best and the brightest, all of the aforementioned?

What about all the Americans that went they got drafted said well, Uncle Sam wants me, it is an undeclared war, but my dad, my uncle, my older brother fought in Korea, and that was not a war, but a police action, according to President Truman, that was undeclared. But here is McNamara calling it a war. Aid and comfort to the enemy in time of war.

Well, I have before me a letter, Mr. Speaker, from some of the greatest Americans that this country has ever had serve in uniform, our POW's in Hanoi. This is a group of leaders, the ones that were tortured the most, the ones that were tortured far more than others who have gone a different direction from them.

This comes from the American Defense Institute, which is founded by Eugene Red McDaniel, acknowledged by all the POW's, I reread some of his periods of torture in here, and it is absolutely incredible that he survived, the tearing apart of his body, the infections, hardly a square inch of his body was not ripped. Red McDaniel founded this American Defense Institute, and here is a press release they put out with the names of 60 U.S. POW heroes on it.

"Former U.S. POWs oppose normalization with Vietnam, Alexandria, Virginia. In a letter sent to President Clinton today, the 10th of July, 60 former U.S. POWs, including Congressman SAM JOHNSON, Republican, Texas," SAM had hoped to be with me today, but he had a former engagement tonight. "Lieutenant General John Peter Flynn, U.S. Air Force, retired." He was the highest ranking POW at the time he was shot down, senior U.S. colonel in the Air Force, and he rose to the highest ranks of any of the return

POW's. Brig. Gen. Robinson Risner, one of my squadron commanders at George Air Force Base, shot down eight MiG's in Korea. When they got their hands on Robbie Risner, believe me, the torture he suffered was the torture of the damned. In his book, "The Darkness of The Night," I do not think that is the exact title, but it is close, his story of torture is, again, just medieval, and Capt. Red McDaniel. Red was the communications officer for the escape of Larry Atterbury and John Dromisi. Dromisi was beaten for 38 days. He could not move for 3 months, had to be fed by hand. And Larry Atterbury, 6 foot 3, his size gave them away in their overnight escape, when the sun came up and they were trapped on the bank of the Red River. He was stripped naked, four Vietnamese soldiers stood on the arms and legs, all of this with the approval of the politboru that we are going to recognize tomorrow at a White House Rose Garden cemetery, and they beat him until there was no flesh on his body, from his hair to the soles of his feet. He died after 8 days of constant scourging with long fan belt whips. They actually were fan belts.

These officers, and 57 others from the Vietnam War, expressed their opposition to establishing diplomatic relations with Vietnam. "Until you as commander-in-chief, Mr. Clinton, tell us Hanoi is being fully forthcoming in accounting for our missing comrades." The letter was sent by Captain McDaniel, President of the American Defense Institute on behalf of the former U.S. POW's from Vietnam, concerned with recent reports that a White House announcement of the move is imminent. They invited my colleague, SONNY MONTGOMERY, two star reserve general, combatant from World War II and the 12th Armored Division. He just told me that he would not go to such a ceremony, an honorable man, SONNY MONTGOMERY.

"While we appreciate Vietnam's support for U.S. crash site recovery," no big deal, in letting us spend millions of dollars going out to crash sites that are 30 years old, "And archival research efforts," pathetic, pathetic, entry level archival searches, the former POW stated, "We know firsthand Vietnam's ability to withhold critical information while giving the appearance of cooperation."

Elsewhere in the letter the former POW's contend that Hanoi could do so much more to resolve many of the unresolved POW-MIA cases. I refer anybody watching on C-SPAN, Mr. Speaker, to the aforementioned 260-plus boxes of heroes' bones warehoused somewhere in the suburbs of Hanoi.

"Some of our fellow servicemen went missing during the same incidents which we survived." Two-seat F-4 Phantoms side-by-side, A-6 Intruders. "Some were captured and never heard from again. Some were known to have been held in captivity for several years and their ultimate fate has still not been satisfactorily resolved. Still oth-

ers were known to have died in captivity," 97 of them, Mr. Speaker, and we still have yet to get an accounting on, what did Senator KERREY say on "Meet the Press" yesterday? He corrected me from 97 down to 89 I believe. A fine point. "Yet their remains have not been repatriated to the United States."

The former POW's expressed their concerns that many of the "reports from U.S. and Russian intelligence sources maintain several hundred unidentified American POWs were held separately from us during the war in both Laos and Vietnam and were not released by Hanoi during Operation Homecoming in 1973." Several hundred. I have never held out hope for more than 40, Mr. Speaker. But what do I know compared to these POW's? And called on Clinton to "Send a clear message to Hanoi that America expects full cooperation and disclosure on American POWs and MIAs before agreeing to establish diplomatic and special trading privileges with Vietnam."

Since February 2, 1994, Mr. Speaker, when we relaxed all the trade sanctions, we have gotten back exactly eight remains of Americans, and it cost us thousands of dollars to identify them, because the remains were mixed in with animal bones and several hundred Asian sets of remains. Just no care at all, sending us boxes of this, as though they were cooperating, when they have got this warehouse. Unbelievable. Eight.

We averaged 21 a month under Reagan's 8 years, 24 remains a month under George Bush's 4 years, and now we are down to 8 since February 2 a year ago under Clinton? And that is called prodigious diligence by the Post? Substantial by Senators KERREY and MCCAIN? And what did I say was the word last year, unprecedented, superb this year? Horrible.

That was the press release. Here is the letter.

It says, in closing, the press release brought out the biggest parts of the letter, and I will insert the whole letter into the RECORD, an open letter to President Clinton.

The last paragraphs say, "America deserves straightforward answers if Vietnam really wants normalized diplomatic and economic relations. If Vietnam truly has nothing to hide on the POW-MIA issue, then why have they not released their wartime politburo and prison records on American POWs and MIAs? Why have they not fully disclosed other military records on the POWs and MIAs?"

We have had senators go over there, I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, and not ask these direct questions. The politburo records are a key, as are the prison records. Now, they kept accurate records like the gestapo in World War II. And yet we have Members, elected to the U.S. Congress, that make excuses for them. "Oh, with the humidity over there, the records have all, you

know, mildewed and they have been lost and they have been shuffled around."

We did not believe that when we brought German war criminals to trial and to execution. They were obsessive about keeping records. I have just seen declassified top secret records from 1968, the same year that McNamara is in the Caribbean vacationing and skiing at Aspen while these men are being tortured to death in Hanoi and beaten. That very year I saw a reference that we picked up through NSA listening, where they referred to our prisoners as "golden rubies." I remember having a priest who was captured, a Vietnamese Catholic priest, tell me after he had escaped from the Ho Chi Minh Trail, being taken north, one of a handful that were lucky enough to escape, he said they kept referring to prisoners as "pearls," as a string of pearls. That they watched our men when they would come down in a parachute, try to shoot it out and kill two or three villagers, and then take the man captive and not even beat him, just shoot the villagers off. There would be two or three dead people there.

Ted Guy told me the other day how he killed two farmers coming at him with machetes and he was captured. He went through several beatings later and 4 years of solitary. But the soldiers were under orders, these pilots are worth their weight in gold. The survivors from the dozens that died in the slimy camps in the south, "march them north" they said in 1967 and 1968, because the POW's have taken on an absolutely supreme monetary value.

That is why they still talk about Nixon's disgraceful offer of \$3.25 billion to get them to sign on the dotted line after the Paris peace accords and the 18 days of December B-52 raids, only to write off every prisoner in Laos. Remember, Mr. Speaker, 499 Americans missing in Laos, and not a single one ever came home.

The last two paragraphs of the POW letter is, "We would only be compounding a national tragedy if we normalized relations with Hanoi before you as commander-in-chief can tell us Hanoi is being fully forthcoming in accounting for our missing comrades."

Compounding a national tragedy. If there are a million Americans, or more than that, watching tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want them to hear those words ringing in their heads tomorrow around noon eastern time, if we reward the war criminals and the war criminal JOP in Hanoi with the final insult, betraying 1.5 million Vietnamese casualties, half a million or more, 700,000 United States wounded, and those 58,747, roughly, names on the Vietnam Wall.

"Perhaps more than any other group of Americans, we desire to put the war behind us, but it must be done in an honorable way." And that sentence is underlined. It must be done in an honorable way.

"We, therefore, ask you to send a clear message to Hanoi that America expects full cooperation and disclosure on American prisoners and missing in action before agreeing to establish diplomatic and special trading relations with Vietnam."

Sincerely, John Peter Flynn, Lieutenant General, Air Force, retired. Robbie Risner, I repeat, my squadron commander at my last base of assignment, Brigadier General. Our own courageous Gary Cooper here from Dallas, SAM JOHNSON, Member of Congress. Eugene Red McDaniel, John A. Alpers, Baugh, Speed, Baldock, Beeler, Boyer, Black, Brown, Carey, Burns, DiBernado, Lieutenant Colonel, Marine Corps, horribly tortured. Franke, Goodermote, Jensen. James Hickerson, Navy, married my good friend Carol Hansen, who lost her handsome young Marine Steve Hansen.

□ 2145

I took their little son, now Jim Hickerson's stepson, Todd, up in the Goodyear blimp to use it as an excuse to talk about the POW's on my television show in 1970. That is 25 years ago. Todd is now 30, flying F-18's in the U.S. Navy. Graduate from Annapolis. James Young, Charlie Plumb, who gives inspirational speeches all over this country, Captain Plumb, U.S. Navy. Larry Friese, Julius Jayroe, Bruce Seeber, Konrad Trautman, most of them in this book. Larry Barbay. I will give the reporters all these names, Mr. Speaker. Ron Bliss, Arthur Burer, James O. Hivner, Gordon Larson, Swede Larson, who told the press at a press conference at an air base in South Vietnam, why do you fly, colonel, they said? He said, I fly to stop the supply of arms and materiel, bayonets coming down the Ho Chi Minh Trail so that these young drafted 18- and 19-year-olds will not face this brutal Communist attempt at conquest of Vietnam. I fly to stop those materiel supplies from killing our young men down in South Vietnam. He was shot down that afternoon. Swede Larson, name carved in a wall, snuck out of the camps, turned up a prisoner years later. His family never gave up hope praying for Swede. Robert Lewis, master sergeant, U.S. Army, another heroic POW; Jim Lamar, colonel. At one time the four colonels were isolated from everybody else. He was one of the first of the four Air Force colonels, Armand Myers, Terry Uyeyama, colonel, U.S. Air Force. I think he is from Hawaii. Richard Vogel. Ted Guy who testified before my committee last week, horrible beatings, 4 years in solitary confinement, just like Congressman JOHNSON. Paul Galanti hit the cover of Life Magazine, sign behind him, clean and neat, all that orchestrated stuff. Laird Gutteresen, another Air Force colonel, one of the heroes, I worked closely with his wife, as I did with SAM JOHNSON's wife. Larry Stark, civilian, captured during the Tet offensive, captured while McNamara was skiing in

Aspen. So was Michael Bengel, walked up the Ho Chi Minh Trail all the way up to Hanoi. Marion Marshall, Richard Mullen, another great Irishman suffered severe torture. Phil Smith, William Stark, Captain Stark, another great Navy guy. David Allwine, Bob Barrett, Jack Bomar, another one of the Air Force colonels, Larry Chesley. SAM JOHNSON just pointed out to me tonight, Larry Chesley was his backseater in his F-4. Chelsey was the first one to get a book out after they came back, 7 years in Hanoi. Being a very junior officer, he was not tortured like SAM, badly, slapped around but nothing severe. And the Mormon church, I remember, helped him publish his book quickly. Came out in the summer of 1973, 2 years before Saigon fell. That was the first of 19 books like this that I have read cover to cover.

I am just now rereading SAM JOHNSON's fabulous motivational and inspiring book. Robert Stirr, C.D. Rice, Bernard Talley, Paul Montague. Leo Thorsness, my friend, Medal of Honor winner. I walked precincts for him up in South Dakota when he had George McGovern on the ropes and then came the Watergate collapse, Nixon's resignation, less than 90 days before the election. And Leo got 47 percent; 4 years later he runs for the House, goes to bed a winner and wakes up, loses by less than 100 votes. I remember coming to our big conference over there. What a great Congressman he would be. Went on to become a State senator in Washington. Tremendous daughter that I worked with, tremendous wife, Gay Lee.

Robert Lerseth, Ray Vodhen. Ray Vodhen, one of our first men captured, F-8 crusader pilot, 8 years in captivity almost. Richard Tangeman. John Pitchford, another colonel, I worked with his wife, another Shirley, I believe, just like Shirley Johnson, SAM's wife. Steven Long, Brian Woods, Dale Osborne.

Steven Long, what a story. I met Steven Long the day he came back and first hit the United States. Then I saw him a couple years ago, to refresh my memory. He was shot down on the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Captured by Pathet Lao and then immediately turned over to the North Vietnamese.

They took him inside a cave in Laos that he said was so massively cavernous that they had three floors in the cave made with bamboo, solid bamboo flooring. And every now and then a person would come by with one of these little Dutchboy hats on that the Pathet Lao wore. And he would say, North Vietnamese? And they would say no, no, Pathet Lao, Pathet Lao. But there was very few of them. He said the cave was filled with North Vietnamese.

Troops moving south. He was moved within 24 hours on his way to the Hanoi prison system. The tragedy about—let us see what rank he retired as. The tragedy with—colonel, U.S. Air Force, so he had a full career.

The tragedy is that Nixon, through Kissinger and Ambassador Larry Eagleburger and current Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Winston Lord, whom I met with one of my sons in Beijing in 1988, as I was getting ready, at my expense, Mr. Speaker, to ride the Trans-Siberian Railroad, these three in Paris, in ascending importance, Winston Lord, Larry Eagleburger, and Kissinger made a tragic mistake. They demanded that Laos, which had a seat in the United Nations then, as did Cambodia, Vietnam did not, they demanded that Laos return all their prisoners.

And they told me to my face, in one of my four visits to Laos, that we have tens of tens of American prisoners, Scot Petroski said that in front of Carol Hanson, now Carol Hickerson, and three of the other wives who have never remarried. They could not find the second hero. He told the five of us, I have tens and tens, and tens of prisoners, over 100 prisoners, and we will return them when you negotiate directly with the Pathet Lao Communists here in Luang Prabong or down in Vien Chong in the Mekong. And, of course, Kissinger said, you will return all prisoners through Hanoi. That is what we negotiated with the people who have the hegemony over the whole area, the ones that Clinton wants to normalize with tomorrow.

The tragedy is that Kissinger kept bombing Laos after January 27, 1973. We bombed for 4 days. then all February. That was not a leap year, 28 days. then all March, all April, all 31 days of May, all June, all 31 days of July and almost up to the end of August. For 8 months we kept bombing Laos and telling them, but return your American prisoners through Hanoi. And Laos told us to go to hell. And do you know what, there is a certain logic to Laos saying, you stop bombing us and we will give your prisoners back. Kissinger won the Nobel Prize, Le Duc Tho refused it because he said, I am not through fighting yet, and he did not. Two years later, without ever receiving the \$100,000 or so from the Nobel Prize, up to \$300,000 now, he just kept fighting.

To Kissinger's credit, the money he took, because he did take that prize, he gave that money to the families who had missing in action heroes so that their children could use Kissinger's award money for college scholarships. An honorable thing that not many people know about. I want Kissinger to come before my chairmanship and my military personnel committee. I will not have to subpoena him. I want him and Larry Eagleburger and Winston Lord to explain to me how they wrote off Steven Long, colonel of the U.S. Air Force, retired, as a Laotian-held prisoner.

I remember standing in Brentwood, CA, not 100 yards from where Nicole Simpson and Ron Goldman were murdered, at a news rack in front of the Westward Ho market. I am standing

there looking at a headline that says, all prisoners were returned from Laos. Nixon wins, it said, all Laotian-held prisoners returned. Not Dave Hrdlicka, not Eugene DeBruin, not Charlie Skelton who was shot down on his 33d birthday, father of five, his oldest son now a Franciscan priest, already ordained 20 years or so.

I said not the four, the people from the plane shot down along the trail of late 1972. This is not what they are talking about. They are talking about people held inside the Hanoi prison system who were captured, like Long, on the Ho Chi Minh Trail, pulled into those caves and sent off to the Hanoi system, to Dogpatch, to the Plantation, to New Guy Village or to the dreaded hellhole of Wallow. They were held there, all 10 of them.

There was one exception, Ernie Brace, a CIA Air American crewman, captured, the rest of his crew was killed. He was taken to Dien Bien Phu, which is right on the border between Laos, just inside North Vietnam. He was held there for 3 weeks. Then taken to Hanoi. And the first person who tapped him up on the wall was young JOHN MCCAIN, now a U.S. Senator.

So except for 3 weeks with Ernie Brace, all of the 10 were held in the Hanoi prison system. Bottom line: Not a single American hero returned from Laos. And before somebody nitpicks, yes, there was Dieter Dengler, who had been an Eastern Airlines pilot up to its collapse and probably retired, maybe still flying. Dieter Dengler escaped with the young Air Force lieutenant, Dean something, watched Dean totally, cleanly beheaded right in front of him by a farmer with a machete and got up and ran until his body was slashed from all the vines and staggered into a small encampment in south Laos, an absolute wreck. That was an escape case.

And then the pilot of one of these 89th Squadron perk flights out of Andrews that took a Lester Wolff CODEL into Moscow. I am sitting with him in the Ukraina Hotel. He tells me how he was shot down in an old V-10 in Laos. His backseater, I can still remember the call sign Shoebox. They were being beaten in a small hootch by Pathet Lao Communists who could not speak English. They were screaming back at him, taking the Lord's name in vain, why are you yelling at us, what are you beating us for? We can—cannot speak English. And they take the master sergeant Shoebox outside. And all of a sudden they hear helicopters fly over. And he says, he hears Shoebox, a blood-curdling scream. And they untie him from this bamboo pole inside the hootch. He still had a pole through his arms. And they drag him outside, and he sees Shoebox stabbed in the lower abdomen and cut all the way up to his throat, his intestines coming out. He said his legs went to jelly under him. He collapsed on the ground.

They picked him up and dragged him along, his legs dragging in the ground.

Then all of a sudden the helicopter makes another low pass and they run off into the jungle and leave him there. He gets his footing back, stands up and runs into the jungle. The bamboo pole through his arms is hitting the trees and he thinks he is going to break his neck with a whiplash until finally the bamboo pole collapses and he puts it in front of him like wings and runs through the woods and comes into a clearing in the woods.

As he is telling me this in this filthy hotel in Moscow, built in the late 1940's, Gothic looking, ugly looking, one of the seven sisters, tears are running down his face, telling me how the helicopter comes down low over him and then climbs up over the tree line and he breaks down crying like a baby.

He says, all of a sudden four people pounce on him and he begins to fight. And he says it reminds me now in retrospect like one of these cartoons in the comics in the newspaper where you just see a ball of activity with arms and legs and fur coming out of it. And he said, all of a sudden he is punching these guys in the face. All of a sudden he is aware of a downdraft and they lift him up in the air and throw him on a helicopter and climb in after him, and they were friendly Laotian forces, an insert team that helped rescue this Air Force colonel, name forgotten to me, flying our 707 into Moscow.

He said the copilot, like in the movie, turns around and says, do you want a beer? And he said they took him back.

Never have seen this story reported anywhere, checked it out, found out it was true. That is one of the air escape cases from Laos. But he was never recorded a prisoner. There was one man shot down after January 1973 that Senator Cranston intervened on his behalf. We got him back sometime in 1974 or early 1975.

I know all the exception cases, so do not anybody write me who is watching on C-SPAN that I do not know what I am talking about. I am a bloody expert on this issue for 30 years. That is why I have every right to say, it is a treachery to normalize relations with the war criminals in Hanoi, to tell dictatorships all over the world that you do not ever have to have an election. There is no election planned in Vietnam and they have told us there never will be. Castro, for over three decades, has never had an election and never will have until God takes him out. He will have his cells filled with political prisoners.

□ 2200

China, what are they doing to American Harry Wu? They will not even let us meet with him, violating every diplomatic code. North Korea, in concert with Iran, trying to send them New Dawn missiles, the capability to strike not just Israel but to strike into Europe, into NATO countries, cover all of Turkey with missiles. It is unbelievable that we should rationalize we are playing China off against Vietnam. We tried to play Iraq against Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with this. Ask the 148 families of Americans who lost our men in the Gulf war, or the 99 British and French and allied people who lost men. Ask them if they think it was good to play the Iraq card against Iran. It is going to be a disgraceful day in our history tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a press release from the American Defense Institute and a copy of a letter to President Clinton:

THE AMERICAN DEFENSE INSTITUTE,
Alexandria, VA, July 10, 1995.

FORMER UNITED STATES POW'S OPPOSE NORMALIZATION WITH VIETNAM

ALEXANDRIA, VA.—In a letter sent to President Clinton today, 60 former U.S. POWs—including Congressman Sam Johnson, (R-TX); LtGen John Peter Flynn, USAF (Ret); BG Robinson Risner, USAF (Ret); and Captain Red McDaniel, USN(Ret)—from the Vietnam War expressed their opposition to establishing diplomatic relations with Vietnam "until you, as Commander in Chief, tell us Hanoi is being fully forthcoming in accounting for our missing comrades." The letter was sent by Captain McDaniel, President of the American Defense Institute, on behalf of former U.S. POWs from Vietnam concerned with recent reports that a White House announcement of the move is imminent.

"While we appreciate Vietnam's support for U.S. crash site recovery and archival research efforts," the former POWs stated, "we know first-hand Vietnam's ability to withhold critical information while giving the appearance of cooperation."

Elsewhere in the letter, the former POWs contend that Hanoi "could do much more" to resolve many of the unresolved POW/MIA cases.

"Some of our fellow servicemen became missing during the same incidents which we survived. . . Some were captured and never heard from again. . . Still others were known to have died in captivity, yet their remains have not been repatriated to the United States."

The former POWs expressed their concern that many of the "reports from U.S. and Russian intelligence sources that maintain several hundred unidentified American POWs were held separately from us during the war, in both Laos and Vietnam, and were not released by Hanoi during Operation Homecoming in 1973. . . have yet to be fully investigated" and called on the President to "send a clear message to Hanoi that America expects full cooperation and disclosure on American POWs and MIAs before agreeing to establish diplomatic and special trading privileges with Vietnam."

Attached is a copy of the letter and the list of the former POWs.

JULY 10, 1995.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT CLINTON
FROM FORMER U.S. POW'S

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As former U.S. Prisoners of war during the Vietnam Conflict, we are writing to request not to establish normal diplomatic relations with Vietnam until you can certify that there has been full disclosure and cooperation by Hanoi on the POW/MIA issue. While we appreciate Vietnam's support for U.S. crash site recovery and archival research efforts, we know first-hand Vietnam's ability to withhold critical information while giving the appearance of cooperation. We were all subjected to such propaganda activity during the war, and we would be the least surprised if Hanoi was

continuing to use similar tactics in its dealings with the United States.

Of particular concern to us are the several hundred POW/MIA cases involving our fellow servicemen who were captured or lost in enemy-controlled areas during the war, yet they still have not been accounted for by Vietnam. We understand that much of the fragmentary information provided by Vietnamese officials to date indicates they could do more to resolve these cases.

Some of our fellow servicemen became missing during the same incidents which we survived. They have not been accounted for. Some were captured and never heard from again. They have not been accounted for. Some were known to have been held in captivity for several years and their ultimate fate has still not been satisfactorily resolved. They have not been accounted for. Still others were known to have died in captivity, yet their remains have not been repatriated to the United States. They have not been accounted for.

Finally, we remain deeply concerned with reports from U.S. and Russian intelligence sources that maintain several hundred unidentified American POWs were held separately from us during war, in both Laos and Vietnam, and were not released by Hanoi during Operation Homecoming in 1973. Many of these reports have yet to be fully investigated.

America deserves straightforward answers if Vietnam really wants normalized diplomatic and economic relations. If Vietnam truly has nothing to hide on the POW/MIA issue, then why have they not released their wartime politburo and prison records on American POWs and MIAs? Why have they not fully disclosed other military records on POWs and MIAs?

We would only be compounding a national tragedy if we normalized relations with Hanoi before you, as Commander in Chief, can tell us Hanoi is being fully forthcoming in accounting for our missing comrades.

Perhaps more than any other group of Americans, we want to put the war behind us. But it must be done in an honorable way. We, therefore, ask you send a clear message to Hanoi that America expects full cooperation and disclosure on American POWs and MIAs before agreeing to establish diplomatic and special trading privileges with Vietnam.

Sincerely,

John Peter Flynn, Lt Gen, USAF(ret); Robinson Risner, Brig Gen, USAF(ret); Sam Johnson, Member of Congress; Eugene "Red" McDaniel, CAPT, USN(ret); John A. Alpers, Lt Col, USAF(ret); William J. Baugh, Col, USAF(ret); Adkins, C. Speed, MAJ, USA(ret); F.C. Baldock, CDR, USN(ret); Carroll Beeler, CAPT, USN(ret); Terry L. Boyer, Lt Col, USAF(ret); Cole Black, CAPT USN(ret); Paul G. Brown, LtCol, USMC(ret); David J. Carey, CAPT, USN(ret); John D. Burns, CAPT, USN(ret); James V. DiBernado, LtCol, USMC(ret); F.A.W. Franke, CAPT, USN(ret); Wayne Goodermote, CAPT, USN(ret); Jay R. Jensen, Lt Col, USAF(ret); James M. Hickerson, CAPT, USN(ret); James F. Young, Col, USAF(ret); J. Charles Plumb, CAPT USN(ret); Larry Friese, CDR, USN(ret); Julius Jayroe, Col, USAF(ret); Bruce Seeber, Col, USAF(ret); Konrad Trautman, Col, USAF(ret); Lawrence Barbay, Lt Col, USAF(ret); Ron Bliss, Capt, USAF(ret); Arthur Rurer, Col, USAF(ret); James O. Hivner, Col, USAF(ret); Gordon A. Larson, Col, USAF(ret); Robert Lewis, MSgt, USA(ret); James L. Lamar, Col, USAF(ret); Armand J. Myers, Col, USAF(ret); Terry Uyeyama, Col,

USAF(ret); Richard D. Vogel, Col, USAF(ret); Ted Guy, Col, USAF(ret); Paul E. Galanti, CDR, USN(ret); Laird Guttersen, Col, USAF(ret); Lawrence J. Stark, Civ; Michael D. Bengel, Civ; Mar-ion A. Marshall, Lt Col, USAF(ret); Richard D. Mullen, CAPT, USN(ret); Philip E. Smith, Lt Col, USAF(ret); William Stark, CAPT, USN(ret); David F. Allwine, MSgt, USA(ret); Bob Barrett, Col, USAF(ret); Jack W. Bomar, Col, USAF(ret); Larry J. Chesley, Lt Col, USAF(ret); C.D. Rice, CDR, USN(ret); Robert L. Stirm, Col, USAF(ret); Bernard Talley, Col, USAF(ret); Paul Montague, Civ; Leo Thorsness, Col, USAF(ret); Robert Lerseth, CAPT, USN(ret); Ray A. Vodhen, CAPT, USN(ret); Richard G. Tangeman, CAPT, USN(ret); John Pitchford, Col, USAF(ret); Steven Long, Col, USAF(ret); Brian Woods, CAPT, USN(ret); Dale Osborne, CAPT, USN(ret).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRAHAM (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today until 7:30 p.m., on account of illness.

Mr. MFUME (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. TUCKER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official 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. KINGSTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROTH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUTHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, 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. KINGSTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHAYS.

Mr. BILBRAY.

Mr. MARTINI in two instances.

Mr. GILMAN in three instances.

Mr. LATHAM.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUTHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STUPAK.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. FARR.

Mr. TOWNS in three instances.
 Mr. TORRES.
 Mr. MILLER of California.
 Mr. JACOBS.
 Mr. HINCHEY in two instances.
 Mr. NEAL.
 Mr. MENENDEZ.
 Mr. YATES.
 Mr. UNDERWOOD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORNAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WAXMAN.
 Mr. DORNAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 11, 1995, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1151. A letter from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs and Public Liaison), Department of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a Presidential memorandum: Certification regarding use of the exchange stabilization fund and Federal Reserve in relation to the economic crisis in Mexico, pursuant to Public Law 104-6, section 406(a) (109 Stat. 91); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1152. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on abnormal occurrences at licensed nuclear facilities for the fourth quarter of calendar year 1994, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5848; to the Committee on Commerce.

1153. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to Bahrain (Transmittal No. 27-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1154. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Thailand (Transmittal No. DTC-40-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

1155. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to New Zealand (Transmittal No. DTC-36-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1156. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 95-29: Determination to authorize the furnishing of emergency military assistance to the United Nations in support of the Rapid Reaction Force in Bosnia under section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(a)(1); to the Committee on International Relations.

1157. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the list of all reports issued or released

in May 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1158. A letter from the Deputy and Acting CEO, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the corporation's annual management report for the year ended December 31, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 306(a) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1159. A letter from the The Librarian of Congress, transmitting the report of the activities of the Library of Congress, including the Copyright Office, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 139; to the Committee on House Oversight.

1160. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the report of the proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held in Washington DC, on March 14, 1995, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1161. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the third report on the impact of increased aeronautical and nautical chart prices, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1307(a)(2)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1162. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an updated report concerning the emigration laws and policies of Bulgaria, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(b) (H. Doc. No. 104-92); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1163. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to designate defense acquisition pilot programs in accordance with National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on National Security, Government Reform and Oversight, and Small Business.

1164. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Medicare and Medicaid Payment Integrity Act of 1995"; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Commerce, and the Budget.

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. CLINGER: Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. H.R. 1826. A bill to repeal the authorization of transitional appropriations for the U.S. Postal Service, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-174). 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. EMERSON:

H.R. 1997. A bill to provide flexibility to States in the administration of the Food Stamp Program, consolidation of the commodity distribution programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1998. A bill to provide for State credit union representation on the National Credit Union Administration Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. NORWOOD:

H.R. 1999. A bill to establish the Augusta Canal National Heritage Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. FALCOMA):

H.R. 2000. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for the establishment of a multiple-tier price support program for milk to assist milk producers to receive an adequate income from their dairy operations and to support long-term conservation practices by milk producers, while assuring sufficient low-cost dairy products for nutrition assistance programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H. Res. 183. Resolution electing Representative GREG LAUGHLIN of Texas to the Committee on Ways and Means; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. REYNOLDS):

H. Res. 184. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that committee reports accompanying reported bills and joint resolutions contain a detailed analysis of the impact of the bill or joint resolution on children; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

126. The SPEAKER: Presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Nevada, relative to custody requirements for prisoners that exceed constitutional requirements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (H.R. 2001) for the relief of Norton R. Girault; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 38: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GILCHRIST, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H.R. 218: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 248: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 263: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 371: Mr. COLEMAN.

H.R. 491: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 661: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 677: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 709: Mr. ENGEL and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 733: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 734: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 736: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 739: Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. BONO.

H.R. 789: Mrs. VUCANOVICH and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 833: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 835: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 863: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 868: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SHAYS, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 882: Mr. LUTHER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 940: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 941: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1006: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1021: Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 1066: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1083: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 1143: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. KING, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1144: Ms. RIVERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KING, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PAXON, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. FROST, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1145: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DOYLE and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1154: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. MARTINI.

H.R. 1169: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1204: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1314: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1356: Mr. OWENS, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1376: Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. HEINEMAN.

H.R. 1377: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1381: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 1444: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1533: Mr. DORNAN and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1559: Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. CAMP and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1560: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1568: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1594: Ms. PRYCE and Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 1610: Mr. HORN and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 1675: Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 1716: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1735: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRAZER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1744: Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 1758: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. COLEMAN.

H.R. 1765: Mr. STUMP, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. PACKARD, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Mrs. SEASTRAND.

H.R. 1863: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. VENTO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1872: Mr. BALDACCIO and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 1885: Mr. EWING and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 1891: Mr. BEILENSEN.

H.R. 1915: Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 1930: Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 1947: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 1984: Mr. HANCOCK.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. DAVIS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Con. Res. 54: Ms. HARMAN.

H. Con. Res. 76: Mr. TORRES, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 122: Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 142: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. BOUCHER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. MARKEY

AMENDMENT NO. 34: Page 29, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 505. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities", and increasing the amount made available for "Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund" and "Nuclear Regulatory Commission—Salaries and Expenses" (consisting of an increase of \$200,000,000 and \$11,000,000, respectively), by \$211,000,000.

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 35: Page 16, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(less \$20,000,000)".

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 36: Page 16, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(less \$53,923,000)".

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 37: Page 16, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(less \$255,698,000)".

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 38: Page 18, strike lines 8 through 20.

H.R. 1976

OFFERED BY: MR. BREWSTER

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE VIII—DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCKBOX

DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND; DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS

SEC. 801. (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.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Fund an amount equal to the allocations under section 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations with jurisdiction over this Act minus the aggregate level of new budget authority and outlays resulting from the enactment of this Act, as calculated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(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 reissued.

(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 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.

H.R. 1976

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 69, strike lines 17 and 18 and insert a period.

H.R. 1976

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 726. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out a market promotion program pursuant to section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623).

H.R. 1976

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 726. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out the annual programs established under the Agricultural Act of 1949 for wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, extra long staple cotton, rice, and other commodities when the total amount of payments under one or more of such programs exceed \$50,000 per producer.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. BREWSTER

AMENDMENT NO. 3: 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.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Fund an amount equal to the allocations under section 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations with jurisdiction over this Act minus the aggregate level of new budget authority and outlays resulting from the enactment of this Act, as calculated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(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 reissued.

(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 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.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. CREMEANS

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 94, after line 24, add the following:

Sec. 318. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for the purposes of acquiring land in the counties of Lawrence, Monroe, or Washington, Ohio, for the Wayne National Forest.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. FOX

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 56, line 3, strike "\$552,871,000" and insert "\$602,871,000".

Page 56, line 10, strike "\$133,946,000" and insert "\$183,946,000".

Page 56, line 17, strike "\$107,466,000" and insert "\$157,466,000".

Page 58, line 12, strike "\$79,766,000" and insert "\$29,766,000".

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 94, after line 24, insert the following:

Sec. 318. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to issue a domestic livestock grazing permit for the grazing season which commences on March 1, 1996, with respect to National Forest lands in the 16 contiguous Western States (except National Grasslands) administered by the Forest Service or to public domain lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that annual domestic livestock grazing fee required pursuant to such permit is for less than fair market value.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 94, after line 24, insert the following:

Sec. 318. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to enter into or renew a contract to provide public accommodations, facilities, or services within the National Park System when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such contract was entered into or renewed on a basis other than competitive bidding without preferences and that such contract does not include measures needed to ensure the protection and preservation of park resources.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 94, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 318. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to sell any part of the United States share of petroleum produced from the naval petroleum reserves when it is made known to the Federal disbursing official concerned that any such sale is at a price below the prevailing local market price of comparable petroleum.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. UNDERWOOD

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 34, line 24, strike "\$65,705,000" and insert "\$61,125,000".

Page 35, line 11, insert after "(2)"; the following: "(2) \$4,580,000 shall be available for impact aid for Guam under Public Law 99-239 (relating to the Compact of Free Association);".

Page 35, line 11, strike "(2)" and insert "(3)".

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. UNDERWOOD

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 34, line 24, insert after "\$65,705,000" the following: "(less \$4,580,000 for technical assistance)".

Page 35, line 11, insert after "(2)"; the following: "(2) \$4,580,000 shall be available for impact aid for Guam under Public Law 99-239 (relating to the Compact of Free Association);".

Page 35, line 11, strike "(2)" and insert "(3)".